

Mobius Cooperative Collection Development ~~Committee~~ Task Force Meeting
Oct. 25, 2002, hosted by CMSU, Warrensburg.

Present: Anne Barker, Pat Gregory, Gary Harris, Mary Heady, Tesuk Im, Becky Kiel, Craig Kubic, Ann Riley, John Small, Robert Frizzell

Absent: Ed Buis

Meeting opened at 10:35 with introductions of those present and a reading of the charge of the committee. " The MOBIUS Collection Development Task Force is responsible for exploring cooperative collection development by MOBIUS member institutions. The Task Force will operate in two phases. During Phase I (over six-months with a report to the Executive Committee in February 2003), the Task Force will be charged with investigating the management issues associated with cooperative collection development among 50+ institutions. During Phase II (over six-months with a report to the Executive Committee in August 2003), the Task Force will be charged with developing a cooperative collection development implementation plan for MOBIUS."

Ann Riley raised the question of whether we are to look at institutional management issues or collection management issues or both. The resulting discussion suggests both, as decisions on collaborative projects are made in the context of local collection decisions and as collection management decisions both affect and are affected by institutional management decisions.

Discussion of what we envision collaborative collection development to be brought out the following elements:

- Identification of collection strengths through comparison of collection analysis, collection policy statements, comparison of programs
- Sharing information/decisions regarding weeding, withdrawing, canceling subscriptions, including sharing discarded materials through gifts and exchanges
- Group purchases or coordination in purchasing expensive items to minimize duplication
- Group licensing or negotiating copyright or other license issues in order to gain greater leverage

Management issues so far identified include the following:

- Communication, specifically about what we own and lack
- Financial incentive to participate in collaborative projects (In this context, the committee agrees that cost SAVINGS are NOT the major incentive; rather improving quality, service and efficiency with little or no increase in costs are the motivating factors.)
- The need to measure library performance in terms of access rather than ownership. (See <http://www.arl.org/stats/newmeas/newmeas.html>)
- Buy-in/commitment from MOBIUS members, including librarians, faculty, and administration.
- Clarity about the goals and responsibilities of the task force

- Recognition that not all MOBIUS members may be involved in each collaborative project. With varying types and sizes of institutions it may be advantageous to encourage sub-groups in pursuing more specific projects, e.g. those with aviation programs coordinating in that area; theological schools coordinating in that area, etc.
- Education about collection management tools, e.g. SCAT tables
- Clarity about communication paths from and to the committee: e.g., how would this committee dovetail with MERAC.

Discussion on collecting information on collection development policies and practices resulted in the following ideas:

- A first step would be to collect policy statements from the participating institutions. But policy statements may be non-existent or may not reflect reality or may be too general to convey useful information.
- The OCLC/Amigos software might be used to compare holdings, but it doesn't work with Dewey classification.
- A survey may collect more useful information. Gary indicated he could handle technical aspects of conducting the survey. Ann Riley recommended getting help from SLCC research staff on formulating questions. Information we'd wish to collect includes:
 - Programs offered
 - Collection development policies
 - Acquisition budgets, funding for journals, monographs, electronic resources
 - Number of items acquired
 - Methods of acquisition
 - Analysis of holdings, strengths/weaknesses of collection
 - Areas for potential collaboration
- The SCAT tables and III collection management reports might be useful for comparing holdings, but SCAT tables can be used only within each cluster, not across clusters. To compare across clusters we'd have to set up a separate comparative SCAT table for each cluster.
- We need to include more qualitative aspects: last title negotiations, checking lists, meetings of selectors to provide more anecdotal detail.
- MOBIUS lending records might give us an idea of which collection strengths are being tapped by other institutions.
- Pat indicated that the MERLIN Collection Development Committee has worked on comparing electronic resources and done detailed evaluations of databases for potential purchase. **They've divided these into the following categories: Business, Arts & Humanities, Social Science, Science, Engineering & Technology, General/Multidisciplinary, and Health Sciences.**

Actions taken at this meeting:

- Ann Riley and Anne Barker named co-chairs.
- In-person meeting tentatively scheduled for Feb. 7 at MCO in Columbia, pending date of MOBIUS council meeting.

- Online meeting scheduled for the morning of Nov. 21.
- One additional online meeting anticipated in mid-January.
- Gary announced an invitation for a speaker in Potsdam NY April 2-3, to be posted to the listserv.
- Gary distributed copies of the Illinois Cooperative Collection Managment Program Statement of Principles (<http://www.niulib.niu.edu/ccm/statepri.html>)
- Tesuk distributed copies of Gay N. Dannelly, "'Uneasy Lies the Head': Selecting Resources in a Consortial Setting," *Journal of Library Administration*, v. 28 no. 2 1999, p. 57-67.

Actions to be taken:

- Seek representative from Bridges so that all clusters will be represented.
- Gary will email copies of SCAT tables and collection development reports for consideration.
- Those who have electronic classroom software (WebCT, Blackboard, etc.) will check on hosting the online meetings.
- Gary will check on archiving the committee listserv.
- Ann Riley and Gary will seek more information on the committee's charge.
- Pat will provide information on the 7 subject categories identified by MCDC.
- Immediate goal is to determine what sort of a report we should produce for February.

After a delicious lunch, a tour of the beautiful new library building, and some continued discussion, the meeting adjourned at 2:00. Special thanks to John for hosting the meeting and participating despite being ill.

Submitted by Anne Barker, Oct. 28, 2002.

Revised Nov. 26, 2002