# Review of the Scholarly Services portfolio at the University of Melbourne

Professor Jane Long (chair)

Ms Sally Hirst, Hirst Projects

Ms Sue Roberts, University of Auckland

Professor Nick Haslam, University of Melbourne

Ms Jane Richards, University of Melbourne

Ms Anastasia Slipper, University of Melbourne

**10 August 2017**

# Scholarly Services Review 2017

## Executive summary and recommendations

Executive summary ..... 3
Recommendations ..... 4
Discussion ..... 5
1. Structural arrangements ..... 5
1.1 Leadership roles ..... 5
1.2 Information flows and transparency ..... 5
2. Branding and stakeholder communication ..... 6
2.1 Establishing the Scholarly Services identity ..... 6
2.2 Linking strategy and operations ..... 7
2.3 Faculty and University committees ..... 7
3. Service offering: range and resourcing ..... 7
3.1 Planning and allocation of resourcing ..... 7
3.2 Service Catalogue ..... 8
4. Object-based learning (OBL) and increasing access to collections ..... 8
5. Financial management: Materials Vote and copyright licensing ..... 9
5.1 Materials Vote ..... 9
5.2 Copyright licensing ..... 10
6. The digital agenda ..... 10
7. Study spaces: Library as Place ..... 11
8. Avenues for innovation ..... 12
Commendations ..... 13
Attachment: list of participants ..... 14
Attachment: summary of submissions ..... 15

# Executive summary

This review of Scholarly Services (formally established in March 2017) affords a significant opportunity to assess its existing and future operations to ensure their effectiveness and strategic alignment in the broader context of the Melbourne Operating Model; to identify further potential synergies between constituent groups within the Scholarly Services portfolio; and to consider the extent to which current arrangements enable staff to contribute to well-planned and sustainable innovation in the service of the University community.

While the activities undertaken by the different workgroups comprising Scholarly Services are diverse, all cluster reasonably coherently around the University's core missions in research, learning and teaching, and engagement. The Review Panel has received numerous submissions from across the University and interviews were also conducted in on-site meetings in the week of June 26-30, 2017. Drawing on all sources, it is clear to the Panel that the contributions of the Service's staff to the scholarly life of the University are generally highly regarded by both academic and professional staff, as well as by students. Indeed, stakeholders sometimes characterise their interactions with staff in Scholarly Services, not as customer-service transactions, but as something akin to deeper 'partnerships' which add value across a range of scholarly activities, and which can facilitate engagement or delivery in ways which enhance the University's distinctiveness.

Although its constituent elements often have much longer histories within the institution, the new Scholarly Services portfolio must rapidly consolidate its position, if it is to anticipate and meet the needs of the University and best leverage the knowledge and expertise of staff in its workgroups. In a period of considerable structural change, the Review Panel's recommendations presented here have been developed with an eye to three interrelated imperatives:

- staff in and beyond Scholarly Services must be confident about the portfolio's purpose and identity, and their role within it;
- in a context of very active strategy generation in a number of Chancellery portfolios, priorities for Scholarly Services should be clarified and communicated to enable sound forward planning and resource allocation;
- inclusive avenues for innovation and communication within the portfolio, and utilisation of staff expertise, should be further fostered.

The second imperative is especially compelling for the portfolio to make the most of its strong foundations. The three areas brought together to create Scholarly Services currently enjoy an enviable reputation for timely, expert service, and elicit tremendous goodwill amongst users. A lack of clarity about priorities in future, however, stands to inhibit effective forward planning and the application of resources. It may also impede the proactive management of stakeholder expectations to the detriment of both the internal culture of, and external satisfaction with, Scholarly Services.

We commend the report to you.

The Review Panel would also gratefully acknowledge the interest and engagement of a large number of academic and professional staff, as well as students, who made submissions to the review. The panel also extends its sincere thanks to Margaret L Ruwoldt and Louise Craven. Their insight, preparation and planning, professional advice and unstinting assistance have made for a seamless experience.

# Recommendations

The Review Panel recommends that:

1. the leadership role of Director, Scholarly Services be filled on a substantive basis as soon as possible;
2. the position descriptions of other senior leaders within the portfolio be revised as appropriate to reflect the new structural arrangements and reporting lines, including emphasis upon intra-portfolio communication and decision-making, to maximise clarity for staff;
3. the new Director Scholarly Services undertake an information-flow mapping exercise to detect and address any impediments to communication, consultation and transparency of decision-making, for local use, in light of the new structural arrangements in Scholarly Services and the broader changes to governance under the Melbourne Operating Model;
4. a communications and internal marketing plan be developed and implemented to inform all stakeholders about the scope and identity of Scholarly Services, its major priorities and contribution to the University's strategic intentions;
5. University Services consider the local processes and broader interactions needed for Scholarly Services to deliver its contribution to the University's strategic goals within defined resource parameters, predictably and effectively, with reference to a set of priorities agreed bi-annually between portfolio leaders and circulated to staff
6. a comprehensive assessment of the existing service catalogue of Scholarly Services be undertaken, to gauge its alignment with University strategy and to prioritise future resource allocation;
7. Object-based learning (OBL) requests be made in advance of each semester to enable effective planning and distribution of resources across academic divisions and, as appropriate, to identify when additional demands for OBL are not sustainable without some transfer of resources;
8. the parameters of the Materials Vote be revised, to specifically exclude the impact of fluctuating currency conditions (such fluctuations to be managed separately within Finance); and to provide an annual percentage increase on the overall budget that mitigates the effect of vendor price increases.
9. responsibility be allocated within Scholarly Services for working with Chancellery, Academic Divisions and University Services to support the development and implementation of a 'digital uplift' agenda for the University of Melbourne.
10. Scholarly Services define a process and a masterplan for design, development and management of Scholarly Services spaces across all campuses, acknowledging the central role of library spaces in embodying a learning culture and providing access to a broader range of services.
11. a small working group partner with the Business Improvement Group (Academic Services) on developing and piloting an innovation framework for Scholarly Services, with the intention of eventually scaling up the framework to support innovation across the whole of Academic Services.

# Discussion

## 1. Structural arrangements

### *1.1 Leadership roles*

The recent formation of Scholarly Services as a portfolio incorporating Scholarly Information (previously known as the Library), Learning Environments, and Research and Collections, draws together three important workgroups with a particularly strong interaction with the scholarly life of the University. While each section of the portfolio varies in size, work practices and areas of staff expertise, the rationale underpinning the portfolio appeared to the Panel to be compelling. Overwhelmingly, feedback in the submissions emphasised the important contribution of its sections-- often conceived of as providing service in a valued 'partnership' with staff, especially those in academic divisions, as well as with all cohorts of students in their learning and research journeys, and the University's alumni and other stakeholders.

There is a sense that some of the synergies within the portfolio have yet to be identified and exploited to best advantage, a process which will take place over time as the portfolio settles. The Review Panel believes that the appointment of a Director for Scholarly Services is a vital step to equip the area to plan and operate effectively and to build cohesion among its constituent elements.

> *Recommendation 1: Fill the substantive role of Director Scholarly Services as soon as possible.*

To support the new Director it will be necessary to redesign and (where vacant) fill the senior leadership roles within Scholarly Services. These positions will be essential for developing capacity to deal with areas of immediate and emerging concern; building productive relationships with multiple stakeholders in Chancellery and Academic Divisions; embedding change and a culture of user-focused continuous improvement; and providing clarity of direction to staff, customers and stakeholders.

> *Recommendation 2: Revise the position descriptions of other senior leaders within the portfolio to reflect the new structural arrangements and reporting lines, including emphasis upon intra-portfolio communication and decision-making.*

### *1.2 Information flows and transparency*

The new structural arrangements in Scholarly Services and the broader changes to governance under the Melbourne Operating Model appear to have inadvertently created some cul-de-sacs and gaps in up-down, down-up and lateral communication, consultation and decision-making. These effects emerge in day-to-day operations and in Scholarly Services' relationships with the committees and advisory groups that have an interest in its activities.

The Review Panel is also aware that the creation of Scholarly Services as part of the Melbourne Operating Model, has created some confusion for staff. Some staff lament what they perceive as a too rigid separation between the strategic and the operational, the Chancellery and University Services, where they feel uncertain about the mechanisms through which they can have input into their own work priorities and planning. Some staff expressed concern that the formation of Scholarly Services means that its two smaller constituent workgroups will be overwhelmed by the larger

group, and their distinctiveness lost. Some staff expressed concern that streamlining reporting lines had effectively 'demoted' them or distanced them from the strategic decision-making which bears directly upon their work. Further, a view in one area was expressed that in a drive to simplify reporting, lines are blurred (whereby a manager, for example, was cited as a sometime client).

After due deliberation, the Review Panel concluded that some of these concerns are symptomatic of a broader challenge: that of settling down a newly configured portfolio, the need to address effective communication, intra- and inter-portfolio planning, and roles and responsibilities within it. The Review Panel also agrees on the need to separate those issues which have accompanied larger structural changes (including reporting lines which follow the logic of the Melbourne Operating Model, which is well beyond the scope for this review), from issues which are adjacent to, but separate from, those changes. The Panel notes that some of the latter issues—the content of individual position descriptions, for example, or perceived conflicts of interest-- should be addressed through existing management channels.

> *Recommendation 3: After appointment of the Director Scholarly Services, undertake an information-flow mapping exercise to detect and address any impediments to communication, consultation and transparency of decision-making, for local use.*

An early task for the new Director will be to establish and embed a clear vision and mission for Scholarly Services. Areas to be addressed should include – though not be limited to -- priorities for resource allocation; organisational culture and inclusion; work practices, innovation and streamlining of existing processes.

Staff at all levels of Scholarly Services have expertise and knowledge to bring into planning, both for their own portfolio and for the broader Academic Services division. Across University Services, and particularly within Academic Services, there is also a push to involve customers (clients, stakeholders, end-users) in decision-making at all stages of ideation, design, development and evaluation of services. An inclusive approach to planning, along with strengthened communications and stakeholder relationships, would help to mitigate perceived gaps between University strategy and Scholarly Services operations.

## 2. Branding and stakeholder communication

### *2.1 Establishing the Scholarly Services identity*

The new entity of Scholarly Services needs to establish its position within the University and clearly demonstrate its value proposition for learning, teaching and research (not only the student experience, which is the main focus of Academic Services). It is especially important to ensure that the portfolio is understood to incorporate, not only the library and its many services, but a wide range of other staff and services whose work and expertise contributes significantly to the University's scholarly endeavours.

We note that at present, staff in several areas of Scholarly Services state that they have found it hard to understand and embrace the term 'Scholarly Services'. There is a confusion about the language, the brand image applied to various products and services, and long-standing assumptions about the nature and scope of an academic library. For those staff struggling with recent changes, this uncertainty about identity is accompanied by a sense of loss. Recognising the diversity of expertise and experience now encompassed by Scholarly Services, however, the Review Panel believes that, if

concerted attention is given to developing a coherent identity and culture for Scholarly Services both internally and outwards to the University, staff will be more confident about the portfolio, and its benefits.

### *2.2 Linking strategy and operations*

Based on comments in submissions and interviews, the Review Panel suggests there is a need for a consistent narrative link between two conceptual levels: a focus on the University's 'business' as a whole, i.e. what makes Melbourne successful in competition with other universities; and attention to decisions about service delivery to the 'consumer' – students, researchers, academic staff, alumni and so on.

The expertise and ideas of staff members working close to the 'front line' are undoubtedly valuable inputs when identifying new opportunities and directions for the University. Some staff expressed a view that their expected input into any 'innovation' agenda, was confined solely to practical matters of local productivity and efficiency. As such, it would be timely to consider the ways in which innovative thinking in Scholarly Services can be encouraged and recognised, and the conduits through which good ideas might be communicated clearly identified.

### *2.3 Faculty and University committees*

We are aware that there are Library User groups in several faculties, complemented by the existence of the Libraries and Academic Resources Committee (LARC), which is a subcommittee of Academic Board. Feedback from academic and professional staff indicates these channels are not currently being used effectively for communication with Academic Divisions or Academic Board. There is a perception that people who should be heard are not speaking, or do not have a seat at the appropriate table. Although Scholarly Services staff are involved in some Library User groups, they are not always well informed about internal Scholarly Services planning and changes. There also seems to be a gap in communication between Associate Deans (in their responsibilities for relevant domains, eg teaching and learning, research, and digital) and staff in different sections of Scholarly Services.

Liaison librarians in most disciplines have developed close relationships with committees and stakeholders in the relevant Academic Division and are well placed to represent Scholarly Services in these forums. For effective communication, these representatives must be well briefed and confident in their understanding of the full range of Scholarly Services activities and developments. This requires time (of the individual librarian) and efficient routine communication within Scholarly Services.

*Recommendation 4: Develop and implement a communications and internal marketing plan to inform all stakeholders about the scope and identity of Scholarly Services, its major priorities and contribution to the University's strategic intentions.*

## 3. Service offering: range and resourcing

### *3.1 Planning and allocation of resourcing*

The Melbourne Operating Model imposes certain known constraints on resourcing and management choices. If "providing service excellence" is the driver for decisions, then people in front-line service delivery roles will feel pressured to attempt to fulfil all requests. In this environment a prioritisation

framework can help staff to bridge perceived gaps in the alignment of strategy and operational decision-making, giving them a tool for evaluating requests and effectively managing client expectations.

Several staff noted, in interviews and in submissions, that innovations and major projects such as Arts West, MOOCs and the Flexible Academic Programming initiative (FlexAP) are typically planned and led from Academic Divisions or Chancellery. Although these projects might be reasonably expected to have flow-on effects for University Services, there is a need to develop widely-understood mechanisms to plan, adjust and allocate operational resources to ensure that any new initiative is supported and maintained, be it a system, a pedagogical practice, or specific infrastructure. Early consultation and realistic budgeting for the post-project operational phase will become increasingly crucial: without adequate planning, the original vision of the project will not be fully delivered.

To date the University Services move towards user-focused service improvement, using Agile and Lean techniques, has not permeated Scholarly Services and its workgroups to any great extent. Meaningful involvement of customers, clients and Scholarly Services staff would enable a more proactive and forward-thinking approach to planning and to the design, delivery and continuous improvement of services.

*Recommendation 5: University Services should consider the local processes and broader interactions needed for Scholarly Services to deliver its contribution to the University's strategic goals within defined resource parameters, predictably and effectively, with reference to an agreed set of priorities.*

### *3.2 Service Catalogue*

Scholarly Services provides a wide range of services, many of which are 'student facing'. The University has already seen a significant increase in student enrolments over the last five years, and this trend is being actively pursued by the University for at least the next several years. As well, the profile of the student body is changing: undergraduates are no longer the largest cohort, and graduate students have different expectations and support requirements. The predictable workload implications for Scholarly Services must be addressed urgently, with a view to maintaining and improving the quality of services while not imposing unrealistic workloads on individual staff and teams.

*Recommendation 6: Undertake a comprehensive assessment of the existing service catalogue of Scholarly Services to gauge its alignment with University strategy and to form the basis for prioritising future resource allocation.*

## 4. Object-based learning (OBL) and increasing access to collections

Object-based learning (OBL) at the University of Melbourne has developed differentially across the academic divisions. The role of Scholarly Services staff is widely praised in this area, drawing upon expertise in OBL and the effective integration of OBL learning opportunities into the curriculum. While OBL undoubtedly highlights and makes great use of the University's collections, and demand in some areas for OBL sessions provided by Scholarly Services is growing, the Review Panel observed that to date, there is little discussion of the impact of OBL upon student learning outcomes, and its pedagogical advantages in comparison to other approaches.

The growth of OBL is an important means of utilising collections and engaging students: but is there a teaching and learning rationale for its further development? Do students learn more effectively as a consequence of their OBL interactions? While it is certainly not the role of the Review Panel to answer such questions, or to deliberate upon them, it received numerous comments concerning the implications of OBL for future resource allocation. Given the increasing cost of OBL in respect of staffing and infrastructure, the Panel was interested to understand OBL's benefits and its efficacy as a part of a distinctive Melbourne offer. The Panel heard that staff currently engaging in OBL from Scholarly Services are stretched: their capacity to provide more service will be very limited. Given the asymmetry in academic divisions' use of OBL, and increasing demand for it at a direct cost to Scholarly Services, consideration of future needs and staff resourcing should occur. In particular, it may be pertinent to consider a fee-for-service regime for OBL provision beyond an agreed ceiling (although it is recognised that the specific skill of staff engaged in OBL provision does not readily lend itself to an outsourcing, scale-up/scale-down model of delivery).

*Recommendation 7: Object-based learning (OBL) requests should be made in advance of each semester to enable effective planning and distribution of resources across academic divisions and, as appropriate, to identify when additional demands for OBL are not sustainable without some transfer of resources.*

## 5. Financial management: Materials Vote and copyright licensing

### *5.1 Materials Vote*

The Materials Vote at the University currently encompasses international currency fluctuations, in what appears to be an unusual departure from practice elsewhere in the sector where currency fluctuations are routinely removed from negotiation of baseline materials funding (and where extensive hedging is undertaken to mitigate the impact of currency shifts). While the vagaries of currency fluctuations are to some extent predictable, major ups and downs can have a considerable impact on the purchasing power of the University year to year.

There is undoubtedly consideration to be made about the Materials Vote, its size, and its application. However, the Review Panel is strongly of the view that currency fluctuations should not be incorporated within it, but separated out to be dealt with via hedging and other mechanisms by experts in Finance. Removing this component would conduce to more predictability in planning, and would also reduce 'background noise' in any future discussion about the size or comparability of the Materials Vote at the University.

Comparison data from the Group of Eight demonstrates that the University has not maintained its position within that cohort over the period. It could be argued that a decline in spend is not in and of itself indicative of much—it is complicated by issues such as the balance of use of digital and physical resources (the University being a comparatively heavy user of the latter, within the Go8); the balance between inter-library lending, and purchase; and the discipline demographics of different institutions. However, the inclusion of currency variations as a component of the Materials Vote at the University is perceived very much as a capricious and detrimental factor, which at its worst, penalises scholars by reducing access to research infrastructure.

A second and equally important factor is diminishing the buying power of the Materials Vote. Academic publishers and other vendors regularly increase their prices, on average by about 5 per cent per year. These increases are outside the control of the University, though Scholarly Services is

working with the Procurement group to negotiate with selected vendors where savings might be made. Good practice in other universities is to allow for vendor price increases in the collections budget.

> *Recommendation 8: Revise the parameters of the Materials Vote to specifically exclude the impact, whether positive or negative, of fluctuating currency conditions (such fluctuations to be managed separately within Finance); and to provide an annual percentage increase on the overall budget that mitigates the effect of vendor price increases.*

### *5.2 Copyright licensing*

The University pays annual licensing fees to external organisations such as Copyright Australia Ltd (CAL) to allow students and staff to use copyright works in their academic and professional activities. This is a University expense, required to mitigate legal risk and to enable continuance of teaching, research and the administrative operations of the University. The University has no control over the fees levied, and in recent years those fees have increased considerably.

Because the University Copyright Office is located within Scholarly Services, the administration of copyright licences and payment of fees is funded by Scholarly Services. Under present arrangements there appears to be no provision to vary the budget for copyright licence fees: a significant shortfall in 2016-2017 was met from within the Scholarly Services budget.

While specific budget allocations are out of scope for this Review, we note this structural anomaly as an area of concern due to its potential to adversely affect resourcing for other areas of Scholarly Services.

## 6. The digital agenda

The University's commitment to digitisation in research and teaching and learning, and in the development of digital fluency among all staff and students, requires immediate and detailed consideration vis-à-vis the sustainability of the contribution made by Scholarly Services. Currently, the Scholarly Information section is widely understood to have carriage of a Digital Literacy framework, and to be undertaking important work to equip students and some staff in the skills required to more effectively navigate a digital world.

While this work is much needed and of high quality, two concerns arose for the Review Panel. First, the framework as it currently stands does not encompass a university-wide, holistic approach to digital literacy (following, for example, the approach of JISC in the UK, in its interpretation of digital literacy as an orientation informing ways of thinking about and interacting with knowledge), but is more pragmatically skills-based. As a more holistic approach is developed strategically within the Chancellery, however, the need for dedicated services in its support will also expand considerably. We assume that a major effort in this arena will involve sections and divisions beyond Scholarly Services, to realise the University's digital ambitions. However, we believe that even in terms of its existing service catalogue, the scaling up in demand for existing services offered from within Scholarly Services workgroups will not be sustainable without some transfer of resources.

Second, the consideration of all things digital within many different strategic domains will result in implementation requirements and service requests coming to Scholarly Services (and other areas) from many different directions. The strategic dancecard in respect of digital intentions is filling rapidly, and many important and exciting initiatives will build in part on work undertaken in

Scholarly Services: FlexAP, MOOCs, digitisation and digital preservation of collections, digital literacy, online learning initiatives from the LMS to augmented and virtual reality (AR and VR), capability development for academic staff engaged in online and blended learning, design and delivery of curriculum and course content, the many and varied interfaces between the digital and research. All these initiatives involve academic staff and intersect with Scholarly Services, to a great or a lesser degree, and will continue to do so in future.

For professional staff the University workplace is transforming rapidly. Professional staff across the University are increasingly expected to use video-conference tools in meetings, engage with process automation projects, manage and preserve born-digital records, participate in enterprise social networks, and undertake data analysis for business insights and performance reporting.

Several areas of Chancellery, University Services and Academic Divisions are working on initiatives relating to a forward-thinking agenda for digital transformation at the University of Melbourne. As yet, the means of coordinating these activities is not clear to the Review Panel. It is clear, however, that technology and the digital environment drives every transaction, every process and every aspect of teaching and research – and of University management. The need for digital literacy at every level is critical. It is no longer the role of the IT department (except for the most fundamental platform and technical issues), rather it is part of everyone's role in Scholarly Services – and in every branch of the University's activities. It is the connector between information assets, people, and the interactions required for learning, research and collaboration.

Scholarly Services has invested heavily in developing digital platforms to support research and teaching, complemented by deep staff expertise in multiple aspects of technology management and usage. It seems likely opportunities will emerge for Scholarly Services to take a leading role in helping academic and professional staff to operate effectively in an increasingly digital workplace.

Against this background of rapid escalation in both the quantity and diversity of existing and future digital needs, the coordination of priorities to guide staff and to avoid any duplication will be vital. At present, staff in Scholarly Services at times evince some confusion about the ways in which priorities are set, communicated, or changed. Further, they state that increasing demands of day to day work leave little opportunity to reflect upon and have input into the internal prioritisation of service. To manage sensibly the future contribution of Scholarly Services to the 'digital pivot', and to inject clarity for staff, relevant leaders should actively engage in planning to ensure that resources, staffing, responsibilities, collaboration and expectations of Scholarly Services are both well-understood and sustainable.

*Recommendation 9: Assign responsibility within Scholarly Services for working with Chancellery, Academic Divisions and University Services to support the development and implementation of a Digital Uplift agenda for the University of Melbourne.*

## 7. Study spaces: Library as Place

Submissions and interviews suggest that, for students, the library is a fundamental place that embodies the learning culture of the University. This perception is supported by insights from multiple student surveys. As well as being an individual contemplative space, it is a focus for collaboration and a home for specialty services. Scholarly Services needs to reflect that importance in its front of house and not lose sight of its place-making role and its productive role in academic support.

Development of the Student Precinct on the Parkville campus offers an opportunity to rethink the types of spaces available to students outside class time. Worldwide, we note that academic and public libraries have recently become sites for collaborative workspaces, maker spaces and technology transfer activities (such as learning about 3D printing or how to create augmented-reality applications). This should prompt serious consideration about how Scholarly Services might support the emergence of a creative, entrepreneurial, highly collaborative community on and around the University's several campuses.

*Recommendation 10: Define a process and a masterplan for the design, development and management of Scholarly Services spaces across all campuses, which acknowledges the central role of library spaces in embodying a learning culture and providing access to a broader range of services.*

## 8. Avenues for innovation

In the "Summary of submissions" attachment we identify the written submissions that offer ideas for innovations or improvement that could be delivered in a relatively short timeframe. Noting that other areas within Academic Services and University Services have a brief to foster a culture of innovation, business improvement and user-centred service design, the Review Panel urges Scholarly Services to make use of those resources as much as possible.

A first step may be to review the ideas proposed in the submissions, and noted in subsequent interviews, to identify any that could be implemented immediately, using existing resources. These tasks could then be assigned to the relevant manager for action. Examples of such ideas include:

- Reviewing, refining and potentially expanding the Professional Cadetships program
- Seeking opportunities to partner with other areas of Academic Services to enhance students' employability, eg via programs supporting work-integrated learning, innovation and entrepreneurship, leadership skills development, volunteering and internships
- Changing the storage arrangements for materials delivered via the Reading Room
- Identifying functional activities that require programmatic oversight and assigning suitably qualified staff to take on this responsibility, eg coordination of learning and teaching activities, digital capability development, learning design capability

Next, a working group could lead the development of an innovation framework for Scholarly Services, becoming in effect a test-case for creation of a broader Academic Services framework. With a staged approach and appropriate mentoring for participants, multiple small innovation projects could be delivered within 12 months.

*Recommendation 11: Convene a small working group to partner with the Business Improvement Group (Academic Services) on developing and piloting an innovation framework for Scholarly Services, with the intention of eventually scaling up the framework to support innovation across the whole of Academic Services.*

## Commendations

The Review Panel commends:

- Scholarly Services for its very effective role in partnering with academics (as teachers and researchers) in the learning, teaching and research goals of the University. Staff in all areas—including, for example, liaison librarians, learning environments staff, digitisation and OBL specialists-- bring their expertise to bear in their close and effective partnerships with the faculties, to the benefit of staff and students, and in return are held in high regard by stakeholders across the University;
- the strong desire of Scholarly Services staff at all levels to engage in continual improvement of their service delivery and to contribute strategically and creatively to the shaping the future direction of the portfolio;
- the new services, approaches and expertise developed within Scholarly Services, for example in digital scholarship, digital forensics, socio-informatics, elearning, digitisation, and digital literacy. Such developments ensure that Scholarly Services will be well positioned in future, to respond to the more comprehensive digital frameworks being devised by groups in Chancellery.

# Attachment: list of participants

More than 130 students and staff participated in this Review via 69 written submissions and 20 face-to-face meetings with the Review Panel.

## Academic staff

Dr Daniela Acquaro, Professor Stefan Arndt, Dr Helena Bender, Associate Professor Lauren Bennett, Professor Liliana Bove, Associate Professor Albie Brooks, Dr Caroline Cohrssen, Associate Professor Russell Cross, Professor Véronique Duché, Dr Nicky Dulfer, Professor Carolyn Evans, Dr Jessica Garrard, Professor Philip Goad, Dr Annie Gowing, Professor Richard James, Professor Gregor Kennedy, Dr Tine Köhler, Mr Paul Loh, Associate Professor Gavan McCarthy, Dr Paul Molyneux, Dr Jean Mulder, Professor Pip Nicholson, Associate Professor Julie Satur, Dr Yvette Slaughter, Professor Liz Sonenberg, Ms Bronwyn Tarrant, Associate Professor Frederik Vervaet, Mr David Wilson, Dr Peter Woelert, Dr Natasha Ziebell, and approximately 40 academic staff who participated in an ABP survey.

## Students

Andrew Black, Emily De Rango, Leo Featherstone, Tracey Griffiths, Andrew Hollander, Beornn McCarthy, Caley McPherson, Jessica Peeler, Emily Roberts, Roger Samuel, Lori Vullings.

## Professional staff and other contributors

Joe Arthur, Ruth Baxter, Georgina Binns, Rebecca Bond, Sara Brocklesby, Rachael Buchanan, Jo-Anne Cooper, Steve Cramond, Stephen Creese, Amanda Davis, Bronwyn Disseldorp, Ailsa Dott, Paul Duldig, Jenny Ellis, Sue Fairbanks, Kat Frame, Yvette Grant, Assyl Haidar, David Honeybone, Andrea Hurt, David Israel, Deb Jones, Karen Kealy, Philip G Kent, Joanne Kuluveovski, Appy Laspagis, Bernard Lyons, Ruth McConchie, Donna McRostie, Fiona Moore, Naomi Mullumby, Peter Neish, Sarah Petchell, Andrea Philips, Mark Pickett, Jane Richards, Tarek Sharaf, Justin Shearer, Susie Shears, Patrick Stoddart, Ashley Sutherland, Carl Temple, Kylie Tran, Guido Tresoldi, Eileen Wall, Jennifer Warburton, Sally Watt, Lyle Winton, Katie Wood, Sandra Woods, and members of the National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU). Thanks also to Jeissy Scherping, Vivienne Stagg, Joyce Bowden and Lorraine Quattrochi for their assistance with organising meetings and venues.

## Sponsor and Review Panel

Sponsor: Neil Robinson, Deputy Head University Services and Academic Registrar

External members of the Review Panel:

- Professor Jane Long (chair)
- Sally Hirst, Hirst Projects
- Sue Roberts, University of Auckland

Melbourne University members of the Panel:

- Professor Nick Haslam
- Ms Jane Richards
- Ms Anastasia Slipper

Project coordination: Margaret L Ruwoldt and Louise Craven

# Attachment: summary of submissions

| SubmissionID | Cohort | Precis | Improvement idea |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Professional staff | Reading Room: access to archives, Special Collections, cultural collections, Grainger Museum collection | ✓ |
| 2 | Academic staff | Brownless Library – excellent support for teaching and research (nursing)<br>LMS and Learning Environments – excellent support and video production facilities | |
| 3 | Professional staff | Internal communication; management decisions; role and structure of Client Services team | ✓ |
| 4 | Academic staff | Giblin Eunson library – excellent support for teaching and research (management and marketing) | |
| 5 | Professional staff | Expenditure on Library materials: publishers' price rises outstripping budget growth; effect of currency fluctuations; benchmarking with other universities; need for both print and digital resources | |
| 6 | Professional staff | Increase opportunities for librarians to work alongside academics in course design and delivery; move from being service providers to being trusted advisers | |
| 7 | Student | Availability of study spaces and computers: "the quality of libraries is great, but more study spaces would be great!" | |
| 8 | Academic staff | [confidential] | |
| 9 | Academic staff | Case study: scaffolded learning integrated into Master of Teaching programs: co-creation and co-delivery with Library staff | |
| 10 | Academic staff | Support for graduate programs and research in Education faculty | |
| 11 | Academic staff | Support for graduate programs and research in Education faculty | |
| 12 | Student | Discovery federated search engine: access to 'more obscure' articles and papers | ✓ |
| 13 | Academic staff | Support for graduate programs and research in Education faculty | |
| 14 | Academic staff | Support for graduate programs and research in Education faculty | |

| SubmissionID | Cohort | Precis | Improvement idea |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Academic staff | Expenditure on Library materials: publishers' price rises outstripping budget growth; effect of currency fluctuations<br>Academic voice in strategic direction of Library<br>Importance of collection depth and quality in maintaining research output and profile | |
| 16 | Academic staff | Support for graduate programs and research in Education faculty | |
| 17 | Academic staff | High level of satisfaction with existing Library services at Creswick campus | |
| 18 | Professional staff | Case study: librarian embedded 1 day/week in faculty to provide research support services | |
| 19 | Academic staff | Support for graduate programs and research in Education faculty | |
| 20 | Professional staff | Fostering innovation and collaboration across Academic Services; improving decision-making; developing staff capability | ✓ |
| 21 | Professional staff | [confidential] | |
| 22 | Academic staff | Support for graduate programs and research in Education faculty | |
| 23 | Professional staff | Service delivery model at Southbank campus; number and expertise of Library staff; staff and student satisfaction with services currently offered | |
| 24 | Professional staff | High level of student satisfaction with services at Lenton Parr Library (Southbank); collaboration with Academic Skills and faculty staff to embed scholarly literacy skills into curriculum for a three-year School of Art program. | |
| 25 | Professional staff | [confidential] | |
| 26 | Professional staff | Detailed description of purchasing practices for collection development | |
| 27 | Student | Study spaces, study support spaces, and employability services for graduate students | ✓ |
| 28 | Academic staff | Relevant qualifications and experience for Law Library staff; essential role of Law Library in supporting research and teaching; allocation of funding for Materials Vote; digital literacy for academic and professional staff; digital agenda for whole of UoM, and relationship with Learning Environments | |

| SubmissionID | Cohort | Precis | Improvement idea |
|---|---|---|---|
| 29 | Academic staff | Role of Digital Scholarship group within Research and Collections: productive interfaces and collaborations, particularly in digital humanities, that are not evident in org charts but support broader University and societal needs/goals | |
| 30 | Academic staff | Role of physical library at small 'remote' campus (Burnley) where library is a hub for provision of other student services | |
| 31 | Academic staff | Teaching resources and assistance: scholarly skills (avoiding plagiarism) and discipline knowledge, delivered online, in print, via multimedia. Collaborative work practices. | |
| 32 | Academic staff | Library role in teaching compulsory introductory unit for Australian Award Scholarship holders: biennial intake, up to 200 students in each cohort. Essential transition for master and PhD students; consistently high rating for scholarly literacy skills in Subject Experience Survey. | |
| 33 | Academic staff | Proactive and helpful support for students in accounting | |
| 34 | Academic staff | Support for teaching and student research in Global Management Consulting subject. Opportunity to provide better support for research by staff. | ✓ |
| 35 | Academic staff | Essential role of Scholarly Services in supporting research and research training. Scope of review should include scholarly communication, research workflows, open science. Role of Scholarly Services in measuring and lifting digital literacy of staff and students; collections into classrooms; teaching technologies to academics; creating physical spaces that invite and elicit collaboration. Attachment: list of emerging service needs. | ✓ |
| 36 | Academic staff | Support for students in Master of Education (Wellbeing) program. Stability of library staffing and discipline-based service model are strengths in developing high standards of support for teaching and learning. | |
| 37 | Academic staff | High quality of support for research training: contribution to redesigning Doctor of Education (coursework) program; design and delivery of workshops, online learning and consultations for RHD students. | |
| 38 | Professional staff | Role and value of social media in service delivery and outreach; need for a social media coordinator and enhanced digital literacy among staff | ✓ |

| SubmissionID | Cohort | Precis | Improvement idea |
|---|---|---|---|
| 39 | Professional staff | Consolidation of music and VCA libraries; physical space on campus; need for specialist staff and capability-building; opportunities to develop digital services; building relationships with committees and other org units | ✓ |
| 40 | Professional staff | Academic staff satisfaction with existing services; close relationship with faculty due to co-location in Melbourne School of Design building. Opportunities to partner on digitisation and digital literacy projects, eg embedding scholarly literacy into online learning units. LMS has limited capacity to handle large file uploads (design files). Would like a full-time T&L Librarian for the faculty. | ✓ |
| 41 | Professional staff | Value of using rare/special collections in teaching; increasing demand for access to special and cultural collections for object-based learning, digitisation, engagement and exhibitions, etc. Create a Special Collections Research Centre within Baillieu Library building | ✓ |
| 42 | Academic staff | Difficulty in resolving IT issues (eg enabling Chinese-language support on desktop computer) and requesting library assistance for foreign-language research and writing tasks. | ✓ |
| 43 | Professional staff | Overview of current org structure: vision and mission, benefits and synergies, key challenges. Detailed profiles of learning and teaching support; student experience; research support and infrastructure; engagement; collections; people and organisation. | |
| 44 | Professional staff | Examples of improved support for teaching, research, engagement activities. Must develop a digital archiving function; based on embedding of digital skills/practices and building of partnerships for specific skills, capabilities, projects. | ✓ |
| 45 | Student | Using Creswick library as central contact/support point for PhD study in history, due to physical location near home. Request multi-function device for printing, scanning. | ✓ |
| 46 | Professional staff | Role of client services librarians; workload management and opportunities for professional development. Coordination of refurbishment and building projects. | |
| 47 | Professional staff | Role of Learning Environments in leading/supporting significant reform, eg moving all University Breadth subjects into online-only delivery mode; creating degree-level entry points in LMS for all UG programs. Concern around lack | |

| SubmissionID | Cohort | Precis | Improvement idea |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | of clear governance structure to provide strategic guidance on LE role. Resourcing of core systems support and academic capability development; staffing for capital-funded projects. | |
| 48 | Professional staff | Role of client services librarians; constraints on range of activities (eg support for students with disability). Limitations of UoM access control system for after-hours access to library spaces. | ✓ |
| 49 | Professional staff | Library relationship with Education faculty, range of specialist services and partnerships involved. Concerns about Materials Vote and demand for physical spaces; opportunity to employ an eLearning Coordinator; need for improved communication/internal marketing support. | ✓ |
| 50 | Professional staff | Increasing size of business faculty vs size of Library team. Library support for Work Integrated Learning subjects. Examples of recent innovations and trial projects. | |
| 51 | Professional staff | Value of cadetships program for individuals. Opportunity to improve uptake of new ideas and support innovation projects; improve succession planning; extend cadet placements into learning technology areas (Learning Environments). | ✓ |
| 52 | Professional staff | Description of Research Information Program providing expertise and infrastructure to support researchers through exploration, discovery and dissemination phases. Open Access, informatics, digitisation, data forensics, digital preservation and asset management. | |
| 53 | Professional staff | Overview of Research and Collections group within Scholarly Services. Challenges: building research infrastructure; developing expertise in digital scholarship; adopt scholar-centred model of service design and delivery; balancing custodial and non-custodial models of collection management. | |
| 54 | Professional staff | Importance of Special Collections in object-based learning model (Arts faculty, Arts West building). Strategic imperative to enhance OBL, role of Library in supporting this. | |
| 55 | Professional staff | Opportunities for building digital collections: student participation in digitisation projects; links between digital and physical collections (eg furniture, construction materials) for object-based learning. Successful model in ABP library; could be extended with appointment of a T&L Liaison Librarian (specialist role) to provide support and continuity. | ✓ |

| SubmissionID | Cohort | Precis | Improvement idea |
|---|---|---|---|
| 56 | Student | Library essential for access to a range of student services; opening hours; specialist collection. Poor quality of library building. | |
| 57 | Professional staff | Organisational alignment of facilities planning and space management team: most of their work is for libraries; relatively little space occupied by other areas of Academic Services. | |
| 58 | Student | Free or low-cost digital access to texts, reading materials; formal and informal study spaces; building maintenance. Development of student precinct likely to increase usage of nearby library branches; other student services (eg Stop1) need to match opening hours to student presence on campus. | ✓ |
| 59 | Professional staff | Workload management in Law Library; branding of library; job design and career development for library staff. | |
| 60 | Professional staff | Close relationship between library and faculty research management unit: mutual sharing of staff roles; excellent support for business intelligence, research profiling, bilbiometrics, input to tenders, Open Access for research outputs. | |
| 61 | Professional staff | Branding of Learning Environments. Dated suite of educational technologies (LMS, lecture capture and related systems); opportunities to upgrade and re-tool. Need to invest in “3rd space professionals” ie roles and individuals that blend academic and professional skills. Peer universities are investing in senior roles, larger teams. Visibility and accountability of LE in org structure. | ✓ |
| 62 | Professional staff | Role of senior client services librarian: workload management; staffing at service points; career progression. Capabilities in metric reporting and user experience design. | ✓ |
| 63 | Professional staff | Staffing of Architecture Building and Planning (ABP) and Burnley libraries: proposal to change org structure. | |
| 64 | Professional staff | Staffing at Burnley library; liaison support role for Science and Engineering library team; role of senior client services librarian; potential impact of Student Precinct construction projects on availability of study spaces in libraries; communication about known issues/outages in access to online library materials. | ✓ |
| 65 | Academic staff | Range of library services is appreciated by academic staff; relationship with Learning | |

| SubmissionID | Cohort | Precis | Improvement idea |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Environments is not well understood. Library induction for new academic staff. Opening hours and sharing of costs for providing this service. Seating, maintenance of physical space. Examples of students (and teachers?) using Library facilities when faculty spaces or equipment are not available. | |
| 66 | Professional staff | Output from Scholarly Staff workshop: SWOT analysis with summary of themes; attachment contains all free-form comments from 110 staff. | ✓ |
| 67 | Interested party | Role of Archives Advisory Board; liaison with donors and strategic partner organisations | |
| 68 | Academic staff | Appreciate work of specialist librarian who provides study guides, study skills for students, research support for academics. | |
| 69 | Student | Using Creswick library as central contact/support point for PhD study in history, due to physical location near home. | |