Mailboxes	Compose	Rules	Settings	Help	Log Out

✉ ▸	Next Unread	Reply	Reply To All	Forward
	Back to INBOX	Delete	Set Flag	Close as Unread

From: "Michael C Piper" <aj0386@wayne.edu>
Subject: FW: DALNET New Member Policy Group: draft agenda for second meeting
Date: Wed, 26 Jun 2002 12:08:36 -0400
To: "Margaret E. Auer" <auerme@udmercy.edu>

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael C Piper [mailto:aj0386@wayne.edu]
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2002 9:42 AM
To: DALNETNM@LISTS.WAYNE.EDU
Subject: RE: DALNET New Member Policy Group: draft agenda for second
meeting

Dear colleagues,

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the DALNET New Member Policy Group. Here
is my understanding of agreements from our first meeting:

1) Review our committee charge. We suggested one additional bullet for the
DALNET New Member Policy Group Charge:

* (Proposed new bullet) What is the best practice for accommodating new
members? Do we need one process for candidates who approach us, and another
for candidates we identify?

2) Review current DALNET Bylaws related to membership. After we prepare our
recommendations, we'll go back and review the Bylaws again, in case we need
to propose changes in them to reflect our recommendations.

3) Assess current member pricing formula. Bob provided background on our
current membership formula. DALNET's original formula was based on volumes,
computer terminals and number of annual circulations. From those numbers,
DALNET determined a percent of total, then apportioned costs proportionally
among members. As the membership grew, this formula evolved and became a
starting point for negotiated contracts.

With the introduction of Horizon, the Finance Committee looked at various
formulas, including the number of patrons, transactions and building
locations. The Finance Committee tried to come up with a new, workable
formula based on combinations of statistics and other factors.

When these formulas were computed and compared to costs existing members
were paying, there were differences between the formula and the costs
members were paying at the time, which would have complicated any efforts to
implement these new formulas, since members seek price stability first and
foremost.

So the Finance Committee decided to settle on one statistical basis for this
cost formula: number of records in the member's collection. While this
formula worked well for existing members, it was more problematic for new

members. So the committee revised the membership pricing policy to reflect volumes only. Current practice is to use this approach for negotiating contracts with prospective members. When this approach was first adopted, the agreement was to review it in five years, a date which is approaching. So this is a good time for us to have this discussion.

Advantages of current approach: It is easy, straightforward and based on a readily-available statistic.

What's missing from the current approach? It has no built-in review process, to accommodate members whose collections expand.

4) An optimal pricing formula should reflect these attributes: Equity, stability, consistency, comparability among members, adequately addressing the complexity of members with multiple sites, and a built-in review process. How does our current formula measure up in these areas? While the current approach is inconsistent, and does not adequately address the complexity of some members, such as those with multiple sites, we seemed to indicate it would be hard to come up with a better one, since imposing a new formula could be disruptive, and would probably be more complicated to implement. Two weeks later, what do we think about this?

5) What are the cost factors for bringing new members online? Cost factors include: Staff time, training hours required to bring new member staff up to speed, and machine resources. While we could include a defined number of staff hours per site, with the understanding that the member site will pay $X per hour above this number, this would likely create more problems than it would solve. Two weeks later, what do we think about this?

6) Partnership agreement. We began to sketch an outline of basic services members should expect from DALNET:

* Briefing on DALNET standards and policies
* Horizon overview training
* Data entry and table configuration
* Data mapping and conversion
* Training in Horizon modules
* Marketing support for publicizing Horizon
* Follow-up consulting, problem-solving and training with Horizon

7) What does being in DALNET mean, in terms of benefits? What is each member expected to contribute? We began outlining expectations for new members, such as the basic skill set each is expected to contribute. Do we need to develop a checklist incorporating these factors?

8) Parking lot issues to pick up in future meetings

* How do we respond to unsolicited calls from prospective members? What is the preferred process?

* What are the financial parameters for staff to work with before they must consult with Finance Committee?

* Do we need to look at the categories of membership?

* Report needs to clarify the DALNET employees who will be responsible for new member contacts.

* Where does marketing fit into this charge?