

MOBIUS ACCESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 23, 2001

Minutes

Persons present: Gordon Johnston, Carol Warrington, Loretta Ponzar, Linda Medaris, Gaye Pate, Elise Fisher, Jim Mulder, Judy Fox, Joni Blake, Scott Britton, June Deweese (observer), Mary Jo Barbush-Weiss, Ellen Eliceiri, Gary Harris.

I. Reports from Clusters

- A. Southeast is working on a name for their cluster.
- B. Archway has a chronic bag shortage and some of the bags are extremely dirty. They have also been noticing a large number of duplicates in the Inn-Reach database making trouble-shooting difficult.
- C. Quest has no real report. They are still waiting for their turn to implement.
- D. Swan is just up on Inn-Reach, practicing and learning.
- E. WILO finished training in December
- F. LANCE just finished circulation training last week.
- G. Merlin has several suggestions for the Lost Book policy to be brought up later in the meeting. June DeWeese discussed sample cards for Distance Learning students. Merlin would like to eliminate HEC (Higher Education Council) cards. Judy Fox suggested that it might be better to wait until Bridges is up and running first.
- H. Bridges is involved in lots of discussions and meetings as they prepare for implementation.
- I. Washington University is receiving books not checked out through the system by the lending library. This suggests the need for more training or at least reminding people.

II. Lost Book Policy

- A. Merlin wants to put off implementation of the reconciliation clause (#7). This clause causes some consternation in the MU accounting office. Accounting will not allow payment without an itemized bill. Merlin would prefer to handle billing on each student/book problem as it arises. Others are concerned that reconciliation bills might get too large, thereby requiring oversight and approval by institutional boards of trustees. By consensus, the Committee decided to change clause #7 to read:

A system of reconciliation should be investigated so libraries may reimburse each other based on net losses.

- B. Arthur libraries do not like the \$20 billing/processing fee and would like to see it eliminated. There was lively discussion on this subject with institutions who have significant medical/science collections insisting on not diminishing the \$120 replacement fee and other institutions insisting that the \$120 fee not go any higher. No one seemed to care what happened to the \$20 billing/processing fee as long as the total stayed at \$120. Finally, Elise Fisher moved and Scott Britton seconded the following replacement wording for clause #2.

The lost book fee is \$100 plus a billing/processing fee of \$20. The billing fee can be waived by the borrowing library if the book is returned. If the book is not returned the lost book fee and the

processing fee of \$120 goes to the lending library.

Motion passed.

C. The Committee changed the last sentence of clause #5 to read as follows.

A MOBIUS BLOCK code will be used by all clusters.

D. The Committee added words to the last sentence of clause 4 to read as follows.

In this case, the borrowing library can keep or waive the \$20 non-refundable billing/processing fee.

E. The Committee made the following changes to the texts for notices/bills.

a. The last sentence of the Second Overdue will read as follows.

If the item(s) are not returned within 10 days, you will be billed a \$100 lost book fee plus a \$20 non-refundable processing fee for each item and your borrowing privileges will be suspended.

b. The last sentence of the Bill will read as follows.

Your borrowing privilege will be suspended until you pay this amount or return the items.

III. Loan Periods, Number of Renewals, Maximum Requests

Merlin and Arthur clusters would like to increase the maximum undergraduate loans up to 20 items. However, some institutions are concerned patrons will run up huge debts if the maximum number of loans is increased. The Committee discussed creating an additional patron type for patrons in special circumstances such as senior seminars. Judy will write up a proposal to which the Committee can react.

IV. Request Balancing Table

In the original set-up of INN-Reach Merlin was coded as the highest priority and everyone else at the lowest priority. As a result, Merlin is loaning at a 4.6/1 loan to borrow rate. The Committee agreed that the Request Balancing Table needs to be adjusted. However, members asked several questions about how the system selects a lender in load leveling. MCL is going to get more information so the issues can be discussed more clearly at the next meeting.

V. Visiting Patron Library Guide

A. Scott Britton prepared a list of libraries and ID's who were participating in Visiting Patron. This will be put on the MOBIUS Website.

B. The Committee discussed the banding of books loaned to visiting patron. Merlin doesn't. The consensus was that banding would be cumbersome at circulation so visiting patron books should probably not be banded.

VI. Processing MOBIUS reports

Several Committee members reported difficulty resolving problem records in INN-Reach overdues. Librarians need a complete list of location codes to identify which library has a problem record. The consensus is that at some point we probably need to ask III for an enhancement that will provide additional information of the Returned Too Long report.

VII. OCLC ILLiad for ILL

OCLC ILLiad is a product that competes with Clio managing interlibrary loan traffic. ILLiad has more features but is more expensive. Many members need more information about this product. Judy will try to get out some information.

VIII. The next meeting will be April 24, 2001

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Upchurch