CAUL Meeting Papers (2010/1)

25-26 March, 2010
Canberra

Group Meetings 10.00-5.00 24 March
   & 9.30-11.30 25 March
   & 2.00-4.00 26 March
CAUL Meeting 1.00-5.30 25 March
   & 9.00-1.00 26 March
CAUL Dinner 7 for 7.30pm 25 March

Venues:
Australian National University
University House, Great Hall & Menzies Library Meeting Rooms

CAUL Dinner @ The Lobby
CAUL Meeting 2010/1
25-26 March, 2010
with associated meeting on 24th, 25th and 26th March
University House, The Australian National University, Canberra

AGENDA

949. *Introduction & Welcome. Cathrine Harboe-Ree

950. *Attendance & Apologies. Expected to attend:

From CAUL: New CAUL members, acting CAUL members and delegates for CAUL members:
Sue Craig, USQ; Wendy Abbott, Bond U; Jim Graham, ACU; Margaret Jones, UWA; Stephen
Gillespie, RMIT (day 2 only); [Alice Ferguson, CSU];

From CONZUL: John Redmayne, Massey U; Larraine Shepherd, AUT University; Gail Pattie, U
Canterbury; Sue Roberts, VUW;

Guests: Dr Glenn Withers, CEO, Universities Australia; Clare McLaughlin, Manager,
eResearch, Research Infrastructure Branch, Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and
Research; Paul Sherlock, Director, Information Strategy and Technology Services, UniSA &
Deputy Chair, CAUDIT; Bruce Jennings, Director, Equity and Indigenous Programs, Equity
Performance and Indigenous Branch, Higher Education Group, DEEWR; Dr Andrew Treloar,
Director of Technology, Australian National Data Service;

Apologies: Linda Luther, UTas (no delegate); Liz Curach, UWS (no delegate); Alex Byrne,
UTS (apology for day 1); Alan Smith, USQ; Grace Saw, Bond U; Chris Sheargold, ACU;
Adriana de Groot, Lincoln U (no delegate); Craig Anderson, RMIT (apology for day 2); Shirley
Oakley, CSU;

951. *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.

952. Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting CAUL 2009/2. (Paper included)

953. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings 2009/6, 2010/1. (Papers (2) included)

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

STRATEGIC PLAN

955. Review of the Strategic Plan. Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Imogen Garner (Paper included)

Recommendation to CAUL: That the draft CAUL Strategic Plan 2010 - 2012 be accepted.

Support for Research

956. *DIISR (Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research). Clare
McLaughlin, Manager, eResearch, Research Infrastructure Branch, DIISR. Hot Topic

957. *CAUDIT support for research. Paul Sherlock, Director, Information Strategy and
Technology Services, UniSA & Deputy Chair, CAUDIT. Hot Topic

958. *ANDS Metadata Stores. Dr Andrew Treloar, Director of Technology, Australian National
Data Service. Hot Topic

959. *Institutional support for research - The University of Melbourne. Philip Kent Hot
Topic
960. Institutional Repositories.
   a) CAIRSS (CAUL Australian Institutional Repositories Support Service). Helen Livingston
   b) *Australasian Digital Theses (ADT) Program. Helen Livingston

961. *COSI (CAUL Open Scholarship Initiative). Maxine Brodie, Judy Stokker

962. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). Andrew Wells (Paper included)
   a) CEIRC plan 2010-2012. Andrew Wells (Paper included)
      Recommendation to CAUL: That CAUL endorse the CEIRC plan 2010-2012
   b) *CAUL-Industry Think Tank 2009. Andrew Wells, John Shipp (Paper included)
      Recommendation to CAUL: That CAUL note the Think Tank report.

Support for Learning & Teaching


964. *Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). The list of ALTC winners announced in July, 2009 included a number of library staff from Newcastle, ECU, UQ and UniSA, and UTS. Greg Anderson, Dan Archibald, Keith Webster and Helen Livingston. Hot Topic

965. Information Literacy Working Group. Ruth Quinn (Papers(2) included)
   Recommendations to CAUL:
   1. That the ILWG report be noted.
   2. That the results of the survey be disseminated to respondents and made available from the CAUL homepage.
   3. That CAUL give serious consideration to facilitating the establishment of a clearinghouse of learning materials that could be used in Information Literacy programs.
   4. That CAUL give serious consideration to convening a meeting of Information Literacy practitioners given inactivity in this area from ANZIIL.
   5. That CAUL accepts the proposal from Executive that ILWG be discontinued due to the operationalisation of the activity within our institutions.

966. University Library Australia. Shirley Oakley

Delivering Quality & Value

967. Best Practice Working Group. Helen Livingston
   a) Insync Surveys. Helen Livingston


969. *IRU Value and Impact Workshop. Ainslie Dewe Hot Topic

970. *CAUDIT Benchmarking. Paul Sherlock Hot Topic

971. *Statistics. The CAUL Statistics Focus Group has commenced a review of the CAUL statistics. Craig Anderson
972. **Staff Development.**
   a)  **Review of criteria for the CAUL Achievement Award.** John Shipp *(Paper included)*
   
   b)  **UNISON staff development fund.** John Shipp
   
   c)  **CAUL Library Staff Development Conference 2010.** Ainslie Dewe

---

**Advocacy & Influence**

973. **President’s Report.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree

974. **Copyright.** Derek Whitehead
   a)  *Copyright and licensing issues in transnational education.* Derek Whitehead *(Hot Topic)*
   
   b)  **Universities Australia & Copyright.** Heather Gordon

---

975. **Relationships with other Organisations.**
   a)  *Universities Australia.* Dr Glenn Withers, CEO of Universities Australia will address the meeting. *(Hot Topic)*
   
   b)  **CAUL regional and sectoral groups.** Regional and sectoral groups are encouraged to provide a brief report to CAUL on their achievements and activities.
   
   i)  **LATN (Libraries of the Australian Technology Network of Universities).** Alex Byrne *(Papers (2) included)*

   **Recommendation to CAUL:** That the LATN report be noted.

   c)  **CONZUL.** John Redmayne *(Paper included)*
   
   d)  **CAUDIT (Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology) and ACODE (Australasian Council on Open, Distance and eLearning).** Cathrine Harboe-Ree
   
   i)  **EDUCAUSE 2011.** Andrew Wells
   
   e)  **National Library of Australia.**
   
   i)  **Libraries Australia.** Anne Horn, Liz Burke. *(Paper included)*

   **Recommendation to CAUL:** That the Libraries Australia report be noted.

---

**CAUL Administration**

976. **Forthcoming Meetings**
   a)  **CAUL Meeting 2010/2.** QUT, Brisbane, September 16-17, 2010.
   
   b)  **CAUL Meeting 2011/1.**
   
   c)  **CAUL Meeting 2011/2.**

977. **CAUL Finances.** Imogen Garner *(Paper included)*

   **Recommendation to CAUL:** That CAUL notes the Treasurer’s Report.


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

979. **Other business.**
### CAUL Meeting Schedule

**Venue:** University House and Menzies Library @ ANU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day &amp; Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday @ Menzies Library @ ANU</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAUL Working Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am-2.30pm</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Executive</strong></td>
<td>Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Chair; Ainslie Dewe, Heather Gordon, Imogen Garner, John Shipp, Diane Costello, Andrew Wells for CEIRC item at 11.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm-4.00pm</td>
<td><strong>[ALIA House meeting]</strong></td>
<td>John Shipp, Andrew Wells, Craig Anderson, Graham Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm-5.00pm</td>
<td><strong>CAIRSS Steering Committee</strong></td>
<td>Helen Livingston, chair; Heather Gordon, Judy Stokker, Simon McMillan, Sten Christensen, Kate Watson, Sue Craig, Derek Whitehead, Diane Costello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday @ Menzies Library @ ANU</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAUL Working Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30am-11.30am</td>
<td><strong>Best Practice Working Group</strong></td>
<td>Helen Livingston, chair; Graham Black, Ruth Quinn, Dan Archibald, Heather Gordon, Liz Burke, Des Stewart, Derek Whitehead, Leeanne Pitman, Philip Kent, Barbara Paton, Jan Gordon, Greg Anderson, Margie Jantti, Ralph Kiel, Sue Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am-11.30am</td>
<td><strong>COSI</strong></td>
<td>Judy Stokker, Maxine Brodie, John Shipp, Alex Byrne, Ian McBain, Sandra Jeffries, Lorraine Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday @ University House @ ANU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon – 1.00pm</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm – 2.30pm</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Meeting – Business</strong>, to include the following plus any starred items not included as a <strong>Hot Topic</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAIRSS/ ADT.</strong></td>
<td>The future, or not, of the ADT and target date for the migration of all theses from VT-ETD servers to institutional repositories. Helen Livingston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSI.</strong></td>
<td>A briefing on the purpose and likely activities for the program. Maxine Brodie and Judy Stokker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright and licensing issues in transnational education. Derek Whitehead</td>
<td>15m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30pm – 3.00pm</td>
<td><strong>Afternoon tea</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistics.</strong> The CSFG held a meeting on February 12 to discuss its approach to the review of the CAUL statistics. [5 minutes, preferably 10, or (ideally) if it fit into the agenda, 30 minutes for directed small group discussions] Craig Anderson</td>
<td>30-40m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEIRC/ Think Tank.</strong> Follow up re pricing models [introductory session (20 - 30 minutes) then a break followed by small group discussions (30 minutes)and then a general session (15 - 20 minutes )to bring it all together] Andrew Wells, John Shipp</td>
<td>60-75m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00pm</td>
<td><strong>Meeting wrap-up – Cathrine Harboe-Ree</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm for 7.30pm</td>
<td><strong>CAUL dinner @ The Lobby</strong>, King George Terrace, Parkes (opposite the rose gardens of old Parliament House) <a href="http://www.thelobby.com.au/">http://www.thelobby.com.au/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00am to 1.00pm</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Meeting – Hot Topics</strong></td>
<td>Great Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00am - 9.45am</td>
<td><strong>Universities Australia.</strong> Glenn Withers to discuss Universities Australia’s directions and connections with libraries. Dr Glenn Withers, Chief Executive Officer, Universities Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9.45am - 10.30am    | **Teaching/ learning focus, student engagement, student experience.** Government policy and programs relating to student equity, student engagement, and the partnerships program. Bruce Jennings, Director, Equity and Indigenous Programs, Equity Performance and Indigenous Branch, Higher Education Group, DEEWR (20m)  
La Trobe is working on a design for learning, pretesting and post-testing and demonstrable changes in student behaviour. Ainslie Dewe  
ALTC Citations and Awards 2009 –  
University of South Australia, For sustained commitment to strategic and diverse information literacy programs that help students engage as learners with the information environment. Helen Livingston (5m)  
UQ on citations and referencing. Keith Webster (5m)  
UNewcastle’s is a module for architecture students with embedded academic integrity. Debbie Booth collaborated with an academic and the module will be gradually rolled out across the University with disciplinary modifications. Greg Anderson (5m)  
ECU’s award presented in 2009 was based on work actually started in 2007. Dan Archibald (5m) |                               | 75m DEEWR 20m ALTC 30-40m |
| 10.30am - 11.00am   | **Morning tea**                                                       |                               | 30m                |
| 11.00am - 12 noon   | **Measurement – benchmarking and the value of libraries.**          |                               | 60m                |
|                     | CAUDIT’s work on benchmarking Paul Sherlock, Director, Information Strategy and Technology Services, UniSA & Deputy Chair, CAUDIT (30m)  
Go8’s Outsell report. Vic Elliott (31m)  
IRU Value and Impact Workshop. Ainslie Dewe |                               |                    |
| 12 noon - 1.00pm    | **Research infrastructure and support.**                             |                               | 60m                |
|                     | DIISR programs, including ANDS. Clare McLaughlin, Manager, eResearch, Research Infrastructure Branch, Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research (20m)  
CAUDIT’s activities in this area. Paul Sherlock, Director, Information Strategy and Technology Services, UniSA & Deputy Chair, CAUDIT (20m)  
ANDS metadata stores. Dr Andrew Treloar, Director of Technology, Australian National Data Service (20m)  
Research support including data management at the University of Melbourne. Philip Kent (20m) |                               |                    |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th># pax &amp; Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm-2.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch - Meeting Closes</td>
<td>Great Hall (inside)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sectoral Meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm-</td>
<td><strong>IRU</strong></td>
<td>Menzies Library APAC Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ian McBain, chair;</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heather Gordon, Greg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson, Ainslie Dewe,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lyn Bosanquet, Liz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burke; Ruth Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm-</td>
<td><strong>Go8</strong></td>
<td>Menzies Library Meeting Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Wells, chair;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vic Elliott, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shipp, Keith Webster,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cathrine Harboe-Ree,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Choate, Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Philip Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm-5.00p</td>
<td><strong>LATN</strong></td>
<td>Airport meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Byrne, chair;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imogen Garner, Stephen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gillespie, Helen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livingston, Judy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stokker, Lorraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
918. *Introduction & Welcome. Andrew Wells welcomed members and delegates to the meeting, and invited selected members to introduce new members of CAUL to their first meeting as a CAUL member:
Imogen Garner introduced Liz Burke;
Ainslie Dewe introduced Ralph Kiel;
Philip Kent introduced Barbara Paton; and
John Shipp introduced Lyn Bosanquet.

919. *Attendance & Apologies.
From CAUL:
* Heather Pearsall, ACU
Vic Elliott, ANU
Grace Saw, Bond U
Graham Black, CQU
Ruth Quinn, CDU
Shirley Oakley, CSU
Imogen Garner, Curtin U
* Sue Owen, Deakin U
Dan Archibald, ECU
Ian McBain, Flinders U
% Lyn Bosanquet, Griffith U
Heather Gordon, JCU
Ainslie Dewe, La Trobe U, Deputy President
Maxine Brodie, Macquarie U
Catherine Harboe-Ree, Monash U
% Liz Burke, Murdoch U
Judy Stokker, QUT
Craig Anderson, RMIT U
Des Stewart, SCU
Derek Whitehead, Swinburne U
Ray Choate, U Adelaide
Anita Crotty, U Canberra
Philip Kent, U Melbourne
% Barbara Paton, UNE
Andrew Wells, UNSW, President
Jan Gordon, UNSW@ADFA
Greg Anderson, U Newcastle
Stephen McVey, UNDA
Keith Webster, UQ
Helen Livingston, UniSA
* Sue Craig, USQ
John Shipp, U Sydney
Linda Luther, U Tasmania
Alex Byrne, UTS
Sandra Jeffries, USC
* Margaret Jones, UWA
Liz Curach, UWS
Felicity McGregor, UoW
% Ralph Kiel, VU
In attendance:
Diane Costello, CAUL

From CONZUL:
John Redmayne, Massey U;
Gail Pattie, UCanterbury

Guests:
Professor Tom Cochrane, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Technology, Information and Learning Support, QUT;
Dr Hamish Coates, Principal Research Fellow, ACER

Apologies:
John Arfield, UWA;
Alan Smith, USQ;
& Leeanne Pitman, U Ballarat;
Anne Horn, Deakin U;
Chris Sheargold, ACU

& not represented
% first meeting as CAUL Member
# Acting Director
* Delegate of CAUL Member
920. *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.

921. *Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting CAUL 2009/1.* The minutes were circulated with the agenda. With the addition of Des Stewart to the attendance list, members accepted the minutes without further correction.

922. *Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings 2009/2, 2009/3, 2009/4.* The minutes of the previous meetings were circulated with the agenda. Alex Byrne inquired as to progress on plans for the disposition of UNISON’s funds being transferred to CAUL for staff development purposes. This was discussed under item 936 below.

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

924. *CAUL Elections.* Andrew Wells, as retiring President, warmly congratulated Cathrine Harboe-Ree, returning to the Executive as President, and John Shipp and Imogen Garner returning as members. He thanked Greg Anderson who is also retiring from the Executive, and advised members that Cathrine Harboe-Ree would take over the chairing of this meeting on the second day.

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

925. *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 a survey was released in August to academic staff at ANU, UQ and the University of Adelaide, and thus far the response rate has been very good. Researchers are being asked to assess value for money of the resources they are using. The vast majority, 91%, agree that value is good to excellent, but the underlying question is how much they would be prepared to pay. Data analysis will begin in October, with focus groups being conducted in the other four institutions to validate the outcomes of the survey sample. He thanked Ray Choate and Keith Webster for preparing their staff for the surveys and acknowledged CAUL’s contribution of $20,000.

926. *Review of the Strategic Plan.* CAUL strategic plan for 2010-2012. The Executive recommended restructuring the strategic plan to separate out the operational elements, and target the highest priority activities. It drafted a revised plan and identified areas for discussion. It suggested a separate section for Information Resources.

As in previous reviews of the plan, breakout groups were asked to work on specific sections of the plan, as well as to offer an overall view. Their recommendations are reported in Appendix I.

**Support for Research**

927. **Australian Research Council (ARC).**

a) **ERA (Excellence in Research Australia).** This is a standing item, but was not discussed.

928. **Research Infrastructure.**

a) **Institutional Repositories.**

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

Helen Livingston reported that CAIRSS was now six months into its two year life. USQ sub-contracted Swinburne to handle the copyright service and appointed Kate Watson as project manager. ANDS plans to appoint a staff member to liaise with and work across both ANDS and CAIRSS.
The CAIRSS team has made presentations at a number of events, held teleconferences of repository managers, arranged discussions around metadata schema, MACAR and the ADT with a view to preparing briefings for the Steering Committee, and is planning a series of software-specific group teleconferences e.g. for VITAL users and DSpace users, and a community day for repository managers in December.

Current issues concern the ERA, the transition of the ADT, funding post-2010, etc. CAIRSS has been invited to become a member of COAR, the Confederation of Open Access Repositories. (Action: HL)

Members were reminded that ASHER funding finishes at the end of 2009, and most will have planned for the transfer of repository costs into their operational budget. It was noted that the ASHER funding was primarily to support the ERA infrastructure, perhaps with the unintended consequence of reducing open access rather than the opposite.

The CAIRSS service will be reviewed during 2010, at which time CONZUL will be consulted about their future participation. (Action: CAIRSS SC)

Judy Stokker reported on the move of OAKList from the QUT Law Faculty to joint arrangement with QUT Library and CAIRSS providing ongoing support. She reminded members that it is a model database of publisher policies on open access, that was originally funded by the government's SII to complement Sherpa/ROMEO. It focuses on Australian publishers and essentially serves authors, but also allows publishers to benchmark their policies against other publishers. Since moving to the QUT Library, the OAKList interface has been simplified. It allows anyone to enter the data, which is then sent for peer review. The CAIRSS contribution is to facilitate the review process by inviting repository managers to review new records and providing feedback to the publishers. The database structure and terminology has now been aligned with Sherpa/ROMEO to allow future integration if necessary.

The presentation for this item is at http://www.caul.edu.au/cairss/cairss-oaklist.pdf

(1) *CAIRSS Governance. The CAIRSS Steering Committee has recommended to the Executive that CAIRSS adopt the CEIRC committee model i.e. to include 3 CAUL members and 2 experienced practitioners, with the added attendance of the service providers.

*The Executive recommended to CAUL that the stated governance model be adopted and that the current CAUL members on the steering committee continue until the end of 2010, without the need for an election process. Agreed.*

Nominations for the repository managers will be called in the near future. (Action: DC)

ii) Australasian Digital Theses (ADT) Program. A report from Andrew Wells was included with the agenda papers. It included a recommendation to CAUL:

*CAIRSS responsibility for ADT to be agreed by end of 2009.*

This item was not discussed. This recommendation is considered to be accepted. (Action: CAIRSS SC)

b) *Research Support. Judy Stokker's presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/caul20092stokker-research.pdf. She discussed QUT's Building eResearch Support Capability and Capacity project which is aimed at building the university’s research profile. Key issues are training and information/tools creation and dissemination, including better integration of the range of websites within the university. A key challenge is to convince researchers of the need for good data management.
In discussion on how others are strengthening awareness and capacity in their own institutions, it was suggested that CAUL hosts a sharing day on data management.  

**Action: Executive**

c) *ANDS (Australian National Data Service).* Cathrine Harboe-Ree brought members up to date, speaking to a presentation prepared by Ross Wilkinson. The presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20092ands.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20092ands.pdf). She reminded members that a total funding of $72m for ANDS and the ARDC (the Australian Research Data Commons) was expected to be disbursed over two years, to fund infrastructure but not to run it. She urged CAUL members and their institutions to be involved as the funds will be readily available to those with the capacity to use it.

ANDS now has seven sub-programs, and, is in the process of contacting each institution to find out where the gaps are and how ANDS can help. CAUL members should locate the ANDS contact in their own institution to ensure that there is a coherent approach across the library, ITS and eResearch areas, and to remind them of the library’s capacity to support data management. ANDS will deal only with the central university processes and has notionally allocated funds to each based on institutional size. Greg Anderson reported that the library offered to be the contact at the University of Newcastle and this role is working well.

929. Scholarly Communication.

a) *Jockeying for position: research competition, open access & the race to the top.* Professor Tom Cochrane reprised a recent SCONUL presentation. His presentation is at [http://www.caul.edu.au/scholcomm/caul20092cochrane.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/scholcomm/caul20092cochrane.pdf). He referred members to John Houghton’s economic modelling and the “annoying persistence of confusables.” In 1994, a SCONUL survey suggested that journal subscriptions would reduce to 25% of then-current numbers over 5-10 years, but in spite of significant pressures, there has been relatively little change over that time.

Government priorities are having a significant impact on the research community, including as a driver towards open access, but researchers are only interested in showing their best work in institutional repositories, not preprints and corrigenda. The momentum for getting content into institutional repositories at QUT has been overtaken by the academic community. They are more concerned with theft of authorship than theft of text. Figures show that there is greater citation of all deposited content, not just that which is mandated. Greater exposure leads to more inquiries re higher degree research, and more income for research. The RQF/ERA process has convinced the research office of the need to include the library in the process. The agendas of research assessment and open access have become confused – see Peter Suber’s field guide to misunderstandings. In all university discussions regarding open access, anything written for remuneration is deliberately excluded.

Professor Cochrane questioned the library director’s role in changing the system, suggesting that many were waiting for the pressure to come from the academic community while continuing to support the current publisher-based system. He recommended making changes locally now, rather than waiting for bigger changes to take effect in North America and Europe.

He referred to the new National Research Infrastructure Council, which was comprised of the heads of peak funding bodies and other organisations with an independent lay chair. He is a member through his chairmanship of AeRIC. The accessibility framework is no longer on the government’s agenda but is likely to resurface later. The NHMRC is moving towards mandating open access for its funded research.

b) *Open Access.* Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that she, John Shipp and Maxine Brodie had visited the ARC and the NHMRC to discuss policy drivers of behaviour in research. Although the ARC is supportive of open access in spirit, there are no resources for the accessibility framework so it is likely there will be no future ASHER funds, no funds to drive researcher behaviour. ANDS is a potential OA funding source, but has no authority
nor mandating ability. The ARC will continue to engage with CAUL and the ERA will have an ongoing impact on behaviour.

The NHMRC is more likely to move forward on open access, following decisions of the NIH and the NHS, and it is on their board’s agenda. Libraries are not on the agenda, however they have discussed the possibility of a central repository with the National Library. Cathrine Harboe-Ree recommended that CAUL begins a regime of regular meetings with both the ARC and the NHMRC, noting that this alone was not sufficient and that additional work should be undertaken between meetings. *(Action: CH-R)*

It was suggested that it would be helpful to have a kit of information, e.g. simple documentation and training, which could be used for institutional advocacy. Members supported this suggestion and Maxine Brodie expressed interest in preparing this should resources be available. It was suggested that CAIRSS be involved or that SPARCAUL be revisited. It was noted that OAKList is available to assist authors. The Executive will consider resources following the report from the three proponents. *(Action: Executive)*

The ARC is considering allowing grants to be used for publication costs, but it was suggested that CAUL dissuade them from taking up this option.

Researchers are being encouraged to publish in ARC-listed journals and the most prestigious journals, without necessarily being aware of what copyright is being transferred to publishers, or what their other options might be.

c)  *CAUL-Industry Think Tank 2009.* Andrew Wells advised members that he was preparing a report on the Think Tank. He had received many positive comments on the event from all types of participants. He added that it had raised a number of issues that CEIRC would start working on e.g. deposit of authors’ works in institutional repositories and new pricing models, and others that CEIRC had already addressed. *(Action: AW)*

d)  *CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC).* A report from Greg Anderson was included with the agenda papers. He advised members that the CEIRC committee will be seeking publishers to work with new pricing models for the next round of major contract renewals starting from 2012. All renegotiations will posit the inclusion of the publisher’s version of local authors’ articles in the institutional repository.

The CAUL office is currently reviewing low take-up and/or low value products with a view to removing them from the CEIRC portfolio to improve efficiency. There is a great number of new offers on the table, and it will again be necessary to review the resources needed to support CEIRC. *(Action: CEIRC)*

Greg Anderson advised members that the same team which conducted the Wiley-Blackwell negotiations will also negotiate with Springer. The team had begun with three members and was expanded to include all CAUL members on the CEIRC committee. The group worked well, mostly by email and teleconference.

In response to a comment on multi-campus institutions, members were reminded that CEIRC already takes this into account in its discussions with publishers – if FTE is used as a basis for pricing, then all campuses should be included; otherwise, if sites are small, they can be excluded from additional costs. In case of a CEIRC offer, members are encouraged to refer such questions back to the CAUL office rather than to the publisher or their agent in the first instance. *(Action: All)*

i)  *Wiley-Blackwell 2010-2012.* Greg Anderson reported on the meeting with Wiley-Blackwell following the Think Tank. A revised three-year offer was circulated to CAUL that week, with all options for all institutions fully costed. The offer also included worked examples. To date, 29 renewal confirmations have been received, including four upgrades from subject collections to the full collection. Most were interested in the early payment discount. Wiley-Blackwell agreed with CEIRC that the current-spend model was unsustainable and they would work together over the next three years to evaluate other options. *(Action: CEIRC)*
ii) **Scopus/ Web of Science 2011-.** Andrew Wells reported on Universities Australia’s negotiations with Thomson Reuters and Elsevier, and the role of Diane Costello and himself as CAUL representatives. Members expressed concern at the delay in the proceedings and spoke strongly against any suggestion of rolling over the current Web of Science agreement pending the finalisation of a new one. It was noted that the ARC is tendering for bibliographic data services and it was possible they could choose both products for different purposes. It was agreed to prepare a CAUL briefing note. *(Action: AW, DC)*

iii) **Springer 2010-2012.** As noted earlier, the Wiley-Blackwell negotiation team will also undertake the Springer renegotiations.

iv) **Taylor & Francis 2009-2011 and 1-2-3 2010-2012.** Andrew Wells advised members of Go8 discussions with TandF noting that it was expected that any gains out of those negotiations were expected to be transmitted to all CAUL.

v) **Go8 discussions with publishers.** Andrew Wells suggested that it was likely that the inclusion of a Go8 member on the CEIRC negotiating committees would be considered preferable to separate Go8 negotiations. In the meantime, he brought members up to date with the discussion with four major publishers since April 2009, and members shared their own experience with the current renewals round.

**Support for Learning & Teaching**

930. **Student engagement.** Dr Hamish Coates, Principal Research Fellow, ACER addressed members on the student surveys run by ACER, the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE). Dr Coates’ presentation is at [http://www.caul.edu.au/best-practice/caul20092coates.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/best-practice/caul20092coates.pdf)

He advised members that the survey used OECD parameters and addressed teaching processes and institution services – how do students perceive the available support, how they learn, etc. The intention is to determine what is effective learning and how can it be measured. ACER conducts a gap analysis between the student and staff (teaching) surveys. He cautioned against too much faith in the results of client satisfaction surveys, placing more emphasis instead on support received. The surveys generally show a correlation between use of libraries and student experience generally. A student’s departure intention is directly related to support or lack thereof. An inventory of good learning practices may have its own effect just by the exercise of filling in the report.

He noted that most Australian universities will have the full AUSSE survey data which shows *inter alia* which disciplines are using their services, and which can be used for further data manipulation. Newer surveys will allow institutions the option of adding local questions, including discipline-specific questions. It may be possible to obtain group data, rather than asking for individual institutional data. *(Action: Executive)*

ACER prepares research briefings on various topics, and offers hints on how the survey data can be used to set benchmarks, and how to encourage students to fill in the forms. They could consider a focus on libraries in next year’s survey, and suggested that CAUL could help to identify gaps in the surveys. *(Action: Executive)*

In a discussion on satisfaction surveys, Dr Coates suggested that they measure happiness which is not the basis on which staff are employed so not relevant. It is more useful to focus on learning outcomes, departure intentions, measures of higher-order thinking.

In discussion on turning survey results into action, Dr Coates suggested that this required capacity building in Australia which is some way behind the United States in this area. He suggested that ACER work with planning offices, hold conferences, address different groups such as CAUL, etc.

931. **Learning Skills.** Linda Luther’s presentation is at [http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/caul20092luther.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/caul20092luther.pdf) She described her role as Director of Student Experience and Learning, which includes the library academic teaching support services, student support services e.g. counselling, and the University Preparation Program to assist mature-age students.
engage with higher education. A notable result was reduced attrition in some programs due to the increased support given to students. Using students for peer support has been the most successful approach. The challenge is to match students to the wide range of support programs, and to link programs with specific courses and sometimes with assessment.

Cathrine Harboe-Ree’s presentation was prepared by Lisa Smith and is at http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/caul20092harboe-ree-learningskills.pdf She discussed the transfer of responsibility for learning skills to the library at Monash in 2007. The library takes a skills development approach rather than a more traditional remedial approach. The learning skills advisers are all teachers, not librarians, and generally hold Masters in TESOL-type skills. Service level agreements have been established with faculties, identifying student outcomes as performance indicators. The library seeks to ensure that other areas of the university understand the services offered so that students may be referred when appropriate. Using the information literacy model assisted in the transition to learning skills, but also helped to stimulate current information literacy programs.

932. *E-textbooks: Issues for University Libraries.* Graham Black and Judy Stokker. The presentation for this session was prepared by QUT’s Ann Huthwaite, and is at http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/caul20092etextbooks.pdf Graham Black referred to the JISC e-book observatory project where 36 core textbooks made available across the sector were subjected to deep-log usage analysis. This showed average usage time of 13 minutes, with 85% of users accessing a page per minute in short sharp bursts. He discussed the problem with finding suitable business models, and where overlap occurs between the library and the campus bookshop, and whether there will be a transition from user pays to library pays. He noted that many textbooks are deliberately subject to embargo periods and current editions are not available online. It appears that take-up is more advanced in the USA than in Australia. It was noted that publishers’ efforts are being directed at academic staff rather than libraries, seeking to be involved in curriculum design and LMS, which will not necessarily be visible to the library. UQ has been in discussion with Splinter (sic) re print-on-demand from subscribed content and providing personal e-copies to users.

There was some concern about the publication of research data, particularly with respect to ethics and confidentiality. Barriers are most likely to be raised by university ethics committees, with the default option being to lock up the data, and leave only the description accessible.

933. *Information Literacy Working Group.* A report from Ruth Quinn was included in the agenda papers. This item was not discussed.

934. *University Library Australia.* A report from Shirley Oakley was included in the agenda papers. This item was not discussed.

Delivering Quality & Value

935. *Leadership.* Felicity McGregor’s presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/best-practice/caul20092mcgregor.pdf She reported that UoW originally started leadership training in 1987, influenced by the Australian Business Excellence Framework and Invest in People (IIP). A focus was on performance sustainability, aiming to retain good staff. This has in part led to an aging workforce, and there is a regular problem with filling vacancies. She discussed the process of identifying leaders and leadership qualities via a series of workshops and individual discussions, aided by a consultancy firm, Career Innovations. It was often possible to identify good staff but not to predict how good they could be. This process, using the Lominger Leadership Architect workshop, helped to identify potential leaders, and confirmed that self-knowledge is one of the critical competencies. Weekly coaching of selected staff by the consultant and library executive helped to focus on goals, motivation and performance. It was a significant investment in both time and funds, but the outcomes proved its value.


The CAUL Achievement Award is an annual budget item of $6,000 to reward high achieving staff of a member organisation in areas included in the CAUL strategic plan. It was thought time to review the award, including why it is given e.g. to inspire innovation, and whether
CAUL should make more use of the winners e.g. to make presentations to CAUDIT and ACODE in addition to the annual presentation to CAUL. It was suggested that the award allows libraries to promote their activities within their own institutions, provides evidence of prior achievement for ALTC applications, etc. There was no suggestion that the award be discontinued. (Action: Executive)

UNISON has offered CAUL the $46,000 left in its accounts for the purpose of staff development. In its discussion about potential uses of the fund, the Executive suggested *inter alia* that it be used to fund a scholarship to the CAUDIT or ACODE institutes, that it be used to encourage leadership development for staff at HEW 7, or that it be used to shadow the CAUL Executive Officer (rejected because of logistic difficulties.) It was suggested that shadowing a university librarian or associate could be valuable.

Other current avenues for staff development include the Universities Australia Library Staff Development Conference, which has been held biennially and will be taken over by CAUL since Universities Australia withdrew from all staff development activities, the CAUDIT institute where library staff mix with IT staff, and CAVAL's Horizon program which focuses on the individual and complements the CAUL program. Members agreed that the high level focus of the Universities Australia program was valuable, with presentations from Vice-Chancellors or deputies, and several university librarians reflecting on their careers and challenges. The program committee for the 2010 event comprises Ainslie Dewe, Judy Stokker, Ralph Kiel and Graham Black.

Members recommended that the Executive use the fund to support CAUL project work – one-off activities which benefit CAUL and provide a staff development opportunity. (Action: Executive)

937. Best Practice. There was no report from the Best Practice Working Group.

938. *Insync Surveys.* Helen Livingston reported that a number of libraries had run the new survey in 2009, and many reported a higher response rate than usual. She asked members to provide feedback to the Executive or to the BPWG. (Action: All)

939. Statistics. There was no report from the CAUL Statistics Focus Group.

Advocacy & Influence

940. *Copyright.* Derek Whitehead updated members on the activities of the ADA and the ALCC. He noted the appointment of Matt Dawes as ADA/ALCC copyright adviser. He referred to the litigation between UWA and Gray, noting that this issue was essentially about patents and not of direct relevance to libraries, but that it pointed to the need for universities to review their IP policies. He reminded members that the Google Books Settlement, currently before the US court, is about the US and not Australia – it was notable that even the libraries involved in the discussions do not agree with each other. CAUL has made contact with the GBS organisation to ensure that we are kept in the loop, and the ADA/ALCC will be meeting with Google soon.

a) **Universities Australia Contracts.** Derek Whitehead advised members on the progress of the lead-up to the renegotiation of the CAL and ScreenRights contracts. He referred to some pilot studies being undertaken to determine how best to assess remunerable content – seemingly a more complex exercise than originally thought.

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. There were no reports presented.

b) **CONZUL.** A report from John Redmayne was included with the agenda papers. This item was not discussed.

special interest group on quality, and on the SCONUL presentations on super-
convergence, and the competencies and generic skills required in hybrid professional
roles.

d) CAUDIT (Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology)
   and ACODE (Australasian Council on Open, Distance and eLearning).
   i) EDUCAUSE 2009. Imogen Garner was a member of the conference steering
      committee. This item was not discussed.
   ii) EDUCAUSE 2011. Andrew Wells is a member of the conference steering
      committee. This item was not discussed.

e) National Library of Australia.
   i) Libraries Australia. A report from Linda Luther was included with the agenda
      papers. This item was not discussed.

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. This item was not separately discussed.

944. *CAUL Finances. The full supporting reports i.e. balance sheets, profit & loss reports and
cash flow reports are online at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2008.xls and
doc$/budget2010.xls  Imogen Garner, Diane Costello

   a) CAUL Budget Principles. Imogen Garner spoke to the draft proposal on budget
      principles, noting that she had drawn on earlier CAUL discussions and decisions. She
      referred especially to item 6 that CAUL will, as a minimum, run a balanced operational
      budget for its day-to-day expenses. The operational budget is essentially that shown in
      the AUD account, where income is membership fees and interest earned, and expenses
      are mainly staffing, meeting expenses, statistics and the CAUL Achievement Award. She
      proposed to members that CAUL increases its fees annually to keep pace with salary
      increases, not for 2010, but foreshadowed for 2011. Also for consideration for the 2011
      budget will be the resources, if any, required for CAIRSS, CEIRC and any other projects.
      It was noted that QULOC had developed similar principles, and it was considered a
      valuable exercise. Members endorsed putting these principles in place, and supported
      increasing fees gradually rather than irregularly in larger increments. (Action: Executive)

   b) CAUL Budget 2010. Draft. Imogen Garner confirmed, following the previous
      discussion, that the CAUL membership fee would not be increased for 2010. (Action: DC)

   c) CAUL Budget 2009. Imogen Garner advised members that there is likely be a small
      deficit in the 2009 budget due to enhancements to the CAUL statistics website.

945. CAUL Risk Assessment. The CAUL risk assessment document was included with the agenda.
This item was not discussed.

946. CAUL Web Site Redevelopment. A progress report is included with the Executive Officer’s
report. This item was not discussed.

947. Executive Officer’s Report. A report from Diane Costello was included in the agenda
papers. This item was not discussed.

948. Other business. In closing, Cathrine Harboe-Ree stated that she was looking forward to
being CAUL President, and thanked Andrew Wells for his seven years on the Executive,
including three on the CEIRC committee and two as President, where he was an effective
communicator both within CAUL and externally with Universities Australia and the various
government departments who invited CAUL to contribute to various reviews.

The meeting concluded at 1pm September 22.

Appendix I follows.
Appendix I.

Strategic Plan Review.

Andrew Wells introduced the Executive’s draft of the revised strategic plan. He explained that “communication and influence” had been brought to the front, noting that this affects everything that CAUL does. “Student experience” replaces “teaching & learning.” “Information resources” had been extracted from the separate areas of research and teaching & learning. “Having an impact” replaces “delivering quality and value” and encompasses the work of the Best Practice Working Group, workforce planning, the value proposition, etc.

He asked members to consider what CAUL can do as a group. He asked them to focus on what was most important, rather than what is desirable.

In discussion of the four other topics, members should take into account what CAUL should do regarding communication and influence, the fifth topic.

The goals should reflect the terminology used in each of the topic areas.

The Student Experience. (Ainslie Dewe)

Optimising and maximising the student experience – recommend that the focus be on learning and teaching and community service – more longevity than “student experience.”

Recommend that ULA be included in Information Resources, not Student Experience.

Work collaboratively with CAUDIT and ACODE to improve the student experience. Note that ACODE members are not usually the directors of teaching and learning.

Collaborate with deans to understand better how to engage with the discipline, and with teaching staff e.g. in law.

Continue to develop best practices and guidelines, such as those for offshore students.

Work towards the inclusion of libraries in the universities’ student engagement initiatives.

Information literacy should be part of the whole student experience.

Gather more data e.g. what is happening with information literacy in secondary schools, what are the differences between disciplines, learning management systems, etc

Learning spaces – how to evaluate return on investment, how to expose the library’s role, etc

Graduate attributes – how can CAUL contribute?

Include internationalisation.

Include basic student IT support.

Optimising access to Information Resources. (Heather Gordon)

Members generally supported the separation of this area from research, though it was noted that some items cut across the Research goals.

To promote strategic resource sharing and collaboration by taking an active role in OCLC Asia Pacific Regional Council

Implement the recommendations of the CEIRC review

Review and report on the impact of this implementation

Strategically collaborate with SPARC

Investigate and recommend changes to open access and educate academics about copyright ownership

Support requirements by federal authorities to deposit outcomes of research in open access repositories

Continue to lobby research funding groups for requirements to deposit outcomes of research in open access repositories.
Finalise copyright toolkit and arrange delivery through CAIRSS.

**Research.** (Imogen Garner, John Shipp)

Rationale needs a major rewrite.

Maximise international collaboration with groups such as SCONUL and CURL.

Extend copyright advice to the academic community e.g. not signing rights to publishers.

Develop strong relationships with eResearch bodies at the national level (call this research rather than eResearch) such as ANDS, DVC (Research), the ARC and the NHMRC, etc.

Recommend that open access be included in Research not in Information Resources i.e. before publication, this belongs in research, after publication becomes information resources.

Represent libraries in the research cycle - advocacy role - develop a CAUL statement along the lines of the statement on the GFC.

Collaborate in training across the sector e.g. for bibliometrics work.

Support for repositories e.g. CAIRSS to expand to include standards and better practice.

Active sharing of information to ensure university librarians or libraries are not left out of the loop e.g. discussions relating to the indirect costs of research.

Clarify CAUL’s role in libraries’ maximising research outcomes and/or impact through measures, services, etc

**Delivering Quality and Value.** (Greg Anderson, Cathrine Harboe-Ree)

Members supported retaining the current name as this area is about more than impact.

Defining the value proposition - expose the value of university libraries.

Continuous improvement – how does CAUL help libraries to do this?

Workforce planning is local and CAUL does not have a role in it.

Staff development – CAUL’s contributions:

- staff development event such as the replacement for Universities Australia’ Library Staff Development Conference held biennially;
- CAUL achievement award;
- the use of UNISON’s funds to support a staff development exercise.

Add client surveys into the work of the Best Practice Working Group – do not specifically refer to Insync.

TEQSA – include a hot topic at a CAUL meeting in 2010.

Share good practice more actively e.g. via surveys, but also in other areas.

CAUL’s role is to take a snapshot of what is happening in university libraries.

Review the CAUL statistics.
CAUL Executive Meeting 2009/6
18 November 2009
Melbourne
in conjunction with joint CCA meeting
Board Room, Monash Conference Centre, 30 Collins Street, Melbourne

Minutes
(Finalised 12/2/10)

1932. Attendance & Apologies. Cathrine Harboe-Ree (President), Ainslie Dewe (Deputy
President), Imogen Garner (Treasurer), Heather Gordon, John Shipp. A special welcome was
given to Cathrine Harboe-Ree and John Shipp attending their first meeting of the new
committee.
Apology: Greg Anderson, chair, CEIRC.
In attendance: Diane Costello.

1933. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meeting 2009/5, Sydney. The draft minutes were included
with the agenda papers.

1934. Minutes of CAUL Meeting 2009/2 – September 21-22, 2009. The draft minutes were
included with the agenda papers. Notes of several of the Hot Topics presentations are yet to
be completed. All action items are included. A separate action list will be appended to future
minutes. (Action: DC)

1935. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda. Cathrine Harboe-Ree took
members through action items.

From CAUL 2009/2:
Item 928(b). CAUL could host a sharing day on data management – could be either separate
or attached – add to agenda (Action: DC)

Item 929(b). Cathrine Harboe-Ree and John Shipp will meet with the ARC and the NHMRC on
November 27. An announcement on mandating is expected from the NHMRC.

Item 930. It was suggested that CAUL might assist AUSSE in adding to its library-related
questions. It was agreed to consider it in the strategic plan and also to pass for consideration
to the BPWG with a view to identifying gaps. (Action: DC)

Item 938. Helen Livingston would like feedback on the revised Insync survey. (Action: All)

1936. CAUL Constitution. A draft amendment to the constitution was included with the agenda
papers. It related to the role of immediate past presidents of CAUL. Cathrine Harboe-Ree
discussed the rationale for raising this issue. CAUDIT does have a position of past president
which is a varying length, and may even serve after retirement. Alternatives are that the
position be included for a given period e.g. offered a place on the Executive for one or two
years, but not for the four years if a president serves 2 terms, or that it be an ad hoc
appointment but that might be problematic if not done automatically. It was agreed that there
is not sufficient reason to propose such a change to CAUL.

In discussion, members noted the following:

CAUDIT makes better use of its retired colleagues for consultancy etc and do use their past
presidents. CAUL should consider using recent past members to write reports, submissions to
government, etc
There is some feeling among the membership that the executive is a closed shop or that elections are somehow managed. It could seem that the deputy is also the president elect, or that the deputy gets the first option if they wish to, but in fact all positions are open to all. If individuals remain on the Executive (in various roles) for many yeas, it could be a disincentive to new members nominating for the Executive. It is important to cycle members into the Executive for the experience. Members were reminded that in some years there has been very intense competition and other years there has been none. It was suggested having a brief discussion at the next CAUL meeting, particularly as there are so many new members. The President will discuss her impressions, and cover some of the issues raised by members.  

(Action: DC)

There are already examples of the deputy not ever serving as president, so this is not really a convention, but the president has in most cases had some experience on the Executive, but there have been notable, successful exceptions. When the constitution was first framed, members were very clear that the president not serve more than two terms. In 2008 it was decided not to have the past president and not to have a president-elect. Voting for a deputy is quite different from voting for a president-elect.

It was agreed that the Executive Officer would continue managing the election process, including the call for nominations, and act as returning officer.  

(Action: DC)

1937. Executive Committee Portfolios. Two positions chosen by the Executive are the Treasurer, held for the past year by Imogen Garner and continuing, and the Executive representative on the CEIRC committee, held for the past year by Greg Anderson. Heather Gordon currently represents the Executive on the CAIRSS Steering Committee. Ainslie Dewe is representing the Executive on the CAUL Staff Development Conference 2010 program committee. Heather Gordon is supervising the completion of the website project, and Imogen Garner has taken carriage of the strategic planning. John Shipp will work with Cathrine Harboe-Ree on advocacy and will take carriage of open access work. Ainslie Dewe has to date taken a watching brief on government reports issues papers and is happy to continue.  

(Action: Executive)

CEIRC Committee.

Andrew Wells was nominated as the Executive representative on CEIRC for one year, to complete the implementation of the CEIRC review, and will chair the committee. He may be invited to Executive meetings either in person or by teleconference. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will advise CAUL.  

(Action: CH-R)

It was noted that the Executive’s representative on CEIRC is not automatically the chair of the committee. It was suggested that the CEIRC chair be an ex officio member of the Executive, but the experience of Heather Gordon indicates that this direct conduit is not essential in order to drive change.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1938. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item). Imogen Garner drafted a plan based on discussion at the CAUL meeting. It was included with the agenda papers with a cover note and a marked up copy of the earlier version. Imogen Garner outlined how she put the document together, including perusing previous minutes for activities not covered in the current plan. It was agreed to develop one more draft before working through individual actions.

It was useful leading with the communication section, especially the advocacy. It was suggested that any action intended for all members should not necessarily stay in the plan. The mission still confuses the business of CAUL with the business of the institutions. The committee should look at what CAUL can do rather than what the institutions can do, for example, CAUL can collect information, analyse it and feed it back to CAUL.

Investigate the feasibility of working with ACODE on issues raised in the joint CCA meeting.

It was noted that the education section is very thin compared with the research section. There are huge changes in education coming, *vis à vis* student engagement rather than information
literacy, social inclusion, etc and the challenge will be whether CAUL can contribute. The plan should address what will happen in the industry over the next three years – monitoring changes in the environment, implementing support strategies, making connections with DEEWR. The recommendations in the ESOS act review should be examined to see whether there is anything CAUL can do collectively. What should CAUL do with respect to the Australian Qualifications Framework.

It was noted that the comments from the CAUL meeting do not provide guidance on priorities for 2010. An operational plan may be designed to sit under the strategic plan.

It was agreed to send marked up copies to Imogen Garner by December 2, and note which areas should be deleted. (Action: All)

a) From 2007-2009 plan:

22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative (Ad Hoc Working Group) The Go8 has employed Outsell to undertake a cost-benefit study. CAUL is contributing AUD 20,000 and payment is underway. The ANU, UQ and UAdelaide are the libraries being surveyed, and four other Go8 institutions will participate in focus groups to validate the survey results.

1939. CAUL Achievement Award 2009. Two nominations have been received, and were circulated to the committee on November 2. These are considered confidential so were not included in the meeting papers. The award should reward ground-breakers, leadership roles, people who are sought out for advice, on a national stage. Nominees could be more specific about the evidence, using examples from other quality awards. It was suggested revising guidelines to make them clearer. John Shipp will review the guidelines further to streamline the nomination process. (Action: JS)

It was recommended that the CAUL Achievement Award be promoted more widely after each announcement of the winners, especially given the range of activities and the excellence of previous winners. It was suggested that the criteria be tightened up, with more emphasis on the CAUL perspective, and that CAUL members be encouraged to address the criteria and to encourage staff to be in a position to win it. (Action: Executive)

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1940. CAUL Finances. The Treasurer’s report is included in the meeting papers. The budget principles, based on the QULOC principles, were accepted by CAUL. The importance of adhering to the processes was agreed. The main principle is that fees keep pace with costs on an annual basis rather than relying on retained earnings, which may then be used for projects. This will mean an increase in fees for 2011, for discussion at the July Executive meeting along with CEIRC resourcing and the future of CAIRSS. The achievement award will be retained, and the statistics enhancements and the website should be finalised by the end of the year. The term deposit will mature soon.

a) CAUL Budget Planning. The CAUL budget principles have been updated following discussion at CAUL2009/2.

b) CAUL Budget 2008. http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-docs/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 began April 28, and the draft report was published in early November.

c) CAUL Budget 2009. http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-docs/budget2009.xls The 2009 budget figures have been updated. ANU has invoiced CAUL for the Go8 Outsell contribution of $20,000, which has been applied to the budget against the Research & Development category.

d) CAUL Budget 2010. http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-docs/budget2010.xls A copy of the draft budget, already included in the CAUL meeting papers, was included in the agenda papers. The 2010 budget document as presented to CAUL2009/2 included a note to the effect that the increased costs of the CEIRC program led to an increase in the CEIRC fee
of nearly 9% or $200 per member for 2010. The committee supported the proposed CEIRC fee increase, and invoices will now be issued. (Action: DC) The CAUL membership fee was not increased, as already discussed at CAUL.

It was noted that Greg Anderson is recommending an increase in staffing for the CAUL office.

Not included in the budget document was the SPARC membership fee for 2010, agreed at Exec2008/6 that the USD 5,500 be paid by CAUL rather than by voluntary participants. The 27 volunteers for the 2009 fee paid USD 200 each. (Action: DC)

1941. Risk assessment for CAUL. http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/risk-assessment2007.doc It was noted that CAUDIT is planning to incorporate, in the main because they want to be able to apply directly for government funds. The CEIRC review sought legal advice on this issue and was advised that although there is some potential liability for committee members, there are good practical reasons why no change should be made to the current set up.

1942. CAUL Web Site.

a) Web Site Redevelopment. http://caul.dev.wiliam.com.au/ Heather Gordon was invited by the President to supervise the completion of the project. She met with Diane Costello in Canberra on November 1 to review progress and outline the plans for completion and launch of the site. A report on progress was included in the Executive Officer's report, appended to these minutes. Heather Gordon added that a process for updating the website for external authors will be devised. It was noted that a proprietary site search engine will be used rather than Google because the latter cannot index the members-only pages, but Google may still be used to search the site as it would any other site. Web 2.0 features other than RSS will not be available in the current version.

The committee endorsed the proposal to move to the new site early in the new year, hosted at ANU, and to rename the current site as archive.caul.edu.au (Action: DC)

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1943. CAIRSS (CAUL Australasian Institutional Repository Support Services). Heather Gordon reported that the two repository managers for the steering committee, Simon McMillan and Sten Christensen, had been chosen for a range of factors in addition to their experience and involvement in the repository community - the nature of their institution, software used, city vs regional etc. She added that copyright kit is behind schedule because of staff turnover at Swinburne; CAIRSS Central is hosting several software-specific teleconferences; and a community day is scheduled for December 1 on the Sunshine Coast.

a) ADT. Heather Gordon reported that a brief paper on the options for transition from the ADT to CAIRSS had been presented to the steering committee, but was short on detail. This topic will be discussed in more detail at the forthcoming teleconference.

1944. Excellence in Research Australia (ERA). Australian Research Council. This item will be removed from the agenda and any future ERA topics may be considered under the CAIRSS item.

1945. Research Infrastructure.

a) AeRIC (The Australian eResearch Infrastructure Council). https://www.pfc.org.au/bin/view/Main/AeRIC See also item 1954(d). Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported on AeRIC at the CCA meeting. She reported that governance of research infrastructure has changed fundamentally, and new committees have been formed. There is no longer any direct library representation. AeRIC’s membership is the chairs (no alternates permitted) of the various groups such as ANDS, and is chaired by Tom Cochrane who does have library background and responsibility. This appears to be a better vehicle for cohesion and communication among the participant groups but it is not clear whether they have a broader perspective.

CAUDIT has representation through its AAF role but not as CAUDIT. She suggested that there is no avenue for direct input. Although DIISR has offered to attend a CAUL meeting
this not the best way to drive exploratory thinking, and libraries do have much to offer. All research infrastructure funding is now in the ANDS basket. It may be possible to engage CAUDIT as a channel, and Cathrine Harboe-Ree suggested that CAUL and CAUDIT explore the strategic options for the next generation of activity, and find other channels to keep the dialogue going with government. (Action: CH-R)

It was suggested that meetings be arranged periodically with Tom Cochrane and Glenn Withers. (Action: CH-R)

[Later note: the terms of reference and work plan to the end of 2010 are included with the AeRIC meeting papers from October 2009.]

1946. Open Access. Cathrine Harboe-Ree, John Shipp

a) **CAUL Working Group on Open Scholarship - COSI (CAUL Open Scholarship Initiative).** A proposal for the establishment of a CAUL working group on open scholarship from Judy Stokker and Maxine Brodie was included with the agenda papers. The committee supported the proposal and agreed that John Shipp should represent the Executive. At this stage, no resources are sought from CAUL because much of this work is already happening within institutions. Ainslie Dewe suggested that it be named COSI i.e. CAUL Open Scholarship Initiative.

It was suggested that the term open scholarship implies much wider collaboration with researchers and others, and is very timely – a step forward from open access. Diane Costello will call for nominations from CAUL, and the selection will be made by the convenors to balance members on the committee. (Action: DC)

b) **Confederation of Open Access Repositories.** [http://www.driver-repository.eu/DRIVER-COAR.html](http://www.driver-repository.eu/DRIVER-COAR.html) Judy Stokker and Maxine Brodie have recommended that CAUL joins COAR. JISC and CARL announced their charter membership on October 23. A copy of the COAR web page was included with the agenda papers. It was agreed to wait until COAR is fully set up and a considered recommendation is received from COSI. (Action: COSI)

1947. Collections Council of Australia. Collections Council of Australia seeks new benchmarks for collections policy. A draft model was circulated to the Executive on September 23. The committee noted the document, and also that funding for the CCA will cease following a transitional period of length to be determined. The draft model was planned for finalisation at the end of 2011.

1948. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).

a) **CAUL Industry Think Tank, Sydney, 17-18 August 2009.** A report from Andrew Wells was included in the agenda papers. Diane Costello tabled notes from the CEIRC committee on November 16.

It was noted that some recommendations are aspirational and some are concrete, and for sending to CAUL, it should include firm, specific, considered recommendations. It should clearly identify those which are to be actioned by CAUL and CEIRC, and others which are for consideration by all members. Following approval by the Executive, they should be passed to CEIRC for action. (Action: Executive)

Imogen Garner suggested that this would be imposing additional work on CEIRC. The President responded that much of the work would have been on CEIRC’s agenda in the normal course of events.

Cathrine Harboe-Ree will discuss further with Andrew Wells. (Action: CH-R)

In discussion on licences, and in particular confidentiality clauses, it was suggested that in some cases the clause may be struck out, and initialled and returned to the publisher who, in many cases will accept it without further amendment. The committee supported CEIRC drafting a model clause to strike out confidentiality clauses. (Action: CEIRC)
With reference to the recommendation on determining who is using what, Ainslie Dewe reported that personnel at HKUST are working with open source software to analyse usage logs.

b) **Scopus and Web of Science.** Diane Costello reported on the status of the negotiations, noting that the advisory panel teleconference would be held November 24 to discuss the revised proposals of both publishers. Universities Australia had advised Vice-Chancellors that CAUL would be preparing estimated invoices for all current subscribers to assist those who wish to pay prior to the finalisation of the negotiations.

c) **Wiley-Blackwell 2010-2012 negotiations.** Diane Costello reported on the status of the renewals. Of the 61 current subscribers, only one, a New Zealand Crown Research Institute, cancelled their package, while all CAUL and CONZUL members have renewed with five upgrading to the full collection.

d) **Australian Publishers Association. Scholarly & Journals Committee.** Andrew Wells has replied to Mark Robertson affirming CAUL’s willingness to meet with them as and when the need arises, or on a more regular basis if required. A response has been received from Mark Robertson. The Executive would welcome any discussion with this group.

**CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING**

1949. **Information Literacy Working Group.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree has discussed with Ruth Quinn the composition and future of the ILWG. The Guidelines for CAUL Committee Composition and Election were included in the agenda papers for background information. It was agreed that information literacy is effectively operationalised. If anything particularly interesting occurs in this area it could be presented as a hot topic. Some of the data gathering elements are included in the strategic plan, and members raised some issues during the strategic plan discussions, so they will need to be addressed. It was agreed to ask the group to provide an exit strategy. *(Action: CH-R)*

It was suggested, and agreed, that the ULA working group be renamed a reference group rather than a working group. *(Action: Executive)*

1950. **Copyright.**

a) **Universities Australia negotiations with CAL.** Heather Gordon reported on this item at the CCA meeting. The Expert Reference Group has not met recently, but ANU’s pilot survey has been completed, and the next stage will involve reviewing data from 8 universities.

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

1951. **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. A report of options discussed earlier was included with the agenda papers.

It was noted that this amount of money would earn relatively little interest annually, and determined that it was reasonable for the funds to be expended over a finite number of years and eventually run out. It was agreed to use the UNISON funds to support project work.

In discussion, members suggested that it be used for CAUL benefit rather than institutional benefit; target future library leaders; benefit CAUL by asking awardees to present a hot topic on the outcomes of their project/travel; linked to the strategic plan e.g. tracking the latest developments in information literacy; fund a scholarship to attend a CAUDIT or ACODE institute; used for a variety of purposes over time, so not fund the same topic more than a given number of times.
John Shipp offered to draft guidelines. It was agreed that the HEW level is less important than the outcome, but that the university librarian would not be eligible. It was noted that VALA has a travelling fellowship and CAUDIT had one in the past.  \textbf{(Action: JS)}

\textbf{b) CAUL Library Staff Development Conference 2010.} July 2010 in Melbourne. The first teleconference of the program committee was held October 22. Ainslie Dewe reported on the themes being discussed.

\textbf{1952. Workforce planning.} Innovation and Business Skills Australia (IBSA) is a national Skills Council and undertakes an annual environment scan (ESCAN) in preparation for advising governments and other stakeholders on skills and workforce development needs across the cultural and creative sector (among others). ….. The Collections Council and IBSA have had a long association and, to assist IBSA, the CCA is looking for ten individuals who are connected with the collections sector who would like to be part of ESCAN. The CCA requested a response by Monday 28 September. This was considered of marginal interest.

\textbf{COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE}

\textbf{1953. Communication.} (Standing item)

\textbf{a) President's Report.} Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported on her discussions with CAUL members and staff - with the Executive, convenors of working groups and all new CAUL members. She noted that members appeared overwhelmingly engaged with and positive about CAUL, that new members valued the welcome by other members, and all agreed that the Think Tank was the highlight of the year. They were highly complimentary of Andrew Wells' presidency, positive about the structure of the CAUL meetings and their content, and were very interested in knowing how to be involved in committees.

Additional comments included: introduce a template to clarify the purpose of each paper included in the agenda papers; introducing a new members' forum; progress report on the CEIRC reforms; waiting for the new website to be launched before submitting new content.

The committee resolved to encourage more members to nominate for committees, and to bring hot topics to CAUL meetings. A list of previous topics and presenters may be used as a guide to gaps to date.

\textbf{b) Public Relations/ Media Reports.} There were no relevant media reports.

\textbf{c) CAUL Report 2007-2008.} (standing item) It had been agreed that a biennial report be produced i.e. for 2007-2008, but it is yet to be completed. It is awaiting editing.  
\textbf{(Action: DC)}

\textbf{d) Executive Officer's Report.} Diane Costello tabled a report, referring members particularly to the progress report on the website redevelopment, discussed at item 1942(a), the comments on the draft Think Tank report from the CEIRC committee members, and the proposed increase in the CEIRC fee for 2010, as described in the introduction to the draft 2010 budget in the meeting papers for CAUL 2009/2, discussed under item 1940(d).

\textbf{1954. Submissions to Public Inquiries.} It was noted that a review of the AQF was being undertaken, and agreed that the consultation paper on the Australian Qualifications Framework would be located and the review added to the next agenda. \textbf{(Action: DC)}

\textbf{a) Terms of Reference for the review of the Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000 and associated regulatory and legislative frameworks.} An issues paper will be released on the Australian Education International website in September 2009, outlining the key issues for the international education sector and inviting written submissions from interested stakeholders on specific consultation questions by the end of November 2009. An interim report from the Review will be available for consideration by COAG in November 2009 with a final report expected in early 2010. \textbf{http://www.aei.gov.au/AEI/ESOS/Default.htm} The terms of reference were
included with the agenda papers. It was noted that most universities have submitted their responses. This item will be kept on the agenda until the report is released.

b) **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 registered its interest on November 12. Initial submissions were due 20 January 2009. CAUL’s submission was emailed on January 20.


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

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. The final report was released July 14.

The government’s response was announced November 11 – no change to the current regime will be imposed. This item is now concluded.

c) **Towards Government 2.0: An Issues Paper.** Government 2.0 Taskforce, Department of Finance and Deregulation. 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/)

d) **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 confirmed that this is not of immediate interest for CAUL. No action will be taken unless something changes. This item will be removed from the agenda.

e) **Digital Economy Future Directions.** A consultation paper has been issued by the Australian Government with responses due February 2009. Information from submissions was taken into account in developing the *Australia’s Digital Economy: Future Directions* paper. Feedback is invited to be sent to DEFutureDirections@dbcde.gov.au. [http://www.dbcde.gov.au/digital_economy/future_directions_of_the_digital_economy/australias_digital_economy_future_directions](http://www.dbcde.gov.au/digital_economy/future_directions_of_the_digital_economy/australias_digital_economy_future_directions) CAUL will monitor the response to this. It was noted that the digital economy paper was better than the draft, but CAUL cannot usefully do anything further at this stage. If there is any further activity, this item will be brought back onto the agenda.


g) **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) This will need to be taken into account in the strategic plan.
1955. Relationships with other organisations.

a) **DIISR (Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research) / AeRIC.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree advised that she would seek a meeting with Julie Evans, to whom Clare McLaughlin now reports, in the new year. (Action: CH-R)

b) **Council of Australian Directors for Academic Development (CADAD) - invitation to discuss alliance with CAUL.** The email to Cathrine Harboe-Ree was included in the agenda papers. At the meeting of CAUDIT/CAUL/ACODE, it was decided that ACODE would first discuss with CADAD the overlap between the organisations before any further consideration of additional alliances would be undertaken.

c) **Tertiary Education Associations Forum.** CAUL was invited to attend the inaugural meeting in Melbourne on October 28. Ainslie Dewe attended on behalf of the President, and provided some notes from the meeting. The invitation and the report from Ainslie Dewe were included with the agenda papers.

d) **CAUDIT & ACODE.**
   i) **Memorandum of Understanding 2003.** ACODE has raised this for discussion on the CCA agenda for discussion. A copy of the MOU was included with the agenda papers.
   ii) **Exploring Educational Possibilities: Emerging Technologies and the National Broadband Network.** Griffith University, 25 September 2009. A report from Ainslie Dewe was circulated with the agenda.
   iii) **EDUCAUSE 2011.** Andrew Wells has advised that the conference committee is likely to be the following: Peter James (UTS), Chris Foley (MURDOCH Past Chair), Paul Campbell (ACU), Richard Northam (CAUDIT), Andrew Wells (UNSW – CAUL), Joe McIvor (UOW), Mick Houlahan (UWS), Conference Organising Company, and that the dates are likely to be May 8-11.

e) **Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA).** ALIA National Partnerships Standing Committee invitation. Information about the partnership was included with the agenda papers. It was agreed that Cathrine Harboe-Ree would attend the first teleconference, and then review CAUL’s participation. (Action: CH-R)

f) **CAVAL.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree has written to Janette Wright regarding a proposed survey of CAUL members’ print storage requirements. There has been no further action. This can be removed from the agenda.

g) **National Library of Australia.** It was suggested that CAUL and NSLA hold another joint meeting. It was agreed to discuss with NSLA the holding of a joint NSLA/CAUL Executive meeting during 2010 at a mutually convenient time. (Action: DC)

i) **Libraries Australia Advisory Committee.** Linda Luther has advised of her intention to step down from the LAAC after the meeting in November. It is expected that the NLA will ask CAUL for a replacement. The other current CAUL representative is Anne Horn. In theory, these representative positions are for two years, renewable, but in practice, CAUL has replaced them when the representatives have elected to retire. Previous representatives have been:
   - Marian Bate resigned June 2001, replaced by Doreen Parker
   - Helen Livingston resigned June 2002, replaced by John Arfield
   - Doreen Parker resigned May 2003, replaced by Linda Luther
   - John Arfield, from June 2002 to November 2006, replaced by Anne Horn
   - Linda Luther, from May 2003 to November 2009

   The last change was in March 2007: “With thanks to the five who expressed willingness to represent CAUL on the LAAC (Liz Curach, Graham Black, Anne Horn, Stephen McVey and Craig Anderson), the Executive has invited Anne Horn to join Linda Luther on the committee.”
Vic Elliott will be attending with his OCLC hat. CAUL will call for expressions of interest in the second LAAC position, for a final decision by the Executive. (Action: DC)

ii) Further advice was received from Linda Luther on November 9 regarding:
   1. Proposed presentation from NSLA on “Re-imagining libraries.”
   2. CAUL involvement in OCLC governance.

1956. CAUL Meetings.

   a) **Hot Topics.** A list of Hot Topics for the meetings held 2003 to date has been compiled and was included with the agenda papers. Members agreed that it was an interesting and useful list, and could be used to ensure that the widest possible range of members was invited to present at CAUL meetings.

   b) **Meeting papers.** It is suggested that each paper include a covering document to explain why the paper is included. Heather Gordon

   c) **CAUL meeting 2010/ 1 - March 25-26, Canberra.** (Easter is April 4)

   d) **CAUL meeting 2010/ 2, Brisbane, 16-17 September.** The ALIA 2010 conference date is set for 2-3 September 2010 in Brisbane at the BCEC. The CAUL meeting will be held in the Gibson Room, (10th floor, Z block), Gardens Point campus. Keith Webster has foreshadowed an event to celebrate a significant anniversary of the University of Queensland Library. It was later agreed that UQ could host an event alongside the planned Brisbane meeting.

   **Email from Graham Black:**

   “I was wondering if its possible for the CAUL executive to reconsider the dates for the 2010/2 meeting in Brisbane. The dates are currently set for 16-17 September 2010. ALIA has replaced the void left by IFLA with a two day conference on 2-3 September 2010 in Brisbane. It would be good from an attendance and vendor relations perspective if the two events could be held in the one week. Unfortunately, ALIA is restricted in its dates by available time at the Brisbane Convention Centre. Hence my email to you about reconsidering the CAUL dates.”

   The general understanding from CAUL members is that they don’t want to have events backed on to other major events because of the length of time they would be out of the office. In other cases, they may attend the event rather than funding two separate journeys. It was noted that a number of CAUL members did stay on to attend ALIA after the last Perth meeting.

1957. Forthcoming Executive Meetings. It was agreed to prepare a schedule of major items to be addressed at specific meetings during the year, and include them in the agenda item listing future meetings. (Action: DC)

   a) **Draft schedule for 2010.** Options were circulated to the committee. Dates for the first and third meetings are still to be confirmed.

   Potential clashes:

   2010
   Leave/absences currently planned:
   Cathrine Harboe-Ree – January 2009
   2010 April 2-5 Easter
   2010 April 18-21 *Chicago, IL* ICOLC (Diane Costello attending - tbc)
   2010 June 20-24 *Chicago, IL* IATUL (Imogen Garner, Ainslie Dewe attending)
   2010 August 10-15 *Goteborg, Sweden* IFLA 2010
   2010 September 2-3 *Brisbane* ALIA 2010
   2010 October 12-15 *Anaheim, California* EDUCAUSE 2010

   i) **2010/1.** To be confirmed.
ii) **2010/2.** In conjunction with CAUL 2010/1, Canberra, 25-26 March. Note that if this is to be held on March 24, then it must be held late in the day.

iii) **2010/3.** To be confirmed.

iv) **2010/4.** In conjunction with CCA joint executives, Brisbane, 27 July.

v) **2010/5.** In conjunction with CAUL 2010/2, Brisbane, 16-17 September. Note that if this is to be held on March 24, then it must be held late in the day.

vi) **2010/6.** In conjunction with CCA joint executives, Sydney, 17 November.

**1958.** Other business.

a) **Principles for accepting invitations offered to CAUL members and staff.** What principles should be adopted in decided which invitations for a CAUL member, an Executive Member, a member of another CAUL committee, or the Executive Officer, should be accepted? Cathrine Harboe-Ree.

Some points for consideration: What is the likely benefit / risk to CAUL? If it is addressed to the Executive Officer, when is it more appropriate to be represented by a CAUL member? Who is the invitation from? Who is it addressed to? Who is it intended for? What resources (money, time, et al) are involved for CAUL and/or the inviting organisation or the invitee’s organisation? What are the implications for CAUL if the inviting organisation pays travel and/or expenses?

The meeting concluded at 5.15pm.
CAUL Executive Meeting 2010/1
Friday, 12 February 2010, from 8.30am to 3pm
The University of Melbourne, Baillieu Library

DRAFT Minutes
(Updated 18/3/10)

1959. Attendance & Apologies. Cathrine Harboe-Ree (President), Ainslie Dewe (Deputy President), Imogen Garner (Treasurer), Heather Gordon, John Shipp. Andrew Wells joined the meeting at 10am by teleconference for the CEIRC item. In attendance: Diane Costello.

1960. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meeting 2009/6, Melbourne. The draft minutes were included in the agenda papers. There were no amendments.

1961. Minutes of CAUL Meeting 2009/2 – September 21-22, 2009. The draft minutes were included with the previous agenda papers. Notes of several of the Hot Topics presentations are yet to be completed. (Action: DC)

1962. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda.
From CAUL 2009/2:
Item 930. It was suggested that CAUL might assist AUSSE in adding to its library-related questions. It was agreed to consider it in the strategic plan and also to pass for consideration to the BPWG with a view to identifying gaps. (Action: DC)
Item 938. Helen Livingston would like feedback on the revised Insync survey. (Action: HL)

From Executive 2009/6:
Item 1949. ULA. In discussion of the strategic plan and the role of working groups, it was proposed that the ULA Working Group be re-badged to the ULA Reference Group. This will be referred to Shirley Oakley. (Action: DC)

STRATEGIC PLAN
1963. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item). An updated draft for the 2010-2012 plan from Imogen Garner is included with the agenda papers. She noted that the plan did not yet include actions or priorities. It was agreed that all items would be annotated as ongoing or for 2010. (Action: CH-R) A clear numbering system will be added to the plan when it is complete. (Action: DC) A number of suggestions were made to the latest draft:
The membership definition should reflect that in the constitution. Potentially other colleges could become universities, but they would not necessarily become members of Universities Australia.
Communication and Influence
It was suggested that the rationale focus on CAUL’s potential contribution rather than its visibility.
Teaching and Learning
Maximising the outcomes of teaching and learning are as important as maximising research outcomes, and should be reflected in the environment and under the goals. Skills development should be included in the rationale.
Research

The rationale should note that this is a critical time for scholarly communication. The transformation of research has as much impact as the changes in teaching and learning and should be reflected in the environment and the goals. Purchasing fits better under resources rather than institutional repositories. A number of actions in the CEIRC plan should be included here.

Members expressed thanks to Imogen Garner for her work in pulling the document together.

a) From 2007-2009 plan:

22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative (Ad Hoc Working Group) The Go8 has employed Outsell to undertake a cost-benefit study. CAUL is contributing AUD 20,000 and payment is underway. The ANU, UQ and UAdelaide are the libraries being surveyed, and four other Go8 institutions will participate in focus groups to validate the survey results.

Vic Elliott has circulated copies of the Outsell report to all CAUL members, and will discuss it at the CAUL meeting. Cathrine Harboe-Ree noted a wide consistency in the outcomes for each institution, and states that it looks positive for libraries. A key factor was to find whether researchers are aware of the costs of library services. It focussed only on researchers and not on students because a more diffuse survey would have become too difficult methodologically. There has been relatively little research about library value, so this will be a positive contribution. It was suggested that CAUL members may be interested in tabling the Outsell report at meetings of their Academic Boards.

It was noted that IRUA ran a workshop on impact. It covered the return to the university's values e.g. critical thought. For each new proposal, identify how it helps the university in the achievement of its mission. It was suggested including a report from this workshop on the CAUL agenda.

Paul Sherlock has been tentatively invited to speak on CAUDIT benchmarking, and agreed to include this with the IRUA and Outsell reports. (Action: DC)

1964. CAUL Achievement Award. A revised draft of the award criteria has been prepared by John Shipp. Members discussed whether the award should be restricted to library staff e.g. if someone brought in on a project, noting that the aim is to reflect on advances that benefit CAUL. It was agreed that it should continue to be a member of the library staff – it is one of the ways of encouraging professional development within CAUL, it is difficult to envision someone who would be outside the library, and it is supported by members' fees.

The award primarily recognises personal achievement. The award criteria should stress that it is not just for the nominee's doing his/her job, no matter how well it is done. It should be for contribution beyond the day-to-day, for exceptional leadership or advocacy, for breaking the mould, beyond their own institution. It was agreed that the activity should be sustained over at least two years, noting that ALTC awards requires at least 3 years.

The nomination requires the university librarian’s support, but it could be either self-nomination or the university librarian’s nomination. It should include sufficient supporting evidence. Nominations will be called in July, and decisions at the last Executive meeting of the year. The award will be made at the discretion of the Executive, which reserves the right not to make an award. It will be available every year, but dependent on merit. Successful nominees will be advised as soon as possible.

John Shipp will revise the document and send to Diane Costello to add to the CAUL agenda. (Action: JS) (Action: DC)
**CAUL ADMINISTRATION**

**1965. CAUL Finances.** Imogen Garner spoke to the treasurer’s report included in the agenda papers.

It was noted that COSI has not asked for supporting funds. CAUL will pay if travel to meet with the NHMRC is required. If this becomes regular, it should be added as a budget program.

A proposal for additional funding for CEIRC should be prepared for the July meeting in preparation for the September CAUL agenda. *(Action: DC)*

CAIRSS runs to the end of 2010 but preparations for ongoing support should begin immediately. It will be included on the agenda for the CAIRSS steering committee. *(Action: DC)* It was noted that the ADT levy has been retained. It was also noted that CAIRSS has yet to make a substantial start in some areas, e.g. the copyright site not yet available. The Steering Committee should clarify what value CAIRSS does or could add and options for the future, including an exit strategy. A new CAIRSS model may be different from the current one.

**a) CAUL Budget Planning.** The CAUL budget principles have been updated following discussion at CAUL2009/2, and a copy was included in the agenda papers.

It has been proposed that office staffing be expanded, with the second assistant being increased to 25 hours per week, funded out of reserves and to be included in the budget for 2011.

In principle, the CEIRC levy will cover the full cost of the CEIRC program. The 2011 budget proposal should include a full report of CEIRC costs, and note the impact of the 2010 reduction in the CEIRC portfolio. It is expected that members will recognise the value of CEIRC and will accept the necessity of its cost. John Shipp suggested that a regular administrative cost be included in CEIRC subscription costs rather than a fixed fee levy. *(Action: DC)*

Ainslie Dewe asked that project-related, non-recurrent, expenditure be made more visible in the budget report. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will refer to her finance officer for advice. *(Action: CH-R)*


**d) CAUL Budget 2010.** [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2010.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2010.xls) An updated budget spreadsheet was included with the agenda papers. SPARC has been added to the CEIRC program budget. It is suggested that it be moved to a COSI budget. It was noted that it still includes expenditure against the website development, and this will be removed. *(Action: DC)*

**e) NISO (National Information Standards Organisation).** Maxine Brodie has asked whether CAUL might take over payment of Australia’s NISO annual subscription, currently about $11,000 per year. DEST used to pay it, when it was supporting a range of standards-based programs, some led by Neil McLean. DEEWR is not interested in supporting the subscription any longer. It was noted that it is not only CAUL that might benefit, and CAUL’s guidelines were consulted to determine that NISO is not of direct benefit to CAUL members and hence not to be supported from CAUL funds no matter how worthy or that CAUL might be supportive of its goals. It was suggested that the Link Affiliates Team within ADFI at USQ might be the more obvious source of support.

1967. CAUL Web Site.  [http://caul.dev.wiliam.com.au/](http://caul.dev.wiliam.com.au/) Diane Costello reported that she is working towards a launch at the end of February or at least to have a firm launch date. The final CEIRC areas are being updated, and a contact person at ANU is now in place to arrange the move. (Action: DC) It was suggested that the launch take place at the CAUL meeting.

Heather Gordon commented that the site was now built around a content management system which is a positive move, but the Executive will need to work towards an exit strategy, towards cloud computing in the site’s next incarnation. (Action: Executive)

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1968. CAIRSS (CAUL Australasian Institutional Repository Support Services).  Heather Gordon noted some outstanding issues including the dark archive and lack of progress on copyright, however the copyright position at Swinburne has now been filled so this should start things moving. Diane Costello reported on the ARC-CAIRSS meeting last week in Canberra. It was attended by Kate Watson and Peter Sefton, with Diane Costello representing the steering committee. It was noted that a university librarian should be present at future meetings, but late arrangements and logistics made that difficult on this occasion.

a) ADT.  Heather Gordon reported on the discussion of migration from ADT to CAIRSS at the December meeting of the steering committee. It will require all CAUL institutions to migrate theses to institutional repositories by a given date. The question of whether CAUL wishes to maintain a national service should be put on March agenda. The President will discuss with Heather Gordon and Helen Livingston. (Action: CH-R)

1969. Research Infrastructure.  CAUL and CAUDIT have agreed to consider what strategic activity is required for the new generation of research infrastructure and investigate options for communicating these to relevant government entities. CAUL/ACODE/CAUDIT should be lobbying as a group rather than individually. CAUL will endeavour to meet periodically with AeRIC and Universities Australia regarding research infrastructure. It was noted that PMSEIC has just released report on data. [NB: need reference]

a) AeRIC.  Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that AeRIC had only met once. Clare McLaughlin has offered to come to the next CAUL meeting to discuss what is happening in this area. (Action: DC)

Cathrine Harboe-Ree raised the issue of there no longer being any designated source of seed funding for information infrastructure, along the lines of JISC programs. JISC is able to put significant effort into scholarly communication. Most related funds are tied up in ANDS, and CAUL does not have a direct representation on AeRIC. It therefore needs to find other approaches. These could be targeted applications for funding rather than responding to calls from more general funding programs e.g. the government review of clinical placements which could be useful because of support to hospital libraries.

Diane Costello already scans JISC calls for funding applications with a view to highlighting those of interest to CAUL, or which CAUL might wish to replicate. It was suggested that CAUL develop definite proposals for funding, such as for the continuation of CAIRSS, and call for support from Vice-Chancellors and Universities Australia. (Action: Executive)

b) ARCS (Australian Research Collaboration Service).  Cathrine Harboe-Ree prepared a response to ARCS’ call for comments on research data storage and collaboration infrastructure. The comments were returned to ARCS on December 17.

c) CAUL “sharing day on data management.” This was raised at CAUL 2009/2 and later suggested that it may be attached to a CAUL meeting or held separately, depending on the likely range of delegates. Paul Sherlock is interested in CAUDIT’s working with CAUL on research support. There is now a requirement for universities to have metadata stores and five institutions are being funded to test this. It was suggested that consortia be formed with institutions who are using similar software. It was suggested that some
coordination between CAUL, CAUDIT and the research offices could form the basis of a workshop for both CAUL and CAUDIT, to be organised by ANDS, potentially in April/May 2010. (Action: CH-R)

One of ANDS’ goals is that it be the voice for data, and there is a working group to determine what this should look like. It was noted that many institutions would have received a letter from ANDS late in 2009, and most universities are well into the process of determining how to use the available funds.


a) **CAUL Working Group on Open Scholarship - COSI (CAUL Open Scholarship Initiative).** Nominations were called for membership of the working group, and seven were received. In addition to the core members of Judy Stokker, Maxine Brodie and John Shipp, the following were selected: Alex Byrne, Ian McBain, Sandra Jeffries and Larraine Shepherd from CONZUL. The convenors are already in contact with the NHMRC, and will make a presentation at the next CAUL meeting.

1971. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). Andrew Wells joined the meeting by teleconference for this item. A draft plan for 2010-2012 was included with the agenda papers, for Executive approval before presenting to the CEIRC committee. The plan includes agreed items from the CEIRC review and from the Think Tank, and both should be picked up in CAUL’s strategic plan. (Action: AW) It was recommended that the CEIRC committee remain focussed on the program rather than on resources e.g. CAUL office, and that decisions which affect those resources i.e. the handling of invoicing within the office, should be made at the Executive.

The following recommendation should be made more active:

1. Monitor price increases and raise with publishers when they are above agreed limit (currently 3%)

The following recommendation needs to include reporting on its impact:

2. Reduce handling of low take up offers and report on impact on CAUL Office operations

Andrew Wells reported on the meeting with SAGE representatives regarding the next three year contract for SAGE Premier. The negotiation team has requested more information and further clarification.

Two representatives of Electronic Resources Australia, Warwick Cathro from the NLA and Roxanne Missingham from the Parliamentary Library, attended the CEIRC meeting. They reported that although there had been a big take-up by school libraries, it was uneven in the other sectors. They thanked CAUL for its support and expertise over the years that the program was being developed and tested. It was also reported that walk-in access to University electronic resources has been raised with the NLA as a problem. Warwick Cathro noted that universities have a considerable range of resources not held by the NLA. The CEIRC committee has reiterated that this is not a licensing issue, but complicated by equipment resourcing and network security issues. They will endeavour to outline to the NLA how access may be achieved. It was noted that Cathrine Harboe-Ree intends to meet with the Director-General of the NLA in the near future.

a) **CAUL Industry Think Tank, Sydney, 17-18 August 2009.** A revised draft report was included with the agenda papers, for confirmation by the Executive before further circulation. It was suggested that the wording in recommendation 7 does not reflect the rest of the report, and that references to individuals should be removed. Andrew Wells was thanked for his report and will begin on the external “manifesto.” (Action: AW)

It was agreed to hold a think tank in 2011 (not 2012), possibly with a smaller number of specific publishers on pricing mechanisms. It was agreed that CAUL needs to work through the issues first, starting with the next CAUL meeting. It was noted that John Shipp has been invited by Wiley-Blackwell to contribute to their discussions on new pricing
models and Andrew Wells is working with Elsevier, and it would be useful to include a paper on pricing models and allocation models in the CAUL agenda. (Action: AW, JS)

CEIRC will draft a licence clause on confidentiality which highlights those which are satisfactory and those which are not. (Action: CEIRC)

a) **Scopus and Web of Science.** Andrew Wells commented on the firm advice from Diane Costello which contributed to the improvement of the offers, particularly for Thomson Reuters. The model of offering one price for all institutions to participate is not felt to be the best approach. The Executive expressed appreciation to both for their work with Universities Australia.

b) **Australian Publishers Association. Scholarly & Journals Committee.** It was suggested that a meeting might be arranged alongside the next CEIRC meeting in Melbourne. (Action: CH-R)

c) **Casual vacancy on the CEIRC committee.** The Executive endorsed the process to fill the casual vacancy on the CEIRC committee created by the retirement of Debby Macdonald. A member of the committee’s alumni will be invited to complete the term of office. (Action: DC)

**CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING**

**1972. Information Literacy Working Group.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree has invited the group to prepare an exit strategy before winding up, to include a recommendation for the maintenance of the website content. There has been no feedback to date. (Action: DC)


a) **Universities Australia negotiations with CAL.** Diane Costello has been invited to a meeting on February 17 with Universities Australia, Bill Kyrios et al to look at the content of CAUL licences vis-à-vis remuneration for copying. Heather Gordon added that the Expert Reference Group (ERG) will be meeting soon. Universities Australia has identified eight universities to participate in the EUS study and the 2001 guidelines are being evaluated. Each university institutional repository setup is being recorded, and each institution should receive copies of their own data.

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

**1974. 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 has been agreed that the funds be used for project work which doubles as a staff development exercise. Guidelines are being drafted. John Shipp will circulate a proposal that this be used in support of the CAUL Library Staff Development Conference. (Action: JS)

b) **CAUL Library Staff Development Conference 2010.** 19-20 July 2010 at Rydges Melbourne. Ainslie Dewe and Diane Costello reported on progress with the program and organisation, and noted that a reasonable number of institutions have already indicated their intention to send at least one delegate. The session on career planning was discussed and noted that the facilitator would best be someone with an organisational development perspective. It was agreed that the suggested presenter from UWA would be suitable. (Action: DC)

**COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE**

**1975. Communication.** (Standing item)

a) **President’s Report - visit to SCONUL.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported on a meeting with Jane Core, president of SCONUL, and Toby Bainton. SCONUL secretary. Although they welcome their contact with CAUL and its members, they are all facing years of contracting budgets, and are unlikely to be thinking of long-distance study tours for some
time. All resources pricing is print-based because UK libraries pay 17% VAT on electronic resources. They are moving to inter-institutional shared services along the lines of CAVAL and CEIRC.

SCONUL is incorporated and registered as a charity, and receives JISC funding for a number of specific activities. One board member, David Ball, has a focus on international strategies; others focus on lobbying, legislation watch, collaboration. The board conducts a planning meeting once a year with all the chairs of working groups – board members do not participate in any of these groups.

They recently conducted an extensive review of library systems, resulting in a request to HEFCE for funding for a combined system for 12 institutions. [Later note: JISC & SCONUL LMS Study Project: evaluation & horizon scan of HE library management systems & the related systems landscape. Joint Information Systems Committee (UK) http://www.sero.co.uk/jisc-lms.html The recommendations have not been published.]

They are involved in libraries of the future program. Cathrine Harboe-Ree also later met with the consultants engaged on this program – they are trying to look 30-50 years into the future – “if the library is the solution to a problem, what is the problem?”. [Later note: http://www.futurelibraries.info/content/]

SCONUL has signed an MOU with JISC, and now participates in its JIR (JISC Information and Resources) Committee.

i) The President has written to Felicity McGregor on the occasion of her retirement in November 2009.

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

   i) **Australian Library News.** ALN would like to carry more frequent pieces on university libraries. The editor has also suggested that CAUL may wish to guest-edit an issue a year. CAUL members will be invited to nominate if they are interested in being a guest editor. **(Action: DC)**

c) **CAUL Report 2007-2008.** It was agreed that this is not a priority, given that all CAUL activity is reported in the minutes which are all made public. It was agreed to discontinue the practice of producing annual reports. **(Action: DC)**

d) **Executive Officer’s Report.** In concert with the President, Diane Costello is developing an annual plan which will articulate plans for the year – it will be made available to the Executive for comment.

1976. **Submissions to Public Inquiries.** [1975]

   a) **An Indicator Framework for Higher Education Performance Funding: Discussion Paper.** December, 2009 Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). Madeleine McPherson was invited to draft a response from CAUL, and the final copy was submitted on February 5. Ainslie Dewe made a significant contribution to the final submission.

   b) **ARCS Request for Open Comment - EIF Funding Projects - Research Data Storage and Collaboration Infrastructure.** Comments were requested by cob 18 December, 2009. The CAUL response was prepared by Cathrine Harboe-Ree.

   c) **Australian Qualifications Framework.** On July 1, 2009, the Ministerial Council for Tertiary Education and Employment was established with responsibility for the AQF. http://www.deewr.gov.au/Skills/Programs/Pages/Ministerial_Council.aspx The consultation paper is *Strengthening the AQF: An Architecture for Australia’s Qualifications*

website in September 2009, outlining the key issues for the international education sector. An interim report from the Review was made available for consideration by COAG in December 2009 with a final report expected in early 2010. 

http://www.deewr.gov.au/Ministers/Gillard/Media/Releases/Pages/Article_091203_121848.aspx This item will be kept on the agenda until the report is released.


http://digital.org.au/submission/documents/20091216ADAandALCC-Gov2.0Submission.pdf This will need to be taken into account in the strategic plan, and will now be removed from the agenda.


http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/policy_issues_reviews/reviews/highered_review/. The report was released December 17 2008 and the government is expected to respond in March/April. 

http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Review/Pages/ReviewofAustralianHigherEducationReport.aspx This will need to be taken into account in the strategic plan, and will now be removed from the agenda.

g) **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 This will need to be taken into account in the strategic plan, and will now be removed from the agenda.

1977. Relationships with other organisations.

a) **DIISR (Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research) / AeRIC.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree will endeavour to arrange meetings with relevant staff e.g. Julie Evans. (Action: CH-R, DC)

b) **CAUDIT & ACODE.**

i) **Memorandum of Understanding 2003.** CAUDIT undertook to draft terms of reference to replace the MOU. The comments of the committee were referred back to CAUDIT and ACODE on December 14. It was suggested being more explicit that these are peak bodies, with only one from the teaching and learning space, so ACODE and the Council of Australian Directors for Academic Development (CADAD) should determine who represents the sector. (Action: DC)

ii) **EDUCAUSE 2011.** Andrew Wells advises that the conference committee will meet on the first Friday of every month from now on. The item will be included on the CAUL agenda. (Action: DC)

c) **Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA).**

i) **ALIA National Partnerships Standing Committee.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree attended the first teleconference of this committee. Cathrine Harboe-Ree confirmed that this is not of direct relevance to CAUL, and all other sectors were represented by ALIA groups.

ii) **LIS Higher Educators Meeting.** Ainslie Dewe participated in a teleconference on December 2. She reported that CAUL is invited to have a representative attend the Higher Educator meeting in Canberra on 21 July. Following discussions with Sue Hutley, John Shipp volunteered to attend the January 21 meeting on CAUL’s behalf. He reported on the meeting, and is willing to attend again to provide some continuity. (Action: JS)
d) **National Library of Australia.** It was suggested that CAUL and NSLA hold another joint meeting. Correspondence with NSLA indicated an interest in such a joint meeting, but problems in fixing a mutually convenient time in 2010. It was suggested that planning for 2011 meetings take into account the potential for a joint meeting, and that the President would endeavour to meet with the NSLA chair sometime during 2010.  
(\textit{Action: CH-R})

i) **Libraries Australia Advisory Committee.** A call for expressions of interest in representing CAUL was circulated to members on December 7. Liz Burke’s nomination was accepted and the NLA has been advised.

e) **Vision Australia.** “Julie Rae from Vision Australia has asked to meet with me next week [7/12/09] to discuss a national repository of accessible materials.” Cathrine Harboe-Ree It was noted that CAL maintains a database for content prepared for sight-impaired people. There is a preference for the translation to happen at the user end rather than the production end i.e. users have software which translates the content at the point of use. It was agreed to invite Julie RAE to CAUL and include in the teaching and learning / student side of the agenda. It was suggested that an hour-long session might include activities elsewhere such as at QUT and JCU, and include discussion.  
(\textit{Action: DC})

f) **Tertiary Education Associations Forum.** A report from the November TEAF meeting was circulated in December. The notes included the statement “There was near unanimous agreement that there is value in a Tertiary Education Associations Forum.”

1978. CAUL Meetings.

a) **Meeting papers.** It is suggested that each paper include a covering document to explain why the paper is included. Heather Gordon will modify the current reporting template to expand its utility.  
(\textit{Action: HG})

b) **CAUL meeting 2010/1 - March 25-26, Canberra.** The meeting will be held at University House at ANU. The following agenda items have been suggested:

i) **CEIRC/Think Tank.** It was agreed that another Think Tank be held in 2011, and to hold an earlier in-house session with CAUL to tease out the issues before meeting with specific publishers just on pricing. This will be included on the CAUL 2010/1 agenda to ensure no loss of momentum from the 2009 Think Tank. Andrew Wells

ii) **CAIRSS/ADT.** The future, or not, of the ADT should be included with the CAUL 2010/1 agenda, along with the now-urgent target date for the migration of all theses from VT-ETD servers to institutional repositories. The report of options available for using the NLA’s discovery service should be fully expanded by that time. Helen Livingston

iii) **COSI.** A briefing on the purpose and likely activities for the program. Maxine Brodie and Judy Stokker.

iv) **Statistics.** It was suggested that Paul Sherlock be invited to show how CAUDIT is handling its statistics. Imogen Garner referred to current CSFG review of the CAUL statistics, and it was noted that the CSFG was holding a meeting on February 12 to discuss its approach to the review. Paul Sherlock, Craig Anderson

v) **Measurement - benchmarking and the value of libraries.** It was suggested that Paul Sherlock discuss CAUDIT’s work on benchmarking, that Vic Elliott report on the Outsell work, and that the IRU impact work be described. Paul Sherlock, Vic Elliott, Ainslie Dewe

vi) **Research infrastructure and support.** It was agreed to invite Clare McLaughlin to outline the relevant DIISR programs, including ANDS, and the Paul Sherlock discuss CAUDIT’s activities in this area. Diane Costello will contact Paul Sherlock and Clare McLaughlin  
(\textit{Action: DC})

vii) **Teaching/learning focus, student engagement.** Members will be invited to present results of ALTC grants and projects as hot topics.  
(\textit{Action: DC}) It was noted that La Trobe is working on a design for learning, pretesting and post-testing and
demonstrable changes in student behaviour. It was suggested inviting an appropriate person from DEEWR to discuss their work in student equity, student experience, or the partnership program. (Action: DC)

viii) **Vision Australia.** It was agreed to invite Julie Rae to outline VA’s programs and how university libraries may benefit and contribute. (Action: DC)

ix) **Universities Australia.** It was agreed to invite Glenn Withers to discuss Universities Australia’s directions and connections with libraries. (Action: DC)

x) **NLA.** It was suggested inviting someone from the resource discovery side e.g. Rose Holley on Trove, which ties in with CAIRSS/ADT, or People Australia and where the personal names are being sourced. [http://trove.nla.gov.au/](http://trove.nla.gov.au/) It was also suggested that Margy Burn’s area on how people use the NLA for research would be interesting.

xi) **EDUCAUSE 2011.** Andrew Wells will be invited to report.

c) **CAUL meeting 2010/2, Brisbane, 16-17 September.** The ALIA 2010 conference date is set for 2-3 September 2010 in Brisbane at the BCEC. The CAUL meeting will be held in the Gibson Room, (10th floor, Z block), Gardens Point campus. Keith Webster has foreshadowed an event to celebrate a significant anniversary of the University of Queensland Library. It was agreed that UQ could host an event alongside the planned Brisbane meeting should they wish to.

d) **CAUL meeting 2011/1.** Diane Costello will draw up a list of next options, including those where CAUL has never met, and invite members to host. (Action: DC) Heather Gordon offered Townsville.

e) **CAUL meeting 2011/2.**

1979. **Forthcoming Executive Meetings.** Major items for each meeting’s agenda are included in the list below.

a) **Draft schedule for 2010.** Options were circulated to the committee. Dates for the third meeting is still to be confirmed. (Paper included)

Potential clashes:

- 2010
- Leave/absences currently planned:
  - Ainslie Dewe – IATUL –
  - Imogen Garner – IATUL –
  - Diane Costello – May/June (tbc), including an OUP library committee meeting.

- 2010 April 2-5 Easter
- 2010 April 18-21 Chicago, IL ICOLC (Diane Costello attending – tbc)
- 2010 June 20-24 Chicago, IL IATUL (Imogen Garner, Ainslie Dewe attending)
- 2010 August 10-15 Goteborg, Sweden IFLA 2010
- 2010 September 2-3 Brisbane ALIA 2010
- 2010 October 12–15 Anaheim, California EDUCAUSE 2010

i) **2010/2.** In conjunction with CAUL 2010/1, Canberra, 25-26 March. The meeting will be held in the morning of the 24th, with joint lunch with the CAIRSS steering committee who will now meet in the afternoon, as John Shipp is attending an ALIA meeting in the afternoon from 1pm. Agenda items will include:

- reviewing the agenda for CAUL 2010/1;

ii) **2010/3.** Melbourne, Tuesday 4 May. Dinner Monday.

iii) **2010/4.** In conjunction with CCA joint executives, Brisbane, 27 July. Agenda items will include:

- planning for CAUL 2010/2;
planning the 2011 budget, specifically any rise in membership fees, CEIRC resourcing, the future (funding) of CAIRSS;

iv) 2010/5. In conjunction with CAUL 2010/2, Brisbane, 16-17 September. Note that if this is to be held on September 15, then it must be held late in the day. Agenda items will include:

- reviewing the agenda for CAUL 2010/2;

v) 2010/6. In conjunction with CCA joint executives, Sydney, 17 November. Agenda items will include:

- the CAUL Achievement Award decision;

vi) 2011/1. Planning for CAUL 2011/1.

vii) 2011/2. In conjunction with CAUL 2011/1. Agenda items will include:

- reviewing the agenda for CAUL 2011/1;


a) Principles for accepting invitations offered to CAUL members and staff. (This item was held over from the last meeting.) What principles should be adopted in deciding which invitations to the Executive Officer or to a CAUL member, an Executive Member, or a member of another CAUL committee, should be accepted?

Some points for consideration: What is the likely benefit / risk to CAUL? If it is addressed to the Executive Officer, when is it more appropriate to be represented by a CAUL member? Who is the invitation from? Who is it addressed to? Who is it intended for? What resources (money, time, et al) are involved for CAUL and/or the inviting organisation or the invitee's organisation? What are the implications for CAUL if the inviting organisation pays travel and/or expenses?

A current invitation to Diane Costello to attend an advisory meeting of Oxford University Press was included in the papers as an example.

In response to a question about personal benefits of attending these meetings, Diane Costello referred to the interaction with the company executives who do not attend trade exhibitions in Australia, to take the opportunity to educate them about local conditions and requirements, to press for changes that sometimes need a direct approach rather than via the regional or local account managers, the opportunity to work with the other international delegates, including other consortium officers and compare how operations and negotiations are handled, and as a professional development opportunity.

In discussion, John Shipp suggested that the Executive Officer is likely to have a wider perspective on CEIRC-related matters than any individual CAUL member. Vendors recognise CAUL/CEIRC as having the answers they want, and the Executive Officer is tied in clearly to this. Other members of the CEIRC committee may be proffered as options, but many would want the Executive Officer specifically.

It was acknowledged that all invitations cannot be accepted, and recommended that no more than one a year be chosen, that it be chosen for CAUL's strategic benefit, and that other publishers be offered an option of a videoconference or an alternative delegate such as a member of the CEIRC committee, or perhaps the CAUL President.

In discussion on specific invitations, it was agreed that the Nature Publishing Group invitation be accepted, both because of the opportunity to press for changes raised recently at the CAUL Think Tank, including a capped pay-per-view option, and because it has been scheduled immediately after the ICOLC meeting in April. It was noted that this is the fourth NPG invitation (and the third acceptance) which may not necessarily be repeated because advisory committee members are rotated regularly.

Diane Costello expressed interest in accepting the OUP invitation in late May, particularly because it is the first time that OUP has invited anyone from this region, and because it
conveniently overlaps with holiday plans. The Executive emphasised that holidays should ideally kept separate from work commitments, but permitted the decision to be left with Diane Costello.

It was agreed to decline the Springer invitation, to be held in Amsterdam immediately prior to the ICOLC meeting in Chicago, and to suggest as alternatives other members of the CEIRC committee. (Action: DC) It was noted that Andrew Wells had also been invited but was also unable to attend.

b) Libraries Australia. The NLA has amended the Libraries Australia fees, taking total library expenditure from CAUL statistics, as specified in 2006, highlighting that tier cut-offs have been raised by 15% raise, and the subscriptions within tiers by 5%. Members were reminded that when discussed in 2006, CAUL was unable to reach a consensus and it was agreed that the NLA should communicate individually with the institutions with whom the NLA has contracts. It was still agreed that total library expenditure is not an appropriate parameter. The CAUL Executive agreed not to comment otherwise on the model. (Action: CH-R)

c) ALIA submission on online content regulation. Submissions to the government inquiry are due Friday 12 February and Derek Whitehead has offered to review ALIA’s proposed joint submission on behalf of CAUL. It was agree that it is an important issue about freedom of information, but it would prefer a different approach, to include implications for universities. It was agreed not to include endorsement by CAUL. (Action: DC)

The meeting concluded at 2.45pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>The Strategic Plan was last reviewed thoroughly at CAUL 2006/1. Executive decided to review the plan in April 2009 and discussion of a new plan for 2010 – 2012 was on the CAUL 2009/2 agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>CAUL Executive 2009/2 – CAUL 2010/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>An updated Strategic Plan for 2010 – 2012 has been drafted based on the previous plan, and input from Executive, and CAUL members at the meeting in September 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td>A draft Strategic Plan 2010 - 2012 has been prepared for approval by CAUL members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>Once approved by CAUL, the Plan will be finalised and placed on the CAUL website. Actions listed for 2010 will be a priority during the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL budget implications</td>
<td>Currently unknown but 2010 actions will be considered and funded as required by Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>That the draft Strategic Plan 2010 – 2012 be accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro-forma updated 18 February 2010
STRATEGIC PLAN
2010-2012

(Drafted 7 March 2010)

CAUL Mission

To support CAUL 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 mission 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

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 socio-economic status and indigenous students;
- Changes in learning and teaching practices facilitated by evolving pedagogical theory and technology;
- Changes in research practices facilitated by evolving technology and increasingly involving collaboration;
- The transformation of scholarly communication including 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; and
- The enduring importance of the librarian’s role and values in an increasingly complex information 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; and
- Openness, responsiveness and customer focus.

Goals

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

- To provide leadership in relevant higher education developments and information policy, and communicate activities to key stakeholders;
- To facilitate the members’ role in supporting and maximising learning and teaching outcomes and contributing positively to the student experience;
- To facilitate the members’ role in supporting and maximising research outcomes;
- To maximise access to information resources and facilitate libraries’ wider scholarly communication and information management roles; and
- To promote continuous improvement and best practice in pursuit of internationally recognised high quality library services and operations.

Actions

Many actions listed under each goal will continue for the life of the Plan. However priority actions for 2010 are noted in each section.
1. COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE

Goal
To provide leadership in relevant higher education developments and information policy, and communicate activities to key stakeholders.

Rationale
CAUL has a unique and important perspective on information, research and education and should contribute to national policy and planning in these areas. CAUL’s ability to project a coherent perspective on key issues of national information policy and resources and communicate the benefits of collaborative and cooperative action undertaken by CAUL and its members is vital to the continued visibility, relevance and importance of university libraries.

Actions
Collaboration & International Engagement
1. Through the CAUL/CAUDIT/ACODE joint executive meetings collaborate on areas of common interest including research support activities, professional development, conferences and general information sharing on current activities. (Executive)
2. Build relationships to ensure collaboration with library and information science sector organisations, both national and international including CONZUL, ALIA & NSLA. (Executive)
3. Actively promote engagement with higher education libraries through study tours that foster closer ties and international understanding. (All members)

Policy in Higher Education and Information Infrastructure
4. Proactively build influence and visibility with policy makers through representation and public submissions, as appropriate. (Executive)
5. Influence the copyright policy and regulatory environment through submissions, relevant committees and bodies. (Executive)
6. Commission research as required. (Executive)
7. Develop a cooperative relationship with Universities Australia (UA). (President and Deputy, 2010)
8. Develop effective relationships with government and research bodies such as NHMRC, ARC, ANDS, DIISR, DEEWR etc. (Executive and COSI, 2010)

External Communication
9. Develop, maintain and promote the CAUL website as a source of information about higher education issues of relevance to university libraries. (Executive Officer and All members)
10. Issue press releases as appropriate. (President)

Internal Communication
11. Ensure that all CAUL members are kept informed of the key activities of the Executive and CAUL Working Groups through reports at meetings and copies of minutes available in agenda papers and on the web. (Executive & Chairs, Working Groups)
12. Welcome and induct new members into CAUL and encourage their participation. (President, Executive Officer and all members)

Planning
13. Regularly review the CAUL strategic plan and report to members on actions in the plan. (Executive & Chairs, Working Groups)
II. CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING AND TEACHING

Goal
To facilitate the members’ role in supporting and maximising learning and teaching outcomes and contributing positively to the student experience.

Rationale
University libraries make a major contribution to learning and teaching through the provision of facilities, services, resources and skills development programs, both physical and virtual.

Physical facilities have undergone major transformations in response to changes in pedagogy and technology and online, location-independent services have emerged as a significant alternative method of service and resource provision.

Developments in flexible learning are forging stronger collaboration between libraries, teaching & learning units, IT departments and faculties.

Actions

Learning outcomes
14. Work collaboratively within CAUL and with CAUDIT and ACODE to improve the student experience. (Executive, T&L Working Group)
15. Collaborate with deans’ groups to engage with specific disciplines. (All members)
17. Explore the library’s role in contributing to T&L standards and quality audits under TEQSA. (T&L Working Group, 2010)
18. Further investigate the contribution of libraries to learning outcomes and the student experience by drawing on research such as the AUSSE survey. (T&L Working Group, 2010)

Information Literacy
19. Share best practice on information literacy. (All members)

Learning spaces
20. Share best practice on the evolution of learning spaces. (All members);

Offshore service delivery
21. Continue to monitor and review the CAUL guidelines for offshore service delivery. (Ad Hoc Working Group)

Indigenous, intercultural and international curriculum
22. Share information about indigenous, intercultural and international activities and the internationalisation of the curriculum. (All members)
III. CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

Goal
To facilitate the members’ role in supporting and maximising research outcomes.

Rationale
University libraries are actively engaged in the Government’s research agenda, particularly through eResearch, institutional repositories and research training. CAUL will continue to respond to emerging opportunities to support and maximise research outcomes and develop strong relationships with research bodies in Australia and overseas.

Actions

eResearch

23. Contribute to the national and international agenda on eResearch initiatives such as the National eResearch Infrastructure Council (NRIC), the Australian eResearch Infrastructure Committee (AeRIC), and the Australian National Data Service (ANDS). (Executive, All members)

24. Explore data management issues and engage in professional development opportunities relevant to university libraries. (All members)

Institutional repositories

25. Contribute to the development and promotion of institutional repositories initiatives. (All members)

26. Share practice in research training in accordance with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. (All members)

27. Determine the future of CAIRSS from 2011. (Executive, CAIRSS, 2010)

28. Continue to support repositories through the CAUL Australian Institutional Repository Support Service (CAIRSS), including standards and best practice. (CAIRSS Steering Committee, 2010)

29. Promote the role of university libraries in the ongoing development of institutional repository initiatives including ERA. (Executive, CAIRSS, 2010)

Open Scholarship

30. Establish a working group on open access called the CAUL Open Scholarship Initiative. (COSI). (Executive, 2010)

31. Revise the CAUL Statement on Open Access. (COSI, 2010)

32. Review the work of other bodies, such as SPARC, to identify strategies and resources that could be adapted for the development of a “toolkit” for members. (COSI, 2010)

33. Provide briefings for CAUL on aspects of “open scholarship”. (COSI)

34. Draft a lobbying/communication strategy, in consultation with CAUL Executive, for the sector. (COSI, 2010)

35. Work with NHMRC to plan for the inclusion of preprints in institutional repositories. (President, COSI, CAIRSS, 2010)

36. Identify organisations that CAUL should establish and maintain links with to progress the open access agenda. (COSI, 2010)

37. Identify training and awareness raising initiatives for staff of member institutions. (COSI, 2010)

Research Training

38. Ensure active sharing of information among CAUL members via ‘Hot Topics’ on developments in support of research. (All members)
IV. INFORMATION RESOURCES

Goal
To maximise access to information resources and facilitate libraries’ wider scholarly communication and information management roles.

Rationale
University libraries’ primary goal continues to be the provision of access to scholarly information. CAUL members manage substantial budgets for information resources and depend on suppliers of scholarly information to meet the research and teaching needs of their institutions. CEIRC is CAUL’s key program for managing relationships with suppliers of electronic information resources. CAUL members have ongoing interests in the transformation of scholarly communication and how information can be used in research, teaching and resource sharing. These interests are addressed through activities in the cooperative acquisition of resources, resource sharing and copyright.

This is a critical time in the evolution of scholarly communication; CAUL must closely monitor and, as appropriate, lead developments and endeavour to achieve optimal outcomes for its members.

Actions

Cost-efficient access to resources

39. Continue to monitor and review protocols for University Library Australia (ULA) – the national borrowing scheme – and address specific issues as they arise. (ULA Reference Group)

40. Develop and test new pricing models, including unbundling. (CEIRC Committee, 2010)

41. Monitor publishers’ price increases. (CEIRC Committee)

42. Undertake price negotiations with major vendors, and establish negotiating teams for major suppliers. (CEIRC Committee)

43. Focus on high take-up subscriptions and reduce the number of low take-up offers. (CEIRC Committee, 2010)

44. Organise a follow up CAUL Think Tank in 2011 to build vendor relationships and CAUL members’ knowledge of the issues. (CEIRC Committee)

45. Communicate regularly to the membership on key CEIRC matters. (CEIRC Chair)

Copyright and intellectual property

46. Contribute to the ongoing operations of the Australian Libraries’ Copyright Committee (ALCC). (Executive representative)

47. Work with Universities Australia (UA) on negotiations with CAL. (CAUL President/Executive Officer, 2010)

48. Educate academics about copyright ownership. (All members)

49. Provide a CAUL statement on academic copyright issues to inform the university community. (Executive, 2010)

50. Finalise the copyright toolkit and arrange delivery through CAIRSS. (CAIRSS, 2010)
V. DELIVERING QUALITY AND VALUE

Goal
To promote continuous improvement and best practice in pursuit of internationally recognised high quality library services and operations.

Rationale
Changes in information and higher education are leading to transformations in the ways universities and university libraries operate and deliver services. Traditional performance measures do not capture new and emerging services. A major challenge is to develop a new language to demonstrate the value of libraries and identify new performance measures that enable meaningful and relevant benchmarking.

Actions

Benchmarking and statistics
51. Continue to use *Insync surveys* for data collection for benchmarking between CAUL members. (All Members)
52. Review and update the CAUL statistics on relevant Australian university library outputs and activities. (Statistics Working Group, 2010)
53. Contribute to the development of international performance measures. (BPWG)
54. Monitor and engage in workforce planning activities for the sector to ensure the development of a capable workforce for the future. (BPWG).

Staff development
55. Facilitate the enhancement of knowledge and skills of members and their staff in delivering high quality outcomes through seminars, workshops, think tanks etc. (Executive)
56. Continue to deliver CAUL Library Staff Development Conferences on a biennial basis from 2010. (Executive/AD Hoc Working Group)
57. Continue to offer the annual CAUL Achievement Award. (Executive);
58. Develop guidelines for the UNISON Staff Development Award. (Executive, 2010)

The value proposition
59. Contribute to a greater understanding of the value proposition of university libraries through support of the GO8 Outsell study. (Executive, 2010)

Best Practice
60. Monitor AUQA and TEQSA developments relevant to university libraries. (Executive, BPWG)
61. Contribute to continuous improvement using survey data to identify high performance libraries for benchmarking. (All members)
62. Continue to promote the use of client surveys to facilitate benchmarking activities. (BPWG)

Education for the library & information science (LIS) sector
63. Contribute to discussions on LIS education and communicate with educators on future requirements for higher education libraries. (Executive, All members)
ATTACHMENT: Acronyms

ACODE – Australian Council on Open, Distance and E-Learning
AeRIC – Australian eResearch Infrastructure Committee
ALIA – Australian Library and Information Association
ALCC - Australian Libraries’ Copyright Committee
ANDS – Australian National Data Services
ARC – Australian Research Council
AUQA – Australian Universities Quality Agency
AUSSE – Australasian Survey of Student Engagement
BPWG – Best Practice Work Group
CAIRSS – CAUL Australian Institutional Repository Support Service
CAL – Copyright Agency Limited
CAUDIT – Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology
CAUL – Council of Australian University Librarians
CEIRC – CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee
CONZUL – Council of New Zealand University Librarians
COSI – CAUL Open Scholarship Initiative
DEEWR – Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
DIISR – Department of Immigration, Industry, Science and Research
ERA – Excellence in Research for Australia
LIS – Library & Information Science
NHMRC – National Health and Medical Research Council
NRIC – National eResearch Infrastructure Council
NSLA – National & State Libraries Australia
SPARC – Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition
TEQSA – Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency
UA – Universities Australia
ULA – University Library Australia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>II. CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchase and licensing of electronic information resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>The committee has met three times – November, February, March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The negotiation team has met with SAGE to discuss the renewal of the three year agreement for SAGE Premier which finishes this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td>The CEIRC plan for 2010-2012 has been developed in concert with the CAUL Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The report from the 2009 Think Tank has been reviewed and actions developed in concert with the CAUL Executive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A plan for the rationalisation of the CEIRC portfolio has been developed, and implementation begun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The CEIRC risk management plan has been reviewed and plans for its revamp are underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</td>
<td>A report on the CEIRC portfolio, showing the number of institutions subscribing to each publisher's portfolio was published to the Datasets Coordinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>The process for rationalisation of the CEIRC portfolio will continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The CEIRC risk management plan will be further developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplans for discussion with selected publishers on new pricing models (including investigation of unbundling) will be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL budget implications</td>
<td>To be considered for the next report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>That CAUL endorse the CEIRC plan for 2010-2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That CAUL notes the Think Tank 2009 report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro-forma updated 18 February 2010
CEIRC PROGRAM

2010-2012

1. Introduction

This document sets out the purpose, governance and principles of the CEIRC Program for 2010-2012. It supersedes the CEIRC Strategic Directions 2004 document and replaces the CEIRC Terms of Reference and Mode of Operation dated October 2002. An Action Plan is included as an appendix, so that it can be updated as required.

2. Purpose and Value

The CAUL Strategic Plan 2010-2012 includes the CEIRC Program in the Information Resources area, with the goal of maximising access to information resources and facilitating libraries’ wider scholarly communication and information management roles. In the CAUL Strategic Plan, it is noted that the CEIRC Program is CAUL’s key means of managing relationships with commercial providers of scholarly communication. The CEIRC Program must therefore manage relationships between CAUL members and suppliers to maximise access to information resources in a number of dimensions:

- cost-effectiveness
- cost-sharing
- access that meets the needs of research, learning and teaching
- long term access
- technical or platform requirements that do not restrict access.

The CEIRC Program needs to be coherent with other CAUL programs or activities in scholarly communication, such as the CAUL Open Scholarship Initiative (COSI).

The 2007 CEIRC review surveyed CEIRC Program’s members who noted these specific benefits:

- Efficient administrative support for subscription management which reduced institutional costs
- Easy access to a wealth of information on content and subscription options
- Ability to opt in or opt out of subscriptions
- CAUL Office expertise

The review recommended building on these benefits through increased efforts in communication with members, more proactive identification of vendor sources and more aggressive price negotiation with vendors. The CAUL Executive supported these recommendations subject to availability of resources.

The 2009 CAUL Think Tank reinforced the role of the CEIRC Program as CAUL’s primary vehicle for relationships with suppliers, with members requesting specific attention to pricing models, price increases, ‘big deal’ issues and usage measurement.

3. Governance

CAUL delegates the oversight and direction of the CEIRC Program to a committee called CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). The day-to-day operation of the CEIRC Program resides in the CAUL Office under the supervision of the CAUL Executive Officer. While not strictly a part of governance, the institutional Datasets Coordinators play an important role in CEIRC operations and decisions CEIRC makes.
3.1 CEIRC Membership

CEIRC has six members. Three are CAUL members, two elected by the membership and the third nominated by the CAUL Executive. The CAUL Executive selects the Chair and Deputy Chair of CEIRC from this group. Two members are institutional Datasets Coordinators, selected from a shortlist by the CAUL Executive. One member is a CONZUL representative nominated by CONZUL. CEIRC meets face to face 4 to 5 times a year.

3.2 Datasets Coordinators

Datasets Coordinators meet face to face annually. Recommendations from this meeting are referred initially to CEIRC for consideration.

4. CEIRC Program Operations

4.1 Administration

The Program has grown quickly over a decade, with increases in the number of members, suppliers and products. The CEIRC review recommended reduction in workload and costs by focusing only on high take up subscriptions and containing membership. In 2008, the CAUL Executive acted on the latter and the CEIRC Program no longer accepts new external members. Progress on reducing low take up subscriptions is a priority for the Program in the 2010-2012 period. The CAUL Office supports CEIRC meetings. The CEIRC review recommended use of software packages for records management to reduce risk and increase efficiency. The CAUL Office has commenced implementation of ACT by Sagesoft. The CAUL Office communicates its resource needs to the CAUL Executive after consulting with CEIRC.

4.2 Communication to Members

For the CEIRC Program, key responsibilities for communication belong to the CAUL Office and the institutional Datasets Coordinators. Through the datasets email list, interactions between these two groups are vital to the operations of the Program. Institutional Datasets Coordinators have important local responsibilities in keeping CAUL members informed as well as taking and communicating their advice. Responsiveness and accuracy are required of all groups.

For CEIRC, the Chair has responsibilities to communicate regularly to the membership on key CEIRC matters. The Chair must keep CAUL Executive informed and take its advice as required. Major suppliers should also be reminded to communicate with the CEIRC Chair on important matters.

The draft minutes of CEIRC meetings are normally made available within 10 working days of the meeting to all members.

4.3 External Representation and Relationships

External representation of CAUL or the CEIRC Program is referred to the CAUL Executive. Personal invitations to represent CAUL or the CEIRC Program to any CAUL member or the CAUL Executive Officer are referred to the CAUL Executive. Vendors should be encouraged to seek CAUL or CEIRC representation through the CAUL President or the Chair of CEIRC. The 2009 Think Tank brought CAUL members and vendors face to face to discuss issues in depth. Holding such events more often is considered beneficial as it assists to build relationships.

4.4 Contracts and Licenses

The CEIRC Program is extremely flexible in the variety of ways it comes to agreements with suppliers. It extends this flexibility to members allowing them to opt in or opt out of CAUL negotiated agreements. The CEIRC Program collects funds on behalf of its members for payments of subscriptions. There are occasional concerns expressed at these operations being carried by CAUL which is an unincorporated organisation. The CEIRC review obtained legal advice that provided means to reduce risk by use of standard clauses clearly identifying CEIRC members as the
licensee and/or clearly limiting the potential liability of CAUL to matters over which CAUL has real control. CEIRC needs to monitor this and ensure agreements are revised as they are renewed. CEIRC needs to take a more active interest in the area of contracts to minimise variety with its attendant costs.

CAUL Office handles invoicing, when there is a financial incentive to do so for its members, and currently does so for about half of the publishers with whom CAUL has agreements.

4.5 Budget

CAUL/CONZUL members pay the same levy. External members pay a higher levy.

CAUL operates local and foreign currency accounts in which member payments are held before subscription payments are made to suppliers.

CEIRC budget matters are addressed in two points of the CAUL Budget Principles (2009):

- The CEIRC levy will cover the full operating costs of the CEIRC Program
- Interest earned in the CAUL foreign currency accounts shall be held in those accounts to provide cash flow to meet payments.

The CEIRC levy is determined by CAUL Executive as part of annual budget process.

4.6 Invoicing and payments

Terms and rules are established by the CAUL Executive and administered by the CAUL Office in communication with Datasets Coordinators.

All members are encouraged to make payments to the CAUL Office by due dates as this reduces costs.

4.7 Negotiation

For major suppliers, negotiating teams will be established in consultation with the CAUL Executive. The CAUL Executive Officer will obtain information for the team prior to negotiations commencing – this may include likely terms of offer, pricing models, license conditions and usage.

5. Summary

In 2010-2012, key activities for the CEIRC Program will be to complete recommendations accepted by the CAUL Executive and matters that arose from the Think Tank.

Andrew Wells
17 March 2010
**ACTIONS 2010-2012**

1. Develop and test new pricing models, including unbundling, with major vendors
   - RMIT Publishing
   - Springer
   - Wiley-Blackwell
   - Elsevier (via Go8)
   - Taylor & Francis

2. Monitor price increases and raise with publishers when they are above agreed limit (currently 3%)

3. Undertake negotiations with major vendors
   - SAGE
   - Lexis Nexis
   - Emerald (2011 item)
   - CAS (2011 item)
   - ACS (possible)
   - Nature Publishing Group – frequent change of models, inconsistent approach to CAUL
   - Thomson Reuters (2012)
   - Scopus (2012)

4. Reduce handling of low take up offers and report on impact on CAUL Office operations

5. Support CAUL Office in review of implementation of ACT/Sagesoft to determine if it results in improved efficiency and risk management [these were identified as potential gains in the CEIRC review]

6. Hold follow up Think Tank in 2011
CAUL THINK TANK 2009

CAUL invited around 80 representatives of university libraries, publishers and agents to a Think Tank held in Sydney on August 17 and 18, 2009. Two academic staff also participated. David Prosser, CEO of SPARC Europe, was the keynote speaker. The program, background papers and presentations will be placed on the CAUL web site (http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/thinktank2009.html)

A stimulus for the event was the global economic crisis and its effects on scholarly publishing. As discussion unfolded over the two days, it became clear that the critical underlying issue is the sustainability of the current system of scholarly publishing.

This report is not intended to be a description of the event, nor does it attempt to record every point that was raised. Instead, the report identifies key issues that emerged over the two days and makes recommendations for further action by CAUL members.

All participants found the event worthwhile. CAUL needs to maintain its engagement with publishers and these issues, so should consider holding similar events on a more regular basis.

1. Pricing models

Most participants recognised the need to move away from current pricing models which are based on historical print spend and appear to be designed for revenue protection. Current models have resulted in loss of parity among like institutions. Many librarians expressed concern about paying for unused content in big deals. A useful discussion could address the value of access compared with the value of actual use. While participants could describe the problems very well, it is fair to say that no-one can come up with solutions. David Prosser identified value as a key issue and suggested that if we were starting from scratch, we could use metric based pricing using indicators such as: total citations; local citations; downloads; research spend; academic and/or student FTEs; and, national or local peer review and evaluation. Elsevier described a possible approach using categories such as research intensiveness, size and geography. Participants noted the transition made by the American Chemical Society to a new pricing model. All parties recognise the negative potential of usage based pricing.

CAUL needs to engage in experimenting with different pricing models with publishers. Transition to new models will inevitably result in winners and losers.

Recommendations:

- Keep this issue in front of publishers. It suits them to stay with current models because it protects revenue. CEIRC is the primary vehicle for this but all members need to contribute to this.

- Encourage and support members to work with publishers on new pricing models. Elsevier has approached UNSW to join a working party. Go8 members have requested action from Taylor & Francis, Wiley-Blackwell and Springer. Emerald, RMIT Publishing, Springer and Wiley-Blackwell have agreed to work with CEIRC over the next three years with a view to establishing new or revised models for the next agreements.
2. **Price increases**

Publishers hope and expect that the global economic crisis is a one-off and plan for the return of price increases starting at 4-5% from 2011. Librarians stressed that their budgets do not increase by these amounts. This is a key issue in negotiation at consortial and local levels. The issue is often hidden by favourable currency movements. Currencies fluctuate: it is important that price increases from the big publishers are resisted because of likely effect on purchasing of specialised materials and monographs. Flexible payment options for large deals are required by some universities to meet internal cash flow requirements.

Recommendations:

- CEIRC negotiations to aim for price increases of 3% or less and removal of confidentiality clauses
- Local negotiations to aim for similar levels
- All members to share information and work together when excessive price increases are proposed. A recent example is Kluwer Law proposing 10%
- Members share information about alternative payment schedules negotiated with suppliers

3. **The Big Deal**

There are a range of views about the big deal. Some like them and some don’t. Everyone understands the difficulties in unbundling them. One publisher complimented the librarians for paying for big deals because it helped fund weaker titles. These titles could either be titles with a small target market or titles of lower interest in their given field – it is not clear which (or whether it is both). This issue is complementary to the pricing model problem. The difference lies in the difficulties libraries face if they prefer to select titles rather than take an entire package. The pricing of individual titles is generally not comparable to the price for everything. There needs to be flexibility and more open pricing approaches.

Recommendation:

- CEIRC find a willing publisher or two to model unbundling of a big deal then turn it into real offers to libraries

4. **Content, metadata and the extras**

A recurring theme was what librarians regard as ‘frills’ and publishers regard as ‘enhancements’. Libraries that are planning to use Primo or Summon need publishers’ metadata as a part of these services for them to be effective. Librarians want the content and want to get users to it as quickly as possible. Publishers want users to get to their web sites, and use their search options, social software and interfaces. No common ground on this issue was evident. Publishers resist component pricing and want to be what was described as ‘full-service partners’ when libraries may be happy to have a ‘Virgin’ or ‘RyanAir’ equivalent.
This is the type of issue that could be taken up by a SPARC type initiative. We need to add our voice to our international partners. We do not know the value our users place on what librarians see as extras. CAUL could consider commissioning research on this topic.

5. **Institutional repositories**

The deposit of articles (pre- or post-print, final article) arose as a standard right libraries want. Publishers vary in their response as to which versions are allowed and when they can be deposited. CAUL should adopt a minimum requirement in licences. Recommendation:

- CEIRC to negotiate deposit of the publisher’s version and/or deposit of the accepted manuscript (Green OA) as a minimum requirement in licences as they are renewed and negotiate from that position

6. **Communication to academic staff and researchers**

The two academic staff gave revealing presentations. They confessed little awareness of the issues, including pricing. Both described the pressure to publish in the ‘best’ journals. The computer science researcher described how research is shared among the discipline, through conferences and networks. Publication in a journal is primarily important for prestige, not for the work of research. The education academic was very aware of open access issues, which are supported at a high level in her university.

Communication and advocacy to academics is the responsibility of every CAUL member. CAUL has provided resources over the years to assist members. This could be scaled up if a SPARC type initiative could be established and maintained.

7. **Usage**

To quote Derek Whitehead: “John Shipp rightly pointed out that he doesn’t have a clue about who uses what. There are ways to find out, and we should expect to find that patterns which apply at one university are likely to apply at others. The wonderful CAUL Statistics Focus Group could take this one up.”

Recommendation: Refer to the CAUL Statistics Focus Group – particularly “who uses what”. COUNTER is a worthy project to normalise what is counted, but we need better information about who is using what. Other questions might be “how” and “what for” but these are wider than statistics. Statistics on “who” would be a good place to start though.

Greg Anderson, Diane Costello, Andrew Wells

16 December 2009
### Section: Contribution to Teaching and Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Review global best practice and make it available to CAUL members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 September alongside CAUL meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of IL Practitioners finalised and disseminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions held with Exec regarding winding down ILWG. Other ILWG members supportive but would like to see it replaced with a broader working group looking at Teaching and Learning issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td>132 responses received for IL Practitioners' survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports,</td>
<td>Report of survey results completed - attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publications since last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>None at this stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL budget implications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>1. That the report be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. That the results of the survey be disseminated to respondents and made available from the CAUL homepage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. That CAUL give serious consideration to facilitating the establishment of a clearinghouse of learning materials that could be used in Information Literacy programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. That CAUL give serious consideration to convening a meeting of Information Literacy practitioners given inactivity in this area from ANZIIL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. That CAUL accepts the proposal from Executive that ILWG be discontinued due to the operationalisation of the activity within our institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Literacy Practitioners’ Survey 2009

Report of Results

Executive Summary

• The results are representative of the sector, with 114 useable responses from 39 of the possible 48 University libraries in Australia and New Zealand.

• There is general support for the term “Information Literacy” with no clear alternative being suggested.

• There is a clear willingness to share instructional materials that have already been developed and agreement that providing access to this material in a central location is seen as an appropriate role for CAUL.

• The results indicate that while Information Literacy is not currently embedded into the curriculum in most Universities there is strong support for it to be so.

• There is also support for online tutorials necessary to complete before graduation, and for discipline specific tutorials to enable benchmarking.

• Information Literacy is seen to be valued by most stakeholders in Universities.

• There was strong support for teaching qualifications for library staff involved in Information Literacy, with a Cert IV in Workplace Training and Assessment being the most popular suggestion.

• The CAUL ILWG website was not well used by respondents, whereas ANZIIL was still seen as a useful resource, even though there has been no activity on that site for over 2 years.

• There was strong support for CAUL to provide a clearing house of learning resources that have been developed, and to convene meetings, seminars on the topic of Information Literacy.

Background info

No. of respondents
132, however only 114 of these were useable. A number of respondents did not complete more than the initial generic questions.

Responses received from 35/40 university libraries (Aus), and 4/8 New Zealand university libraries = reasonable representation
**Position titles:**
Branch Librarian (Section, Branch, Liaison Coordinator) - 33
Executive Level - 2
Librarian (incl Liaison, Faculty, School, Subject, Support) - 76
Other: Archivist, Educational designer - 2
No answer: 5

Majority of responses from targeted group: practitioners.

**Highest qualification of respondents:**

The vast majority of respondents are professionally qualified librarians.

Only 24 of the respondents have a teaching qualification, 8 of which was a Cert IV in Workplace Training and Assessment.

**Terminology**

The majority of respondents are in agreement with the term “Information Literacy”. 14 respondents skipped this question. 65.6% agree with the use of the term, while 34.5% disagreed.
73 respondents chose to provide a comment for this question. 27 of these indicated they didn't like the term “information literacy” as it is not understood by library clients or those outside the library industry. A further 11 indicated confusion over the definition/use of the term, while another 7 indicated concern about the associated term of being “illiterate”, and 7 indicated it was an antiquated term. 13 of those that commented indicated support for the term, mainly because it was a good, all encompassing term (7 respondents).

We asked respondents if they used the term “information literacy” in their communications with clients, and 75 out of the 124 (60.5%) who responded indicated they did, while 39 (40.5%) indicated they did not.

Only 42 (40%) participants responded to our request to provide an alternative term for “information literacy”. Of those the most popular suggestion was
Research Skills (14/42), followed by Information Skills (9/42), and Information Research Skills (5/42). Other suggestions were Library Skills, Library Research Skills, Research Excellence, Research Education, Information Awareness, Search Skills, Critical Thinking, Knowledge Seeking, Research Training, and Structured Learning and Knowledge Competency.

The definition for IL from the CAUL/ANZIIL IL Framework was by far the most preferred definition used within training programs (80.3%).

![Pie chart showing the percentage of respondents who have a definition for IL used as a framework for IL training programs at their University.]

**Design and delivery of Information Literacy**

We asked respondents to indicate the type of training provided and who provides that training and 113 answered the question. The graph below shows the results.

It clearly shows that Librarians and paraprofessional library staff are involved in all types of IL training, followed by the inclusion of academic/teaching staff, but that academic/teaching staff on their own don’t appear to be involved in the delivery of IL training.
To the question regarding library staff also conducting computer and/or learning skills training:

From the comments provided to this question, *Endnote* appeared to be the main computer skills training provided (90%), and there was very little mention of the Library doing any Learning Skills training, although a number mentioned a move
in this direction. It will be interesting to see if this balance moves in any particular direction over the next few years.

The following table depicts the responses to the use of instructional materials in IL programs. Hands on training activities, Lesson plans, and Online tutorials still appear to be very popular.

### Do you use the following instructional materials in your IL programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count (112)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training activities (hands on)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment activities</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online tutorials</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkits</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91% of respondents to the above question indicated they’d be willing to share any of the instructional materials they have available, indicating potential role for CAUL in establishing a repository of such material.

We then listed a number of ways that IL is currently delivered in Universities, and what they would like to see in the future. The tables below show the results.

### Find below a number of ways that IL is delivered in Universities. Please indicate the situation at your University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current situation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count (108)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally embedded into the curriculum, ie not separately assessed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded into the curriculum but separately assessed</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials necessary to complete and pass before graduation is allowed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials available to complete voluntarily</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal discipline specific tutorials</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal generic tutorials</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National discipline specific tutorials to enable benchmarking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traditional methods of delivery still appear to be very strong. Once again it would be interesting to see the movement against LMS and Web 2.0 methods over the next few years.

**Assessment and Evaluation**

In this section we were trying to find out first if and how student outcomes were measured, and then if and how their information literacy program was evaluated, but there was a bit of confusion in the responses received.

We asked respondents for the most successful measures they have used to evaluate student outcomes in relation to information literacy and we received 90 open-ended responses ranging from “yet to find any” and “time”, to “embedded assessment” and “curriculum analysis performance measures”. The most popular responses were “feedback from academic staff” (35%), “improvement in student assignments” (20%) and “feedback from students” (11%). Others mentioned were quizzes/tests, journals/diaries, and pre-and post-tests.

When asked if they had any particular methods of evaluating the success of their IL programs, 44 indicated “yes”, with 54 responding “no”. The most popular methods indicated in the comments field were Feedback from students and academics (15%), evaluation sheets (11%), surveys (10%).

**Resources and Support**

We asked respondents to indicate if they considered the various stakeholders valued the attainment of high level information literacy at their University. As expected, library management is perceived to value a great deal, while the other stakeholders appear to value, but not as much. Results appear in the graph below.
We then asked if respondents considered whether teaching qualifications were useful to their work. 102 respondents answered the question with 82% indicating it useful. The graph below shows the type of qualifications they considered useful to their work. Interestingly the Cert IV course in workplace training and assessment was the most popular followed by the Grad Cert in Teaching. However it is worth noting that only 43 respondents chose to answer that question.
We asked respondents to give two examples of what could be done to improve Information Literacy at their University, and we received 84 responses. 20% indicated “involving and education faculty more”, and another 20% “embedding into curriculum”. Other responses were “compulsory IL classes or assessment (15%) and “developing an online presence” (12%), “support from library management” (9.5%) and “training for library staff” (6%).

89 people chose to answer the question regarding knowledge of successful innovative IL programs, and 61% of indicated they were unaware of any innovative IL programs. In the comments, the only programs to rate more than one mention were those at QUT and University of Sydney.

We wanted to know what sort of resources practitioners find useful in their work and we received 78 responses. The graph below shows the results, with ANZIIL, IL Blogs, and networks being the most mentioned.
We then asked about services they would like to see CAUL provide in the area of Information Literacy. The 96 responses appear in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate a network of IL Practitioners</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene Conferences/Seminars/Meetings specifically on IL</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearinghouse of resources</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - please provide details in the comment box below</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates strong support for CAUL to act as a clearinghouse of resources, followed by convening relevant conferences/seminars.

We then asked if respondents had ever published in the area of Information Literacy. The results are charted below and indicate a strong willingness to do so although activity so far is not high.
31 people chose to provide comments at the end of the survey, the most common comment being criticism about the survey design or relevance of the survey (25%), and a thank you, interested in the results (12%). Other comments ranged from “Library should not own IL – it belongs to academics”, “new to area to difficult to comment”, and “need to promote IL so it is more widely understood”.

Prepared by Ruth Quinn,
Convenor ILWG
March 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count (108)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally embedded into the curriculum, ie not separately assessed</td>
<td>86*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embedded into the curriculum but separately assessed</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutorials necessary to complete and pass before graduation is allowed</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutorials available to complete voluntarily</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal discipline specific tutorials</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal generic tutorials</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National discipline specific tutorials to enable benchmarking</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have highlighted/starred significant differences between the two tables. These results indicate that while IL is not currently totally embedded into the curriculum, the respondents would like it to be in the future. It also indicates support for tutorials necessary to complete and pass before graduation is allowed, and national discipline specific tutorials to enable benchmarking.

The following table refers to the methods of delivery used by IL staff.
### Section 1. Contribution to Learning and Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>ULA Working Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Activity since last report
In line with the CAUL Executive initiatives to streamline activities, the ULA Working Group considered its role and current structure. ULA operates at a more or less routine level. The Working Group has had little ongoing business and is only required to meet to address issues as they arise. There is still a need to keep an instance of the group functional at University Librarian level, to prevent the occasional attempt to revert to a greater regulatory environment at operational level. The intention remains to keep the program light and simple. Accordingly the ULA Working Group recommends to CAUL that:

- The ULA Working Group is re-badged as the ULA Reference Group. It will no longer meet routinely at CAUL meetings or elsewhere, but will convene to handle specific issues, either by meeting or via email.
- The current membership is retained. Oversight of ULA should remain at CAUL member level and not operational level and the current membership has the appropriate breadth, depth and history.

#### Achievements since last report
Update of web site content as required

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

#### Plan for forthcoming activity
Routine maintenance of web site information

#### CAUL budget implications
Nil

#### Recommendations to CAUL
That CAUL accept the recommendation to change the ULA Working Group to the ULA Reference Group, retaining the current membership structure.
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Notes on CAUL Statistics focus group meeting

12 February at RMIT
(Item 971 – CAUL Agenda for 25 March 2010)

Attendees:
Craig Anderson (Chair and note taker)
Maxine Brodie
Stephen Cramond
Cathie Jilovsky
Jocelyn Priddey

Apologies:
Diane Costello
Stephen Gillespie
Heather Jenks
Philip Jane
Leanne Pitman
Janice Van De Velde

Background
The background for the review was discussed. The review has been requested by the CAUL group, and responds to a growing sense that some of the elements of the current CAUL Stats relate to areas of service which are becoming less important, and may not be tracking areas which will be more important in the future.

In addition, some elements are misleading or nearly meaningless, as changes in service delivery and technology, as well as organization structures have altered, particularly over the past 8 years.

The remit from the CAUL group was open-ended – simply that “Statistics are to be reviewed”. The group agreed that we should seek resolution on any recommendations from the CAUL University Librarians at the September 2010 CAUL meeting.

It was noted that a blog on the topic has been started at http://caulstatsreview.blogspot.com/

CAVAL Report:
Cathie Jilovsky reported that the 5 of the enhancements requested in 2009 were ready to be moved onto the production website, following successful testing. The sixth enhancement (to export full-year data as a formatted spreadsheet) required new hardware, which CAVAL was in the process of commissioning.

Cathie’s report also covered the release of the final and complete 2008 stats, information on the handling of e-books, the deemed list and cancelled serials titles.
General discussion on the Review:
Discussion on the current stats elements and collection process were wide ranging, and the following points were made:

There has been a request from CONZAL that they be kept informed about the review and that as far as possible we work on a set of measures, which suits both countries. The CSFG members present were generally supportive of this direction.

The current collection is very input based – as opposed to most current public sector measurement trends, which tend to favour output measures.

Activity elements (such as loans counts) are often used internally, with the CAUL stats sometimes being regarded as the authoritative source for a library’s own measurement.

The overall set of elements is still very “print-centric”.

Should consideration be given to not having any “non-mandatory “elements?

Should we combine our collection with elements of other groups (particularly CAUDIT)

We should be using a 5 – 10 year timeframe – i.e – what is it we will want to be counting and providing comparisons to in 5 years, or 10 years?”

It was agreed that a survey of University Librarians would be useful in order to find out what aspects of the current collection they find most, and least useful, and what they would like to obtain from the Stats in the future. It would be useful to get some background on why and how libraries are using the CAUL Stats.

The broad nature of the group’s remit was discussed, and it was agreed that further definition of the task was needed. Possible objectives of the review might be expressed as:

1. To establish a “core set” of empirical data elements for the CAUL Stats
2. To suggest some new measures as, or if necessary
3. To recommend direction on the use and inclusion of qualitative and/or output measures

Considerable discussion took place around collection counting issues. In particular, the group agreed that:

In the digital environment collection counts have far less meaning than they might have in the print era. They do not provide any indication of collection adequacy nor of fitness for purpose.

That the use of the deemed list was problematic, unlikely to be resolved satisfactorily, and increasingly irrelevant in its current form.

That consideration direction be given to ceasing counting objects such as serials and monograph titles, possibly replacing this with expenditure by accounting classification, such as operating and capital (or “subscription access” and “permanent access”).

That at some stage we have to forego some of the historical time series data we have collected, especially around collections, and make a leap into new ways of measuring resource adequacy.
Some of the issues to be resolved are:

The relationships between KPIs and CAUL stats

The relationship between University rankings and library metrics

The extent upon which University rankings depend upon library metrics

The relationship between the metrics collected by CAUL and those used internationally - this is especially important in relation to international comparison and rankings

It was recognized that whatever we count, something will be “inaccurate”, normally due to variations between different library operations. This may arise from different timing cycles, internal definitions or needs. It was suggested that these variations be recognized and as far as practically possible, minimized. It was accepted that these variations are inevitable, and where variations do take place, these should be noted. Derek Whitehead’s mantra of “Cheap, valid and fairly useful” was endorsed.

**It was agreed that:**

1. We should adhere to a strict timetable for the annual collection in order to provide Universities with the information they need for budgeting, while recognizing that it may take some libraries sometime to gather the information required. The suggested timetable (to be ratified by CAUL) is:

   Collection starts 1 March each year
   (if the deemed list approach continues this mandates that the deemed list figures must be available by then or that the previous year’s figures are used)

   That all data is input by libraries by 1 May

   The stats are made available on 1 June, with the current (i.e. whatever figures are available) DEEWR population figures, and that the DEEWR population figures are updated when they are available.

2. The collection process for the 2009 year be as for the 2008 year, with some minor, and non-contentious changes, but that in 2011, (covering the 2010 year) a revised set of elements be used.

   This is dependant upon a successful trial of the revised elements being run in 2010 on 2009 data. It was noted that there may be a cost from CAVAL for this testing, and for modifications to the current software to support this trial.

3. That in the collection of 2009 data, that we should redefine monograph title counts to include “all accessible titles” – i.e. for libraries with patron driven electronic purchase schemes, that all titles which are readily accessible be counted as being “held” even if they are not yet purchased. The rationale behind this is that users are not aware of what the library has actually paid for - they are only aware of what they can access.

Meeting closed at 1:00

Craig Anderson
19 March 2010
Statistics “Thought starters” and suggest motions

(Item 971 – CAUL Agenda for 25 March 2010)

The CSFG (CAUL Statistics Focus Group) has been asked to “Review CAUL Statistics” at the September 2009 CAUL Meeting. Time has been allowed at the 25 March meeting (Item 971) for directed small group discussions on this topic.

The CSFG held a meeting on February 12 (see “CSFG meeting notes 12 Feb 2010”) to discuss its approach to this review, and out of this meeting a number of questions arose. Amongst these are:

- How do University Librarians tend to use the current set of statistics?
- What improvements or changes would University Librarians like to see?
- What elements, or what aspect of the current set of statistics are particularly difficult to calculate or collect, misleading or irrelevant?
- How important is it to incorporate or recognize output measures?
- If there were three changes to the CAUL Statistics, they would be........

If time permits, I recommend that the group split into 5 groups to discuss these very briefly and report back.

Recommendations to CAUL

The CSFG meeting also suggested that the following direction be adopted for the CAUL Statistics. It is recommended that:

1. We should adhere to a strict timetable for the annual collection in order to provide Universities with the information they need for budgeting, while recognizing that it may take some libraries sometime to gather the information required. The suggested timetable (to be ratified by CAUL) is:

   Collection starts 1 March each year
   (if the deemed list approach continues this mandates that the deemed list figures must be available by then or that the previous year's figures are used)

   That all data is input by libraries by 1 May

   The stats are made available on 1 June, with the current (i.e. whatever figures are available) DEEWR population figures, and that the DEEWR population figures are updated when they are available.

2. The collection process for the 2009 year be as for the 2008 year, with some minor, and non-contentious changes, but that in 2011, (covering the 2010 year) a revised set of elements be used.

   This is dependant upon a successful trial of the revised elements being run in 2010 on 2009 data. It was noted that there may be a cost from CAVAL for this testing, and for modifications to the current software to support this trial.

3. That in the collection of 2009 data, that we should redefine monograph title counts to include “all accessible titles” – i.e. for libraries with patron driven electronic purchase schemes, that all titles which are readily accessible be counted as being “held” even if they are not yet purchased. The rationale behind this is that users are not aware of what the library has actually paid for – they are only aware of what they can access.

Craig Anderson
19 March 2010
The CAUL Achievement Award recognises outstanding contributions that support the achievement of the CAUL strategic agenda.

Criteria
Nominees for the Award will be evaluated in terms of their demonstrated achievements contributing to one or more of the following CAUL goals:

I. CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING AND TEACHING
   Goal: To facilitate an understanding of new developments in learning and teaching that contribute to the student experience.

II. CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH
   Goal: To facilitate the members’ role in supporting and maximising research outcomes.

III. DELIVERING QUALITY AND VALUE
   Goal: To promote continuous improvement and best practice in pursuit of internationally recognised high quality library services and operations.

IV. SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
   Goal: To maximise access to information resources and facilitate libraries’ wider scholarly communication and information management roles.

V. COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE
   Goal: To provide leadership in relevant higher education developments and information policy, and communicate activities to key stakeholders.

Qualifying achievement must be demonstrated to have been influential beyond the nominee’s employing institution over a period of at least two years. Achievements solely at an institutional level are not eligible for consideration.

The nature and quality of achievement must be of a level that is far and above the normal requirements of the individual’s paid position, justifying special recognition.

Nominees would be expected to display exceptional leadership and initiative, have undertaken advocacy at a high level and be able to demonstrate that their achievements have led to change.

Eligibility
Individuals other than the University Librarian or equivalent employed at CAUL member libraries during the twelve months prior to the close of nominations.

The Award primarily recognises personal achievement but more than one individual may be included in the nomination provided that the contribution of each and every nominee meets the criteria.

Previous recipients are eligible for nomination, provided that the nomination is distinct from previous nominations and a period of at least five years has elapsed since the previous Award.
Nomination Process

Nominations close in July of each year.

Nominations should be made on the nomination form and include a brief (no more than one A4 page) outline of the achievement to be recognised against the Award criteria. Supporting evidence of up to 2 A4 pages may be attached.

Nominations should be emailed to the CAUL office.

Announcement of the Award will be made prior to the CAUL meeting following the close of nominations.

Nominations must be accompanied by a reference from the relevant University Librarian.

Assessment Process

Nominations will be evaluated by the CAUL Executive in accordance with the criteria.

Members of the CAUL Executive may nominate staff for an award but must declare any potential conflicts of interest and excuse themselves from the assessment process.

Nominators and successful nominees will be advised as soon as possible.

The CAUL Executive may request further information to substantiate the achievements of the nominee.

The CAUL Executive reserves the right not to make an Award in any given year.

Award Presentation

Recipients will be recognised by a certificate detailing the specific reasons for the award.

The Certificate and Award will be presented at a meeting of CAUL where the recipient may be invited to make a presentation on their contribution to the CAUL Strategic Agenda.

Award Value

$5,000.

Where team awards are made the award money will normally be divided evenly between team members.
CAUL Achievement Award Nomination Form

Select the appropriate category or categories:

- □ CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING AND TEACHING
- □ CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH
- □ DELIVERING QUALITY AND VALUE
- □ SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
- □ COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE

Institution:

Name/Team details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominees are aware of the nomination (yes/no):

Nominated by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone number</td>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achievement statement:
(Statement not to exceed 1 page).

(Supporting documentation not exceeding 2 pages may be attached).

University Librarian’s supporting statement:

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes to nomination process:

1. Please complete one form per individual and per team. For team nominations please list each member of the team on the one form.

2. Please make sure spelling of names, areas and email addresses of nominees and nominator are correct.

3. Nominations must be supported by the relevant University Librarian.

4. Nominations must include a statement (no more than one A4 page) which demonstrates how the nominee’s contribution supports the achievement of the CAUL strategic agenda and states specific and identifiable reasons for the award nomination. This statement should be clear, concise and compelling.

5. Please email nomination to the CAUL office
CAUL Strategic Plan  
Report to CAUL

Author: John Shipp  
Date: 22 March 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Delivering Quality and Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>UNISON Staff Development Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity since last report</strong></td>
<td>Former members of UNISON were surveyed to determine how the $46,381.07 transferred to CAUL could be used to best effect to underwrite the CAUL Staff Development Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Achievements since last report** | Options canvassed were:  
  a. cheaper registrations for all attendees  
  b. subsidise one or more attendees through a competitive process  
  c. pay the costs of a 'star' presenter  
  d. sponsor the conference dinner  
  8 responses were received with majority support for option b followed by option a. Support for the other options was generally lukewarm. |
| Publicity, reports, publications since last report | N/A |
| Plan for forthcoming activity | N/A |
| CAUL budget implications  | None |
| **Recommendations to CAUL** | That CAUL note the response to the survey and establish a UNISON Fellowship to provide assistance to one or more attendees at the CAUL Staff Development Conference on a competitive basis to be determined by the CAUL Executive. |
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### Section III. Delivering Quality and Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>13/14/15 Sharing information and surveys and developing statements of value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Libraries of the Australian Technology Network of Universities (LATN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>LATN met on 4 Feb, 2 Apr, 20 Jul (teleconference), 22 Sep, 23 Nov in 2009 and 3 Feb 2010 (teleconference)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Achievements since last report | - Research Support Forum  
- Survey of performance in regard to Indigenous peoples and issues with international and local benchmarking  
- “How to write a paper” workshop conducted in Melbourne. It will be repeated in Sydney in 2010.  
*** More details in attached Year in Review 2009 |
| Publicity, reports, publications since last report | Libraries of the ATN Research Support Statement (copy attached) |
| Plan for forthcoming activity | Collaboration in a complementary fashion to CAUL |
| CAUL budget implications | Nil |
| Recommendations to CAUL | To note this report |
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Libraries of the Australian Technology Network of Universities

Year in Review 2009

Libraries of the Australian Technology Network, or LATN, comprises the University Librarians of each of the ATN institutions with the Auckland University of Technology (AUT) in New Zealand as an international participant. The LATN group develops an annual strategic plan which is formulated within the wider context of the ATN agenda and includes a number of agreed collaborative projects. Areas that this group are undertaking projects include information literacy, exploring means to maximise access to collections and electronic information resources; and exploring issues around eLibraries, in particular the implications and opportunities for the ATN in response to IT developments.

Research Support
The major LATN initiative in 2009 was a Research Support Forum held at QUT. The Forum was designed to deliver a draft research support plan for each university library and a strategy for LATN collaboration in this area. The latter was summarised in the Libraries of the ATN Research Support Statement which was formulated and submitted to the ATN Vice Chancellors (copy attached). This has been followed up with a comparison of each member’s approach to supporting research and research education.

InfoScholar, an online resource for developing the information competencies of research students was completed under the leadership of QUT.

Collections & Systems
A ‘white paper’ on collection management prepared by UTS to inform thinking about future collections.

LATN agreed to run a webinar on Integrated Library Management Systems, which will be organised by AUT and UniSA in 2010.

Indigenous
A survey to establish current performance in regard to Indigenous peoples and issues was conducted by Curtin and UTS with benchmarking against Charles Darwin University (NT), University of British Columbia (Canada) and Auckland University of Technology (NZ, LATN member).

The Collaborative Online Workspace was upgraded and training was provided by UTS.

Staff development
“How to write a paper”, a workshop for LATN staff on professional writing, was conducted by Curtin in Melbourne. It will be repeated in Sydney in 2010.

Sustainability
Some members, led by UTS, shared information in regard to environmental sustainability by documenting initiatives against the ATN Declaration of Commitment to Local, National and Global Sustainability.

Quality Assurance
Under the leadership of RMIT, LATN contributed to the review of CAUL statistics.

And LATN began to benchmark quality assurance processes, led by Curtin.

Alex Byrne
Chair, LATN

March 2010
Libraries of the ATN Research Support Statement

Libraries of the ATN and its member libraries are committed to enabling and contributing to research at each university and across the Australian Technology Network of Universities. Each of the university libraries facilitate research and provide research training at its university through:

- Providing services which enable researchers to find and access relevant research literature efficiently;
- Developing the capabilities of research students and researchers with a particular emphasis on early career researchers;
- Providing advice and support to researchers in the management and publication of their research at all stages of the research cycle;
- Ensuring the widest dissemination, ready discovery and long term preservation of the university’s research outputs;
- Demonstrating the breadth and quality of research at the university.

The Libraries of the ATN work together to enhance research activity across the Australian Technology Network of Universities by:

- Collaborating and benchmarking to achieve the best possible provision of research support services;
- Showing leadership in the development of eResearch with an emphasis on open access to research findings;
- Developing the skills of library staff to support researchers and research students and influencing the training of future library professionals;
- Contributing to the services offered by the ATN eGrad School to develop the capabilities of research students;
- Advocating the development of sustainable, high quality research information infrastructure.

Alex Byrne
Chair, LATN
January 2010
CAUL Strategic Plan

Report to CAUL

Author: John Redmayne
Date: 10/3/10
Date of previous report: 7/9/09

<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>October 2009-March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **CONZUL meetings.** CONZUL has met twice, in October 2009 in Christchurch, where “our visitor from Australia” was Graham Black (next ALIA President); and in March 2010 where our “visitor from Australia” was Cathrine Harboe-Ree (President, CAUL). We greatly enjoyed both Australian visitors, who also made very worthwhile contributions to the discussions at our meetings.

2. **Staff movements.** Adriana de Groot is the Acting University Librarian, Lincoln University.

3. **CONZULAC.** This is CONZUL’s book purchasing consortium. The previous contract was held by Blackwells, but this time YBP were successful. The contract runs for three years from 1 January 2010. Libraries have offered up a varying percentage of their monographs expenditure to be part of the contract (varies between 30% and 60%).

4. **CONZUL Sponsored Interest Group Meetings.** Two are being arranged for this year: (1) Digitization and collaborative selection of Pasifika materials (2) Library learning spaces (to which architects and university facilities staff will also be invited). Auckland, Massey and Canterbury, who employ Asian Languages Librarians, will also be holding a separate meeting for this group. A meeting of IR staff paid for by TEC (Tertiary Education Commission) project funding, will also take place.

5. **Library budgets for 2010.** Generally collection budgets are adequate for normal activity (including serial renewals, without the need to cancel), operational budgets are tight. The USD is at about 0.70 for us, which is a comparatively good rate.

6. **Storage Project.** The TEC project for a national shared store is proceeding well, with a workshop to take place in June, and a completed report by the end of the year. Funding was also made available over the summer for a number of small projects at each university to identify items which could potentially be held in a national store.

7. **Digitization of the A-Js (Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives).** This is a collaborative project between the National Library of New Zealand and a number of sector groups. A trial database now exists, and the first ten years of appendices should be publicly available later this year.

8. **Library salaries survey.** This is a remuneration survey across the whole NZ library sector, led by LIANZA. For the first time all NZ university libraries took part. The mean salary for the NZ University
Librarians was $141,215 (compared with $132,635 in 2008). In terms of mean average salaries for librarians, the special library sector (especially law specials) are the highest paid, followed by the National Library, and then Universities. There is then somewhat of a gap before the polytechnics, then publics, and with school librarians the lowest. In terms of gender ratios, the National Library (22%) and Universities (21%) have the highest percentage of male staff, while the schools, not surprisingly, had the lowest (2%).

9. **National Library of New Zealand.** There are currently proposals to merge the National Library and Archives NZ into the Dept. of Internals Affairs. The consequences of this proposal and the impact on the National Library are not yet clear, although there are not any indications that the National Library is in favour. The proposals are part of a cabinet paper which has not yet been released.

10. **Minister of Tertiary Education.** The Minister of Education, Anne Tolley, who has given a very mediocre performance so far, has had the tertiary part of her portfolio taken away from her. The new Minister for Tertiary Education is Steven Joyce, a multi millionaire (from the media sector) and with a reputation as a fix-it man for the government. Steven is, however, not without his merits, and in his other portfolios appears to listen and to make good decisions. The government budget, in late May, however, it not expected to bring any particularly good news for the tertiary sector.

---

**Plan for forthcoming activity**

The next meeting of CONZUL will be October 14-15, at the University of Waikato (Hamilton). Again we would welcome “visitors from Australia”.

**For information**

LIANZA (the Library and Information Association of New Zealand Aotearoa) is having its centenary this year. To mark the occasion, the LIANZA Conference will go back to Dunedin (“At the edge: Te Matakaaheru “, 28 Nov-1 Dec 2010)
## Advocacy and Communication

### Action

Relationships with other organisations – Libraries Australia Advisory Committee

### Responsibility

Anne Horn and Linda Luther (outgoing CAUL representative and Chair)  
Liz Burke (incoming CAUL representative)

### Activity since last report

The Libraries Australia Advisory Committee (LAAC) provides strategic advice to the National Library of Australia on the future developments of Libraries Australia and serves as a mechanism for representation of library sectors.

The LAAC met on the 4th November 2009 in Hobart and was followed by the Libraries Australia Forum. The papers for the LAAC meeting are available at [http://www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/about/laac-papers.html](http://www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/about/laac-papers.html). (Please note new location.) Highlights reported included:

- The *newspaper digitisation project* has received very positive feedback from academics and historians. Guidelines have been developed for other libraries wanting to contribute newspaper content to the project.

- Federal government funds have been awarded to prepare a business case for a new policy proposal to deal with the digital deluge across 3 Commonwealth organisations- the NLA, National Archives and National Film and Sound Archive. If successful, then the digitisation activity at the NLA will significantly increase.

- The roll out of Trove was discussed, including the new interface and the capability to bring together a wealth of information across many sources (Suggested search: Mary Durack). [Trove is receiving international acknowledgement, including directly from researchers. (A.H.)]

- The Annual Report 2008/2009 provides data on the use of different services – searching, document requesting and supply, library holdings. It is worth reviewing the level of activity for individual libraries.

- The NLA advised that the scheduled review of charges for university libraries was to take place prior to July 2010. The CAUL Executive was advised subsequent to the meeting of the outcome of the NLA’s review as a courtesy before communicating directly with individual libraries with which the NLA has contracts.

### Achievements since last report

Vic Elliot attended the OCLC member’s Council in Dublin, Ohio as well as the inaugural Asia Pacific Regional Council meeting in Beijing. [Note: Subsequent to these meetings, the proposed policy for use and transfer of Worldcat records has been withdrawn.]
| Plan for forthcoming activity | The next meeting of the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee will be held on 14 April 2010.

The OCLC Asia/Pacific Regional Forum will be held on the 15<sup>th</sup> April, followed by the National Library of Australia’s Innovation Forum on the 16<sup>th</sup> April 2010. |
| CAUL budget implications | None |
| Recommendations to CAUL | It is recommended that CAUL note the report. |
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### CAUL Strategic Plan


**Report to CAUL**

**Author:** Imogen Garner  
**Date:** 11 March 2010  
**Date of previous report:** 2009/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>CAUL Finances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Report to CAUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Each meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>Reports were prepared for the CAUL Executive meetings 2009/6 and 2010/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Achievements since last report | CAUL 2010 budget: is available for consideration. Expected salary increases for 2010 based on ANU enterprise bargaining for the Executive Officer, Finance and Administration Officer, the Administration Officer and additional casual hours to support processing CEIRC renewals have not been reflected in member fees in the 2010 budget and any deficit will be covered by retained earnings. In addition at its 2010/1 meeting Executive approved an extension of the current casual hours of the third office position to 25 hours per week to also be met from reserves. However in line with the CAUL Budget Principles agreed at the September 2009 meeting of CAUL, salary increases from 2011 onwards will be factored into future budgets.  
CAUL retained earnings 2009: CAUL retained earnings in the AUD account at the beginning of 2010 were $306,743.89. This may be amended following the audit, which commenced February 4.  
Interest earned on AUD and foreign currency accounts 2009: Interest earned in the foreign USD and EUR accounts in 2009 was zero with 337.66 pounds earned in the GBP account. Interest earned in the AUS account was $18,364.85. Previous interest earned in the USD, GBP and EUR accounts has been retained in those accounts to assist with cash flow. The lack of interest in 2009 supports previous decisions by CAUL Executives to keep interest earned in the foreign accounts in those accounts, and not to apply it to recurrent expenses. |
| Publicity, reports, publications since last report | |
| Plan for forthcoming activity | CAUL Executive will prepare a proposal for increasing membership fees in time for consideration by members at the next CAUL meeting in September. |
| CAUL budget implications | Membership fee increases to balance the CAUL operating budget from 2011. |
| Recommendations to CAUL | That CAUL notes the Treasurer’s Report |

Pro-forma updated 18 February 2010
<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><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>52,520.32</td>
<td>$55,746.15</td>
<td>$3,225.84</td>
<td>6.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>19,000.00</td>
<td>22,132.62</td>
<td>12,899.63</td>
<td>$-9,232.99</td>
<td>-41.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution (membership)</td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>3,832.08</td>
<td>$-3,167.92</td>
<td>-45.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,400.00</td>
<td>1,558.05</td>
<td>$-1,841.95</td>
<td>-54.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,190.00</td>
<td>8,190.00</td>
<td>8,383.37</td>
<td>$193.37</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>$2,989.00</td>
<td>$-11.00</td>
<td>-0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Meetings</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>14,228.05</td>
<td>$-771.95</td>
<td>-5.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>$-1,800.00</td>
<td>-66.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Meetings</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>$-1,800.00</td>
<td>-90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation/Seminars</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>$-1,800.00</td>
<td>-90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>$-1,800.00</td>
<td>-90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications / Web Site</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Achievement Award</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>4,963.37</td>
<td>$1,036.63</td>
<td>-17.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Operating)</strong></td>
<td>170,200.00</td>
<td>134,242.93</td>
<td>35,957.07</td>
<td>$36,811.78</td>
<td>27.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMMES</strong></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>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Membership</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-2,500.00</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Copyright)</strong></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>20,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution (statistics)</td>
<td>6,140.00</td>
<td>6,140.00</td>
<td>6,140.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Meetings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>393.64</td>
<td>-$606.36</td>
<td>-60.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTER Membership</td>
<td>850.00</td>
<td>850.00</td>
<td>850.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILWG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Site Enhancement</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</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>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Best Practice)</strong></td>
<td>7,890.00</td>
<td>60,125.00</td>
<td>-52,235.00</td>
<td>60,125.00</td>
<td>50,964.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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><strong>Sub-total (ULA)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</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>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (R&amp;D)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>-20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL operations)</strong></td>
<td>198,090.00</td>
<td>237,367.93</td>
<td>-39,277.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>461,867.93</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>78,780.47</td>
<td>$93,619.23</td>
<td>$4,838.75</td>
<td>6.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (external)</td>
<td>77,740.00</td>
<td>65,955.75</td>
<td>78,485.26</td>
<td>$12,529.51</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>17,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>12,659.31</td>
<td>-3,134.77</td>
<td>-15.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>13,600.00</td>
<td>13,600.00</td>
<td>6,232.19</td>
<td>-$7,367.81</td>
<td>-54.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>395.47</td>
<td>-$4,604.53</td>
<td>-92.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOLC Meetings</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>1,865.52</td>
<td>-$3,134.48</td>
<td>-62.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL-Industry ThinkTank</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>680.77</td>
<td>$680.77</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (CEIRC)</strong></td>
<td>183,490.00</td>
<td>183,336.23</td>
<td>153.77</td>
<td>183,336.23</td>
<td>183,037.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)</strong></td>
<td>381,580.00</td>
<td>420,704.16</td>
<td>-39,124.16</td>
<td>420,704.16</td>
<td>645,204.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus / (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>381,580.00</td>
<td>420,704.16</td>
<td>-39,124.16</td>
<td>($39,124.16)</td>
<td>-$101,159.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Databases Subscriptions**
- Subscriptions Income: 1,546,268.10
- Subscriptions Payments: 1,466,369.99

**CAIRSS/ADT Program (liability account)**
- CAIRSS/ADT Membership Fees: 36,000.00
- Transfer from ARROW: 580,000.00

**FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS**
- USD ACCOUNT: Subscriptions Income 18,196,710.83, Bank Charges 3,607.28
- TOTAL USD: 18,196,710.83
- £ ACCOUNT: Subscriptions Income 2,691,913.65, Bank Charges 385.84
- TOTAL £: 2,692,251.31
- EUR ACCOUNT: Subscriptions Income 178,258.00, Bank Charges 33.71
- TOTAL EUR: 178,258.00

**TOTAL (CAIRSS)**: 366,000.00, Surplus / (Deficit): 18,196,710.83 - 1,466,369.99 = 16,730,340.84

**TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)**: 18,196,710.83 - 1,466,369.99 = 16,730,340.84

**YTD Interest earned on Foreign Currency Accounts (@ given exchange rate)**
- USD account: 0.00 @ 0.9234
- GBP account: 591.87 @ 0.5705
- EUR account: 0.00 @ 0.6375

**Total in AUD**: 591.87

**CAUL 2010/1 Agenda item 977(a)**
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; 17,000 to 23/7/07; $19,000 12 months to 1/11/09

< 15% time allocated to general CAUL activity by FAA HEW4 incl o/c & salary mgmt plus extra hours 0.15 for admin support

315+GST per fortnight

CAUL Office replacement computer - asset rather than expense

LibStffDevSem2010 committee

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

Go8 Outsell Cost-Benefit Study

39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL

External members *23
Wintec withdrew 10/11/08
HortRes merged with CFR

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

1 meeting only in 2009
late April - airfare paid by NPG

Income minus expenditure (proposed to be cost neutral)

40 CAUL members but not CONZUL
for 2 year program

Program started 20/3/09

16/3/08-16/3/10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted Income</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Budgeted Balance</th>
<th>Expected Expenditure to date (28/2/10)</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>144,000.00</td>
<td>Executive Officer (0.4)</td>
<td>54,351.08</td>
<td>9,058.51</td>
<td>$8,882.40</td>
<td>$176.11</td>
<td>-1.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>21,000.00</td>
<td>Admin Assistant (0.15)</td>
<td>11,209.91</td>
<td>1,668.32</td>
<td>1,764.80</td>
<td>$103.52</td>
<td>-5.54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution (membership)</td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>1,166.67</td>
<td>825.24</td>
<td>$341.43</td>
<td>-29.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>3,400.00</td>
<td>566.67</td>
<td>2,901.01</td>
<td>$2,334.35</td>
<td>411.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,190.00</td>
<td>1,365.00</td>
<td>1,413.08</td>
<td>$48.08</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Meetings</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>185.45</td>
<td>$2,314.55</td>
<td>-92.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>1,292.39</td>
<td>$707.61</td>
<td>-35.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President’s Meetings</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>333.33</td>
<td>1,423.64</td>
<td>$1,090.31</td>
<td>327.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>166.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$166.67</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publications / Web Site</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Achievement Award</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Operating)</strong></td>
<td>172,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>126,650.99</td>
<td>45,549.01</td>
<td>20,108.50</td>
<td>18,688.01</td>
<td>-1,420.48</td>
<td>-7.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>ALCC Membership</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$3,333.33</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADA Membership</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$83.33</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>416.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$416.67</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Copyright)</strong></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>4,833.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>8,330.00</td>
<td>Statistics Publication</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>8,333.33</td>
<td>-8,330.00</td>
<td>$16,663.33</td>
<td>-199.96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics Meetings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>166.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$166.67</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COUNTER Membership</td>
<td>912.50</td>
<td>152.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$152.08</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ILWG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best Practice Working Group</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Best Practice)</strong></td>
<td>8,330.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>51,912.50</td>
<td>-43,582.50</td>
<td>8,652.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SUB-TOTAL (CAUL operations)** | 200,530.00 |                       | 201,563.49 | 32,593.92 | 32,593.92 | 10,358.01 | -1,420.48 | -0.07%
| **CEIRC PROGRAM** |   |                     |   |                  |                                        |                          |            |             |
| CEIRC Levy (internal) | 115,150.00 | Executive Officer (0.6) | 81,526.62 | 13,587.77 | $13,323.60 | -$264.17 | -1.94% |
| CEIRC Levy (external) | 84,525.00 | CEIRC Assistant (0.65+) | 82,887.00 | 13,014.50 | 12,145.13 | -$869.37 | -6.52% |
| check! | 194,775.00 | Meetings | 15,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 3,063.23 | $563.23 | 22.53% |
|                  |     | Audit & Accounting | 13,600.00 | 2,266.67 | 11,604.06 | $9,337.39 | 411.94% |
|                  |     | Research | 5,000.00 | 833.33 | 0.00 | -$833.33 | -100.00% |
|                  |     | ICOLC Meetings | 5,000.00 | 3,498.44 | 0.00 | -$501.56 | -100.00% |
|                  |     | SPARC membership fee | 7,333.33 | 1,222.22 | 18,706.80 | $17,484.58 | 1430.56% |
|                  |     | CAUL-Industry ThinkTank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| **Sub-total (CEIRC)** | 199,675.00 |                       | 210,346.95 | 37,671.95 | 32,593.92 | $24,680.05 | 65.23% |
| **SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)** | 400,205.00 |                       | 411,910.44 | 70,318.41 | 70,318.41 | 113,901.89 | 21.09%
| **Surplus / (Deficit)** | $11,705.44 |     | $2,370.15 | 3.37% |
| **Datasets Subscriptions** |   | Subscriptions Income | 62,453.09 | 42,812.73 | 0.00 | 42,812.73 |
|                  |     | Subscriptions Payments | 42,812.73 | 0.00 | 42,812.73 |
| **SUB-TOTAL (AUD account)** | 462,658.09 |                       | 454,723.17 | 113,131.14 | 115,012.29 | $2,370.15 | 2.10% |
| **CAIRSS/ADT Program (liability account)** |   | CAIRSS/ADT Membership Fees | 36,000.00 | 6,000.00 | 0.00 | -$6,000.00 | -100.00% |
|                  |     | Transfer from ARROW | 290,000.00 | 48,333.33 | 51,356.15 | $3,022.82 | 6.25% |
| **Sub-total (CAIRSS)** | 326,000.00 |                       | 326,000.00 | 54,333.33 | 51,356.15 |
| **FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS (reported in native currency, not converted to AUD)** |   | Subscriptions Income | 1,059.00 | 1,059.00 | 0.00 | 1,059.00 |
|                  |     | Subscriptions Payments | 1,059.00 | 0.00 | 1,059.00 |
| **TOTAL** | 1,059.00 | Subscriptions Income | 1,059.00 | 1,059.00 | 0.00 | 1,059.00 |
| **Total in AUD** | $2,370.15 |     | $2,370.15 | 3.37% |

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

- **USD account**: 0.00 @ 0.9131
- **GBP account**: 0.00 @ 0.6994
- **EUR account**: 0.00 @ 0.6694

Total in AUD: 0.00
CAUL Executive Officer:

- 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; 22.717 in 2004; 14.014 to 30/6/06
  - 17,000 to 23/7/07; 21,000 to 7/09

- < 15% time allocated to general CAUL activity by FAA HEW4 incl o/c & salary mgmt plus extra hours 0.15 for admin support

- 315+GST per fortnight

- Estimate $2500 per year server cost, plus approx $2000 software fixes. dmc 15/1/10

- $5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting

- 40 CAUL members

- Updated 1/12/09 - 1/6th of 50k

- Library Consortium £365 ($545)

- 39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL

- 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 2010
  - mid April


- 40 CAUL members but not CONZUL

- 16/3/08-16/3/10
Executive Officer's report to CAUL
17 September 2009 to 18 March 2010

This report is compiled, in part, from reports to the CAUL Executive.

CAUL Office.

Most of the office activity in the September/November period is CEIRC-related and in the December/January period is finance-related, though there was a significant amount of effort in planning & arranging meetings for the beginning of the year – Datasets Coordinators forum, CEIRC, the Executive and VALA – and for the July Library Staff Development Conference.

The President meets weekly with the Executive Officer by telephone. A report was prepared on “achievements” for 2009 and priorities for 2010.

In February, the Executive approved extended staffing in the CAUL office, leading to the appointment of Meredith Hawke to the second administrative assistant position, for 25 hours/week to the end of February 2011, with continuation contingent upon another review of office workloads. This position replaces the two casual allocations, 5 hours/week originally allocated to administrative support but now used entirely for CEIRC support, and 10 hours/week x 17 weeks during the CEIRC renewals period towards the end of the last two years. The One Umbrella sourced potential interviewees, and will manage the salary and on-costs. I was assisted in the interviewing process by Helena Zobec, Chifley Library Precinct Manager at ANU. Meredith began work on March 17.

I took leave from January 18-25 inclusive, and Alisha Davies took leave the week before the Christmas shutdown.

CAUL Library Staff Development Conference, 19-20 July 2010, Melbourne - Planning.

The committee's first meeting resulted in the outline of a program with suggested speakers and structure. The committee met twice more in November and February, and worked on the draft schedule and program content. Quotes were sought from two previously-used Melbourne venues, and Rydges Melbourne chosen and confirmed in late January. The dates were also confirmed - Monday 19 and Tuesday 20 July. The committee is still finalising the program, with one session still to be completed. Invitations to all other speakers have been issued and confirmed. The budget is being compiled now that most speakers are known. The dinner venue has been confirmed.

CAIRSS.

UNSW proposed a timetable for CAIRSS to take over the management of the ADT server and service from January 1, 2010. UNSW has effectively handed user support of the central metadata repository to CAIRSS, and has advised CAIRSS of the potential life of the hardware.

The December teleconference of the steering committee focussed mainly on the migration of the ADT to CAIRSS. An options paper provided in August was not sufficient to permit the CAIRSS Steering Committee to make a considered proposal to CAUL for the transition, so I prepared a report for the chair to clarify the information and analysis still needed. A document regarding options for migration was expanded for the December meeting, and a further revised document was circulated to the Executive in March, for discussion with CAUL at the March meeting.

It proposes replacing the targeted searching via the metadata repository with searching for theses via Trove, the NLA's resource discovery system (a less clean and less targeted option), and transfers the ADT front end to CAUL, for maintenance via the CAUL website. This will include guidance on searching for Australian higher degree theses via Trove, and referrals for the kind of copyright questions now received via the ADT site. There are also recommendations for the migration of those still-running VT-ETD sites to the local institutional repositories with the assistance of CAIRSS staff.

CAIRSS is performing a useful function as a conduit between repository managers and the ARC/ERA team. A meeting was arranged with the ARC/ERA in early February to discuss both the forthcoming testing phase, and the communication channels between the ERA, CAIRSS and the repository managers. It was attended by Kate Watson and Peter Sefton from CAIRSS, and I represented the steering committee.
Finance.

A report and recommendation on the rollover of the $150,000 term deposit was prepared for the Treasurer, prior to the maturity of the investment on December 5. The funds were reinvested following approval from the Executive.

The 2008 audit was completed in December, and some outstanding issues with GST levied on some foreign currency invoices have resulted in a refund to CAUL from the ATO. The 2008 budget spreadsheet was updated accordingly. Liability for long service leave for the Executive Officer has also been clarified, with 80% being paid upfront via fortnightly payments to ANU, and the remainder a liability claimed when the leave is actually taken. This is likely to result in a reduction to the current liability balance.

The 2009 audit began on February 1 - its commencement must wait on final reconciliation of the December accounts, the processing of the December quarter BAS, and the assessment of current liabilities for unpaid incoming and outgoing invoices. Notable changes to regular operational costs in 2009 included website development expenses (the auditor plans to investigate whether the development should be expensed or capitalised), the re-balancing of the CAUL and CEIRC fees, the management of the CAIRSS liability, and the increased staffing expense for website population and increased CEIRC support. The other significant change from the previous year was the increase in the cost of the statistics collection, due to CAVAL’s move to charge “full costs” for the service and support, resulting in an increase from $34k to $47k from 2008 to 2009.

At its meeting on November 16, the CEIRC committee endorsed the proposed increase in the CEIRC membership fee to cover the increased costs of the program in 2010. This $200/$300 increase will cover the current level of resources only. They also supported the proposal that CAUL continue to fund the Executive Officer to attend the annual ICOLC meeting in North America.

CAUL also receives regular requests from publishers for confirmation of outstanding invoices as at 31 December to be forwarded to their auditors.

CEIRC.

During the renewals cycle, 88 individual products were cancelled due to more stringent review of subscriptions by institutions. At the same time, an additional 248 subscriptions or purchases have been added, some for new products, and others from additional take-up of current products.

The major renegotiations for Wiley-Blackwell and Springer (except the Go8, which has its own Springer agreement) were completed and the final subscription lists nearly complete. For Wiley-Blackwell, only one institution cancelled, a New Zealand CRI. The CSIRO has moved to an individual agreement, as they had with their Blackwell package. Five CAUL/CONZUL institutions upgraded from STM to full collections. For Springer, all 49 subscribers renewed. In addition, for the current multi-year subscriptions to Taylor and Francis, all subscribers confirmed that they would be continuing with their current contract in 2010, 16 on the newer 1-2-3 agreement, and 15 of the remaining 23 retaining access to the full collection.

There is a very high transaction load in the office during the renewals period, with 300 products from 89 vendors, some of whom represent multiple publishers. 2,000 invoices were issued (including ad hoc invoices for 27 institutions, so that they could have payments processed before their finance departments closed for the year) and 350 publishers’ invoices paid.

The process to rationalise the CEIRC portfolio has begun - with the first batch of sixteen publishers circulated to members, with a call for an alert to any potential problems by March 12. The only potential problem raised was whether “we would lose bargaining power.” The process will cover the following steps:

1. A comprehensive list of current CEIRC publishers and the number of institutions subscribing to one or more of their products has been compiled.

2. The publishers to be targeted for reduced CEIRC support will be circulated to Datasets Coordinators for comment, in particular whether there is likely to be any insuperable problem or significant price difference caused by the reduced central CEIRC support.
3. The selected publishers will be advised of the reduced CEIRC involvement, viz CEIRC will offer to include annual pricing information on its website and notify its members of its availability, it will maintain sales and technical support contact details on the website, and it will advise members to contact the publisher directly for all matters.

4. The size of the CEIRC program will again be reviewed at the end of the next renewal cycle, to determine the number of new publishers/products which may have replaced the discarded one.

**Universities Australia Web of Science / Scopus negotiations.**

Since the first teleconference of the advisory panel in August 2009, regular contact was maintained with Universities Australia, and feedback provided on their negotiations with both Elsevier and Thomson Reuters. I drafted a report for Andrew Wells to communicate progress to CAUL, and with the support of Universities Australia, was able to advise members of the final proposal as soon as the information was released to Vice-Chancellors. Universities Australia accepted CAUL's offer to issue proforma invoices to all members, to allow for those (23) who wished to pay in 2009. CAUL also issued invoices on behalf of Thomson Reuters who were not able to provide them quickly enough for those (11) who took up the separate Web of Science back-file offer.

**Website Development.** (Report prepared for Executive 2009/6 17 November 2009)

Heather Gordon was invited by the President to supervise the completion of the project. She met with Diane Costello in Canberra on November 1 to review progress and outline the plans for completion and launch of the site.

**Progress to date.** Since the site was handed to CAUL and a training session for the Sitedock publishing software undertaken in late March, 2009, 330 hours have been expended, including just over 200 casual hours (Christine Henderson), but not including my time. There was 14 years worth of content to be moved – 1700 html pages, which required all the internal links to the 6,000 internal documents to be updated.

**Content.** The sections for which the bulk of the pages have been migrated and links completed are:
- CEIRC
- CAUL meetings
- CAUL statistics
- CAUL surveys
- External links to other organisations and reports
- Best Practice
- Information Literacy
- ULA
- Member lists and directories.

What hasn’t been done – sections which I need to do – include:
- CAUL corporate information
- reviewing all top-level pages for consistency and structure
- testing user access for members-only pages
- finalising the enhancement of the sort function for menu items
- procedures to migrate the site from Wiliam to ANU.

Of the CEIRC pages that have been migrated, all were brought up to date before Christine finished on October 11, but have not been maintained in parallel with the current site because of time constraints during CEIRC renewals. They will be a high priority for updating following the changeover. The CEIRC committee recommended that the new site not be launched before the renewals processing was completed because of the potential disruption to that process.

**Site changeover.** It is proposed that the current site stay live but be renamed to archive.caul.edu.au, and not updated. This should be low impact because the site was built such that internal links are relative rather than absolute, and will still be correct while pointing to internal pages/documents. When the development site is renamed to www.caul.edu.au, most of the new pages will already be redirected from the old URLs. Additional information can be added to the 404 error page, and the home page, to alert users to the existence of the archives.
The preferred time for the changeover is first thing in the new year, the quietest time of the year for the CAUL office and all programs.

**Authoring the website.** The site software allows the use of authors outside the CAUL office, though the latter will retain publishing rights and will authorise author access. Processes and workflows for this option are yet to be designed.

**Secure access to members-only pages/documents.** Passworded (members-only) pages on the new site will require individual user passwords rather than the current system-wide ID/password combination. The new user IDs will be the users’ email addresses. Only official institutional addresses will be accepted as IDs as a security measure - when the address is no longer validated by the institution, it will be deleted from the website users list.

**Site software.** The site software, SiteDock, is proprietary, though runs on a Microsoft Windows server. This was not the preferred option but was the only viable solution available after a long search process for a company willing to handle such a “small” job. RSS feeds will be available but not other Web 2.0 features at this stage.

**Hosting.** Quotes were received from CAVAL and the ANU for the hosting of the site. ANU is the preferred host because of its experience, capacity and continuity, and because the most recent quote of $2,500 includes set-up costs and licensing, for both the operating system and the database. Space/backup are normal operations and are included. Traffic is low, in the context of the wider university environment, and is included at this stage.

**Update 18 March 2010.**

Communication has been established between the site developers, William, and ANU, regarding the transfer of the site to an ANU server. The final back-end fixes are in train, one to implement a drag-and-drop function to replace the step-by-step reordering function for lists with dozens, not to say hundreds of items (I have recommended to the developers that they design an “insert” function for their back-end!) and one to prevent files with the same name but used in different sections of the site (the content management system does not allow the site manager to structure the documents on the site.) Other inconsistencies are being reported and addressed. Front-end functions are being tested and fixed where necessary.

The old website is still being updated.

**Meeting arrangements (travel, agenda, venues, minutes, etc):**

CAUL Executive 2009/5 Sydney September 20  
CAUL Meeting 2009/2 Sydney 21-22 September  
CAIRSS Steering Committee 2009/7 Sydney September 22  
Library Staff Development Conference 2010 program committee teleconference October 22  
CEIRC Committee 2009/5 Melbourne November 16  
CAUDIT/CAUL/ACODE joint meeting Melbourne November 18  
CAUL Executive 2009/6 Melbourne November 18  
Library Staff Development Conference 2010 program committee teleconference November 20  
CAIRSS Steering Committee 2009/8 teleconference December 2  
Datasets Coordinators Meeting Melbourne 8 February 2010  
CEIRC Committee 2010/1 Melbourne 10 February  
CAUL Executive Meeting 2010/1 Melbourne 12 February  
CAUL Executive Meeting 2010/2 Canberra 24 March  
CAUL Meeting 2010/1 Canberra 25-26 March  
Library Staff Development Conference 2010 Melbourne July  
Library Staff Development Conference 2010 Melbourne 19-20 July  
CAUL Meeting 2010/2 Brisbane 16-17 September
Meetings held/ attended:

October 12 – Vision Australia, Julie RAE
October 14 – Walter Turnbull, Russell Livermore re CAUL audit 2008
November 1 – Heather Gordon re CAUL website
November 9 – ANU DOI Accounts re CAUL rental and salary expenses for 2010
November 20 – Library Staff Development Conference 2010 program committee teleconference
November 27 – CAUL President
December 2 – CEIRC handover meeting, Sydney, with President, incoming and outgoing CEIRC chairs
December 23 – Walter Turnbull, auditor Russell Livermore re finalisation of 2008 audit
January 29 – ALCC/ADA, Matt Dawes introductory meeting
February 1 – Walter Turnbull, auditor Claire Tingey re start of 2009 audit
February 5 – ARC/ERA, Alex Cooke, Emmi Mokedakis et al, meeting re CAIRSS involvement, with Kate Watson and Peter Sefton
February 5 – Library Staff Development Conference 2010 program committee teleconference
February 26 – Australia-Japan Foundation/ Otemon University visit, arranged by DFAT
February 17 – Universities Australia re EUS analysis vis à vis CEIRC licences
February 23 – first of three interviews for CAUL office staffing
February 25 – ANU, Allan Williams re hosting of CAUL website
February 26 – Walter Turnbull, Claire Tingey re 2009 audit

Meetings held/ attended – CEIRC related:

September 18 – Readex, Norman Williams, with Petros Demetriou and Dyan Francis from DA.
September 18 – BioMed Central, Natalia Timiros, teleconference
September 23 – ProQuest, Kim Jans
October 8 – Universities Australia, Paul Stubing re Scopus/Web of Science
October 15 – Adam Matthew Digital, Ben Cartwright
October 16 – Springer 2010-2012 negotiation team, teleconference
November 6 – Standard & Poor, Ritika Kak, teleconference
November 11 – Oxford Economics, Sam Wong
November 24 – Universities Australia teleconference re Web of Science/Scopus contract negotiations
December 3 – SAGE, Rosalia da Garcia re negotiations for 2011-2013 contract
December 11 – JSTOR teleconference, Bruce Heterick
December 15 – ProQuest, Brad Rosairo and Kevin Serpanchy re restructure of handling ProQuest offers to CAUL members
December 15 – Nature Publishing Group teleconference, Tamara Joyner re ppv offer to members
January 11 – JISC teleconference, Albert Prior regarding cost allocation models
February 5 – OUP, Marika Whitfield and Aviva Weinstein, International Sales Manager
February 9 – VALA meetings with:
  Palgrave Macmillan – Tamara Joyner
  Begell House – Mike Walsh and Peter Hoving, iGroup
  ebrary – Ian Hames and Christopher Warnock, CEO and CTO
  Alexander Street Press – Julie Stevens and Dan Hamid
  Serials Solutions – Matt Hall and Jane Burke, Senior Vice President
  Cambridge University Press – Jenny Simons, Lesley Boyle, Business Development Manager
  JSTOR/Portico – Bruce Heterick
  INFORMS – Randy Kiefer and Mark Doherty, Executive Director
February 10 – SAGE, Rosalia da Garcia et al re negotiations for 2011-2013 contract with Andrew Wells, Greg Anderson and Jocelyn Priddy
February 11 – VALA meetings with:
  Thomas Telford / ICE Publishing – Neil Byrne
  Oxford Journals – Matthew Howells
  Institute of Physics Publishing – Patrick Doogue and Tony O’Rourke, Head of Sales and Marketing (Europe and Rest of World)
  EPIC (New Zealand consortium) – Paula Banks and Heather Jenks
  Euromonitor – Poonam Ramchand and Nadira Mohsin
  Nature Publishing Group – Tamara Joyner and Dr Antoine Bocquet, Associate Director of NPG in the Asia-Pacific
IEEE – Patrick Leung (APAC Regional Manager) with Jay Glaisyer, EBSCO
March 2 – Elsevier, Nigel Ashworth and Linda Dunne
March 4 – Wolters Kluwer Ovid, Jon Ward and Samantha Patrick
March 10 – SerialsSolutions, Erin Pryor and Richard Levy
March 15 – Australian Publishers Association, Melbourne, Paul Reekie and Mark Robertson with
Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Andrew Wells and Ainslie Dewe

Diane Costello
18 March 2010
To Colleagues and Friends,

Although our post office box hasn't moved, over the years, the way it is addressed has been changed a couple of times, the latest being to the version in my signature below.

If you maintain such things as postal addresses, please update your records.

We are also physically in the same spot, as per http://www.caul.edu.au/office.htm

Best wishes,
Diane

----
Diane Costello
Executive Officer, CAUL (Council of Australian University Librarians),
PO Box 8169 Australian National University ACT 0200 Australia
Tel: +61 2 6125 2990    Fax: +61 2 6248 8571
diane.costello@caul.edu.au    http://www.caul.edu.au/

caul-circular2 mailing list
caul-circular2@caul.edu.au
## Delivering Quality and Value

### UNISON Staff Development Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-line</th>
<th>Activity since last report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former members of UNISON were surveyed to determine how the $46,381.07 transferred to CAUL could be used to best effect to underwrite the CAUL Staff Development Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements since last report</th>
<th>Options canvassed were:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. cheaper registrations for all attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. subsidise one or more attendees through a competitive process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. pay the costs of a ‘star’ presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. sponsor the conference dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 responses were received with majority support for option b followed by option a. Support for the other options was generally lukewarm.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for forthcoming activity</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUL budget implications</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations to CAUL</th>
<th>That CAUL note the response to the survey and establish a UNISON Fellowship to provide assistance to one or more attendees at the CAUL Staff Development Conference on a competitive basis to be determined by the CAUL Executive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Pro-forma updated 18 February 2010