

Institute of Professional Editors (IPEd) Interim Council

Teleconference, 8 October 2006, 0900–1100 AEST

MINUTES

Participants

State/territory delegates

Canberra	Virginia Wilton (VW)
New South Wales	Michael Lewis (ML)
Queensland	Robin Bennett (RB)
South Australia	Susan Rintoul (SR)
Tasmania	Sheila Allison (SA)
Victoria	Katya Johanson (KJ)
Western Australia	Anne Surma (AS)

Accreditation Board Chair	Robin Bennett (RB)
Secretary	Ed Highley (EH)
Liaison Officer	Janet Mackenzie (JM)

1. Elect chair, confirm agenda and record participants and apologies

VW agreed to chair the conference. The agenda was confirmed. There were no apologies.

2. Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the face-to-face meeting held in Canberra on 5–6 August, which had been pre-circulated, were confirmed.

3. Business arising

The following comments were made on some of the action items from the August meeting.

KJ and VW were to investigate industry training advisory bodies as possible sources of accreditation scheme establishment funds. KJ said that she had contacted relevant ITABs but had so far received no more than acknowledgments. She will persist.

VW will circulate a note from Chris Pirie (CSE) on Australian Government insurance requirements for editing and associated contracts.

EH noted that, due to uncontrollable circumstances, he had been unable to follow-up with the ETMWG its plan to provide a list of training courses for the website.

JM said that she had so far received no satisfactory response to her letter to the University of Sydney about its bastardisation of the IPEd (CASE)/DDOGS policy on editing theses. She said she will continue to pursue the matter with vigour.

4. Finance

4.1 Recent expenses (August IC meeting; teleconferences)

EH noted that the only recent expenses had been for teleconferences of the SRWG and CMG. All expenses for the August meeting had still not been received. He asked that these be sent as soon as possible, particularly as VW's company was carrying a significant bill for delegates' accommodation. These accounts and the recent teleconferences will be the last to operate under the old system. Expenses incurred after 30 September will draw on the seed fund.

4.2 Status of the seed fund

All societies had now committed to the fund, by either full payment or a payment plan. Delivery of the contribution from the Tasmanian Society is postponed until after the national conference next year. The NSW Society has provided half of its allocation, with the rest to come at the start of its next subscription period, which is at the beginning of the 2007 calendar year.

4.3 Seed-fund modus operandi

Delegates agreed that society members incurring IPEd-related costs should be reimbursed through their societies which would, in turn, be reimbursed from the seed fund. Calls on the seed fund should be routed initially through the IPEd Secretary and be identified by a subject line unique to each activity, e.g. 'AB assessors meeting 12/06', 'IPEd IC meeting 2/07'.

4.4 The budget (see also items 5.2 and 6.1.3)

The indicative budget drafted at the August meeting will be updated as information on expenditure comes to hand.

ML noted that he believed that income earned by IPEd might be subject to taxation. He said that the NSW Society paid tax on at least some of its income. He clarified this in the following message circulated after the teleconference.

I have a response to the tax question. It turns out that we are taxed on income received from non-members.

For NSW purposes, that means non-member fees for meetings and training workshops; presumably it also includes sales of our Editorial Services Directory to non-members. I can't think of anything else. But it seems unlikely that other state societies aren't also faced with the same liability. I'd say there are also significant implications for accreditation charges, at least.

4.5 Discussion article on membership fees (Attachments 1 and 2)

Interim Council commended SR for writing and circulating this article among the societies. True, the response to it from members was very small, but one construction one might put on this is that members would not be averse to fee increases to finance expanded society and national activities. SR said that one conclusion that might be drawn is that all societies might need both associate

and full membership classes, the former to accommodate members who had no interest in accreditation or other 'national' activities.

ML noted that it was the responsibility of individual societies to set their membership fees and the activities they fund. He said that NSW budgeted for an annual program of activities. He raised the questions: How is IPEd going to be funded (in the long term)? Who/what will constitute its membership? EH said that the plan had always been that the societies would be the members of IPEd, not members of the societies.

VW said that it would be useful to have a table of the classes of membership and associated fees. ML said that NSW might have already collected such information. If so, he would forward it to VW.

RB said that the comment had been made in September that the Queensland society was in crisis and that SR's paper would help broaden discussions on the society's future activities.

ML noted that SR had used the appellation 'member of IPEd' in the final lines of her paper. He said that he felt that 'member of the IPEd Interim Council' would be a correct designation.

5. Accreditation Board

5.1 Progress report (Attachment 3)

Speaking to her tabled report, RB reported that all documentation covering applications for accreditation would, by December, be more or less finalised as drafts for submission to the membership. An associated milestone on the road to implementation of the scheme would be the meeting of assessors in Melbourne on 2–3 December. The main activities during 2007, up to October, the planned date of the first call for applications for accreditation, would be training of assessors and running of workshops for members.

Some delegates noted that it was now impossible for their societies to run, before the end of this year, the planned member workshops on accreditation guidelines.

SR and SA said that their societies (SA and Tas) planned to do things via email and the IPEd website. VW said Canberra might take the same approach.

ML reported that progress in this area was lagging in NSW: the society's nominated assessors had not met as yet. He said it would be treated as a high priority activity from now on.

RB said that, if needs be, society workshops could be deferred until the new year.

VW reported that Chris Pirie and Lee Kirwan had agreed to be joint AB delegates for the Canberra Society. RB said that, if possible, she would get both to participate in teleconferences.

5.2 AB indicative budget 2006–07 (Attachment 4)

It was noted that the \$5000 line item for the assessors meeting in December should have mentioned airfares as well as accommodation and food. RB will circulate a revised document.

JM asked if fund-raising work (e.g. the CAL submission) was to be reactivated. RB said she would seek ideas from AB people and forward any to the Interim Council.

5.3 Reporting arrangements for the AB

There was some discussion about the roles of the Chair of the AB and the IPEd delegate on the AB in reporting to council. JM noted that, since it was possible that the AB's interests might from time to time conflict with those of IPEd, it was essential that the IPEd Interim Council delegate on the AB report directly to council. She wanted an 'independent' report on AB activities and progress.

ML opined that the current arrangement by which the chair and delegate jointly reported to council [see minutes of the August IC meeting] might be considered an interim arrangement subject to adjustment when the accreditation system is fully implemented.

5.4 Other matters

Nil.

6. Working groups

6.1 Progress reports

6.1.1 Communication (Attachments 5 and 5a)

It was noted that one of the activities of the CWG's planned PR campaign was the framing of a 'mission statement' for IPEd and that the Interim Council had already agreed, at its August meeting, to adopt the statement 'To advance the profession of editing'. The statement on the front page of the IPEd website is: 'The Institute of Professional Editors (IPEd) exists to advance the profession of editing'. EH is to convey this information to CWG convenor Kathie Stove.

KJ questioned the fund-raising mentioned in the CWG's plan, noting that she believed that the Interim Council had already agreed that all proposals for such activity are to be directed

through it. The meeting confirmed this, and the CWG is to be so informed.

ML questioned the strategy of unveiling the proposed PR campaign at the Hobart conference, saying it should perhaps first go to the individual societies for their imprimatur.

In summary, the Interim Council commended the plan being developed by the CWG and agreed to it in principle but with no commitment to any particular activity. It would welcome costed proposals from the group.

AS asked if and how the Interim Council planned to raise funds, and there was some discussion of this, including the failed CAL submission (is a revised proposal to be put to CAL?) and the possibility of a Literature Board grant. VW questioned the need for external funding, asking if the institute is to be run as a business or a charity. She said that she believed that the overriding aim of our activities was to raise the incomes of editors. RB said she thought it would be dangerous to rely solely on the societies for funds.

6.1.2 Education, Training and Mentoring (no formal report)

6.1.3 National Organisation (Attachments 6 and 7)

VW explained that the documents tabled were not outputs of the NOWG as a whole but had been drafted by herself and her partner Bruce Hanford (BH), with some input from NOWG member Deborah Edward. Bruce joined this part of the teleconference.

Discussion centred on the spreadsheets. RB asked about the likely costs of independent legal and accounting advice for the routine activities of IPEd (i.e. not set-up costs). VW said that the costs would be equivalent to those incurred in running a small to medium-size business. BH added that operation of an accreditation scheme was a high-risk activity and that professional indemnity insurance would be needed. He added that it might be necessary to formally train assessors and to get them, through insurance, to carry some risk themselves. He stressed that the assessors and the body running the accreditation scheme must be indemnified. He estimated that perhaps 6–10% of the fee charged for accreditation would need to be allocated to risk management.

BH said that he thought that events management and workshops might generate possible surpluses to cross-fund other activities, and that a publishing business might yield a 5% surplus.

VW said that the accreditation system needs to make a profit. BH said that the transaction costs for such an activity are high, and could lead to high losses. The accreditation fee currently being proposed seemed too low to him.

VW stressed that the fee charged for accreditation will be crucial to the success of the enterprise. RB said that this will be discussed at the forthcoming AB teleconference and at the AB's next face-to-face meeting.

BH said that it would be crucial to build a business model for the Institute/Accreditation Board.

VW said that non-members of a society could be charged a higher fee for accreditation. BH said that, in the Canadian system, this extra fee was hefty—a 60–70% premium. ML said that it might be better to make the standard fee for accreditation that for non-members, with a discount for members.

VW concluded the discussion by noting that the council had to take forward all these issues with some urgency. She asked for written comments on the papers within a week. They will then be made available via the website and other means to all society members and other parties who might be interested, and become a key item on the agenda for the face-to-face meeting of the Interim Council in February.

6.1.4 Standards Revision (no formal report, but see edwiki at www.iped-editors.org)

6.2 General discussion on working group operations

No further discussion.

[Time was too short for any more than brief discussion of each of the remaining agenda items.]

7. **Enhancing IPEd–society communication—what should go on www.iped-editors.org?**

It was confirmed that the final minutes of Interim Council meetings should be public documents on the website. Draft minutes should be available to only Interim Council members and associated office holders.

8. **Issues raised by delegates and others**

Interim Council agreed to the suggestion by RB that it take out a subscription to the Arts Law Centre. The cost for 12 months membership will be \$220. RB will send details to EH for action.

9. Planning for the 2007 national conference

SA reported that planning was proceeding smoothly and that John Wiley had once again agreed to be the major sponsor of our biennial national conference.

10. Other business

Nil

11. Date for next meeting

A face-to-face meeting will be held in Adelaide on 3–4 February 2007.

ATTACHMENT 1

Discussion paper

Societies of Editors members' subscription fees — Future directions

We editors have an exciting time ahead as we see accreditation and a new national body coming together. It's time perhaps to look at our general funding—in state as well as national areas.

Is our funding adequate? It seems that some of the societies in Australia are feeling increasingly constrained by their dependence on volunteer labour and the rising work commitments of committee members. At least two of the societies now pay for a part-time administrator. New costs such as these arise and, even if some societies have funds at present, they still need to look at the future. As well, there is a need for us to look at the annual funding of our national body. Both these areas would benefit from more funds.

I believe our members' subscription fees are too low. How many other professional bodies do we know that set their rates at less than \$100pa?

The Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance recently offered members of Australian Societies of Editors a discount if they joined, the fee amounting to \$439.40pa if you earn \$45,000 a year. They call it \$8.45 a week. The MEAA has a diverse membership. How would the profession of editors advance if we put that sort of money into our own societies so they could promote us in every sense at a state and national level?

Here are some other examples of subscription fees to roughly similar professional bodies (I would be pleased to hear of any other fee scales):

Librarians, ALIA— full member \$251 (more than \$30,000pa), reduced fees structure \$126–\$64

<http://www.alia.org.au/membership.benefits/fees.html>

Graphic Designers, AGDA—full membership \$192.50pa

<http://www.agda.com.au/>

Accountants, AFANZ—\$132pa

http://www.afaanz.org/afaanz_member.htm

Hospital Pharmacists, SHPA—full member \$341pa, reduced fees structure

<http://www.shpa.org.au/>

None are less than \$100pa. So what should we be paying? More than \$100pa, I believe.

Generally societies have a diverse range of members, some not working as full-time editors: for instance, graphic designers and others in the publishing industry, semi-retired people, and so on. We have new graduates entering. We welcome our diversity

and would never want to deter those members from membership. So we must seriously consider a tiered fee structure (most societies already have one, in any event). A fair system based on total income might look like this:

\$50,000+	\$250pa
\$30,000–\$50,000	\$150pa
\$0–\$30,000	\$100pa

That would mean we would be paying \$5 a week if we earned a decent salary from editing and \$3 a week if we weren't. Would this be onerous? Probably not. But think of what all our societies could do with the extra money to benefit us—to provide more workshops and training courses, run more efficiently, raise our profile, get more work for editors, and much more.

We need to look to our future: to put editors on the map and keep them there, both on a state and national level, we need to consider setting our subscription fees at a realistic level.

Comments are welcome to:

Susan Rintoul
susan@seaviewpress.com.au

Please note: The author is a member of both the IPEd Interim Council and the Society of Editors (SA), but the views expressed here are not necessarily shared by either organisation. This paper is intended only to raise a general discussion throughout the societies of editors.

ATTACHMENT 2

To: IPED

From: Susan Rintoul

Report on the discussion article on members' fees

A number of interesting issues arose from the article that I asked to be placed in all the societies' newsletters. All editors said they would run it but I cannot confirm it went in all (space may have prohibited it), except the ones I got feedback from, below. NSW is running it in October, I understand.

I asked for feedback. The amount received was interesting and echoed that received previously from members en masse, i.e. very little. There was a total of nine comments. Only five comments came from members (1400) whom I did not recognise as society committee members (they may have been). However, those who sent responses had thought carefully about the issue so their feedback is very valuable. In addition, it may have been hotly debated within particular societies and if so I would be very pleased to hear from IPED delegates.

But what does this general lack of feedback say? This is an issue that directly hits members' hip pockets, and I was suggesting quite a substantial rise. So I will speculate here that the low feedback was a result of one or more of these:

- members generally agree with a rise in fees
- members do not feel strongly about a rise in fees
- the topic did not make an impact on members

There was some agreement that fees should rise. There was some criticism of asking for what was seen as a much larger fee. There was discussion of the tiered system.

Now, the societies are of course free to charge their members what they like. While I hope this feedback may be useful to societies, it is entirely up to them what they do.

But where IPED does have an interest is in the funding levy. My treasurer raised the point that IPED is charging associates as well as full members the full levy (\$20) but associates do not get access to accreditation (and so may have less reason to fund a national body and accreditation scheme). I told her that the decision had been made because different sorts of membership had made it too difficult to work out (as I recalled).

However, it seems reasonable that two tiers of membership (full and associate) continue in those societies that have them, and this is supported by some of the feedback (see below).

IPED needs to be seen to be fair and reasonable and modest (as it is of course) in its request for funding. This was called seed funding but at present it looks a lot like annual funding.

I would like to suggest that for 2007 it requests:
\$20 per full member levy

\$10 per associate levy

I think there may be a good case for raising the levy in 2008 when the benefits of the national body and of accreditation start to make themselves felt.

However, I think for now we should look at a reasonable levy for 2007. This could be a good time to discuss it early and reach a decision.

Here is all the feedback.

FEEDBACK FROM MEMBERS

Dear Ms Rintoul

I refer to your invitation for comments at the bottom of your Discussion Paper, "Society of Editors members' subscription fees – Future directions", in the latest issue of the Society of Editors (Victoria) newsletter.

I don't see a logical argument formulated in your paper for why a tiered fee structure based on income level (whether members are earning a "decent salary from editing") is a "fair" system – only examples that other societies are doing this.

My opinion is that the income editors earn is the sum of an equation with several variables, not the least of which is lifestyle choice. For example, why should a full-time in-house editor on a good salary pay a higher fee than a freelance who is at home raising children and taking on a bit of editing work to supplement a partner's income? Or than a financially established individual who is going back to study for personal interest or career advancement? If all members are receiving the same benefits from belonging to the society, then they should all pay the same fee. One could argue that the freelance editor and student are not partaking in the full benefits of membership; in that case, perhaps some kind of user pays system could be investigated as a fairer alternative than an income tier? For example, a basic fee could entitle members to the benefit of having the profession's profile raised by the society's activities, which benefits all members whether they are full-time or part-time or occasional editors, and additional fees could entitle receipt of the newsletter (for those semi-retired people and people from peripheral professions wanting to keep in touch with the society's goings on) or to receive job vacancy alerts and discounted training courses (most useful to people currently earning their living from editing).

I understand that you don't want to discourage students, semi-retired people and graphic designers from joining, but might not a tiered fee structure discourage established, working editors from joining, particularly if they can't see any benefit for their increased fee?

In addition, I wonder how a tier system would be applied – whether it would be based on trust or whether members would have to provide some documentation showing what they earned for editing services during the last financial year to a membership officer.

Kind regards

Alice Franek
(Vic)

20 September

I believe our members' subscription fees are too low. How many other professional bodies do we know that set their rates at less than \$100 pa? (**Susan Rintoul**)

Dear Susan,

To answer your question above, Australian Science Communicators - \$77, and a number of professional (food/dairy) industry bodies that I am a member of are all under \$100. The Society of Editors is not the only professional body that is relevant to my work and if the subscription fee went to \$250, I would not continue my membership (this would solely be a financial decision). I don't believe the Society needs extra funds to run workshops - we live in a "user pays" society and those that would like to attend workshops can do so at their own expense. I don't believe that members should be subsidising workshops that are not of direct relevance or interest to them. I also do not believe that "distant" members would like to subsidise workshops that are always located large distances from them.

While some may earn salaries over \$50000, these salaries do not always relate directly or solely to editing, so my feeling is that basing a subscription rate on a person's taxable income is somewhat misguided.

Thank you for raising the issue for discussion, but I hope that due consideration can be given to some of the issues raised above before the Society makes (in my view a misguided) decision to significantly increase the subscription fee.

Kind Regards

Peter Roupas

Dr Peter Roupas

Team Leader - Knowledge Management

CSIRO-Food Science Australia

671 Sneydes Road (Private Bag 16)

Werribee, Victoria 3030

AUSTRALIA

Food Science Australia - a joint venture of CSIRO and the Victorian Government

18 September

Hi Susan,

I am happy to pay more for membership fees (depending on what tier category I fall into at the time). I think it would be great if the society could do more, particularly along the lines of editing courses. I would want to know what spending was planned before the fees were set, however.

Thanks,

Sally Roberts

83377369

6 September

Dear Susan

Thank you for your article on membership fees for the Society of Editors. Personally, I have always thought that our fees were low, but this has been especially so in more

recent years since the nation-wide (hyphen!) development of the various societies and our continued push to promote the work and profile of editors. I would be happy to pay the sort of fees you suggest, and the sliding scale seems very reasonable. There is another method that also comes to mind -- that of full membership (for fully-employed members, accorded full voting rights etc.) and associate membership (for part-time or 'hobby' editors, with no voting rights etc.). Just some more food for thought...

Regards

Christine Nagel
Christine Nagel Literary Services
Member: SOEWA

24 August

Susan

I thought you might like some feedback from an editor on the edge. By this I mean someone who is a member of another profession but has ended up becoming an editor as well. I agree the current subscription fee of \$60 is too low. Until last year I was a member of two other professional societies: the Australian Society of Archivists (\$270 based on income) and Museums Australia (\$115 – basic rate). Then Museums Australia based their rates on income which put my subscription up to \$160 so I dropped that membership which was discretionary (ie not vital to my source of income). I'm still a member of the Australian Society of Archivists because that is my primary source of income.

Your proposed system based on total income would set my subscription at \$250 which frankly I wouldn't pay. As with my previous subscription to Museums Australia, I'd be prepared to pay something like \$100-\$120 for Society of Editors membership. Perhaps the system should be based on editing income rather than total income – my editing income ranges from \$0 to \$5,000 p.a. so I'd expect to pay \$100 if your system were amended in this way and would think that fair.

If you'd like an example of another professional society (eg fees for retirees etc) this is a link to the Australian Society of Archivists site:

<http://www.archivists.org.au/membership.html>. It's also important to demonstrate what you get for your subscription – if the rate goes up members might expect more than the current newsletter!

Cheers,
Maggie Shapley

FEEDBACK FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Susan, I think your paper should go in the newsletter as written, but expect it will indeed trigger debate. We certainly need to generate funds to cover national expenses. However the societies are not-for-profit organisations - all they need to do is cover their costs.

There's nothing in your statement that says why so much money is needed, the rationale being that other professional groups do it. Will that wash when it's such a big hike being proposed? It might be more persuasive to base the proposal on a predicted national budget.

For your consideration.

Cheers
Karen
(SA)

Hi Susan

My response lines up with Karen's. I imagine a member might say 'as a member, what do I get for my money now? What might more money bring?' I suggest you move these words (or something like them) closer to the beginning of your paper: 'But think of what all our societies could do with the extra money to benefit us-to provide more workshops and training courses, run more efficiently, raise our profile, get more work for editors, and much more.' This means the argument is about benefits rather than what other professional groups pay.

It seems to me that accreditation is worthwhile only if its results can be marketed, ie the message needs to be 'all organisations need clear communications, clear communications require professional editing (in its broadest sense), professional editors are those who have undergone the rigorous accreditation processes of IPED'. This kind of marketing will benefit all members but will require significant funding. (No doubt Kathie Stove's group are thinking about these issues.)

Cheers
Pamela Ball
(SA)

FEEDBACK FROM IPED MEMBERS

Hi Susan,

I've also come late to this discussion, but I think it's a great way to stimulate discussion. Will you send it to the Victorian newsletter editor too (kirstie.innes-will@macmillan.com.au)?

Katya

Hi Susan

I've only just had a chance to read your document and I think it's fabulous — very persuasive. Thank you. I'd like to pass it on to our newsletter editor too. Is there a final copy available, or do we simply accept the comments on Janet's marked-up version?

Best wishes

Anne

Dr Anne Surma

Senior Lecturer in English and Professional Writing

Coming on board late here; apologies for that.

As I said at our meeting, I see it as my role in NSW to ensure that the decision-making processes are carried out properly -- not to actually be a decision-maker. So I won't express a personal view on the suggestions, but I will say that they deserve wide publicity and close examination. I've no doubt that the editor of Blue Pencil will be delighted to publish.

Cheers,

-Michael

Michael Lewis

Dear Susan

congratulations on putting this together. Hope it is published widely and causes much thought among our members. Some minor changes attached for you to consider.

Cheers

Janet

Thanks Susan, that's excellent. And Janet's changes are fine. I think we should submit it to the societies' newsletters asap. I'm happy to send it to our editor now if that's OK with you.

Cheers

Sheila

ATTACHMENT 3

Accreditation Board report, October 2006

Board members are currently considering Janet's draft guidelines for applicants and assessors. The appeal guidelines, procedures manual and position description for the Accreditation Secretary should be circulated to all AB members for comment by cob on Friday, 6 October. The revised text of all these documents and draft proformas should be available for circulation by the end of October.

Most societies have now scheduled their workshops to examine the draft revised Standards, accreditation information kits and any other IPEd documents available at the time. At least three of these workshops will take place in November (including Victoria on 7 November and Queensland on 18 November). I have also contacted Mike Purdy to investigate the possibility of arranging moderated online discussion of the guidelines and other documents during November, as well as online handling of accreditation procedures.

During October and November the AB will be working on practicalities arising from the guidelines and procedures, such as the number of assessors panels, payment of assessors and period of accreditation. Feedback from society workshops will guide any additional changes and will also be provided to participants in the assessors workshop to be held on 2-3 December.

Most societies have nominated the assessors who will be participating in that workshop; at least one has offered to pay her own way and others may join this group. All the Victorian assessors will be invited to attend; all additional attendees will be welcome. Board members will be discussing the aims, content, preparation of dummy applications, proposed agenda and desired follow-up actions via email and teleconference (16 October). All dummy applications must be completed by 21 November so documents can be circulated to participants in sufficient time before the workshop.

The action sheet resulting from that teleconference will be circulated to all board members within two days, the draft minutes will be completed and circulated within 10 days after the teleconference.

The AB will be holding a face-to-face meeting by the end of January 2007; this may take place as early as November.

I have reactivated the fundraising process within the board. I see a revised CAL submission and an application to the Literature Board as high priorities.

I have contacted the convenors of working groups to arrange a time for a teleconference; 12 November is the target date. I have also contacted Kathie Stove re the desired focus on accreditation within the group's promotion campaign, that is, as an essential feature of articles on editing and editors and a specific focus on accreditation as the go-live date approaches. I have offered support and assistance

from the AB in preparing this material; Kathie has circulated our request to all members of her group.

In retrospect, the reporting arrangement agreed by the IPEd Interim Council in Canberra concerns me; I have shared these concerns with my board colleagues. I have every respect for Michael and every confidence in him. But the proposal that the IPEd Interim Council delegate to the board should represent the AB at council meetings places a heavy burden on him and appears to be an inefficient method of operating, since no IPEd council delegate can reasonably be expected to have the same depth of knowledge as the Chair of the board. It also seems illogical: working group convenors will continue to report directly to the council. However, I am happy to work with Michael to see how best we can make this approach work.

Robin Bennett
Chair, Accreditation Board

ATTACHMENT 4

Accreditation Board: indicative set-up expenditure 2006-7

Teleconferences (early October, mid-December to mid-January, early March 2007
and August 2007) @ \$329 each = \$1316

Assessors meeting, 2-3 December = \$5000
(airfares, accommodation and food)

Assessors meeting (printing/photocopying) \$400

Face-to-face meeting 2006 (by December) = \$5000

Face-to-face meeting, May 2007 = \$1440
(one night's accommodation)

Conference paper (printing and delivery, May 2007) = \$380

Conference handouts (printing/photocopying, May 2007) = \$400

FishReading (subject to AB decision, estimated costs to be confirmed with MP)
= ??

TOTAL = \$13 936 plus

NOTES

- **Teleconferences.** The dates of teleconferences are approximate, to be determined by the board. Use of landlines may reduce the cost per teleconference; this is based on the cost of our most recent one on 30 April. I have met the cost of teleconferences to date through a personal account with Express Teleconferencing. If all AB members had broadband installed and used Skype or a similar provider, the total cost of teleconferences would be minimal; this is something we should aim for.
- **Assessors meeting.** The estimate for the assessors meeting is based on a total of 13 assessors, two each for NSW, Vic, Qld, SA, WA and Canberra, and one for Tassie. It is also based on the assumption that we can organise a free venue for the workshop.

Face-to-face meeting, May 2007. The costs for this meeting are based on the estimated cost of one additional night's accommodation per person.

ATTACHMENT 5

IPEd Communication Working Group

Draft plan for National PR Campaign, September 2006

Many professional editors feel undervalued in the workplace and unknown in the general community, and this feeling is reflected in their status as professionals and their rates of pay. This plan aims to start a campaign that will increase the profile of editors and the societies of editors in Australia.

The Institute of Professional Editors (IPEd) is a collaboration of the professional societies of editors in each state and territory. Members of those societies of editors work in a wide range of industries and industry sectors, including publishing, academia, business, government and non-government, as employees or as freelance contractors.

Communication Working Group brief

- To prepare a plan for a national campaign to promote editors and editing, execute the parts of the plan within the capabilities of the members working group and recruit a PR company to complete the remaining parts
- To suggest ways of paying for the national promotional campaign

The following plan aims to begin to fulfil the brief.

Campaign goals

- To raise the awareness of editing and the role of editors in Australia
- To inform government, industry and business of the benefits of and urgent need for professional editing services.

Campaign objectives

- To develop a national mission statement for use by all state and territory societies of editors by the official launch of IPEd (projected as July 2007) which can be used as a educational slogan or identifier on all promotional material
- To develop a national communications plan by May 2007 (for presentation at the Hobart conference) detailing and costing promotional tactics with timelines for the following 12 month period
- To develop a communications campaign to be distributed to each state and territory society by July 2007 detailing promotional tactics they can carry out over the following 12 month period

Target audiences

The target audience is in 3 groups:

1. current and potential employers and clients who use or should use editors, in the areas of:
 - government and public service
 - corporate business
 - non-government organisations
 - small business
 - publishing houses
2. potential editors who need to be encouraged to enter the profession

3. community at large which is unaware of editors.

The first group should be the main target at this stage and within that group government and corporates would be the target groups from which the short-term return would be the greatest.

Year 1

ending at conference May 2007

Mission statement and slogan

Mission statement

To [produce, bring about, elicit, encourage] clear, coherent, concise and consistent writing appropriate for its purpose.

Slogan suggestions

Mean what you write, write what you mean editors

If it's a matter of words – ask an editor

Editing – a partnership in words

Editors add value

Editors ... because once is not enough

Questionnaire

Finalise questionnaire for distribution.

Work put best method of widest distribution.

Distribute questionnaire.

Funding

Source funding bodies and write successful grant applications to help fund the promotion campaign.

Publicity campaign

Develop national campaign strategy (finalise this document) to present for ratification at the Hobart conference in May 2007.

Develop media campaign for editors to coincide with the conference in May 2007.

Develop media campaign for IPEd launch (print, radio, web, email blitz)

Year 2 and following years

Develop campaign strategies further in the form of:

- State-based strategies
- short-term strategies
- long-term strategies (the role of editors' societies; the needs of freelance editors; the need to encourage the next generation to consider editing as a career).

Other strategy suggestions

- Media campaigns on topical issues: media releases – nationally by IPEd or locally by state and territory societies as appropriate – in response to a topical issue; a representative from each society would be primed and available for interviews
- Regular columns in major newspapers and journals in every state or territory to increase and maintain awareness of the importance of (for example) the role of editing in **all** communication, issues relevant to language, editors and the profession.
- Feature articles in business and industry group magazines

- Development and promotion of website: www.iped-editors.org/
- Regular events: debates by high-profile speakers on contentious topics, annual 'fairs' at which we showcase the work of editors and annual award ceremonies, public discussion by a brave author who values the editorial process on their experience with the editor in a public forum (e.g. on Radio National)
- Annual awards at an annual event to celebrate good editing and use of language with categories such as: book editor, brochure editor and website editor of the year; publication of the year (perhaps in size categories); booby prizes; best gobbledegook
- Award system in individual societies celebrated at an annual event and feeding into national awards
- Radio or print competitions: limerick writing, marketing jingle
- Promotion of web-based freelance registers/directories
- Promotional stickers and flyers with a tag line (Editors do it with words; Editors crystallise the message (on holographic paper); Editors orchestrate the message
- Advertise editors' societies in appropriate magazines and journals (e.g. writing society publications, professional journals, business journals and government journals).
- Raising awareness among industry groups through formal presentations or mail out campaign to chambers of commerce, industry groups, government departments, selected large businesses
- Gather evidence on the benefits of editing (large research project)
- Explore sponsorship possibilities

Strategies for attracting new professionals

- Encouraging students by: adding student membership category in societies; having occasional student meetings or 'nights'; attending course and career expos; having an annual student prize; developing an editing information pack
- Developing a publication or series of publications on: editing, digital publishing, grammar, web design and other topics
- Placing articles in student newspapers at relevant universities