"A writing career"

There are three things I want to convey in this article: who I am; why I nominated for president; and what I hope will be the future of our Society. My wife, Clare, dragged me kicking and screaming into my role as an editor and writer at Practical Editing. I could not figure out how I had arrived at this point in my career where I would be writing and editing documentation for other engineers and so many other professionals. This is not to say that I don’t enjoy what I am doing now. I love the variety and challenge that each new client brings: researching biomedical prosthetics for an academic journal article, learning about the mind for a psychologist’s webpage, creating graphics for a brochure, or learning about the music industry for a band’s bio. I love every challenge. It was certainly an unexpected twist.

I grew up loving the written word but one reason it was a rather reluctant start to my writing career was that I had it tortured out of me by a distinctly bland, grammar-school English curriculum. Even with the help of a very lovely English teacher who took the time to teach me how to write a decent essay and sculpt a reasonable literary argument, my passion for the written word was already fading because it became a very heavy task rather than a joy.

Flash forward 20 years or so and I find myself deep in the world of the written word. I love the variety I can enjoy in my work and I seek out training to further my knowledge and skills. I am teaching myself pocket psychology and good mental health practices along with learning how to be a valued father to my lovely, rambunctious children. I try to balance and integrate all of this with my desire to help others in the community. I am an active member of the Weston Creek Men’s Shed and I feel being a more active member of the Canberra Society of Editors (CSE) is a natural addition.

That explains my engagement with the Society but not volunteering to be president! I enjoy contributing where I can. Having been a volunteer firefighter, I know the value of stepping up and having a go. This is a complex time for our Society as we decide our future and I felt it was important to do something.

What do I hope to achieve? I want to help the Society to thrive, regardless of its future direction. I want to do all I can to ensure we preserve and nurture the rich heritage, wealth of knowledge, and spirit in the current membership. I would like to see the Society grow to include Canberra’s editors and writers at all stages of their careers, without losing its existing soul.

I’m looking forward to this challenge and supporting CSE through the coming year.

Johann Idriss
President
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I wrote in the last edition that I might have one more column if I wrote it before the CSE elections, when I had to step down.

As things turned out, I wasn’t able to give my President’s Report to the AGM—thanks to being immobilised with a fractured foot—and V-P Kaaren Sutcliffe kindly stepped in to preside and read my report to the meeting.

So our editor, Farid, has indulged me one more time. Elsewhere in this edition, Kaaren has written a summary of the AGM and the highlights of my report, which allows me to be more personal here.

It has been an honour to serve two full years as CSE President, preceded by a year as Vice-President that included three months as Acting President after Connie’s sudden move to Sydney.

I had many personal rewards during this period, but I was especially fortunate and proud to have been President at the time of three memorable events: CSE’s 21st anniversary party in December 2013—a grand occasion; the successful and widely acclaimed 2015 write|edit|index Conference in May 2015; and handing over to IPEd in 2015 a national mentoring program that had begun as a CSE ‘pilot’ only three years earlier.

But while big events might provide the ‘headlines’, they aren’t the main game. Running the Society is the main game. In this endeavour, I was blessed to be part of a Committee that embodied a culture of goodwill, cooperation and commitment—commitment to ensuring the Society delivered the services and networking opportunities our members join for.

And the Committee has done this without fail despite some unforeseen or protracted absences, two accommodation upheavals, and the massive additional coincident demands of the IPEd transformation project.

As a Committee, we tidied up some long-running loose ends (purchased public liability insurance, a data projector and a portable screen), and kept the Society financially secure and growing.

I trust that our new President, Johann Idriss, and his executive team, will enjoy a similar level of support and a similar rewarding experience as I did.

I remain full of admiration and gratitude not just for the Committee I worked with but for all those—past, present and future—who volunteer their time and energy to make sure the Society keeps successfully doing what its founders created it to do.

I am personally richer for having served as CSE President for two years. I thank you for giving me the opportunity.

---

Dr Amanda Laugesen will be our speaker during the September general meeting. Her recently published book Furphies and Whizz-bangs, documents the slang used by Australian soldiers during the First World War. In her talk, Amanda will share her fascinating research into this topic. She will introduce some of the words and expressions used by soldiers. She will also talk about the way slang reflected their varied war experiences, and examine some of the lasting effects of the war on our language.

---

CSE September meeting
Get informed about IPEd transition before you cast your vote.

Date and time  Wednesday 30 September, 5:45 for 6:16 pm
Place The Ferguson Room, National Library of Australia

All CSE members are urged to attend.

As well as a fascinating presentation by Dr Amanda Laugesen (see page 18), we will present an information session chaired by Johann Idriss, our new President, on the forthcoming IPEd transition vote. This is your final opportunity to get to know about what is involved and how to cast an informed vote.

The evening’s agenda
1.  6:15–7:15, speaker
2.  7:15–7:30, break
3.  7:30 pm, President’s announcements; IPEd transition discussion
Membership

Thank you to all of you who have paid their 2015–2016 membership fees. The Committee is pleased to note that approximately two-thirds of our members have renewed at the time of writing this report. Those who have not renewed are reminded that membership would lapse if fees were not paid by August 1. If you do wish to continue your membership, we grant a grace period before you need to reapply (at the whim of the Membership Secretary!). If you have decided not to renew, please notify us so we can update our records.

Linda Weber
Membership Secretary

New CSE members

A warm welcome to these new members!

Full
Laura Cook
Jennifer Grimwade
Johann Idriss
Michele Parsons
Kate Potter
Denise Sutherland
Tessa Wooldridge
Georgina Wyatt

Associate
Melanie Davies
Sally de-Vitry Smith
Annie Ellis
Jennifer Gan
Lorna Tilley

Student
Keren Baker
Adam Fenech

Professional development

Planning for the 2016 training calendar is underway. If you have ideas for workshops that you would like to see organised, please email Katie so she could add them to the list of workshops.

How to run a webinar

Cost: $20 for members
Tuesday 20 October 7–8 pm, online

We announce our first webinar workshop for editors. This workshop will be presented by Hilary Cadman, a highly experienced editor and trainer, with a PhD in biochemistry and a Masters in science communication. Over the past 35 years, Hilary has worked internationally as a scientist, university lecturer, and as an in-house or freelance technical editor. ‘An introduction to webinars’ will outline the advantages of delivering training courses or working with a client online.

The 45-minute webinar will:
• outline the features of ClickWebinar for participants and presenters
• discuss the pros and cons of webinars
• use a sample training exercise to illustrate how a webinar can be used.

You can use either Mac or PC so long as you are connected to the Internet. When you register for the webinar, we send your email address to Hilary and she will ‘invite’ you to the webinar. You sign in using your computer at the appointed time.

You can register here.

Katie Poidomani
Professional Development and Training Coordinator
Katie@edgeediting.com.au or 0402 904 301

News from the Accreditation Board

Accreditation exam date announced—25 June 2016

The Accreditation Board has announced that the next accreditation exam, which will be an on-screen exam, will be held on Saturday, 25 June 2016. This is later than the date of 30 April which we had previously been working towards, but on reviewing the schedule of measures that needed to be implemented to minimise the risks associated with the new method of delivery, we felt it safest to allow a little extra time. The Board apologises to members who may have been planning to take the exam in April, but we hope you’ll appreciate the extra time for preparation.

Registrations will open at the beginning of March, and exam preparation workshops will be held in March or April. Exam preparation workshops will include sessions where participants can brush up on their Microsoft Word skills and practice using the on-screen format.
If you’re a Mac user and thinking of taking the exam, we’d like to talk to you as we’re still working on the level of support we provide to Mac users. Contact Ted Briggs at tedbriggs@grapevine.com.au.

2011 accreditations due for renewal in 2016
A reminder to AEs who were accredited in 2011: you will need to renew your accreditation next year. So make sure that you are keeping track of professional activities you will need to document when the time comes to submit your application for renewal. Check out the requirements on the IPEd website, here.

Ted Briggs AE
Chair Accreditation Board

After all the excitement of going national, becoming an IPEd program, the May conference in Canberra, and the publicity this program has received at the EAC conference in Toronto, and more recently on several LinkedIn groups, perhaps it’s time to have a look at what the program is all about.

We are often asked questions about the program; here are a few answers:

Is mentoring only for established editors, or can anyone join in?
Our program is for all editors, no matter what grade of membership they hold—full/professional members, associate members, student members. Everyone has different needs: established editors may want guidance in setting out on a new career path, or may want help setting up a freelance business after leaving an in-house position. Newer editors may want help in consolidating their copyediting skills, or may want to know the best ways to network, perhaps in order to interest senior editors in making use of their skills for contract work. The possibilities are endless. Read the Mentoring Program Guidance Notes on the IPEd website.

What does a mentor really do?
In our program, the mentor is a friendly guide to the mentee. The mentor is chosen for their skills and knowledge in the areas in which the mentee wants to be helped. The mentor shares their knowledge with the mentee, helps by perhaps setting assignments for the mentee to work on, makes suggestions and discusses options for achieving goals, but never does actual work for the mentee. A good mentorship is one where a friendly relationship develops, and both people find the experience rewarding.

Why are there workshops for mentors and not for mentees?
Very good question! Mentors need to understand just what ‘mentoring’ means in the overall ‘professional development’ spectrum, particularly as we see it for editors and for our program—we all need to be ‘singing from the same song sheet’ as it were. Mentors need to be alerted to the twists and turns a mentorship can take over time, and be as well prepared as possible for the role before starting a mentorship. They need an opportunity to ask questions and pose problems—so we have groups of prospective mentors in free workshops, so that ideas can be bounced around the table—a real table or a Skype virtual table. Mentees don’t need this guidance—they ‘drive’ the mentorship by directing the goals they want to achieve, and it’s up to their mentors to try to fit in with these wishes and come to mentoring sessions prepared to discuss what the mentee wants guidance about. Having said that, if a group of members of any editing society would like to have a general discussion for prospective mentees, your local mentoring coordinator may be able to arrange such a discussion for you—in person, or on Skype.
Can a person be both a mentor and a mentee?
Yes, if you have the time, and can separate the two roles out in your mind.

What are the qualifications for being a mentee?
You need to be a member of a society of editors at any level. You need to have undertaken at least one workshop or course that includes copyediting and proofreading skills (the program is not designed to teach basic editing skills). And you need to have at least some experience of actual editing, either for pay or as a volunteer.

If these few questions have sparked more in your mind, please contact your state mentoring coordinator, or, if you don’t know who that is, contact Ted or Elizabeth and we’ll pass the contact information on to you.

Ted Briggs AE
tedbriggs@grapevine.com.au
Joint National Coordinators

Elizabeth Manning Murphy DE
emmurphy@ozemail.com.au

Mentoring in the ACT

Following the demonstration of the new on-screen accreditation exam format at the recent writeeditindex conference in Canberra, there is growing interest from editors in booking up a mentor to help guide them through preparation for the exam. One ACT mentor is currently helping editors in Canberra, Sydney and Melbourne. If you are thinking of asking for such guidance, let the ACT mentoring coordinator know as soon as possible. There is no limit to the topics in which you can ask to be mentored, so long as they are related to editing—recent enquiries have included help with fiction editing, setting up a freelance business, and networking effectively.

For more information, write to the ACT Mentoring Coordinator Ara Nalbandian at yerevanarax7@hotmail.com, or to either of the National Coordinators.

IPEd news

Eris Harrison attended her first monthly IPEd Council meeting on Sunday 6 September. This was also the day of the Council’s AGM.

Council Chair Kerry Davies tabled a comprehensive report on the Institute’s activities over the year and thanked all Councillors, substitute Councillors and sitters-in for participating in the business of the year.

• The transition plan and support for the working parties continues to be an intense area of work.
• The seventh National Survey of Editors was conducted.
• The Accreditation Board continued the development of the on-screen exam.
• Council supported, and participated in, the Conference.
• IPEd signed an agreement with CSE that saw the Mentoring Program become the IPEd National Mentoring Program.
• Three Councillors met with the Australian Government Department of Finance to lobby for the seventh edition of Style Manual. Lobbying will be ongoing.
• Council recognised the accreditation programs of three of our international counterparts, with PEG to follow soon.
• On behalf of IPEd, Rosemary Noble attended the editing conference in Toronto in June.

The audited financial statements of the company were tabled. A surplus of $23,627 resulted. The bank balance at 30 June 2015 was $94,434, with $13,991 owing, leaving net assets of $89,743.

The budget for 2015–16 predicts a deficit of $50,000.
Three new Councillors were appointed. The current Councillors are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Eris Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Julie Ganner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Kerry Davies (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Loene Doube (Honorary Treasurer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Charles Houen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Kathleen Stewart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The company secretary is Margaret Telford.

These and all other things relating to the Institute’s activities over the year will be covered in detail in IPEd’s 2015 annual report, currently in preparation.

The Council’s regular monthly meeting immediately followed the AGM. Kerry Davies was reappointed as Chair of Council.

Transition project manager Rosemary Noble reported on the work of the five research teams of WP4 and confirmed that the White Papers are still expected to be distributed on or before 27 September.

The budgeted deficit for 2015–16 was discussed in some detail. Charles Houen has taken on the task of reducing expenditure. He will return to the next Council meeting with proposals for belt tightening.

Ted Briggs reported on the development of the on-screen accreditation exam, which is progressing well and will now be held on 25 June 2016. Communication Officer Mary-Ann Came reported that production of the annual report for the year just completed is well advanced. A draft will shortly go to Councillors for checking, before distribution of the approved version to members via the society presidents and publication on the IPEd website.

Eris Harrison AE
IPEd Councillor

**IPEd Notes**

**June–August 2015**

**Professional development information on the IPEd website**

IPEd has expanded the ‘professional development’ section of the IPEd website by listing the workshops conducted by all Australian societies of editors. It includes details of the workshops and links to the societies’ websites for further information. Also, this section includes a list of past IPEd conferences with links to conference papers if available. Refer to the [Professional development page](#) on the IPEd website.

**Updated ‘Guideline for editing research theses’**

The ‘Guidelines for editing research theses’ was recently updated regarding plagiarism, and the documents for editors, students and supervisors were amended. The guidelines were originally developed in conjunction with the Deans and Directors of Graduate Studies (DDoS), which is now the Australian Council of Graduate Research Inc. (ACGR).

The ACGR included an item in its newsletter to universities and on its website that explained the guidelines and encouraged universities to ensure that their websites contain the most recent updates to the guidelines. The news item included links to the ‘Guidelines for editing research theses’ and ‘Australian standards for editing practice’.

**IPEd Prize 2015**

IPEd is pleased to be sponsoring the IPEd Prize 2015. The prize is $250 for an essay or paper written as part of a postgraduate degree in editing, publishing or another discipline with a focus on editing. IPEd’s sponsorship
of the prize is to support and foster research in editing and publishing, which is part of its broader mission to enhance the editing profession. Further information about the IPEd Prize and the IPEd Prize Entry form are available from the Awards page of the IPEd website.

Entries must be submitted to the IPEd Secretary by email: secretary@iped-editor.org by Friday 4 December 2015.

IPEd sponsors Viva La Novella 4

Viva La Novella is a competition run by publisher Seizure, and aims to promote and reward the work of three Australian authors and develop the careers of three editors by providing them with the opportunity to edit a short novel.

IPEd and the Society of Editors NSW will be sponsoring Viva La Novella 4, which runs from August 2015 to August 2016.

The three editors will be encouraged to get involved in every part of the process. They will be mentored and given the opportunity to be the publisher, project manager and editor. The project aims to see three original novellas released in print and digital formats.

Further information about Viva La Novella is available on the Seizure online website and editors interested in applying to edit one of the novellas can register their interest on the submission form.

Meet the author: Steve Lewis

Apparently, Steve and Chris combined their ideas for writing novels. As long-time residents and fans of Canberra, they both felt that Canberra was the perfect setting for a political drama, and they were keen to make the national capital one of the main characters of their novels. Images of Canberra’s iconic places are littered throughout their books; for example, the opening scene of The Mandarin Code features a body being pulled from Lake Burley Griffin in a wintry Canberra morning.

Steve took us through some of the steps he took together with Chris Uhlmann to write a political thriller. He freely admitted that neither had any idea on writing a novel, let alone writing one together. As a sign of the times, one of the first things they did was setting up a shared document online and writing alternate chapters. Then, they came together intermittently to smooth those chapters out to ensure just one voice predominate throughout.

The roles of their editors, of course, stimulated much discussion, but the final editing experience had a happy ending. Initially, they unfortunately dealt with an overzealous and brutal freelance editor who shredded their first effort and ‘took out their voice’. Although the damaged egos were still evident, luckily for Steve and Chris—and fans of their novels—the original HarperCollins editor stepped in and restored most of the many deletions.

Also fulfilling a long-held dream, The Mandarin Code and The Marmalade Files will be produced as a six-part television miniseries, with filming starting at the end of August. In answer to a question from the audience, Steve admitted that realisation of the miniseries was a great motivator because they had struggled with greater effort and more research for the materialisation of the second of the two novels.

Stand & Deliver was a different writing experience. For Steve, writing this book was an opportunity to highlight what an important institution the National Press Club is for freedom of speech. Rather than just reproducing speeches, the book aimed to reflect the full colour of stories from the
past, with backstories and context. Importantly for Steve, the book also included a retelling of the infamous ‘Wormgate’ affair that, if the National Press Club had its time again, it would have handled differently.

Finally, Steve spoke about plans for the Winter Writers Festival for the Canberra Region, which will be affiliated with the Melbourne Writers Festival. This affiliation not only provides a mentoring opportunity whereby Canberra organisers would learn from more experienced Melbourne festival organisers, but also enables Canberra to host well-known Australian and international authors whom it couldn’t otherwise afford or have access to. Although details for the festival are still being finalised, the intention is that it will be held within the Parliamentary Triangle in August 2016. Watch this space for opportunities to contribute to this great event.

Needless to say, the July meeting was one of those where time was far too short—but, luckily, Steve promised to come back another time to finish his tales and to update us on the progress of the planned festival.

Pam Faulks

The Society held its Annual General Meeting for 2015 on 26 August in the Seminar Room, University House, ANU. After the committee’s initial concerns that the chairs would be empty as apologies poured in faster than acceptances, on the night, the room was full and all the seats were taken. All up, 27 full members and a further dozen associate and student members attended. Thanks again to all of you!

As outgoing Vice-President, I chaired the meeting because outgoing President, Alan Cummine, was laid up with a broken foot. I keenly assured those present—before the elections part of the meeting—that neck braces and foot casts did not come with the role of being a committee member but were more to do with rugged life on rural properties. Riding young brumbies and wielding chainsaws on high logs are not in any of the duty descriptions.

Fortunately, this assurance seemed to work and, by the end of the evening, all committee positions for 2015–16 were filled, with only the Vice-President position remaining vacant. However, this is offset by no fewer than five general committee members stepping forward. The new committee is a lovely balance of continuity of members—useful as the IPEd vote and possible transition draw nigh—and new members by way of Johann Idriss as President and Beth Mason as Secretary. A huge sigh of relief was also breathed when Eris Jane Harrison stepped forward as IPEd Councillor, a role that the committee has struggled to find a candidate for. Eris’s expertise as a negotiator and her knowledge of the constitution and company business will see the Society in good stead.

I read the President’s Report on Alan’s behalf. Alan thanked the members for the opportunity to serve as President for two years. He praised the now smooth general business of the Society, including convivial monthly meetings with interesting guest speakers, committed and collaborative committee, regular and engaging newsletter, and varied professional development on offer. His highlights for the year were the Conference in May, the now National Mentoring Program, the increase in membership despite the increase in fees, the Christmas Dinner last December, and further collaboration with the ACT Writers Centre. Alan concluded with his vision for the future of continued collaboration with the local writers and indexers, and doing more to promote the editing profession among the publishing industry and with local educational institutions. The report was well received, with members thanking Alan and wishing him a speedy recovery. The CSE sent him a get-well hamper to aid his recovery.
The meeting also discussed two motions put forward by Cathy Nicoll in relation to the voting protocols that CSE should consider for the IPEd vote in October–November. Cathy drew members’ attention to the important fact that, under the voting rules as specified in the CSE Constitution, as few as 15 full members could determine the way the CSE will vote—and hence the future of the Society. The meeting agreed that further discussion was warranted, and this is now planned for the General Meeting on 30 September. The committee urges as many members as possible to attend this meeting for this discussion, a briefing on the IPEd white papers, and for the forward proposal and voting protocols. We will also have an interesting speaker.

After all this good work, most present adjourned to the Drawing Room, University House, for a sumptuous dinner and for the opportunity to catch up with colleagues and meet new members. The dinner wrapped up at about 9:45 pm, with many members looking as if they could comfortably stay another hour. Next time!

Kaaren Sutcliffe AE

The IPEd vote: My personal transition from 'yes' to 'no'

By Alan Cummine

In October this year, like all of you, I will be asked to vote on a momentous change for the Canberra Society of Editors and our national Institute of Professional Editors. I expect I will vote ‘no’. I say ‘expect’, because from the documents I have read in the last few months and weeks, I doubt that the ‘white papers’ can solve the flaws I believe are inherent in the proposal.

I want to tell you how I have shifted from supporting the ‘concept’ in 2012 to opposing the ‘proposal’ in 2015.

The proposal

As you know, the proposal has two main parts.

First, IPEd will be restructured—from a federation created and funded by seven independent state/territory editors’ societies, into a unitary national body of which individual editors will be ‘direct members’ via their ‘local branch of IPEd’.

Second, CSE and the six other societies will be wound up as independent bodies, transfer their funds to the new IPEd, and become branches of the new IPEd.

An important consequence of this transformation is that the way we manage the new ‘Canberra branch’ will be dictated by the new IPEd constitution and branch by-laws, which are notably more restrictive and legalistic than the CSE constitution we have successfully operated under for 23 years.

My journey … early days

In September 2012, at my first meeting as CSE’s new IPEd Councillor, I supported a decision to set up a review of IPEd to determine a way forward that would enable IPEd to properly fulfil all functions in its original six-function charter.

In the last months of 2012, all society members were ‘surveyed’ and all society committees were asked for their collective views about giving IPEd more funds and about converting IPEd to a ‘direct membership model’. CSE’s view in December 2012 was that a so-called direct membership model (DMM) was probably an inevitable ‘marriage’ that we could all move towards after a few years of ‘being engaged’. An ‘engagement’ would involve reduced duplication by sharing and centralising selected functions, and providing IPEd with extra resources and paid staff to properly promote the editing profession.
The Fremantle conference

At the 2013 IPEd national conference in Fremantle, the IPEd Council plenary session heard two opposing presentations from senior editors about the concept and the emerging proposal. ‘Volunteer burnout’ was a core theme. I had my first real exposure to a persuasive alternative view that made me question my initial support for the concept of ‘integration’.

Conference delegates present at the session were asked to state their preference for three alternative approaches: (1) business as usual; (2) leave the federation intact but raise fees to give IPEd the means to fulfil its charter and centralise or coordinate sharing of functions; or (3) achieving a similar result by transforming the federation to a single unitary DMM as described earlier.

Of 91 question sheets collected at the session, 84 favoured option 2, and seven favoured option 3. In other words, 93% preferred to pay more money, centralise and share selected functions, and not change the current structure. Despite the small ‘sample’ of total national membership (about 6 per cent), I was impressed by the massive majority of those who voted.

Next, 2013 consultations

CSE was very active over the next six months of IPEd’s consultation with its member societies. Committee devoted a full meeting to the ‘business case’ and supporting documents prepared by an IPEd working party. Then CSE set aside the entire October general meeting for a detailed panel discussion of the alternative models that would be put to a ‘referendum’ vote later in the year. CSE was not happy with the unanswered questions about the case being made for the DMM.

Adopting my own variation of a ‘presidential’ approach, I took no sides throughout this process. However, as President, I did sign a letter to IPEd on behalf of the CSE Committee, noting that we had analysed all the circulated documents “looking for answers and justifications that weren’t there” and recommending that the referendum be delayed lest it “elicit a result that is less well informed than it could or should be”.

Follow-up correspondence from CSE to IPEd caused no uplift in our confidence. We noted that the next round of documents “displayed a bias towards the DMM and did not thoroughly articulate why the fees needed to be increased at such a scale,” and that the assumptions served to “distort the balance of the proposals against the IFM” [i.e. the alternative ‘increased fees model’].

IPEd and its Working Party 3 didn’t even acknowledge having received CSE’s correspondence, let alone make any effort to answer the questions or relieve CSE’s concerns. The referendum went ahead as scheduled, asking members to vote to proceed to develop a plan to ‘transition’ to a DMM.

The 2013 ‘referendum’—a very close call

The threshold for proceeding with the ‘transition’ had been set by IPEd Council at 60% of those who voted … not two-thirds or three quarters, as is conventional for votes of such momentous consequence.

And the votes were counted with a preference distribution. Consequently, the result was not the primary vote for the DMM of 55% (which would have been a rejection), but 60.1% after preferences. A subsequent recount produced a final result of 61.2% after preferences.

Of the 37 CSE votes cast, 19 favoured the DMM. That’s 51.4%. Think about that. The results in the other big societies are also telling: Victoria 51%, SA 52%, Queensland 37%, NSW 69%.

Our smaller state societies, Tasmania and WA, voted overwhelmingly in favour—Tasmania at 89% with no preferences. Imagine how that influenced the final result.
The national and CSE votes certainly made me think what a very fine margin we were relying on to justify this demanding and potentially risky adventure.

Some were concerned that only 23% of national membership voted. But that percentage is consistent with other significant IPEd votes in the past, and shouldn’t be seen as remarkable.

My discomfort about the ‘process’ was worsening. There now seemed little chance of first becoming ‘engaged’ through sharing and centralising selected functions and funding IPEd properly before deciding to get married. It seemed completely arse-about to me.

But, as CSE President, I had decided I must remain neutral and balanced.

Working Party 4

Over the next 18 months, IPEd’s Working Party 4 and its five ‘project teams’ did a prodigious amount of volunteer work … and they are still doing it! Meeting regularly, gathering and analysing information from societies, writing and rewriting discussion papers, responding to society comments, seeking legal advice, designing a workable voting system. We owe them all massive respect for their commitment and productivity, especially our own CSE volunteers.

CSE has considered and responded to all the discussion papers, questionnaires, and more formal ‘green papers’. And in some serious detail! Over a five-month span this year alone, CSE Committee devoted a whole Sunday (10 hours), two extra Wednesday nights, and many more individual hours pulling together and submitting two rounds of the Committee’s and the members’ responses to the detailed proposals being put before us.

Most of CSE’s concerns with progressive drafts of the ‘green papers’ on membership, communications and professional development seem to have been accommodated—more or less, one way or another. This bodes well for the prospect of providing member services more efficiently and effectively in the future, whatever the national structure of IPEd and the societies.

By contrast, some of our questions that were not previously answered by WP3 have still not been satisfactorily handled by WP4 and its project teams.

The CSE Committee, which has comprised a fairly even balance of views about the proposal, has been in agreement about a number of persistent ‘sticking points’—especially with the new IPEd constitution, the by-laws governing branch operations, and the finance and accounting procedures.

There is no space to detail them here. But Eris (new IPEd Councillor) and I (as Immediate Past President) have all the relevant correspondence to and from WP3 and WP4, and can show it to any member who asks.

My assessment, my dilemma

Here is the overall conclusion that I and others have drawn from these two-year-long exchanges.

However streamlined the new management systems may be, however much WP4 asserts that the new branches will be freer to deliver the services they do best, however much WP4 asserts that branches will retain much of their current ‘autonomy’ and ‘identity’, the constitution, the by-laws and the financial rules—as revealed in WP4’s dismissive ‘that’s the way it is’ responses to CSE’s repeated questions—leave little room for a new Canberra branch to be confident it can continue to be run for its members as freely and successfully as the Society has been run for 23 years.

As a branch of IPEd, under the regime as currently proposed (before the ‘white papers’), we will become less flexible, versatile and nimble in the way we structure and choose our committee and utilise our members’ skills, and in the way we organise, conduct and pay for our meetings, events and other
member services. We will be subject to an extra and remote administrative layer, we will be denied real-time access to monitor our financial position, the expenditure approval procedure will be more onerous, and our ability to best represent our members’ interests within our own bailiwick will be circumscribed by IPEd’s centralised rules and policies and head office oversight.

My personal dilemma is deciding whether this loss of independence, flexibility, agility—and, well, freedom—can be more than offset by the asserted benefits of the new structure and operations, and whether a fourth consecutive year of distracting demands on our members’ volunteer time and energy will be worth the end result.

I am now far from convinced that this is likely, and my fears are not being allayed by any documents I’m reading.

**Late changes in WP4’s approach**

In June this year, Janet Mackenzie DE wrote an open letter to Editors Victoria, titled ‘Revolution or evolution’, which CSE published in the most recent edition of *The Canberra editor*. WP4 composed a thoughtful open reply, which CSE distributed to all its members via broadcast email on Friday 14 August. It is also published here in this edition. Both letters are worth another read.

I would also commend to you another read of a critical letter by CSE Honorary Life Member, Ed Highley (‘Still time for a rethink on IPEd’, *The Canberra editor*, Feb–Mar 2015) and a WP4 reply (*The Canberra editor*, Apr–May 2015).

Janet Mackenzie proposed taking a staged approach, not unlike CSE Committee’s initial suggestions in December 2012!

In contrast with its unmoving reply to Ed Highley, WP4’s reply to Janet offered a new staged approach and a smaller initial increase in fees, and an extended schedule for transferring all of the newly centralised functions.

But the WP4 reply missed Janet’s fundamental point, which was not that we should simply slow down the process and defer the transfer of some functions, but that we should NOT change the established federated structure to begin with, and that instead we should first seek to achieve the desired objective with more financial and human resources and collaborative effort. (Similar to CSE’s ‘engagement before marriage’ approach!)

Indeed, I thought that WP4’s steadfast resolve to push ahead and change the structure as the first step but defer and leave the new IPEd to decide and implement the transfer of the very functions most people see as the easy ones would actually introduce an unacceptable level of uncertainty into the transformation. And it would STILL be arse-about.

I liked that even less than the idea of voting in favour of the whole known proposal at once.

**DMM is not the only way**

For some time now, I have been personally questioning the repeated assertion that a DMM is the ONLY way for IPEd to fulfil all of its six functions. Based on my experience in other professional and industry associations and NGOs since 1975—some unitary, some federated—I know that both structures can offer a cohesive national representative voice.

I worked for years in a ‘unitary’ national not-for-profit company with central financial administration but offering its 22 regional branches more autonomy than IPEd branches will have. So, the proposed IPEd branch by-laws are not “just the way it is.”

I have also had experience with federated bodies that were nationally cohesive and strong with a clear ‘image’ and ‘voice’. Sharing of functions
and responsibilities among the national and state and territory bodies was
clear, agreed, formalised and properly resourced.
IPEd is no different, and need not try to be.
In my experience and estimation, the asserted advantages of the DMM as
‘the only way’ have never been properly compared against the ‘increased
funds/shared functions’ model. I am confident that every one of these
asserted advantages can be achieved with far less upheaval.
We can pay a higher membership subscription (a bit more than now, but
less than proposed under the DMM), mostly as a higher IPEd levy to fund
an Executive Officer and one or more additional staff, fund all chartered
IPEd activities, and set up systems to centralise and share agreed functions.
In so doing, we can achieve these asserted benefits of a DMM—without
having to create a DMM:
• a more prominent image, stronger national voice, and effective
  representation and advocacy currently lacking—even have a single
  national ‘brand’
• better promotion of accreditation and editorial and ethical standards
• better development and maintenance of standards, training and
  mentoring
• prominent and better promoted editorial services directory (ESD)
• convenient self-service to members for subscriptions, event registration
  and the ESD
• more equitable access to services across the branches
• societies relieved of some administrative tasks
• better communication, networking and sharing of ideas across societies
  via available media (website(s), newsletters/journals, social media).
In my considered view, a case cannot be sustained that the only way to
achieve these benefits is by winding up seven independent, decades-old
and largely successful professional societies, to be reborn as local branches
of a new single remotely managed national organisation.
It is tempting to imagine how much more IPEd could have achieved on our
behalf over the past three years had it not been in a state of semiparalysis
formulating reasons for us to take this step. And if we now vote in favour of
this proposal, we will spend another year in a similar state making it happen.

Nearing the end of my journey
I have heard and read some commentary to the effect that defending the
established structure is akin to putting the interests of societies before
those of individual members. I believe such commentary is misguided
and unfair. It certainly is not true for me, and I suspect others would not
appreciate being so judged.
My focus is on how we members can collectively take advantage of the
benefits of national scale, national cooperation, and a single ‘brand’,
without losing the sense of real belonging and responsibility that
comes with local ownership and autonomy.
I have observed and experienced our Society’s historically enthusiastic
member participation gradually eroding over the past three years, coinciding
with this massive transformation project taking our attention away from why
we want to be part of the Society.
When I became President in 2013, I had an idea that our members
could benefit from CSE strengthening connections with schools, tertiary
institutions, other associations and the media. I would have liked us to
spend part of my tenure pursuing that goal for the Society. But we had
precious, little spare time once we set out on the DMM adventure. Now
I just want to see member services and engagement restored as our
paramount concern.
Had we all started 20 years ago with a DMM, I’m sure we’d not be seeking to change it and create a federation. Down the track, conversion to a DMM may become a good arrangement.

But right now, our federation is not broken. Our national body simply needs more people and money to do the job we originally gave it to do, and we can fix that problem without the upheaval we’re about to create. One comment emanating from WP4 is that if we don’t vote to proceed, “it could damage IPEd’s reputation and standing.” Seriously. Stop laughing.

We didn’t even TRY a prenuptial engagement period. We didn’t even TRY to take the least demanding, least intrusive, least turbulent approach to solving ‘the problem’. We went straight for the most romantic lustful solution. We basically decided to elope—and the branches are about to pledge to ‘love, honour and obey’. And, for having made that pledge, branch members will soon be paying twice as much as they pay now.

I have come to the conclusion that we are in danger of making a premature and expensive decision that we do not need to make. There is another way.

Open letter to Janet Mackenzie

On 1 July 2015, Janet Mackenzie, an Honorary Life Member of Editors Victoria, wrote an article titled, Revolution or Evolution: Thoughts on the Direct Membership Model, in which she urged members to vote against the proposed transition to direct membership. This letter responds to Janet’s comments from the point of view of the Transition Working Party.

Dear Janet

Thank you for taking the time to make your views on the forthcoming transition proposal known to Editors Victoria members. The Transition Working Party, of which I [Rosemary Noble] am the Project Manager, takes your comments seriously, as we realise that they reflect the views of many of the total membership. Indeed, we give and will continue to give careful consideration to all members’ views and all current societies’ views and to maintain a careful consultation process throughout, for as long as it takes.

I circulated your letter to all members of this working party and the IPEd Council, and, as a result, the working party (WP4) held a special meeting to discuss the issues you raise.

While we have been receiving feedback on the green papers from individual members, we have also been analysing the tasks and effort needed to set up the new version of IPEd, with its new systems, staff and procedures. That analysis has convinced us that a more gradual approach to the transition than was initially envisaged will be more practical. Details of that approach are given below.

You mention that ‘When IPEd was formed, assurances were given that the national organisation would not attempt any kind of takeover of the state and Canberra societies’. I think it is fair to say that IPEd has respected those assurances, but that project teams in all societies have worked towards implementing national approaches in some areas already. This is no better illustrated than by the success of the national programs that IPEd has gradually been asked to manage, including accreditation, the Australian Standards for Editing Practice and, most recently, the National Mentoring Program.

Programs and projects that surveys show to be important for editors, such as advocacy and equity in professional development opportunities, cannot be achieved successfully by seven small groups, but a single national entity could and would develop such initiatives under a direct membership model. Take for example the current Style Manual interest group. Any influence that editors as a profession are able to have on future government decisions regarding this can only be achieved by IPEd as a whole. IPEd as it is, however much money it has, cannot have the same impact that a focused national organisation of individual editors can have.

You also express your doubts about whether the bigger and wealthier societies such as Editors Victoria will have much to gain from a national model. As an Honorary Life Member of Editors Victoria, I too have a
sentimental attachment to it, but I do not agree that by insisting on keeping to ourselves our assets and advantages while smaller societies struggle along, we are embodying the spirit in which those assets were gathered. Also, many members believe that in the rapidly changing environment in which editors work, a strong national voice is essential. With the small amount of money levied on the societies for IPEd, I believe it has proven to be a prudent and conscientious guardian of funds. Those accumulated funds do not belong to individuals. Wishing to cling to what each society already has would not be in the spirit of benefiting individuals above their societies, the premise on which nationalisation is built.

Janet, you mention several risks to the future of IPEd in the DMM, so let’s look at these one by one:

1. **Death spiral.** We in WP4 acknowledge that a large increase in fees will cause some members to rethink renewing their subscriptions. Others have also expressed this view. The more gradual transition now envisaged will require a less onerous fee structure (see WP4’s modified proposed strategy below). In Queensland recently a large increase (from $85 to $150 for full members; $65 to $90 for associates) actually resulted in an increase in membership, as a new President and committee demonstrated the benefits that would accrue to members for their continued membership. Just a few years ago, this society was in serious danger of disappearing, but an energetic and focused committee was able to turn that around in a short time.

See the bullet list later for details of the proposed variation to the fee structure.

2. **Lack of unanimity.** In any vote of this type there is always a risk of dissatisfaction from those whose vote does not align with the majority decision, but our first consideration is for individual editors, not the societies themselves. One scenario would be that the status quo is maintained and societies who voted against the change would go their own way with their members choosing individually whether to join the new IPEd, stay with their own society or indeed join both.

3. **Burden on volunteers.** It is simply not true that there will be an increased burden on existing volunteers, especially in light of the more gradual transition being considered at this point. Any change will generate new and different work during the transition, but a single national membership structure and financial arrangements, once established, will relieve a huge amount of the burden from society volunteers at present struggling with these tasks.

4. **Disconnection.** At no time has IPEd proposed any diminution of the importance of the local activities that society members enjoy and rely on. Related to the previous point, once local volunteers are able to be freed from the administrative burden of membership and financial portfolios, they will be able to use their available time more creatively to ensure an even wider range of relevant local activities.

Based on feedback from all members and our analysis of the work involved in the transition, WP4 has now agreed to propose the following strategic plan:

- Take a much more gradual, staged approach to the transition to DMM, with the initial stage including the essential elements—that is, those elements without which the later stages can’t happen. Most importantly, this stage would implement a centralised membership system using MEMNET.

That will enable:
- a single membership structure
- event management and registration
- a national freelance register
• the membership list and functions enabling national and branch newsletters
• efficient access to members-only information
• the basis for settling up and handling of finances.

• Engage contract staffing for the first stage, sufficient to manage the membership and event system, to handle all accounting and banking, and essential executive officer duties, to focus on management of the first-stage functions, planning for further stages, and individual advocacy and representation of the new, direct membership organisation.

• Implement, as a consequence, only a modest fee increase at the outset—only enough to cover the essential elements. (This may be as low as $150 for full membership in the first stage instead of the $280 originally envisaged.)

• Include in the information package that will accompany voting documentation an outline of each of the other aspects of a total DMM transition, but as aspirational future services only, based on the work already undertaken by WP4—such items as a national newsletter and a national website, plus the beginnings of readily accessible professional development training and other benefits to individual members of a national organisation. Implementation of these additional shared services and any necessary fee increases will be the business of the new IPEd and subject to approval by the individual members as required by the new constitution.

• Consider the needs of and benefits to individual editor members ahead of those of the current societies or later branches, as individual editors will become the direct members of IPEd, and to give an immediate national voice to Australian editors in a profession where national organisations are the norm internationally.

• Address one aspect of a concern expressed by some about ‘loss of identity’ by making it possible for the branches that succeed the current societies to retain the names of their ‘parent’ society—if they wish.

Janet, thank you for raising these issues when you did. They have helped WP4 in the consideration of a practical and effective transition of IPEd to a national direct membership association.

I hope you agree that these points help to address your concerns about rushing and trying to include too much in one hit. I urge you and all our members to consider these points and familiarise yourselves with the white papers and information pack when that arrives in your mailboxes in the next couple of months. Most of all, I urge you all, when the time comes, to vote because you are fully informed and encourage your fellow editors to vote to make the final decision one that reflects a true majority.

Rosemary Noble AE
Project Manager, IPEd Transition Project, 19 July 2015
Taking in the shortcuts

Find and Replace

The Find and Replace feature of Microsoft Word can be used for more than finding/replacing words—it can look for formatting, paragraph breaks, tabs, styles, page breaks, highlights, symbols, or other features in a document. Wildcards and codes can also be used to find words or phrases with specific characters or character combinations. In this issue, I outline ways to look for specifically formatted characters in a document and replace or remove character formatting. In the upcoming issues, I’ll illustrate examples of wildcards and codes used with Find and Replace. Meanwhile, I’ll illustrate the corresponding keyboard shortcuts.

I have used Word 2013 for illustrating these features, but the shortcuts should work with any previous PC Word version. I have learnt that Mac combination shortcuts differ from, and are more limited than, the PC shortcuts.

1. To open the Find and Replace dialogue box, click Replace on the Home tab, in the Editing group, or type in Ctrl + H or Alt + H + R.

2. If you don’t see the Format button, click More (Alt + M) to turn this feature on.

3. To search for specifically formatted text, type the text in the Find what box. To activate this box for inputting text, type Alt + N. To find specific formatting only, leave Find what box empty.

4. Click Format (Alt + O); then select the format that you want to find and replace.

5. Activate the Replace with (Alt + i) box, click Format (Alt + O), and then select the replacement format. If you also want to replace any specifically formatted text, type the replacement text in the Replace with (Alt + i) box.

6. To find and replace a single occurrence of a specified formatting, click Find Next (Alt + F), and then click Replace (Alt + R). To replace all instances of the specified formatting, click Replace All (Alt + A). If you use the latter options, Word would count the number of changes and report it to you.

Note that in any Word dialogue box, underlined letters can activate specific functions. Their corresponding functions can be turned on by the combination Alt + underlined letter. Thus, by looking at a dialogue box, you can learn the corresponding keyboard shortcuts governing that box. You can thus avoid frequent mousing, and subsequently, prevent potential wrist strain injury that could likely ensue. Eventually, you’d master all the shortcuts, you’d edit text fast, and you’d say goodbye to your mouse while working with Word on a PC.

Also note that both the Find and Replace formatting settings are ‘sticky’. For example, if you set Find to look for highlighted words in your document, the next time you activate Find and Replace, Word would continue looking for highlights; the combination Ctrl + Page Down would do the same unless the previous Find and Replace input is cleared. The formatting can be manually cleared from the Find and Replace boxes by clicking the No Formatting (Alt + t) button.

Now, set yourself an exercise. Find the highlighted words current monthly sales with the bold number $12,368,900 in your document. See how you go. Disable your mouse for this exercise and see how fast you can be.

Farid Rahimi
Newsletter editor

I tried to catch some fog, but I mist.
In this issue of The Canberra editor, ‘Comical Collections’ continues with the international theme. The following notices from around the world indicate just what a world of linguistic knots it’s become! They’ll be of particular interest to editors who specialise in editing works of those whose native tongue isn’t English. We published the first set in the previous issue; here’s the second set.

Ara Nalbandian  
ACT Mentoring Coordinator

Hotel room notice, Thailand
Please do not bring solicitors into your room.

Hotel brochure, Italy
This hotel is renowned for its peace and solitude. In fact, crowds from all over the world flock here to enjoy its solitude.

Hotel lobby, Romania
The lift is being fixed for the next day. During that time we regret that you will be unbearable.

Hotel, Yugoslavia
The flattening of underwear with pleasure is the job of the chambermaid.

Hotel, Japan
You are invited to take advantage of the chambermaid.

In the lobby of a Moscow hotel across from a Russian Orthodox monastery
You are welcome to visit the cemetery where famous Russian and Soviet composers, artists, and writers are buried daily except Thursday.

Taken from a menu, Poland
Salad a firm’s own make; limpid red beet soup with cheesy dumplings in the form of a finger; roasted duck let loose; beef rashers beaten in the country people’s fashion.

Supermarket, Hong Kong
For your convenience, we recommend courteous, efficient self-service.

In an East African newspaper
A new swimming pool is rapidly taking shape since the contractors have thrown in the bulk of their workers.

Hotel, Vienna
In case of fire, do your utmost to alarm the hotel porter.

A sign posted in Germany’s Black Forest
It is strictly forbidden on our black forest camping site that people of different sex, for instance, men and women, live together in one tent unless they are married with each other for this purpose.

Hotel, Zurich
Because of the impropriety of entertaining guests of the opposite sex in the bedroom, it is suggested that the lobby be used for this purpose.

An advertisement by a Hong Kong dentist
Teeth extracted by the latest methodists.

A laundry in Rome
Ladies, leave your clothes here and spend the afternoon having a good time.
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Schedule for next newsletter
The next edition of The Canberra editor will appear in November 2015. The copy deadline for that issue is 5 November.
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All articles must be in .doc format.
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