

**Agenda**  
**MOBIUS Governance & Growth Management Task Force**  
**January 26, 2006**

**Location & Time: MOREnet/MOBIUS Building, Room 205; 1:00 PM**

1. Approval of agenda.
2. Approval of minutes for December 6, 2005
3. Report on discussions with research libraries (St. Louis) – Richard and Shirley
4. Potential partnerships report – revised copy – Cathye
5. Mobius policy on admission of new members (academic) – Mollie
6. Identify issues concerning membership, partnerships, relationships with other agencies (from the charge) – Cathye
7. Identify costs/benefits of potential partnerships and relations (from the charge):
  - Benefits – Julia and Laura
  - Costs -- George
8. Recommendations of the task force.

**Minutes**  
**MOBIUS Governance and Growth Management**  
**December 6, 2005**

**Members Attendance:** Jim Cosgwell; Sarah Cron; Cathye Dierberg (chair); Mollie Dinwiddie; Laura Rein; Julia Schneider; Steve Stoan; Stephanie Tolson

**Ex Officio, Non-Voting Members Attendance:** Margaret Conroy; Sara Parker; George Rickerson

1. **Minutes** – The November 4, 2005 minutes were approved as revised.
2. **Potential Partnerships Report** – The Task Force discussion and approved this report with several revisions. The report is attached to these minutes.
3. **Identified Issues for Potential Partnerships** – The Task Force identified and discussed issues related to the 5 library sectors:
  - *Academic Libraries in Missouri* – Reviewed the locations of these 16 institutions and the general consensus was that it is unlikely that many will apply for membership. However, the Task Force did review the policy for the admission of new members dated 12/2/2000 and felt that some revisions were needed. Mollie will draft a revision making provision for evaluation of the institution to assure adherence to qualifications/standards and some consultation with the involved cluster plus adding charges for staff time in addition to the direct cost charges.
  - *K-12 Schools* – No issues identified.
  - *Special Libraries* – Issues are primarily the same as public libraries.
  - *Public Libraries* – These issues are a primary charge of the Task Force and have been identified in the review of Mobius documents and particularly the review of the Cooperating Partners document. Sara suggested that Mobius might include in the expansion planning a request for funds to the Secretary of State's Office for public library one time costs and the restoration of some public monies to assist in the maintenance of the CLP. Members supported this perspective, as it would certainly be a win-win situation for libraries and citizens alike.
  - *Consortia* – No issues identified.
4. **Great Plains Network Agreement** – George distributed the GPN Consortium Agreement as an example of a consortium set-up without a sponsor.
5. **Consortium with UM** – George followed-up on the possibility of a structure similar to GPN where Mobius members would each sign an agreement with UM with another document defining the consortium and how it functions. Due to the way Mobius functions with UM as the host institution, UM is the legal entity for Mobius and UM is the owner of all of the consortium's assets. Other incentives for this structure include access to the infrastructure and particularly cash flow for

operational payments. In his discussion with counsel, it is unlikely that UM would work with a non-profit (should Mobius decide on that alternative) that it does not control.

Again, there was some discussion regarding some institutions that might not want to sign-off on a completely new agreement and posed the possibility of achieving any changes with an amendment to the current document.

In discussing a possible structure with public libraries, the fundamental issue is whether Mobius is interested in maintaining control or sharing this control with the public libraries. Public libraries are not interested in forming a consortium among all publics but would do so solely for the purpose of a partnership with Mobius (where only participating publics would join).

Steve reviewed the original guidelines that were established for cooperating partners. Visiting patron function is disallowed; only library to library borrowing via InnReach is permissible. There is no participation in governance except the voting membership on 2 advisory committees. Each cooperating partner was set-up individually. They are not able to take advantage of buying into the electronic database licenses. It was originally thought that cataloging standards and authority control were not issues but the recent long-range planning activities brought these forward as being desired.

6. **Cooperating Partners Agreement** – The following changes were recommended for the document *Mobius Cooperating Partners* dated April 16, 2003:
  - Hardware, Software, and Resource Sharing Arrangements – change bullet 4 to indicate must *intersect* with the courier system.
  - Operational Issues – combine bullet 2 and bullet 8 regarding authorized borrowers; Change bullet 7 to indicate the CP sets the borrowing limits as long as they do not exceed the Mobius standard; bullet 9 should specify that a CP only needs 1 intersecting stop with the courier system; change bullet 12 to ...regulating INNReach activity including cataloging standards and authority control...
7. **Council Report** – The next Mobius Council meeting is January 27, 2006. Laura will give an introduction to the Task Force as part of the strategic planning outcomes. Steve will present the background and parameters established for the current Mobius cooperating partners. Cathye will discuss the deliberations of the Task Force and share information on the public library survey and the *Potential Partnerships* document.
8. **Review of Task Force Charge** – Cathye will work on documenting *Identify issues concerning membership, partnerships, relationships with other agencies, and growth*. George will work on the cost portion; Laura and Julia, the benefits portion of *Identify costs/benefits of potential partnerships and relations*.
9. **Next Meeting** – January 26, 2005, 1:00 p.m. in Columbia.

## **Potential Partnerships**

### **MOBIUS Governance and Growth Management**

From the Committee Charge:

- *Identify potential partnerships and areas for cooperation*

The MOBIUS Task Force for Governance and Growth Management (MGGM) identified 5 library sectors to consider for potential partnerships. Each is described below.

#### **Academic Libraries in Missouri**

There are 16 academic institutions in Missouri that appear to meet the MOBIUS criteria for membership but have not made application to do such (with the exception of one that previously withdrew their application). The Task Force has concluded that this sector will not be an area of major growth for MOBIUS nor has it verified the eligibility of each of the institutions. These institutions are listed here for information: Aquinas Institute of Theology, Barnes-Jewish College of Nursing and Allied Health, Calvary Bible College and Theological Seminary, Central Bible College, Cleveland Chiropractic College, College of the Ozarks, Concordia Seminary, Deaconess College of Nursing, Evangel University, Kansas City University of Medicine and Biosciences, Lester L. Cox College of Nursing and Health Sciences, Park University, Research College of Nursing, Saint Luke's College, Southeast Missouri Hospital College of Nursing and Health Sciences, Wentworth Military Academy and Junior College.

#### **K-12 Schools**

The Task Force discussed this issue with State Librarian Sara Parker who advised that the strategy for K-12 is through the public libraries. This sector is not considered an area of growth for Mobius.

#### **Special Libraries**

The Task Force has concluded that this sector is not an area of major growth for MOBIUS. In the past, MOBIUS has had discussions with the Linda Hall Library but decided that a fee-based arrangement was not something we wanted to do. There were also discussions with the St. Louis Research Libraries Consortium that did not come to fruition. In recent discussions with the library directors in this consortium, there may still be an interest here that could be pursued. There are some issues such as the method they use for consistently maintaining each library's records, non-standard subject headings (different thesaurus), collections of mostly non-circulating items, and cost. These issues are surmountable and there are possibilities for State funding to handle some of the one-time costs. This is not considered a large area of growth but the larger academic libraries in MOBIUS are interested in this potential partnership.

#### **Public Libraries**

The Task Force conducted a survey of public libraries in Missouri to determine if there is an audience interested in more resource sharing between academic and public libraries. Eighty-seven (87) of 170 surveys were returned for a return rate of slightly over 50%.

The responses indicated that there are 14 libraries that are *very interested* and 38 that are *somewhat interested*. The responses of these 52 libraries indicate that there is a significant possibility that MOBIUS could and probably should give consideration to some type of potential partnership with these libraries. It is also likely that once scenarios are developed and discussions take place, more interest among other public libraries might be generated.

In addition to asking a question about interest, the survey also queried funding, timeline, MARC records, online catalog, and more information. The responses to these questions speak more to the actual technical and financial feasibility for future partnerships. A spreadsheet is attached here that lists the responses to these questions. Assuming that no public library will replace its current system with Millennium in order to work with MOBIUS, the public libraries that we would be most likely to work with in the foreseeable future are those that are *very interested* and are on Innovative or SIRSI.

Of the Innovative public libraries, 1 respondent is *very interested* and 2 are *somewhat interested*. Of the SIRSI public libraries, MOBIUS has already had conversations with Mid-Continent and Daniel Boone, and both are ready to move forward with MOBIUS. There are also 2 other libraries whose survey responses indicate *very interested* and are on SIRSI. Innovative is currently involved with Michigan for an interface with SIRSI. If this model is successful, it could provide the technical feasibility for all 4 of these libraries and possibly conversations with the additional 5 SIRSI libraries that are *somewhat interested*. Following an Innovative interface with SIRSI, it is reasonable to expect that a technical interface with Dynix would soon follow.

### **Consortia**

There presently are no consortia that are actively discussing a potential partnership with MOBIUS. To actively consider this possibility, the most important issues would include the technical linking of systems and the proximity that makes delivery efficient. Linking with other consortia is unlikely at this time or the near future.

## Public Library Survey by System

Library	Question 1 Interest	Question 5 System	Question 6 More Info
McDonald County Library	No at this time	Book Systems/Atrium	no answer
Wright County Library	No at this time	Book Systems/Atrium	no answer
Cedar County Library District	Somewhat	Book Systems/Webrary	Yes
Gentry County Library	Somewhat	Book Systems/Webrary	Yes
Mercer County Library	No at this time	Book Systems/Webrary	Yes
Scotland County Memorial Library	No at this time	Book Systems/Webrary	Yes
Ray County Library	No at this time	Booksystem/Concourse	no answer
St. Louis Public Library	Somewhat	DRA	Yes
Brentwood Public Library	Very	Dynix	Yes
Cape Girardeau Public Library	Very	Dynix	Yes
Kirkwood Public Library	Very	Dynix	Yes
University City Public Library	Very	Dynix	Yes
Maplewood Public Library	Somewhat	Dynix	no answer
Rock Hill Public Library	Somewhat	Dynix	Yes
Webster Groves Public Library	Somewhat	Dynix	Yes
Adair County Public Library	No at this time	Dynix	Yes
Joplin Public Library	No at this time	Dynix	Yes
Cameron Public Library	Somewhat	Follett	Yes
Carthage Public Library	Somewhat	Follett	Yes
Worth County Library	Somewhat	Follett	Yes
Stone County Library	Very	Innovative	Yes
Lebanon-Laclede County Library	Somewhat	Innovative	Yes
Webster County Library	Somewhat	Innovative	Yes
Boonslick Regional Library	Very	Lib Corp	Yes
Poplar Bluff Public Library	Very	Lib Corp	no answer
St. Clair County Library	Very	Lib Corp	Yes
Barton County Library	Somewhat	Lib Corp	no answer
Douglas County Public Library	Somewhat	Lib Corp	Yes
Mississippi County Library District	Somewhat	Lib Corp	Yes
Riverside Regional Library	Somewhat	Lib Corp	no answer
Mexico-Audrain County Library	No at this time	Lib Corp	no answer
Rolla Public Library	No at this time	Lib Corp	Yes
Barry Lawrence Regional Library	No interest	Lib Corp	no answer
Trails Regional Library	Somewhat	Listen 2000	Yes
Livingston County Library	No at this time	Listen 2000	no answer
Scenic Regional Library	No interest	Listen 2000	Yes
Bonne Terre Memorial Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Brookfield Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Crystal City Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Dallas County Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Desloge Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
DeSoto Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Louisiana Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Marceline Carnegie Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Ozark Regional Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Park Hills Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Pulaski County Library District	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Putnam County Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Seymour Community Library	Somewhat	no answer	no answer

## Public Library Survey by System

Library	Question 1 Interest	Question 5 System	Question 6 More Info
Sullivan Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Van Buren/Carter County Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
West Plains Public Library	Somewhat	no answer	Yes
Bloomfield Public Library	No at this time	no answer	no answer
Centralia Public Library	No at this time	no answer	Yes
Eminence Public Library	No at this time	no answer	no answer
Farmington Public Library	No at this time	no answer	Yes
Howard County Library	No at this time	no answer	no answer
Monroe City Public Library	No at this time	no answer	no answer
Morgan County Library	No at this time	no answer	no answer
Mountain View Public Library	No at this time	no answer	Yes
Price James Library (Tipton)	No at this time	no answer	no answer
Puxico Public Library	No at this time	no answer	no answer
Rich Hill Memorial Library	No at this time	no answer	no answer
Camden County Library District	No interest	no answer	no answer
Clarence Public Library	No interest	no answer	no answer
Fairview Community Library volunteer	No interest	no answer	no answer
LaPlata Public Library	No interest	no answer	no answer
New Madrid County Library	No interest	no answer	no answer
Norborne Public Library	No interest	no answer	no answer
Ozark County Library volunteer	No interest	no answer	no answer
Sikeston Public Library	No interest	no answer	Yes
Rolling Hills Consolidated Library	No interest	no answer	Yes
Keller Public Library	No at this time	OPAC	no answer
Grundy Co. Jewett Norris	Very	Sagebrush	Yes
Shelbina Carnegie Public Library	Very	SIRS Mandarin	Yes
Maryville Public Library	Somewhat	SIRS Mandarin	Yes
Cass County Public Library	Very	SIRSI	Yes
Daniel Boone Regional Library	Very	SIRSI	Yes
Little Dixie Regional Libraries	Very	SIRSI	Yes
Mid-Continent Public Library	Very	SIRSI	Yes
Jefferson County Library	Somewhat	SIRSI	Yes
Kansas City Public Library	Somewhat	SIRSI	no answer
Neosho/Newton County Library	Somewhat	SIRSI	Yes
North Kansas City Public Library	Somewhat	SIRSI	Yes
St. Joseph Public Library	Somewhat	SIRSI	Yes
Sedalia Public Library	No at this time	Winnebago	no answer
Washington County Library	No at this time	Winnebago	no answer

## **MOBIUS POLICY ON ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS**

As of December 1, 2000, institutions wishing to be admitted to MOBIUS must sign a letter of intent directed to the Executive Director of MOBIUS. If an institution's application for membership is approved by the MOBIUS Council, implementation of the institution in the Common Library Platform will be scheduled in consultation with that institution, provided that no institution that joins MOBIUS after July 1, 1998 will be implemented in the CLP earlier than July 1, 2002.

The following costs of CLP implementation for new members will be paid by MOBIUS from appropriated funds: INNOPAC software and hardware expansion costs; data conversion costs; and training will be provided. Costs within the institution for desktop computer upgrades, network implementation and upgrades, barcoding and retrospective conversion are the responsibility of the institution.

The membership fee during the first year of membership will be prorated based on the month the membership becomes active.

Adopted by the MOBIUS Council on December 1, 2000.

## **MOBIUS POLICY ON ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS**

Academic institutions wishing to be admitted to MOBIUS must sign a letter of intent directed to the Executive Director of MOBIUS. If an institution's application for membership is approved by the MOBIUS Council, implementation of the institution in the Common Library Platform will be scheduled in consultation with that institution.

Institutions accepted for MOBIUS membership are responsible for the direct costs associated with their addition to the consortium, including III costs and data conversion costs. [Current estimate for these costs is approximately \$40,000 – 50,000.] Costs within the institution for desktop computer upgrades, network implementation and upgrades, barcoding and retrospective conversion are the responsibility of the institution.

An additional one-time fee of \$10,000 will be assessed each new member to cover indirect costs associated with incorporating the institution into the Common Library Platform such as training time and other services provided by the MOBIUS Consortium Office.

Each new member accepted must also meet normal membership expectations as outlined in other MOBIUS documents. Examples of these expectations include adherence to cataloging standards, maintaining of library collections, contributing to the growth of the shared resources within the consortium, providing authority control for cataloging records, and complying with all policies and procedures applicable to consortium members.



The annual membership fee during the first year of membership will be prorated based on the month the membership becomes active.

Revised by the MOBIUS Council on ????

DRAFT 12/13/05

**DRAFT**  
**For discussion**

**Growth Issues**  
**MOBIUS Governance and Growth Management**

From the Committee Charge:

- *Identify issues concerning membership, partnerships, relationships with other agencies, and growth.*
1. CBHE – no longer participates in funding and governance as specified in Mobius documents.
  2. UM – is currently the fiscal and legal agent for Mobius.
  3. Current membership – continued stability of centralized server environment.
  4. Academics that are not full members of Mobius – upon application for full membership:
    - Evaluate qualifications and requirements.
    - How to add to existing cluster structure with cluster participation.
    - Direct and indirect costs for new member.
  5. Special libraries:
    - At this time, limited to potential of St. Louis group
    - Desired benefits
    - Terms of agreement
    - Direct and indirect costs.
  6. Public libraries:
    - Timeframe for recommendation (5-10 years?)
    - Qualifications (technical (system), librarian, collection, standards)
    - Direct and indirect costs.
    - Any special issues of large, urban libraries.
    - Hardware and software growth issues (including cost) for InnReach.
  7. Governance structure for growth:
    - Status quo (academic full membership with others as cooperating partners)
    - Publics join consortium under State Library sponsorship as Mobius Cooperating Partners
    - Change Mobius governance structure.....
    -
  8. Memorandum of Understanding – will an addendum work for adding new information on UM/CBHE governance Status and the addition of cooperating partners in regard to the consortium? Or, do we need new agreements? (Content pending certain recommendations)

1/26/06

## **Partnering with Public Libraries—Benefits and Concerns      (Rein and Schneider)**

### **Benefits:**

Increased population served would appeal to legislators and may result in some restoration of MOBIUS funds.

The experience with Springfield-Greene and Mid-Rivers has been very successful.

Patrons get access to materials not typically collected by academic libraries.

We participate in contributing to educating life long learners, including our own alumni.

Relationships between public and academic libraries would be strengthened.

Having the same system would facilitate ease of use and transferability for all patrons.

MOBIUS access for public libraries would make processing requests easier than going through OCLC and mailing books to requesting libraries.

Institutions that have distant education programs in Missouri would benefit from distributed access to MOBIUS.

Assume that the public libraries would cover their own direct costs and pay a joining fee so would not be a financial burden and would generate some funds for MOBIUS.

Assume that public libraries will sign agreement stipulating the standards (including cataloging standards) by which they would abide, so quality of CLP would remain high.

### **Concerns:**

Do public libraries want to become full members? If so, the MOU would need major overhaul and buy-in by CEOs.

If they are cooperating partners, would their patrons have “Walk-in” privileges? Would this be open to all public library patrons, including children, which might be a disadvantage to academic libraries?

Expanding our partnership with public libraries may increase public use of materials and facilities, creating a burden on some libraries, especially small, specialized libraries.

Increased membership in MOBIUS would generate more borrowing and could lead to longer turn-around times due to increased workloads.

Academic libraries might need to restrict borrowing of heavily-used portions of their collections [such as audio-visual and curriculum materials].

Public libraries would need to adhere to established cataloging standards.

## Dierberg, Cathye

---

**From:** MOBIUS Governance Forum [MOBGOV-L@PO.MISSOURI.EDU] on behalf of Rickerson, George [RickersonG@UMSYSTEM.EDU]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 19, 2006 12:54 PM  
**To:** MOBGOV-L@PO.MISSOURI.EDU  
**Subject:** [MOBGOV-L] Costs of potential relationships and partnerships

Greetings -

One of my tasks from the 12/6 meeting of the task force was to develop information about the costs of potential relationships and partnerships. This has turned out to be hard to do in the abstract. After thinking through several imaginary scenarios I would have to say I do not believe there are monetary costs that always are present regardless of the initiative. Certainly it is possible to think of ideas which would require the acquisition of software or hardware, but, like most other possible monetary costs, whether these occur will be specific to the idea. The idea that was considered several months ago of forming some kind of resource sharing relationship with Prospector in Colorado could involve monetary costs if it was determined that the two consortia wanted to pay III to develop some enhancements for INN-Reach that would make such a relationship easier to manage.

Another type of cost that can occur when forming relationships or partnerships is political in nature. For example, a partnership with an in-state entity might entail some loss of autonomy or control over some aspect of MOBIUS' programs. Having a relationship with the state in the form of receiving an appropriation very definitely entails some of these types of costs.

My recommendation to MGGM would be that it include in its recommendations one that requires some level of formal business case analysis for suggested partnerships. The extent of this type of analysis will vary, depending on the specifics of a proposal, but it always will involve documentation so that it is clear to everyone what the basis of the decision is, whether we go forward with the suggestion or not.

thanks

George.

\*\*\*\*\*

George Rickerson  
Executive Director  
MOBIUS

Interim Assoc. V.P. for Applications  
University of Missouri  
3212 Lemone Industrial Boulevard  
Columbia, MO 65201

573-882-7233 Fax 573-884-3395  
Toll-free in Missouri: 1-877-3MOBIUS  
rickersong@umsystem.edu  
<http://mobius.missouri.edu>

\*\*\*\*\*