

**UC Acquisitions Common Interest Group (ACIG)
summary minutes
Conference call Monday, October 13, 2008**

Present: Rebecca Green, Lisa Spagnolo, Keith Powell, Germaine Wadeborn, Jim Dooley, Barbara Shader, Catherine Nelson, Lai-Ying Hsiung, Susan Viets

Absent : Tony Harvell

Discussion Items:

Credit/Procurement Card Ordering Lisa polled ACIG (see email dated October 7) for the level of efficiency of/satisfaction with this type of ordering given the issues around additional tracking required by campus accounting departments (paperwork). Other issues which were brought up were reconciliation difficulties with certain vendors (amazon.com—matching titles), and vendors identified by campus accounting as having “unacceptable” Merchant Category Codes (more often a problem for orders placed with organizations and societies). Rebecca reported that while procurement cards are the best option for selectors out of the country on buying trips, the additional processing requirements make them less efficient for domestic purchases. UCB has about 10-20 procurement cards assigned to a few selectors. UCD is considering B&T in an attempt to reduce the use of procurement cards.

Note from Lisa: ALCTS Guide on Credit Card Purchasing, was approved by ALCTS and being worked on by Nancy Gibbs and Narda Tafuri in 2006. I asked Nancy about it last August--at that time still forthcoming. I just sent an email to Christine Taylor in publications at ALCTS to see if there's a date.

Media Vendors UCI and UCD use Action! Library Media Service. Keith mentioned the fact that Action! does not offer a discount on purchases as many library vendors do.

Books with e-content Keith polled ACIG (see email dated September 3) for local campus policies and procedures. No one reported that they identify accompanying materials or access at the point of order. For UCI, UCSF, UCD, accompanying materials are identified and flagged upon receipt as a part of the acquisitions process. For UCSC the catalogers are responsible for noticing accompanying materials. a license agreement is found, the license is forwarded for selector review. Selectors are asked whether to 1) keep both the book and the disc/access; 2) keep the book, toss the disc/forget the access; or 3) return. At UCD, UCB and UCSC, materials are flagged for selector review before they are added to collections. Often, it takes a subject specialist to make a determination as to whether the accompanying material is actually supplementary or simply duplicative. In all cases, for materials which have licensing or other requirements, review is handled at a second level (and third sometimes?).

The question is whether there are ways in which we can propose policies which would simplify and reduce the workload involved in the identification and review and comply with licensing and copyright. UCI is currently revising their procedures and reviewing best practices for policy and workflow in reviewing and processing in a way that promotes the “path of least resistance.” Medical publishers, in particular, seem to be increasing their distribution of accompanying media—an interesting trend

Summary of email responses:

- UCB: license reviewed and signed by ER Librarian for networked items; Main library: accompanying material kept with book, branches follow their respective guidelines
- UCD: initial license review handled by selectors—anything suspicious or complicated gets another review; recent change in policy to keep the media with the book
- UCSD: media and license kept with book; no license review; sticker added with a user warning about copyright; original license on file
- UCM: same as UCSD, and media in special cases that work with RFID
- UCSC: books to Stacks, discs to Media Center, where they do circulate; selectors review licenses
- UCSF: anything suspicious or complicated gets obliterated (unless the item will be networked); otherwise media kept with the book; sticker added with a user warning about copyright

ERMS Implementation Updates

UCB is implementing multiple Innovative Millennium modules, including the ERM. Their expansion training is scheduled in early November. At this point, the ERM is primarily a collection development tool.

UCI has loaded Innovative’s ERM module and has an *ad hoc* implementation team in place. They will use Innovative’s pre-populated resource records, where possible, and some of UCSD’s codes. They’re currently working on display issues and coding. A soft rollout is scheduled for November after their on-site training. UCI’s initial focus will be on Tier 3 resources—all resources, including Tiers 1-2, will eventually be converted. At this point, the ERM is primarily a collection development tool for UCI as well. There are plans to bring in members CD and PS to discuss WebPAC implications.

Since the CDL’s announcement that they’ve gone with SerialsSolutions’ 360 ERMS product, SerialsSolutions has contacted both UCB and UCI to promote how the 360 product will enhance local ERMs.

Catherine brought up that the difficulties in tracking electronic resources is compounded when each campus has its own method/s or platforms in use. The burden of both cost in the software itself and personnel (acquisitions and programming) makes it more unwieldy. Interoperability issues have not been satisfactorily addressed in existing systems. The adoption of a system-

wide ILS would potentially streamline and facilitate tracking and delivery of all resources, but particularly electronic, held locally and consortially.

Setting Holdings at point of order Tony polled ACIG (see emails dated September 10, October 13) for local campus policies and procedures. UCSD and UCLA are looking at WorldCat Selection service—setting holdings at the point of order would facilitate cooperative CD. Lai-Ying brought up several considerations: 1) would you attach holdings to CIP or vendor records (they're tons of these in OCLC now) where no full bib exists and upload brief records for holdings set at OCLC if we want a complete picture of all on order items?; 2) Should OCLC holdings be set at invoice time and not wait for 3 months? 3) What impact will both 1) and 2) have on ILL by making on order information available to the users much earlier in the acquisitions cycle? 4) should item records be always created for all on order items? Tony's question is: Do all campuses have the ILS functionality to gather all ILS deletes of materials never received and batch delete them in OCLC? The different implications and processing considerations require further discussion.

Lisa suggested that a subset of our purchases--YBP approval books--could be more easily analyzed within WorldCat Selection due to both books and slips being issued at the same time in the approval process. For those campuses with PromptCat, having holdings set immediately upon invoicing should result in the desired display in Selection. ACIG could then consider the implications of adjusting the timing for setting holdings for other categories of material.

Summary of responses of current practices:

- UCD: holdings set at invoice date (approvals and firms with PromptCat); otherwise at time of cataloging.
- UCI: considering setting holdings at invoice date
- UCLA: holdings set seven days after ship date
- UCM: holdings set at invoice date
- UCSC: holdings set for Firm Orders at time of order if full records available, but three weeks after invoice date by YBP for YPB approvals. Duplicates are caught early and holdings do not need to be deleted in OCLC, but holdings need to be deleted for rejects. Foreign approvals are all set at time of cataloging.
- UCSF: holdings set at invoice date for PromptCat; at order for all others

Clarification from Lisa: "ship date" and "invoice date" are pretty much the same thing? The books are picked, invoiced, shipped, and the file sent to OCLC for the PromptCat piece. If that is the case, I prefer using the term "invoice date" as it's tied more to the data that's being routed around.

Next scheduled call (Winter) - Monday, January 12th: 9:00am-10:30am

Submitted by Susan Viets

Rev Friday, October 17, 2008