

Minutes
MOBIUS Cooperative Collection Development Task Force Teleconference,
February 27, 2003.

Present: Anne Barker, Ed Buis, Robert Frizzell, Pat Gregory, Gary Harris, Mary Heady, Tesuk Im, Becky Kiel, Genie McKee, Ann Riley, John Small.

Absent: Craig Kubic

The meeting opened at 9:00 with instructions on using videoconference technology from Kevin White of STLCC.

The meeting consisted of revisions of the draft report on management issues, which had been posted to the listserv on Feb. 26. Most of the discussion is best reflected in the markup of the document, which is appended to the minutes.

Discussion on the format of the report resulted in the decision to integrate the outline with the text as main headers for each narrative section and to include an executive summary for those not inclined to read the entire document.

Two passages require some reworking. One is in the section on educating constituencies about cooperative collection development, under III. B. *It may also be beneficial to have the added volume/weight of the consortium in introducing these ideas to accrediting agencies and funding sources.* [Develop this section further. And include in executive summary.]

The other is under III.C. on financial issues: *Should there be a centrally administered fund for cooperative collection development projects? Should a minimum financial contribution be required of member institutions? How should costs and benefits be measured?* [reword this section]

Anne Barker will report to the MOBIUS executive board at the HELIX meeting on March 19. [NOTE: Laura Rein requests that we get the report to the executive board by March 12 so they have a chance to review it before our meeting. I failed to note this during our teleconference. -- AB]

The next teleconference will be arranged by email, probably for sometime in April.

.....

Report on Management Issues (Markup 2/27/03)

The MOBIUS Collection Development Task Force has been charged with first listing the management issues that would affect cooperative collection development efforts within the consortium. To begin to do that, the group drafted a statement of purpose, which follows:

The primary purpose of cooperative collection development by MOBIUS member libraries is to maximize the strength, currency and diversity of ~~individual~~ [their combined] collections to better serve the learners of Missouri. As part of this effort, individual collections must continue to reflect and support their institutions' programs and missions. Enhancement of ~~the combined~~ collections and increased cost effectiveness become possible through strategic diversification and cooperative collection management activities.

MOBIUS is well-positioned to implement cooperative collection management projects. The MOBIUS online catalog, efficient delivery system, consortium office support, committee structure, and communications system provide the basis for effective cooperation. Many MOBIUS institutions already have experience collaborating with other libraries, but can benefit from a wider scope for cooperation.

As stated in the Memorandum of Understanding, cooperative collection development is one of the five objectives of the MOBIUS consortium, supporting the goal "...to provide students and faculty at Missouri's academic institutions with the broadest array of information resources in an easy, timely, and seamless manner regardless of the geographic location of the patron or resources."

In considering the implementation of any cooperative collection management plan or project, various management issues must be addressed. The purpose of this report is to identify the major management issues as a first step toward developing a plan for cooperative collection development within MOBIUS.

Working with this purpose in mind, the Task Force will begin its final report in August 2003 with a review of :

- I. Purpose and introduction of Task Force
 - A. Present situation, existing resources, state of MOBIUS, Memorandum of Understanding
 - B. Systems, committees, structure in place
- II. Review of other (non-Missouri) cooperative projects.
 - A. Selection & management of local collections
 - B. Shared electronic purchases and licensing
 - C. Access, storage, and preservation

Given the present structure of MOBIUS committees, a standing committee on cooperative collection development ~~will probably need to~~ should be created, parallel to the other consortium-wide advisory groups. The Task Force members felt that existing cooperative agreements need to be respected, and that a survey of ~~resources~~ collections of some sort will need to be undertaken at the MOBIUS level. Potential participants will very likely choose to take part in MOBIUS efforts, but the new efforts should not be coercive.

In discussion of the management issues involved in potential MOBIUS projects, several categories emerged. The Task Force drew heavily from the report on the best practices in collection development given at the second Aberdeen Woods Conference on Cooperative Collection Development [(2002) URL], sponsored by the Association for Research Libraries (ARL). In general, the list of issues refers to what would need to be addressed in what the Task Force envisions as layered or segmented projects (IIIA1 below). For example, theological libraries might undertake a project on historical materials, while libraries of various types might undertake a project on science periodicals, etc.

Not all issues are within libraries' control. An example of an area in which MOBIUS would have no control, but one that is nevertheless a management concern, is the question of access versus ownership when individual institutions (or more commonly programs within institutions) deal with professional accrediting agencies that require specific title counts. Of course, funding variation among institutions, both public and private, is the most obvious issue that is to a great extent outside libraries' control.

The detailed list of management issues to be considered in the types of projects the Task Force envisions follows (divided into the three categories developed by the ARL researchers and reported at Aberdeen Woods):

III. Categories of Management issues

A. Formation of cooperatives; mission & agreements [Reformat outline numbering below.]

1. Agreements among segments (by library type, by subject, by material type) multi-layered ~~mosaic~~ [matrix] to address different needs

2. Template of standard agreement (possible to modify for each project, each institution)(levels of participation, collection responsibility, licensing issues)
3. Respect for pre-existing agreements
4. Process for withdrawal or exception to participation
5. Awareness of legal issues (state jurisdiction, copyright, licenses, etc.)

In forming cooperative agreements there is always a need to balance commitment to the collective, commitment to the mission of the individual institution, and pre-existing commitments to other consortia or collectives. ~~Although all the MOBIUS members are committed to cooperative collection development as stated in the Memorandum of Understanding, the diversity of libraries and institutions suggests that while some projects may be appropriate for all members, other projects may interest only subsets of the membership.~~ A potential model [for MOBIUS] would be to centralize coordination and support of cooperative projects, but encourage the development of agreements among interested groups within the consortium on a voluntary basis, resulting in a multi-layered ~~mosaic~~ [matrix] of projects. Projects would probably be developed according to subject area, library type, or material type, e.g. libraries supporting aviation programs ~~would~~ [could] coordinate in this area; community colleges, according to their mission; libraries with large microform collections, etc. ~~This would be analogous to the cafeteria plan of purchasing databases, in which the license is centrally negotiated, but participation by the members is voluntary rather than required.~~ (See Illinet)

In this model, the role of the consortium is to encourage and support the development of cooperative agreements by providing the mechanism for the formation of agreements and technical and legal expertise that might not be readily available to individual member libraries. For example, the development of a template for a standard agreement (~~see materials from Boston~~), standard license language, and a process of central review would ensure that all necessary issues, such as levels of participation, responsibility, financial commitment, assessment, termination of the agreement, and any legal issues, are adequately addressed in the agreement document.

- B. Decision-making, organization & administration [Reformat outline numbering below.]
6. Education of staff, promotion of project
 7. Assessment & evaluation of projects
 8. Relationships with accrediting standards & agencies. (Access v. ownership)
 9. Identification of projects.
 10. Committee structure, authority, coordination. (Clarity of roles: MCO, clusters, selectors.)
 11. Communication of plans, issues

Decision-making authority, the process of making decisions, and the methods of communicating decisions all need to be considered and clearly stated. The following issues must be addressed in any implementation plan: [Reformat below as bulleted list.]

1. *Who has the authority to initiate, plan, and evaluate projects?*
2. *How are projects initiated, planned, and evaluated?*
3. *What criteria are used in evaluating projects?*
4. *What essential elements must be included in any project plan or proposal?*
5. *How are decisions communicated, reported, publicized?*
6. *How do cooperative collection development activities fit in the existing MOBIUS committee structure? E.g. how would a collection development committee dovetail with MERAC?*
7. *What are the roles of MCO, clusters, and selectors in this process?*

Involvement in cooperative collection development involves a shift in emphasis from ownership to access, from institutional competition to collaboration, which affects many constituencies: library employees, teaching faculty, institutional administrators, library users, accrediting agencies, funding agencies, etc. The implementation plan must include plans for conveying to all these participants the benefits of and rationale for cooperation. In addition,

cooperative collection development may involve library employees in new activities (collection analysis, digitization, delivery) that require re-training. A commitment to teaching library users to make the best use of shared resources is also necessary. Education and training in many of these areas would probably be a local responsibility, but the collaborative development of materials to be used could prevent duplication of effort.

It may also be beneficial to have the added volume/weight of the consortium in introducing these ideas to accrediting agencies and funding sources. [Develop this section further. And include in executive summary.]

C. Funding and infrastructure [Reformat outline numbering below.]

12. ~~Local responsibilities: software, telephone, travel, training~~
13. ~~Financial incentives to participate~~
14. ~~Differences in means among members~~
15. ~~Cooperative approval profiling~~
16. ~~Differences in costs among members~~
17. ~~Collection and program analysis~~
18. ~~Space & storage issues~~
19. ~~Joint grant application/administration~~
20. ~~Funding models: central v. cafeteria plan~~

Replace this section of the outline with the following:

- i. sources of funding*
- ii. administration of funds: local v. central responsibilities*
- iii. required/recommended financial commitment*
- iv. assessment of financial benefit/incentive*
- v. differences in costs/means of institutions*
- vi. associated costs—shipping, labor, storage, equipment, etc.*

Funding is ~~of course one of the most~~ a crucial management issue in any project. The sources and distribution of funding may vary from one project to another, depending on various factors. For example, cooperative purchase of a database by the entire consortium would require a commitment from all participants and central coordination of licensing and payment, while a book collection project among several members might involve local cost-shifting, but little or no additional funds and no central accounting. Each project would involve consideration of sources of funding; fund accounting; financial benefits; and costs, including the hidden costs of delivery, additional labor, equipment, additional storage or workspace, preservation or replacement of more heavily used materials. Note that in many cases cooperative projects will result in greater financial efficiency—more resources for the funds in the aggregate—rather than cost reduction.

A more general question is the equitable distribution of costs and funds among consortium members that vary widely in budget, user populations or constituents (~~both in quantity and type, i.e. public v. private~~), as well as in funding sources. The contributions of members may also vary, e.g. the labor involved in retrieving, packaging, and delivering materials, or the use of specialized equipment, requiring consideration in equalizing costs to the member institutions.

Should there be a centrally administered fund for cooperative collection development projects? Should a minimum financial contribution be required of member institutions? How should costs and benefits be measured? [reword this section]

Note that specific projects would most likely have separate agreements, probably developed from a template agreement formulated by the MOBIUS standing committee and approved by appropriate legal counsels. These would cover issues standard to most projects. Some issues, however, can be addressed only at the level of each individual library within the consortium. Participants will need to be clear on the obligations they are undertaking. Local issues include:

IV. Specific local management issues

- A. ~~Local~~ individual institutional needs must be satisfied first.
- B. Roles of selectors must be clear.
- C. Staff times and loyalties must be considered.
- D. Trust among institutions must exist

Finally, each individual project within the mosaic of various cooperative efforts will need to address some issues specific to that project. Some of these that the Task Force has been able to identify are listed here:

V. Management issues that apply to more specific cooperative projects

- E. Joint purchases of online resources
- F. "Last copy" retention plans
- G. Shared storage facilities
- H. Rotating collections
- I. Complementary collection profiles
- J. Digitization
- [Add points below.
- K. Joint grant applications
- L. cooperative approval profiling]

[VI. Next step]

.....

Respectfully submitted,
Anne Barker, February 27, 2003