

# Monash University Library

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	<b>External Review Panel – Recommendations and advisory recommendations</b>				
<b>1</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>				
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Involvement in University planning processes</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
1.1.1	The panel recommends, perhaps through the relevant portfolios and the Monash Futures Project, that consideration is given to how the Library might be supported to achieve involvement in planning activities at an earlier stage to ensure it can provide optimal support for new developments.	This recommendation is directed to the University.  The Library is represented on all relevant standing committees (Academic Board, Education and Research Committees). Discussions will be held with the DVCs Education and Research to ensure that the Library is able to contribute to forward planning.	The Library will seek to contribute to appropriate planning forums.	Library input has been provided to portfolio and other planning activities.	UL, Directors
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Facilities</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
1.2.1	The panel recommends that the University, as a matter of some urgency, addresses the need to redevelop the remaining libraries, given the positive impact such developments have on	This recommendation is directed to the University.  In 2010 feasibility studies were done for both the Caulfield and Matheson Libraries under the auspices of the Facilities	Caulfield and Matheson Libraries to be refurbished.  The Library will continue to highlight the importance of upgrading	Feasibility studies completed, design phase for Caulfield and Matheson commenced.  ESOS compliance achieved for Library	UL

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	<p>the quality of the student experience and the risk of non-compliance with the standards defined in the ESOS Act, especially at the Caulfield Library.</p>	<p>and Services Division to determine possible scope of works and associated costs. These will be presented to the University in early 2011.</p> <p>The University has indicated that both libraries are considered high priorities for refurbishment, with Caulfield to be done first, followed by Matheson.</p> <p>A submission was made relating to the ESOS audit undertaken by the University in the second half of 2010 and the Library will work through the project outlined above and other initiatives to contribute to compliance with the Act.</p>	<p>the branch libraries.</p> <p><b><i>Included in KA 3.8, 3.9, 3.10.</i></b></p>	<p>facilities.</p>	
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Overseas campuses</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
1.3.1	<p>The panel recommends, perhaps through the Monash Futures Governance Working Party, that the University and Library work together to clarify the Library's</p>	<p>This recommendation is directed to the University.</p> <p>At present the agreement between Sunway and Monash specifies that Monash will provide</p>	<p>The Library has a number of actions in the 2011 Annual Plan which consider options for sustainable strategies for systems and web support, advice on</p>	<p>Roles and responsibilities documented.</p>	<p>VP Administration, UL.</p>

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	relationship with the two overseas campus libraries given that existing arrangements lack clarity and do not ensure consistency of experience between sites.	electronic resources to Sunway. There is no other documentation to underpin the many other ways Monash supports Sunway or South Africa, nor an indication of how Monash wants the quality of what is provided in Malaysia or South Africa to be determined.	staffing and operational environments and consistent policy development between the Australian and overseas campus libraries.  The Library will seek advice through the appropriate portfolios to determine how best to clarify its role.  <i>Included in KA 4.1</i>		
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Education, Teaching and Learning strategic support</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
1.4.1	The panel recommends, in the light of developments such as appointments to the e-Education and Teaching and Learning portfolios, that the University works with the Library to determine the triggers (e.g. time, budget level) for the external review of projects such as learning skills and ECHO360 in order to determine their efficacy, sustainability and ongoing alignment with Library strategies.	This recommendation is directed to the University.  The Library will work with the Office of the PVC Teaching and Learning to consider its current and potential contribution to teaching and learning, and the Office of the Chief Information Officer to consider the most effective deployment of ICT to optimise the teaching and learning experience.	In collaboration with the Office of the PVC Teaching and Learning and the Office of the Chief Information Officer, the Library will review ongoing commitments and opportunities for new services and roles as they emerge.	Strategies formulated and evaluation completed as appropriate.	PVC T&L, CIO, UL

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

<b>1.5</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
1.5.1	The panel recommends that early consideration is given to the potential sustainability challenges presented by the extended services offered by the Library.	While applauding the depth and range of the Library's contribution to the University's teaching, learning and research activities, the panel expresses concern in this recommendation about sustainability. The Library does not share this concern. It is deliberately embracing new roles (learning skills, data management, publishing) and considers that this evolution has been of benefit to the University. Discussions about resourcing these roles occurs annually through the budget planning process, or when a new role or extended service is being considered.	Resourcing, particularly for long term support, is documented as part of project plans.  <i>Included in: KA 3.3</i>	Project procedures and plans updated.	UL.
<b>2</b>	<b>Advisory recommendations</b>				
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Research strategy support</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
2.1.1	The Library may wish to consider whether there	This is an ongoing challenge in an institution	The Library to explore its own, faculty and	Greater use of	UL, Directors, Manager

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	would be benefit in considering a broader approach to engaging academics with its changing vision for research support within the networked digital environment.	as large and complex as Monash. The Library needs to make use of as many communication channels as possible to try to let researchers know the full extent of resources, services and programs available to them.  Activities co-ordinated by the Client Service Directors, Data Management Coordinator, Manager Monash University Publishing, etc are focussed on both publicising and extending research services.	university communication channels.	resources and services.	Monash University Publishing, contact librarians, Communications Manager.
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Research strategy support</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
2.2.1	The Library may wish to consider what opportunities there are to advise academics on broader open access developments, given that there is some evidence that these are gaining traction.	A range of communication and training activities across scholarly publishing, research data and copyright already include components which discuss open access.  The launch of Monash University Publishing places an increased emphasis on open access	Pursue opportunities to raise awareness about open access developments and Monash initiatives.  <i>Included in: KA 1.3/4?</i>	Greater engagement with open access initiatives (publishing, use of the ARROW Repository)	CHR, Directors

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

		publishing.  A paper on open scholarship from a Monash perspective was considered by General Library Committee and the Monash Research Committee in 2010, and a follow up paper on scholarly communication is to be considered in 2011.			
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Partnerships</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>		<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
2.3.1	The Library may wish to consider whether there would be benefit from greater communication around developments in institutional relationships with the teaching hospitals and other medical institutions with which the University is engaged and, if so, how this might be enabled.	This is a complex and changing environment. This Library is in discussion with the Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences and the Hospital Librarians.	Regular contact between partner institutions and Client Services staff and Directors develops and maintains these relationships effectively.		Director Client Services, Science, Health and Engineering
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Partnerships</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
2.4.1	The Library may wish to consider whether its	The scholarly communication	No additional strategies will be implemented at	Risk register completed	University

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	<p>routine risk management activities adequately address the potential risks if its portfolio of external and consortial services were to change significantly.</p>	<p>environment is volatile at present, with significant amounts of aggregation and business closure occurring. The Library monitors this environment, actively seeks meetings with vendors and agents and participates in consortial activities.</p> <p>The Library will maintain input to the University risk management and legal compliance, which addresses the higher level aspects of this recommendation.</p>	<p>this stage.</p>	<p>annually.</p>	<p>Librarian</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>Library Self-Review Report Opportunities for Improvement</b>				
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Governance</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.1.1	<p>The Library needs to explore ways of replacing the high level representation it had through the disbanded Senior Management Forum.</p>	<p>See Recommendation 1.1.</p>			
3.1.2	<p>The Library should seek ways to become involved in key University planning processes at an earlier</p>	<p>See Recommendation 1.1.</p>			

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	stage.				
3.1.3	The Library Strategy Group should be reviewed in order to clarify its role and determine strategies for its ongoing development.	This is currently being done as a group activity.	Leadership development project involving Library Strategy Group members to consider this and related issues.	Agreement reached on terms of reference for the group.	LMC/ LSG
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Staff</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.2.1	The activities arising in response to the staff survey should improve communication and the Library's ability to manage change.	The results of the latest staff survey suggest that a proportion of Library staff are not coping with the degree of change to which they are currently being exposed, and communication could be improved. Three working groups and the activity listed under the last recommendation, together with greater emphasis on change management, should address this.	Projects initiated by working parties will address priority areas: leadership etc.  Change management being considered as part of Library Strategy Group activities.	Improved results in next staff survey.	LMC, LSG
3.2.2	Better articulation of the goals and processes of change management in the Library could increase understanding of and engagement with changes, particularly	See recommendation 3.2.1 above.			



## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	among the staff they most directly affect.				
3.2.3	In addition, change management workshops should be offered to all staff.	This will be addressed through staff development programs for 2011 and 2012.	LSG activity plus change management workshops.	Improved results in next staff survey.	Director Central Services
3.2.4	Opportunities should be sought for greater consultation with staff and more staff involvement in projects and new initiatives.	This recommendation also responds to the results of the latest staff survey. Efforts have been made to delegate leadership of more projects to a range of staff, and the LSG is examining leadership issues.	Delegation of project management.  Skills development.	Improved results in next staff survey.	LMC
3.2.5	Benchmarking against similar institutions should be undertaken with sufficient specificity to help identify areas where staffing numbers may need adjustment.	Benchmarking is being undertaken with three other Group of 8 (Go8) university libraries in order to examine cost effectiveness in information resources management.  A framework which will enable the Library to benchmark with other comparable libraries will be developed.	Information resources benchmarking.  Development of framework.	Benchmarking completed.	UL, Directors, Library Planning Executive
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Planning and reporting</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

3.3.1	A review of SLA and KPIs should be conducted to ensure that they accurately reflect structural and service level changes.	It is over 8 years since the Library's Service Level Agreement with faculties was created. It is now time to review this, after first examining the status of SLAs in the University.	Advice on the University requirements will be sought in 2011 and the review undertaken.	New or discontinued SLA.  Revised KPIs.	Library Planning Executive.
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Benchmarking and surveys</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.4.1	The Library should review the statistics it collects and work with CAUL to identify opportunities to use this information in benchmarking.	This should be done in conjunction with recommendations 3.2.5 and 3.3.1.	As above. A framework will be developed. The framework will use public data sets such as the CAUL and American Research Library Statistics to define base level comparisons.	Statistics revised and adapted as appropriate.	Library Planning Executive.
3.4.2	The Library should ensure that it is properly represented in the University's surveys.	The Library has a unique perspective on teaching and learning. Most of the surveys that do or could involve the Library are considered through Education Committee and should be examined as they go forward.	Through contact with the relevant University unit and Education Committee present the Library's perspective on surveys.	Appropriate inclusion of Library perspective in University surveys.	Director Client Services, Humanities and Social Sciences, Library Planning Executive
3.4.3	The Library should actively benchmark with overseas libraries, particularly given the fact that Monash defines itself as a highly	Benchmarking to date has been restricted to Australian comparator institutions. Given Monash's international focus, it is appropriate that	Develop benchmarking framework.  Undertake benchmarking with selected institutions.	Benchmarking undertaken and reported on.	Library Planning Executive.

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	internationalised university.	some benchmarking with overseas institutions be undertaken. This process has commenced.  See also recommendation 3.2.5.			
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Budget</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.5.1	The audit report is expected to provide opportunities for improvement, particularly regarding ordering and acquisitions of collection material.	Recommendations of the audit report have already been implemented.  A review of ongoing workflows will be informed by Financial Services Enhancement changes.	Already implemented.	Processes approved by Risk and Audit Office.	Finance Manager.
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Quality assurance and improvement</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.6.1	More rigorous application of the Thomsett methodology for project management should be considered, particularly the possibility of more formally evaluating the success of projects through post implementation reviews.	A refresher session for Library Management Committee and Library Strategy Group members will to review the Library's use of the methodology and identify areas where different use of the methodology would be productive.	Follow up training on project management to be provided to managers.	Training provided and project management refined.	Director Central services.

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

<b>3.7</b>	<b>Collections</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.7.1	Benchmarking against Go8 universities and overseas should result in stronger collection acquisition budgets in the coming years.	See recommendation 3.4.3.	Detailed benchmarking data will be evaluated in conjunction with selected partners as part of the consideration of collection acquisition requirements.	Revised approach to benchmarking informs budget considerations.	Library Planning Executive.
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Research outputs</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.8.1	Collaboration with key stakeholders to develop a University-wide digitisation strategy should be explored.	At present digitisation occurs in the Library, Archives and faculties and research centres. There is no overarching strategy to guide what will be digitised by whom and how the material will be managed.	Stakeholders – including Records and Archives, eResearch Centre and Library to develop a coordinated view of the needs for digitisation services and means of fulfilling the need.	Strategy developed and implemented.	Director Information Resources, in consultation with others
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Monash University ePress</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.9.1	There is an opportunity for contact librarians to take a wider role in advising academics about the full range of the Library's scholarly publishing activities.	See recommendation 2.1.			

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

<b>3.10 Supporting the Monash Passport</b>					
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.10.1	Passport 2.0 should provide an opportunity for the Library to engage with the stronger research focus of undergraduate students, amongst other things.	<p>The development of collections that align with Passport 2.0 is an important focus for the Library's collection development activities. This is already under consideration.</p> <p>Passport 2.0, particularly the 'Research Challenge' units in the Investigate program, will influence demand on Library services and resources. The program provides opportunities for an early introduction to information research, learning skills and research data management practices.</p>	<p>Collection to be developed in support of Passport 2.0 activities.</p> <p>Information research and learning skills programs to support Passport 2.0.</p>	<p>Collection developed.</p> <p>Programs delivered.</p>	Directors Client Services, Director Information resources
<b>3.11 Information Systems</b>					
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.11.1	The Library should endeavour to use the Shared Services review to assess its needs for specialist staff in order to ensure expert support to key areas and should look	Implementation of the outcomes of the review have resulted in ongoing negotiations to achieve the best outcomes for the University, taking into account aggregating skills	Discussion with OCIO regarding best arrangements.	Decisions implemented.	UL, CIO

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	for advantageous outcomes.	and gaining efficiencies on the one hand and the Library's specialist needs and ability to lead innovation on the other.			
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Human Resources</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.12.1	Creation of a cadet program has been highlighted as an activity which will assist the Library to address an anticipated future shortage of professional Librarians.	<p>This is an excellent idea but it cannot be implemented due to budget restrictions.</p> <p>Following the recommendations of the Service Points review the Library is examining the professional entry level (HEW5) role with a view to career development to address anticipated staffing needs.</p>	Consider for 2012 budget.	Strategy acted on if funds secured.	Director Central Services
3.12.2	Use of technology to better streamline HR processes e.g., e-recruitment and automation of time sheets.	<p>The Library is working with the HR Division to implement a number of initiatives including this one arising from the HR Review.</p> <p>Included in Annual Plan (KA 3.3)</p>	Library adoption of new processes.	Range of new processes implemented.	Director Central Services, HR Manager
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Facilities</b>				

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
3.13.1	The University recognises the need to upgrade the Caulfield and Berwick Libraries and considers the Caulfield Library a high priority for capital works funding. The Matheson Library refurbishment is also supported by the University, and a feasibility study to provide details of options is currently underway.	See recommendation 1.2.			
3.13.2	Plans to increase the student cohort on the Berwick Campus need to include consideration of expanding the Library.	<p>The Library, through the Berwick Library Manager and Library Management Committee members is working with campus management to consider the role and requirements of the Library as the campus grows.</p> <p>The possibility of HEPPP funded staff working from Berwick is being considered.</p>	<p>Input into strategic planning.</p> <p>Staffing component supplemented to provide leadership of programs for low SES students across the University.</p>	Campus plans include adequate space for the Library.	UL, Director Client Services Science Health and Engineering, Berwick Library Manager
<b>3.14</b>	<b>International engagement and partnerships</b>				
	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>

## 2010 Library Quality Review Implementation Plan

3.14.1	Service Level Agreements should be developed to define the relationship and management of services and resources between the Library and the two overseas campuses.	See recommendation 1.3.			
3.14.2	The recent appointment of a librarian to focus support to Monash College students provides an opportunity to further develop relevant information research skills programs.	This has occurred.			