

MOBIUS Cooperative Collection Development Task Force Meeting
May 5, 2003, Lincoln University

Present: Anne Barker (MERLIN) (Co-chair), Robert Frizzell (Towers), Patricia Gregory (MERLIN), Gary Harris (MCO), Tesuk Im (LANCE), Rebecca Kiel (SWAN), Craig Kubic (WILO), Lois Marshall (Arthur), Eugenia McKee (Bridges), Ann Riley (Archway) (Co-chair), Bill Wibbing (WU).

Absent: Ed Buis (Galahad)

1. Introductions and new members.

Welcome to Lois Marshall of Lincoln U., replacing Mary Heady, Molly Dinwidde of CMSU, replacing John Small, and Bill Wibbing from Washington University.

2. Approval of minutes from April 7 teleconference with no changes.

3. Reports on other consortia.

Tesuk Im on KY/TN. No information yet from Vanderbilt. [NOTE: Tesuk subsequently received an email from Vanderbilt, which she forwarded to us. Their information is available at their webpage: <http://www.lib.utk.edu/~alliance/collectiondevelopment.html>] Conference call with representatives from the Kentucky Virtual Library, which functions much as MLNC, providing network and some electronic database purchasing for a consortium of 28 academic libraries, hospital libraries, public libraries, school libraries. Cooperation began in the 1980s, started database purchasing in 1995. "Good working group, non-political", but no structured decision-making process. Fully state funded at the beginning, but membership fees from individual institutions based on size, ranging from \$125 to \$2000. \$2 million from the state for databases, but state funding is decreasing. Assessment data will be available a couple of months from now. Some minutes are available on their web page: <http://www.kyvl.org/html/about/committees/collections/members.shtml>.

Grant funding only for one-time projects, not recurring. No money for software, so no recommendation.

Becky Kiel on Georgia and Alabama. Georgia has an agreement on final copy retention with last copies going to UGA. They've talked about collection development some years ago, but little activity. Gallileo brokers products, but they provided no information on how they make decisions, etc. No word from Alabama.

Bob Frizzel on UT-Austin. No active cooperative collection development. The state of Texas provides databases for consortium of multi-type libraries--schools and public as well as academic. No thoughts on cooperative acquisition beyond databases. No answer from Florida. Tex-share is all state funded. From past experience Bob surmises decisions made by representatives to a board that chooses databases, similar to MERAC.

Anne Barker on ACRL workshop. The consortia involved--CONSORT, Five Colleges, Inc., and Tri-College Consortium--are all much smaller and cooperate at institutional level, not just the libraries. They're involved in a broad range of projects: notification of

cancellations and expensive purchases; de-duplication; database subscriptions; joint approval plans; digital special collections and asset management; distribution of cataloging; joint information literacy programs, etc. Some planning had been done on Mellon grants. See the handouts for more detail, especially on collection analysis: <http://www.brynmawr.edu/consortium/ACRLHandouts/ACRL.html>.

Bob raised the question of a cooperative agreement among the four UM campuses, both library collections and distribution of programs. Ann Riley recommended that he contact Ted Sheldon at UMKC to see if he has knowledge of such an agreement. [NOTE: I've checked with collection development people at UMC and they are aware of only ad hoc conversations among some selectors. AB]

Ann Riley on Minnesota, Ohio, and conveying Ed Buis's report on Illinois. Minnesota has a very active program. Each institution identifies areas in which it will specialize. Completely voluntary, but all public colleges and universities participate. No pooled funding. Another Tri-College: Concordia, MN state U. and ND State U. divide responsibility for collecting materials reviewed in *Choice*. Mention of the Brittle program in KS, involving 60 member libraries in preservation projects, supported by an electronic exchange list.

Illinois has five collection development groups, each with a line item in the Board of Higher Education budget. Began in 1980s. Projects funded through grants from the Commission of Higher Ed. See materials from Ed Buis: Illinois Libraries Cooperative Collection Management Program (<http://www.uic.edu/depts/lib/projects/resources/ilw/ccmcc.html>); Bylaws of the Illinois CCMP (<http://www.niulib.niu.edu/ccm/bylaws.html>); Illinois Cooperative Management Program (<http://www.crl.edu/info/ccd/ccdresp27.htm>). Opinion that this fragmentation into different groups may not be positive, may inhibit communication. Desirable to consider content more than format.

OhioLink has a committee making decisions, focused mainly on electronic projects. Similar to MOBIUS, but no clusters, central office runs INNReach, each institution supports its own platform. Running electronic databases, purchasing of electronic resources. Had institutions report on their perceived strengths. Digital media center.

4. Genie McKee on **collection analysis software**. WLN merged with OCLC in 1999. The present service is called Automated Collection Assessment and Analysis. Based on RLG conspectus, it uses Dewey, LC, NLM. Four types of analysis are available. (See <http://www.oclc.org/western/products/aca/>) Illinois has used this service. Lindenwood has just bought this and is using Maryville as basis of comparison.

5. Gary Harris reported on the task force at the most recent meeting of the **MOBIUS Council**. They had a copy of our report and no questions.

6. Anne Barker will make a presentation on the task force at the **MOBIUS Users Conference** on June 4. The plan is to give an overview of our work, a survey of projects

done by other consortia, and solicit feedback from attendees. Input from other task force members is most welcome.

7. Agreement that **task force documents may be shared with all others**. Gary will remove the password from our MOBIUS web page.

8. Pat Gregory presented a **draft of the charge** for the recommended committee. Agreement that communication with the State Library and MLNC would be beneficial, but these need not be represented on the committee. Some editing of the draft charge resulted in the following:

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.

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*
- *Explore opportunities for 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

9. Statistics and SCAT tables.

The duplication report from Robin shows broad duplication by cluster. A master SCAT table for collection development would have to be loaded on each cluster's machine at a cost of ~\$2500/cluster. This could provide more detailed data such as strengths, gaps, usage, age of collection, at a variety of levels--for the entire consortium, for a cluster or clusters, for individual institutions. Gary Harris will send us all SCAT tables from all the clusters and will investigate the Innopac collection analysis package and the OCLC collection analysis service. We could run a very general SCAT table with broad

categories first, and then develop more specific categories. Action points: investigate Innopac product, OCLC, SCAT tables, availability and cost. Interlibrary loan statistics may also indicate weaknesses and strengths of our collections. Anne Barker and Tesuk Im will look into the possibility of analyzing ILL transaction records.

9. Proposed contents of the implementation plan:

- committee charge
- template agreement,
- recommendations on SCAT table
- model projects

Agreement to leave open the possibility of central funding, while recognizing present fiscal difficulties. The proposed committee should seek new revenue from any available source.

10. Tasks:

- + Examine the SCAT tables that Gary will send
- + Review the Illinois template agreement, consider changes for our purposes
- + Gary will check on prices for the OCLC collection analysis service, additional SCAT tables, and the Innopac collection analysis product.
- + Anne Barker and Tesuk will check on ILL statistics.
- + Anne Barker and Ann Riley will work on a rough draft or at least an outline of our final report.

11. Next meeting at possibly at Central Missouri State University, at 10:30 June 30, possibly beginning the evening before?