

**Acquisitions Subcommittee
Object Code Report
August 9, 2010**

The CPC Object Code Task Force requested that the TSPC Acquisitions Subcommittee prepare an update on the success of the Object Code Pilot Project for E-Resources. We polled our members in July 2010 to gather information on their experience using the object codes and material types. What follows is a brief description of the project, an analysis of the pilot project implementation and recommendations for the future.

Project Description

In Spring 2009 the Object Code Task Force was formed by the CPC to develop object codes for all electronic resources. The object code is an optional field used on Aleph invoices to denote the type of material acquired. The intent of the project was to present data that would help the CPC and ERS Committees compile information on the type and cost of the e-resources we purchased. The task force asked for input from the Acquisitions Subcommittee and Claire Dygert at FCLA, and we helped create the four digit object codes (for invoices) and the corresponding two digit material type codes (for orders and items). We developed twelve codes, listed at the end of the report. We agreed to run a pilot project for the 2009/10 fiscal year to enter the object codes as we paid invoices. Several of the schools also changed the material type code on the order records to reflect the new codes. The pilot project ran from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010. Eight universities volunteered to code all their electronic resource invoices with the newly assigned object codes, and most of them used the codes for the entire 2009/2010 fiscal year. The participating universities are:

FAMU (object codes)	UCF (object codes & mat types)
FAU (object codes)	UNF (object codes & mat types)
FIU (object codes)	FSU (object codes & mat types)
FGCU (object codes & mat types)	NCF (object codes & mat types)

Donna Alsbury at FCLA wrote several reports to collect data. They include:

E-Resources Expenditure Lists	E-Resources Order Lists
E-Resources Expenditure Totals	E-Resources Unpaid Orders

Implementation of the Pilot Project

The unanimous opinion of the group is that system wide use of object codes and material types is a useful tool for local data analysis, and is particularly worth while for compiling data for the SUL as a whole. By using the codes the SUL now has information on how much funding is going toward electronic resources for eight of the 11 schools. FCLA's new Arrow reports itemize the type of e-resource and

provide costs and title counts by object code. The data can be broken down to show either a one time cost (for archive fees and backfiles) or an ongoing annual commitment.

The project took a considerable amount of time to implement. Participants used and appreciated the explanatory documentation prepared by members of CPC and the coded list of shared databases (attached). The time and effort to maintain the codes will not be great once all order records include the two codes.

All participants used the Object Codes, but some did not implement the corresponding Material Type Codes this year. Several intend to use material type codes next year. There was concern that each institution may have differing interpretations on use of specific codes. The suggestion was made that we compare titles and codes across institutions. Several schools said they used the new reports to indicate progress in moving from print to online journals, and to assist with cancellation projects. Some are using the object code data to augment their fund accounting and to get a finer breakdown of costs per budget code. Most use the statistics in their fiscal year end reporting. We appreciate the assistance of Donna Alsbury and Ellen Bishop in implementing the codes and providing good reporting tools. Individual comments follow the report.

Recommendations

The Acquisitions Subcommittee recommends that we continue the project and that we encourage the current participants to implement both the material types (on order records) and object codes (on invoices). We also encourage the remaining institutions to start using the two coding systems so we may have consistent and comprehensive usage statistics through out the SUL. We suggest an annual review of the codes to incorporate new formats, such as streaming videos. We suggest that all institutions using EDI invoice loads populate the Quantity Note field in the order record with the object code, and use the Aleph EDI 30 report to add the object code to the invoices. We would like additional reporting tools that will provide

- Lists of active order records that do not have an appropriate material type or object code (in the Quantity Note field) in the order record
- An automatic way to populate the Quantity Note field to hold the Object Code
- Expansion of the existing reports to cover multiple years on one report
- Title lists with object codes used by each institution to compare consistency of coding

We are pleased with the success of the pilot project and suggest that it now be considered a recommended process for all institutions.

Comments from individual libraries include the following:

Value of the project

The project gives us additional information on costs of e-resources. We use one general budget code for all electronic continuing obligations, and are pleased to have a more specific breakdown by using the object codes

The project in combination with the Aleph ARROW reports has been an effective way to get acquisitions information for electronic resources expenditure across campuses.

The variety of object codes when linked to the budget codes (Aleph ARROW report: *Expenditure Totals by Object Code* w/option to include Object Code/Budget Combination) gives a good overview of the year's electronic resources expenditures. The expansion of codes was a positive change for us.

We will incorporate the data into our annual statistics and will use it to gauge our success in converting from print to online.

I think there are too many codes, but will continue to use the codes as they stand.

This information has been especially useful for collection development and cancellation projects.

We like the variety of codes which addresses the different categories of electronic resources and types of expenditures.

Project worked well because the Electronic Resources Librarian who was familiar with the order and the resource provided the Object Code to be used.

We still do not have the project completely implemented but I think it will be very useful once we have added the new object codes to all our e-resources.

I hope to be able to use the data for statistics and budget projections once all our e-resources are assigned a new code.

All of our e-books did get the new object codes during the first year, and I was able to make some positive changes to our e-book acquisitions work flow. In the past, we would transfer a faculty or librarian e-book selection to an e-book specific fund code so that we could easily track our e-book expenditures. Having the new e-book object codes allowed us to leave e-book selections within the faculty's or liaison's discipline fund code. We could then track it as purchase towards that specific discipline - along with the rest for that discipline - and we could also easily track our e-book expenditures through the object codes.

The implementation produced an interruption of workflow to figure out correct object code to apply. However, it is worth it and hopefully we will soon have all the information entered in the order record so we don't have to re-invent the wheel every time.

We don't have a full year's worth of data as we didn't start till Nov.2009.

I hope there is more correlation and function between Material Format, Material Type and Object Code. Right now there are too many of them and confusing. They should have hierarchical relations and be presented that way to reduce confusion.

I think we need to standardize the use of the object codes state-wide. This is very important if Claire or others will be doing state-wide e-resources reporting using object codes.

It is difficult to tell which codes to use sometimes and I think we need to discuss this further.

We had to take the extra time to determine the appropriate code, and to include it on each line of the invoices we entered manually. We also chose to enter the object code into the order record (Tab 4, Quantity Note) for our Ebsco titles. This was time well spent, but it did require two extra steps when we paid invoices. We also changed our material type codes on the order record to correspond to the Object Code. Next year we will be able to follow the pattern we have now established. We have not run the Aleph EDI Custom 30 report to load the object codes into our Ebsco invoices loaded via EDI. Most of those titles are print, but our object code report totals will not match our budget code totals right now. (We hope to use the Custom 30 report soon.)

Future plans and suggestions for ongoing implementation

We plan to implement the second part of the project dealing with the selection of "Material Type" in the Aleph Order Form, this fiscal year.

Once we have implemented the "Material Type" part of the project we will have access to 2 more Aleph ARROW reports and better able to judge what else we might like/need.

I wish there is a way for ALEPH to set a default according to the first time an Object Code is input

We would like reports based on Material Type. Also, A multi-year Object Code comparison report, e.g. showing migration from Print + Online to Online only

I think we also need a new object code added for streaming videos.

Perhaps a report of any electronic and print + online in the material format field that does not have an object code so we can do clean-up. (We are not using the new e-resources material types).

We should continue the project for object codes. I'm not sure about the new material types as we have not used them yet.

I would like to see all institutions participate, so we have comprehensive stats. Perhaps we could have a conversion process for those schools that are using unique object codes and material types

I would like a report that will look at open order records for serials and standing orders, and report out any records that have an e-resource material type, but do not have a corresponding object code in the Quantity Note field.

I like the reports that Donna has created. I'm wondering if there is a way to pull out the financial data, and dump it into another system, such as an ERM.

I can visualize using some of our existing reports to get subject lists, and include the material type as a way to sort the list by print or electronic access method.

This is a great example of the SULs working together and is a start on sharing data across the system. I would like to know how Claire Dygert and the CPC have used this new information.

There may be some discrepancies between institutions, especially as we compare total titles and total dollar amounts. At our library, we do not create order records for each individual title in a vendor package. In some cases, we do not even enter the titles that are part of our initial spend. For example, we just create a one line invoice for Science Direct. We closed most of the individual order records when we cancelled the print. On the other hand, we pay the Springer invoice through Ebsco, and load each individual title's cost when we pay the invoice. We are a little bit schizophrenic, but it works for us.

I expect that some of our sister institutions will have used different codes for some resources. Perhaps Donna could do a comparison of how titles were coded across the SULs.

Commonly Defined E-Resource Object Codes and Material Types

July 5, 2009

Object Type	Description	Notes	Material Type	Aleph Object Codes
E-book (Recurring Cost)	Use for online books which represent a distinct and discrete monographic work and are bought under a subscription model. Do not use for content that has transformed beyond the “package” to become a seamless database of content (e.g., Contemporary Literary Criticism and Dictionary of Literary Biography vs. the Gale Literature Resource Center.)	Examples: Safari Tech Books online; a subscription to e-brary or MyiLibrary	RC	EBRC
E-book (One Time Cost)	Use for online books which represent a distinct and discrete monographic work and are bought with a one-time fee. Do not use for content that has transformed beyond the “package” to become a seamless database of content (e.g., Contemporary Literary Criticism and Dictionary of Literary Biography vs. the Gale Literature Resource Center.)	Examples: NetLibrary, or options to buy such as Springer, Wiley, R2	ON	EBON
E-journal (Recurring Cost)	Use for online journals which represent distinct and discrete journal publications.	Examples: One title or one e-journal package	RE	EJRE
E-journal Backfile (One Time Cost)	Use for purchase of backfiles for e-journals at a one-time cost.		BF	EJBF
Print + Online E-journal	Use for journal subscriptions where the cost incurred includes payment for both the online and print version of a journal. This category assumes that costs are recurring.		PO	EJPO
Abstract & Indexing Database	Use for databases that include indexes and/or abstracts to content in other resources, but do not include full-text content. This category assumes that costs are recurring.	Examples: Web of Science, Music Index, BIOSIS Previews	DA	AIDA

Aggregator Full-text Database	Use for databases that serve indexing and/abstracting service but also include full-text content. This category assumes that costs are recurring.	Examples: Business Source Premier, ProQuest Nursing & Allied Health	FT	AGFT
Electronic Reference	Use for databases that are neither aggregator full text databases nor abstract & indexing databases. (This would include a wide variety of databases from the Gale Literary Resource Center to LexisNexis Congressional.) This category assumes that costs are recurring.	Examples: Encyclopedia Britannica, Oxford Music Online, Oxford Art Online, Music Online	EF	EREF
One-time e-resource purchase	Use for one-time purchase fees for e-resources. Exclude expenditures for e-journal backfiles and one-time expenditure on e-books.	Examples: Art Index Retrospective, ECCO, EEBO, Alexander Street Press	EP	OTEP
Access/maintenance fee	Use for fees paid to maintain access to online content. These fees may include platform fees.	Examples: Annual access fees for JSTOR, Alexander Street Press. Platform fees: Engineering Index, PsycInfo, INSPEC	FE	AMFE
E-Resource Management Tools	Use for fees paid for services such as Serials Solutions, ERMs, etc.	Examples: MetaLib, Scholarly Stats	TL	ERTL