

**Minutes**  
**MOBIUS Governance and Growth Management**  
**November 4, 2005**

**Members Attendance:** Richard Amelung; Jim Cosgwell; Sarah Cron; Valerie Darst; Cathye Dierberg (chair); Mollie Dinwiddie; Erlene Dudley; Liz MacDonald; Wendy McGrane; Steve Stoan

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

1. **Minutes** – The October 7, 2005 minutes were approved as revised.
2. **Research Libraries Report** – Richard reported that he had conversations regarding the III research libraries in St. Louis. Although not final, reports indicate that the libraries are likely interested in raising the Mobius issue again. As previously indicated, there are issues such as the method they use for maintaining each library's records, non-standard subject headings, collections of mostly non-circulating items, and cost. Sara posed the potential of State Library funding. Richard and Shirley will speak with this group again and report back to the task force.
3. **Not-For-Profit Report** – George reported that there is still more work to be done in looking at the relationship of a not-for-profit with UM and whether it would be a possibility. He noted that Mobius would still need to employ an executive director and support staff plus would need to conduct the business aspects separately from UM. Currently Mobius doesn't pay for overhead so a not-for-profit would need to absorb these costs. Cash flow is also an issue. George indicated that the benefits for a not-for-profit have not been explored. He discussed how the Great Plains Network works as a consortium and contracts with MOREnet for services; the executive director is at Nebraska. He will obtain the 2 agreements that are in use so we can review at the next meeting. Sara reported on LIFT where the non-for-profit is in a situation where it gets public money through the State Library. Erlene shared some basic information on forming a non-for-profit and indicated that the issues are the costs and the benefits. MLNC is already established in the State. George will do more investigation on a non-for-profit with UM for the next meeting. Valerie pointed out that we need to work with the presidents if we should decide on big changes; their perspective on another political subdivision is important.
4. **Public Library Survey** – Erlene discussed the results of the public library survey as distributed with the agenda. The written report includes 86 respondents (return rate of 50.6%). Conclusions of the survey are:
  - More than half of the respondents to the survey (60%) are **very or somewhat interested** in a statewide online system which would include web-based direct patron borrowing of materials from all participating

members and delivery of library materials by courier between libraries, such as that enjoyed by the current MOBIUS Cooperating partners.

- More than three-fourths (78.6%) of the respondents to the survey that are **very interested** in such a system are willing to provide all or some funding to support their participation.
- More than three-fourths (76%) of the respondents to the survey that are **somewhat interested** in such a system could participate only with outside funding.
- Almost half of the libraries that are **not interested** at this time or not interested at all in such a system do not have an online catalog available via the Internet (41%). There is some evidence that these are libraries with volunteer staffs and donated collections.
- More than three-fourths of the respondents (80%) have their catalog records in MARC format.

The survey was very successful in regard to identifying potential partners in the public library sector. It was noted that the survey itself generated interest in cooperation. Most of the libraries that declined are not prepared or positioned for any cooperative program at this time. Both large urban public libraries did respond; however, St. Charles City County Library and St. Louis County Library did not.

5. **Service Policy Agreement** – Richard led the discussion regarding this document:

- Sections 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 need to be modified regarding CBHE as the sponsoring agency.
- Section 3 – how renewed? Maybe annually as defined in the Bylaws III.V.A.
- Signatories need to be modified

6. **Bylaws (rev 2003 June 3)** – Cathye led the discussion regarding the bylaws:

- II.A – Move second sentence on ex-officio members to III. C.1 & D.1. Change CBHE to State Library.
- II.C – Add wording: ...and policies of Mobius *available on the Web*.
- Remove II.E (special membership).
- Keep II.F but renumber to II.E.
- III.D – Add UMC representative to the Executive Committee as ex-officio, non- voting. Significant discussion took place regarding this. Task Force is recommending because it is important to recognize UM being responsible for 1/3 of the revenue and 1/2 of the collection in the union catalog. Recommendation is more political than substantive and felt to benefit Mobius.
- III.D – Add a representative from the cooperating partners to the Executive Committee.
- III.E.1 – Add statement that the executive committee is responsible for keeping Council representatives informed on all consortium business and encouraged to use push technology appropriately.
- III.E.6. Change to: The Treasurer is responsible for staying fully informed and being able to communicate financial information to the Mobius Council and Executive Committee.

- III.E.8. This section needs to be enforced so that the officers present annual reports to the Council.
  - III.I.4 – Add to the duties of the Executive Director: custodian of official records.
  - III.J.2.a – Revise to: ...must be drawn from member institutions *or cooperating partners*.
  - III.J.2.b – Hold on this until we can define cluster in the sense of cooperating partners and those running their own servers.
  - III.K.1. – Revise to: ... must be drawn from member institutions *or cooperating partners*.
  - Definition of terms – define cluster in regard to those running their own servers and cooperating partners.
7. **Long Range Plan Review 2001** – Cathye led this review for Julia who sent the information regarding the accomplishments of the 2001 plan. There were no issues to bring forward in this document.
  8. **Mobius Review 2003** – Jim led this discussion and the task force discussed items regarding continuing review, open season for ports, and the need to have solid relationships with the legislators and the governor's office. There were no issues to bring forward in this document.
  9. **Next Meeting** – December 2, 2005 in Columbia.