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Publishing (SSP — http://www.sspnet.org/) or the Professional and Scholarly Publishing Division (PSP — http://pspcentral.org/) of the Association of American Publishers (AAP). Attendees also suggested that it would be useful for the Medical Library Association (MLA) to provide representation to some of these organizations. The group also heard from Meg White (former president of the American Medical Publishing Association — AMPA) that AMPA had become a committee called the American Medical Publishers Committee (AMPC) folded into the PSP division of the AAP. Finally, it was suggested that a good topic for next year’s lively lunch would be health sciences libraries’ involvement in society representing health sciences publishers. The lunch could include speakers from one or more of these organizations.

Lively Lunch — Thursday, November 9, 2006 — Ordering with eV A — How One University Library Works with the State’s Electronic Procurement System in Virginia — Presented by Polly Khater (Director, Technical Services), Stephen Brooks (Head Acquisitions & Gifts, George Mason University)

In Ordering with eV A — How One University Library Works with the State’s Electronic Procurement System, Polly Khater, Director, Technical Services, and Stephen Brooks, Head Acquisitions & Gifts with George Mason University shared the challenges of the mandatory implementation of eV A (http://www.eva.state.va.us/), Virginia’s award winning e-procurement system utilizing Ariba(r). The library now has three resources to manage and reconcile library acquisitions: eV A, BANNER (used by GMU for all accounting), and their ILS. There exists no transfer of data between the three systems; however, other universities within the state have been successful in programming connectors between other ILS products, eV A and other accounting systems. Each institution is responsible for forging such connectivity, and most do not have the resources to do so. One of the most challenging aspects with eV A is anticipating at the beginning of the fiscal year, the amount of money that will be spent with a vendor. A purchase order (PO) for each vendor is created at the beginning of a fiscal year, and as invoices are received, the amount is deducted from the master PO. If the library will spend less than $2,000 with a vendor, the library manages the creation of the PO via eV A and can modify the amount, if needed.

For acquisitions in excess of $2,000, the University Purchasing department must create the PO, and only the creator of a PO can edit it. While the purchasing department has allowed the increase of some POs, they have advised the library that this is done too often. The Q & A discussion included several sympathies from fellow Virginia institutions who have encountered similar frustrations. It is difficult to nail down an amount that will be spent with a vendor. Special deals and offers like one-time backfiles cannot be foreseen. Each PO has a transaction fee for both the supplier (e.g., a database provider) and the ordering agency (e.g., George Mason). In addition to transaction fees, there are annual registration fees for each participating vendor.

Lively Lunch — Thursday, November 9, 2006 — Surprising Subscriptions: How Electronic Journal Publishing Has Affected the Partnership Among Subscription Agents, Publishers and Librarians — Presented by Heather S. Miller (University at Albany), Ezra Ernst (Swets Information Services), Dan Tonkery (EBSCO Information Services), Dean Schoen (Harrassowitz), Kimberly Steinele (Duke University Press), Tony McSean (Elsevier), Thomas Taylor (Sage Publications), Stephen Clark (College of William and Mary), Lila Ohler (University of Oklahoma Libraries), Susan Zappen (Skidmore College)

Report by Mary Hawks (Collection Management Librarian, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences) <hawkmars@uams.edu>

Heather Miller as moderator asked questions of a panel of three subscription agents, three publishers and three librarians. Subscription agents all agreed that they still do much of what they have always done best: keep track of the journaling process, help set up and maintain online access. Libraries demand immediate response to access problems. With print subscriptions claiming was a much less urgent problem. They welcomed working with consortia and see a growing role of the agent dealing with licenses and price caps. Publishers voiced similar concerns. Electronic journals have added the need for usage statistics and technical support for immediate solutions to access problems. Driven by libraries’ demands they now deal more directly with customers and consortia. One publisher stated that all of these issues require a sophisticated subscription management system that does not yet exist. The librarians all have experienced increased and more sophisticated workloads with e-journals. All three of the librarians rely heavily on agents. The librarians hope for more consolidated usage statistics, more standardized, less complex licenses, and new pricing models.
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