

Minutes
MOBIUS Cooperative Collection Development Task Force
Meeting at CMSU, June 30, 2003

Present: Anne Barker, Ann Campion Riley, Mollie Dinwiddie, Bob Frizzell, Gary Harris, Tesuk Im, Becky Kiel, Craig Kubic, Lois Marshall, Genie McKee, Bill Wibbing

Absent: Ed Buis, Pat Gregory

Ann Campion Riley opened the meeting at 10:30.

1. May minutes and agenda for today's meeting approved.
2. Most of the meeting involved consideration of the draft implementation report, attached below.
 - a. Discussion of the relation to MERAC and other committees resulted in the addition of this line to the draft report (noted in red in the draft): Maintain appropriate communication with other MOBIUS advisory committees.
 - b. The charge of the proposed standing committee was revised slightly to emphasize that the committee will actively initiate and facilitate projects. After considering the charges to other committees, we reduced the charge proper to the italicized paragraph in the draft, while retaining the additional wording in the report.
 - c. This process for project review was decided upon:
Proposal submitted to MCMAC. Committee receives proposal, posts to website for comment from MOBIUS members and as invitation to additional participants. Returned to proposers with MOBIUS endorsement or recommendations for revision. Committee reports on projects to MOBIUS executive committee.
 - d. Discussion of which statistical data to collect resulted in the following: SCAT tables, OCLC collection analysis software, survey of programs, CBHE documentation of institutional missions and programs. ILL statistics.
 - e. We identified the following potential projects:
 - i. Investigate the possibility of state-wide approval vendor agreement
 - ii. Coordinate communication of serials cancellation projects
 - iii. Aviation materials collection
 - iv. Preservation
 - v. Archives
 - vi. Microform sets
 - vii. Creative writing/small press collection
 - viii. Women's studies
 - ix. Develop exchange of withdrawn materials
 - x. Joint storage
 - xi. Last copy retention agreement (digitization)
 - f. Further additions to the draft report are noted in red in the draft.

3. In the context of discussion of digitization, Gary mentioned Kurt Kopp's digitization projects: <http://digital.library.umsystem.edu/>
4. Various members indicated interest in the possibility of a statewide approval contract à la OhioLINK. Ann R. will contact Yankee about coming to our next meeting and Bill will contact Blackwell. Anne B. demonstrated Yankee's GOBI software in use at MU. (To see what this looks like, go to <http://mulibraries.Missouri.edu/barkera/gobi.htm>)
5. We divided various articles among the group for further reading in support of the report. Anne B. will post the complete list of articles on the listserv. Members can send brief annotations or appropriate quotes to the list for inclusion in the report. The bibliography mentioned in the outline is not meant to be comprehensive, but should include the best articles that would be useful for future committee members or for informing college administrators, library staff, or other constituents.
6. Next meeting will be Sept. 5, 10:00 at the MOBIUS consortium office.

We adjourned at 1:50, with thanks to Mollie for hosting the meeting.

Submitted by Anne Barker, July 2, 2003.

.....

Draft Implementation report

Brief Outline

- 1. Forgoing consideration of management issues may be summarized in following statement of values/principles**
- 2. Purpose of cooperative collection development**
- 3. In order to accomplish this purpose the following are required:**
 - a. Decision-making and communication structure**
 - b. On-going assessment/goal-setting**
 - c. Development of financial support**
 - d. Development of library staff and systems**
 - e. Political advocacy, education of users**
- 4. To this end, we recommend the following actions:**
 - a. Establishment of a standing committee on ccd with the following charge**
 - b. Establishment of standard procedure for recommending, deciding on projects, with schedule for assessment of effectiveness**
 - c. Initial base-line assessment of the combined collections, programs, needs in order to set strategic goals**
 - d. Efforts to identify sources of funding to support these activities**

- e. **Provision of materials/resources to support the education of staff and administration on ccd**
5. **Potential projects**
 - a. **Investigate the possibility of state-wide approval vendor agreement**
 - b. **Coordinate communication of serials cancellation projects**
6. **Conclusion: ongoing development**
7. **Appendix: Bibliography of resources**

.....
More detail

2. Statement of values

The following are taken from the Illinois statement of core values (<http://www.niulib.niu.edu/ccm/statepri.html>), which I think just about say it all.

- **Universal benefit**
- **Selective participation and universal input**
- **Local sufficiency**
- **Ease of access to shared resources**
- **Enduring commitment to the goal of shared collection building**
- **Recognition of the contribution of all member libraries**
- **Dependence on the commitment and participation of individual librarians.**

Here's another statement of the Illinois values from <http://www.niulib.niu.edu/ccm/callprop.html>

- **Universal Benefit:** demonstrable benefit to a broad constituency.
- **Open Physical Access:** resources acquired or created with grant funds must be reasonably available to the primary constituents of all libraries in the consortium.
- **Local Sufficiency:** grant projects are not meant to replace the need for locally sufficient collections.
- **Selective Participation, Universal Input:** although not all members are expected to participate actively in all projects, each member library will have an opportunity to respond to project ideas.
- **Multiple Funding Modes:** including consortial, external, and local funding.
- **Creative Pilots:** the consortium encourages the development of creative pilot projects that directly address the needs of library users.

One further statement we might add would be: commitment to cost-effectiveness (as opposed to cost-reduction).

3. Purpose of cooperative collection development

The primary purpose of cooperative collection development by MOBIUS member libraries is to maximize the strength, currency and diversity of 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 collections and increased cost effectiveness become possible through strategic diversification and cooperative collection management activities.

4. In order to accomplish this purpose the following are required:

- a. Decision-making and communication structure
- b. On-going assessment/goal-setting
- c. Development of financial support
- d. Development of library staff and systems
- e. Political advocacy, education of users

5. To this end, we recommend the following actions:

- a. Establishment of a standing committee on ccd with the following charge

The name of the committee will be the MOBIUS Collection Management Advisory Committee (MCMAC).

The committee includes a representative and an alternate from each of the MOBIUS clusters and a liaison from MCO as a non-voting member.

MCMAC is charged by the MOBIUS Council to survey, monitor, and evaluate the MOBIUS collections in order to strengthen the resource base of the member institutions, thereby promoting excellence in academic research and instruction. The committee will act as a clearing house and facilitating agency for the implementation of cooperative collection projects within MOBIUS.

Following the plan set by the MOBIUS Cooperative Collection Development Task Force, this committee will

- Consult with users and colleagues at their respective institutions and other libraries in clusters, using appropriate channels and mechanisms
- **Maintain appropriate communication with other MOBIUS advisory committees.**
- Explore opportunities **and initiate** consortial collaboration in the areas of collection development and collection management

- Investigate current national practices and innovative efforts by other consortia or purchasing groups
- Develop mechanisms to survey relative collection strengths throughout the consortium
- Develop methods of collaboration in specified areas of shared interest, such as subject areas, new academic programs, offsite collection storage, etc.
- Identify potential sources of funding

Decisions will be subject to the review of the MOBIUS Council

This committee structure exploits the strength of the existing MOBIUS infrastructure for communication and decision-making: the website, listserv, etc. Communication with MERAC is especially important due to closely aligned interests.

- b. Establishment of standard procedure for recommending, deciding on projects, with schedule for assessment of effectiveness

We recommend the use of a standard form for proposing cooperative projects. If central funds are available, this would facilitate the comparison and prioritizing of projects. In the absence of such funds, this central review facilitates awareness and communication. The form contributes to the thoughtful planning of any project.

This form includes:

- i. Description of the project goals and plan of execution
- ii. Identification of participants and their responsibilities
- iii. Anticipated costs and funding plan
- iv. Anticipated benefits
- v. Plan for evaluation and for reporting on progress
- vi. Identification of legal issues (copyright, licensing)
- vii. Anticipated duration of the agreement, process for dissolution of any commitments

Signature of directors of each library involved required.

Proposals could be submitted to MCMAC for review at any time. They would be posted or distributed for review and input from all MOBIUS members. Final revision of plans would take place, considering input from other members. The final project proposal would be reviewed by MCMAC, using the following criteria.

- i. *Benefit*: Who will benefit from the project? How many persons? How will they benefit?
- ii. *Cost and Funding Plan*: What is the cost of the project, divided into one-time and continuing costs? Costs should be as exact as possible. How do the libraries propose to meet the costs? How much, if anything, is being requested in external funding? How

much is proposed as cost-sharing, both on the part of the proposing libraries and all libraries in the Consortium? Is there a plan for reverting to local funding after a start-up period?

- iii. *Quality of Plan of Operation*: Is the plan likely to succeed? Are there sufficient guarantees that commitments will be maintained--for example, via a formal written agreement? In particular, is the plan for providing service for the entire Consortium likely to be effective?
- iv. *Expandability, Adaptability*: Might the project, if successful, be expanded to a wider area or adapted by others? What is its value as a pilot project?
- v. *Quality of Plan for Evaluation*: How will project effectiveness be evaluated? What is the plan for review and evaluation?
- vi. *Plan for Reporting on Progress*.

(These are taken from Illinois again. See:

<http://www.niulib.niu.edu/ccm/proproc.html>. More details of their proposal review process, including a point system they use, can be seen at <http://www.niulib.niu.edu/ccm/process.html>.) MCMAC's recommendation would be to proceed or not, depending on the evaluation in light of the strategic value to the consortium. If central funds were available, MCMAC would use these criteria to prioritize the allocation of funds. [Note: if there are no central funds to distribute, would MCMAC have the authority to tell interested libraries not to proceed with a project? **NO**]

- c. Initial base-line assessment of the combined collections, programs, needs in order to set strategic goals

SCAT tables, OCLC collection analysis software, survey of programs, CBHE documentation of institutional missions and programs. ILL statistics.

- d. Efforts to identify sources of funding to support these activities
Possible MCO administration of central funds, grants, or other.
- e. Provision of materials/resources to support the education of staff and administration on ccd.

**For administrators a brief brochure explaining cooperative collection development. ACRL standards for libraries in higher ed.
Centralized development of educational materials for library staff, etc.**

6. Potential projects

- a. **Investigate the possibility of state-wide approval vendor agreement**
- b. **Coordinate communication of serials cancellation projects**
- c. **Aviation materials collection**
- d. **Preservation**
- e. **Archives**
- f. **Microform sets**
- g. **Creative writing/small press collection**

- h. Women's studies**
- i. Develop exchange of withdrawn materials**
- j. Joint storage**
- k. Last copy retention agreement (digitization)**

- 7. Conclusion: ongoing development**
- 8. Appendix: Bibliography of resources**