

Minutes
MOBIUS Governance and Growth Management
October 7, 2005

Members Attendance: Richard Amelung; Jim Cosgwell; Sarah Cron; Valerie Darst; Cathye Dierberg (chair); Mollie Dinwiddie; Erlene Dudley; Liz MacDonald; Wendy McGrane; Laura Rein; Julia Schneider; Steve Stoan; Stephanie Tolson

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

1. **Public Library Survey** – Erlene reported that a letter and survey was sent by the subcommittee to public library directors. Sara (State Library) provided the address labels with the MCO office handling the mailing. Erlene had 39 surveys completed and returned to her and gave a preliminary report. The cut-off date is October 14 and a more comprehensive report will be provided at the next meeting.
2. **Public Library Systems** – Donna presented information she collected regarding the automation systems of Missouri's public libraries:
 - Dynix – 6 systems plus MLC (composed of 9 libraries)
 - The Library Corporation (TLC) – 22 systems
 - Sagebrush – 9 systems
 - Follett – 3 systems
 - Winnebago – 1 system
 - III – St. Louis County plus the 7 libraries in COOL
 - SIRSI – 15 systems including Cass County, Daniel Boone, Hannibal, Heartland Regional, Howard County, KC Public, Keller Public, Little Dixie, Marshall Public, Mid-Continent, North KC Public, Rolling Hills, St. Joseph Public
 - DRA – St. Louis Public
3. **Host Institution Agreement** – Issues included:
 - The Host agreement is important in that it is the contract that defines the terms and conditions under which UM hosts the MCO.
 - Initially the Coordinating Board for Higher Education was the sponsoring agency for all appropriations and authority. Today, the funding does not flow through CBHE nor is there DHE involvement in the current administration of MOBIUS. Since an agreement is no longer appropriate between CBHE and UM, there needs to be another agency to serve as sponsor. All references to CBHE in the host agreement may need to be updated pending decision on a future sponsor. A conversation with CBHE also needs to happen at some point in this process. Three alternatives were discussed:

*UM – in past years the State has allocated Mobius funds to UM; UM is the legal entity for the consortium; problem arises when budget requests are made and must be submitted via UM; may be subject to local issues and budgeting strategies that should not bear on the consortium.

*State Library – good to be attached to a State agency; good source of funding support; integral in the formation of Mobius; concerns include being under a state official, changing State Librarian timing.

*Not-for-profit – some discussion whether we could look at a not-for-profit scenario in the context of the State Library, MLNC, or other entity. George was concerned about UM not being able to handle not-for-profit but will investigate with Erlene and Sarah and report back.

- Some discussion took place regarding Section 5 – Mobius Executive Director. Due to changes at UM, particularly the vacant UM Vice President for Information Technology, change of assignments at UM need to be reviewed as to how it affects the host agreement and Mobius. The agreement needs to be updated to further clarify relationships for the future of Mobius; all references to a UM position in the document may need to be updated. The position of the task force is that Cathye contact the chair of the Executive Committee and recommend that this item be dealt with there (i.e. updating the document after decisions have been made that make that possible to do).
- The Treasurer as mentioned in section 6 has not traditionally presented the budget nor has direct responsibility for the preparation of such. Change this to agree with any changes regarding the Treasurer in the Bylaws document.
- Delete last sentence in 7.2 as that task has been accomplished.
- Replace MOCBHE with Mobius Executive Committee in section 10.

4. **Memorandum of Understanding** – Issues included:

- Same issue as in the host agreement regarding the sponsoring agency. Change references to CBHE pending sponsor decision. However, do not change the historical information in 1.1 regarding CBHE. New language needs to be added to this paragraph regarding cooperating partners and/or future liaisons with other libraries/consortia.
- Add the State Library and MLNC as ex-officio in section 2.2 and 2.4. Eliminate CBHE in both sections.
- Change CBHE to DHE and add the State Library to 5.4.
- Add 6.9: Continue to operate within a centrally located server environment to maintain existing centralized infrastructure. Need to add a statement that defines under what basis members can choose to run their own server. Can grandfather WUSTL and SLU but future withdrawal from the centralized structure would severely harm the financial stability of Mobius.
- Some discussion for and against adding that members on the shared infrastructure must be on the MOREnet backbone. No decision made; references remain the same in 6.2.

- 1.2 and 6.0 maybe changed to distinguish between responsibilities for full members and cooperating partners.
 - Delete “received after July 1, 1998” in 7.1.
5. **InnReach Linking** – George reported that the key issue is delivery of materials when discussing the possibility of linking to another InnReach system; it needs to be a system close to Missouri. One good example would be Colorado where Lanter currently exists. The technical part of linking would be a project with Innovative and the design work would need to be done. From the integration standpoint, Innovative would invent the software.
 6. **Linking Disparate Systems** – Michigan is the model to watch (InnReach/SIRSI) but the lag time is too great; the central server changes format. We need to watch this and evaluate in 12-24 months. In the CARL example, the software to interact with InnReach requires work from the other vendor and it must also be kept in synch over the years.
 7. **Possible Missouri Partners** – There are approximately ½ dozen academic institutions in Missouri who are not interested in joining Mobius. It was noted that Rankin is a member but is still working on record conversion. When discussing the research libraries, Richard volunteered to talk with them to determine if there is any interest.
 8. **Next Meeting** – November 4, 2005 in Columbia.