MembersPresent:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Julie Andresen | Hannibal-LaGrange University |
| Waheeda Bilal | MO State Library |
| Debbie Bradshaw | Nazarene Theological Seminary |
| Chris Brite | Conception Abbey and Theological Seminary |
| James Capeci | MO Southern State University |
| Bryan Carson | MO Valley College |
| Janet Caruthers | Columbia College |
| Eileen Condon | Webster University/Eden Seminary |
| Valerie Darst | Moberly Area Community College |
| Eric Deatherage | Crowder College |
| Ellen Dickman | Logan University |
| Cynthia Dudenhoffer | Central Methodist University |
| Erlene Dudley | William Woods University |
| Lisa Farrell | East Central College |
| Sally Gibson | Missouri Western State University |
| Barbara Glackin | Southeast Missouri State University |
| Renee Gorrell | Goldfarb School of Nursing |
| Rebecca Hamlett | William Jewell College |
| Kenette Harder | Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary |
| Sandra Harris | Maryville University |
| Doug Holland | MO Botanical Gardens |
| Melissa Hopkins | Mineral Area College |
| Emily Jaycox | MO History Museum |
| Jon Jones | Baptist Bible College |
| Dan Kammer | Stephens College |
| Haiying Sarah Qian Li | Lincoln University |
| Liz MacDonald | Lindenwood University |
| Katie Marney | Culver-Stockton University |
| Sharon McCaslin | Fontbonne University |
| Rebekah McKinney | MO Baptist University |
| Maggi Mueller | Saint Paul School of Theology |
| Rebecca Nichols | Avila University |
| Jill Nissen | St. Louis College of Pharmacy |
| Linda Orzel | Harris-Stowe State University |
| Sheila Ouellette | St. Louis Community College |
| James Pakala | Covenant Theological Seminary |
| Tom Peters | Missouri State University |
| M.J. Poehler | Kansas City Art Institute |
| Lisa Pritchard | Jefferson College |
| Christina Prucha | State Technical College |
| Ann Riley | University of MO- Columbia |
| Keli Rylance | Saint Louis Art Museum |
| Jean Sidwell | A.T. Still University |
| Eric Stancliff | Concordia Seminary |
| Stephanie Tolson | St. Charles Community College |
| Ed Walton | Southwest Baptist University |
| Stephen Wynn | Truman State University |

Members Online:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Amy Groskopf | Davenport Public Library |
| Jon Ritterbush | Park University |
| Lori Fitterling | Kansas City University |
| Beth Caldarello | North Central Missouri College |
| Brandy Brady | NW MO State University |
| Christopher Dames | UMSL |
| Denise Stephens | Washington University |
| Courtney Trautwiler | Cottey College |
| Laurie Hathman | Rockhurst |

Guests Present:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Donna Monnig | Moberly Area Community College |
| Susan Swogger | A.T. Still University |
| Steve Jamieson | Covenant Theological Seminary |
| Elizabeth Steffen | Jefferson College |
| Theresa Olson | Maryville University |
| Ying Li | St. Charles Community College |
| Corrie Hutchinson | University of MO- Columbia |
| Joanna DeYoung (ONLINE) | Lindenwood University |

Proxies:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Renee Brumett for Regina Cooper | Springfield-Greene County Library |
| Ann Riley, UM- Columbia for Chris Dames | UM- St. Louis |
| Ann Riley, UM- Columbia for Bonnie Postlethwaite | UM- Kansas City |
| Jim Pakala, Covenant Seminary for Mary Ann Aubin | Kenrick-Glennon Theological Seminary |
| Jared Rinck for Diane Martin | Metropolitan Community College |
| Chris Brite, Conception Abbey for Beth Caldarello | North Central Missouri College |
| Eric Deatherage, Crowder College for Sarah Fancher | Ozarks Technical Community College |
| Eric Deatherage, Crowder College for Courtney Trautwiler | Cottey College |
| Sharon McCaslin, Fontbonne for Laurie Hathman | Rockhurst University |
| Richard Oliver for Dale Jensen | Evangel University |
| Shelly McDavid for | MO University S&T |

1. Opening the Meeting
   1. Call to order – Valerie Darst (President) called the meeting to order at 10:05am
   2. Introductions –
      * 1. Valerie read the list of new Library Directors
        2. Valerie read the list of proxies
        3. Valerie read the list of members attending online
        4. Valerie read the list of guests

1. Membership Assessment Models

A. Presentation of Models:   
Valerie opened the discussion with some background of this Special Membership meeting, and all the documents that members received via email. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss ongoing funding and operation of MOBIUS. Valerie spoke about the Task Force and their work; they were tasked with creating a fair and equitable assessment model for all members. Valerie directed members’ attention to a slide with MOBIUS Assessment Rules:

Assessment formula must match billing formula

Sites should not have dramatic swings year to year.

Changes in library collections over past 20 years requires change to assessment formula.

Institution size should be relatively steady

Overall assessment formula should be reviewed and adjusted on a 5-year cycle.

Valerie told members of two models, the Carnegie Model and FTE. The MOBIUS Board had concerns with the Carnegie model, as there are large discrepancies between institutions. Katie Marney, member of the Task Force, explained a bit about the development of the Carnegie Model and Carnegie Classifications. She explained the classifications come from institutions’ self-reported data. She directed members’ attention to a slide, showing the categories that MOBIUS is using, then talked about the five-year increases and equitability for all members.

Valerie asked members to voice their concerns, and to have a discussion. Sharon McCaslin, Past-President, pointed out that we are working on accepting the Carnegie Model; that is the committee motion on the table.

B. Discussion of Models:

The floor was opened for discussion.

Erlene Dudley, William Woods University: The original model had many variables; lending statistics are still important.

Jim Pakala, Covenant Theological Seminary: Members need to work together now. The central concern is an institution’s ability to pay. Does the Carnegie model take that into account? He pointed out several examples of pricing increases and decreases.

Erlene: The more variables that exist, the more control there is to how they are weighted. Carnegie classifications limit MOBIUS.

Ann Campion-Riley, University of Missouri, Columbia: Task Force looked at the Carnegie Classification model, partly because it is an outside model, and administrations understand Carnegie Classifications. She recommends a modified Carnegie Classification model.

M.J. Poehler, Kansas City Art Institute: In what way is the Carnegie Model more equitable?

Ann: All members receive the same basic services from MOBIUS. The Carnegie model has different prices for the different sizes of institutions.

Debbie Bradshaw, Nazarene Theological Seminary: Questioned the EGP classification heading.

Donna explained that it depended on where an institution fell within the numbers, as to in which classification they were put.

Janet Caruthers, Columbia College: Remarked that all L4 were put together. Questioned where those numbers were coming from. There was discussion of formulating the spreadsheets in the Carnegie model. Question arose about how do the stand-alones figure in this model? They are not paying MOBIUS for local catalog support. Janet remarked that she is seeing a large increase because of their FTE. However, many of their students aren’t in Missouri; they are online students, with the distance learning. Those students don’t utilize the borrowing of physical books.

Sharon: She realizes it is difficult to look at these numbers objectively, if one’s own institution goes up drastically. She went on to say that the membership has to look at what will be sustainable for the organization.

Lisa Farrell, East Central College: From when are the Carnegie numbers? Answer: Five years ago. She remarked that her enrollment has decreased, and those numbers for her are no longer accurate. It was stated that the Carnegie Classification model is changing this year, and will be going to a three-year cycle, instead of five-year.

Chris Bright, Conception Abbey and Seminary: Likes the Carnegie model, it’s easy to see where one fits in. He is a VS4, with 70 students. Other schools with much higher enrollment are also VS4, and will pay the same; this does not seem equitable.

Donna: When Tom Jacobson (from Third Chapter, a consulting group) looked at the assessment model, institutions were put in categories, with averages.

Chris: His president has also questioned his Carnegie assessment and amount.

Christopher Gould, MOBIUS Staff: He could look at the institutions’ cost within each classification.

Cynthia Dudenhoffer, Central Methodist: They also have distance learners, and the increase for Central Methodist is too large for them to accept.

Janet: Questioned why the L4s have such a large increase over the category right above. There had been only slight increases until then.

Erlene: The majority of institutions in MOBIUS are small. For those institutions to remain viable, they are looking at distance learners; their increases because of that are not sustainable for them.

Ann: The challenge is to keep MOBIUS viable. We will have to accept some increases. No one wants costs to go up, but the fact is they will.

Barbara Glackin, Southeast MO State University: Recognizing how unequal costs have been, she requests that someone go back and re-do the math. She expressed concern that the membership fee was increased to $10,000 with no membership discussion.

Keli Rylance, St. Louis Art Museum: In what areas do we see our membership growing? If not in academic institutions, perhaps the Carnegie model is not the best one for us to use? She would advocate for a variable model, especially for those institutions which are not academic.

Erlene: Asked for clarification – are costs going up?

Donna: No, what we are looking at is distribution.

Sharon: This is not just a size issue; there are many other variables. MOBIUS is designed to give a bias to smaller institutions.

Bryan Carson, MO Valley College: There seems to be a lot of variation per FTE.

Donna: About the budget – it doesn’t change a lot year to year. In the past, assessment was based on budget. We are looking at something now that will be more equitable to everyone. She is hearing what people are saying about not being able to afford drastic increases. MOBIUS is keeping the budget as low as they can. She created some “save-the-day” spreadsheet models, keeping assessment flat. There is additional revenue coming in from other places. She wants to keep members happy and Innovative happy, considering our legal contract with them. She and Christopher gave examples of other “save-the-day” models for assessments.

Jim: Thanked Donna for her leadership and her comments. If members do leave, whether they are big or small, there will be costs involved for them.

Valerie: She was asked if membership could choose to not vote today, but vote electronically later, after Donna goes over other models again.

Ann: Is there a motion on the floor?

Sharon: There is an implied motion.

Ann: Moved to postpone vote today.

Janet: Questioned why this proposal is being brought to members now, why is there such a rush?

Valerie & Sharon: This is not new; we have been trying to change assessment model for several years.

Donna: Policy states we present draft of budget to membership by the fall membership meeting.

Stephanie Tolson, St. Charles Community College: She has been in MOBIUS since the beginning; it was created so we could all work together. We depended on large institutions then, such as University of MO. However, budgets do change over time.

Eric Stancliff, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis: Feels that both models proposed are bad, and would like to see further breakdowns in the Carnegie groupings.

Erlene: Seconded motion made by Ann.

Christopher: He will work on Eric’s request of further breakdowns in the Carnegie groupings.

Janet: Will this include information for stand-alones? Yes.

Erlene: Call the question.

Vote, 57 in favor. Motion passed.

Julie Andresen, Hannibal-LaGrange College: Will the date by which members need to inform MOBIUS they want to leave change?

Donna: No.

Sharon: How will we vote on upcoming new information?

Christopher: Will create spreadsheets that will give all scenarios.

There was more discussion on how we will vote – choose one only or rank in order of preference?

Stephanie: Questioned the “save-the-date” scenario, does flat assessment offset those institutions that need to be adjusted?

Donna: No. She spoke about looking at contingency funds to financially help larger institutions.

Jim: Does membership need to authorize use of contingency funds?

Donna: No, the board does.

Discussion of another Fall Membership meeting.

Ann: Pointed out that MLA is meeting in Columbia October 10-12; that would be a good time.

Valerie: Thanked everyone for coming to the meeting, and encouraged members to email if they think of additional questions or concerns.

Donna: Encouraged members to talk to her if they are facing dire financial situations; she wants to work with everyone.

Jon Jones moved to adjourn.

Linda Orzell seconded.

Motion passed. Meeting was adjourned at 12:15pm.