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Executive Summary

In November, 2010, the Collaborative Technical Services Team (CTST) was charged by the Alliance Council to create an “inventory of automated cataloging/acquisition practices” (BP2). The Automated Cataloging & Acquisitions Working Group (AC&A) was formed and a 79 question survey tool was created and sent to member institutions through the Alliance Catalog & Cataloging listserv representatives in August 2011. Responses were compiled in October 2011 and results are included in the following two reports:

Executive Charts Only Report: A 26 page document made up of charts and specific spreadsheets to provide a compressed overview of institutional responses. (Added comments by institutions to specific survey questions can be found in the Complete Survey Report.)

Complete Survey Report: A 77 page detailed document compiling responses and comments from individual institutions in spreadsheets and includes charts to aggregate overall institutional responses.

The Survey Tool:

The survey consisted of 79 questions which focused on 1 time purchases (firm orders) of print monographs in English language (unless Approval books were specified) and consisted of the following sections:

- Selection
- Ordering
- Invoicing
- WorldCat Cataloging Partners
- Cataloging
- End Processing

As part of the survey process an offline version was created and responders were encouraged to print out the questions before filling out the online survey. For many institutions, collaboration between acquisitions and catalog units was needed in order to complete the survey.

Recommendations & Observations:

Recommendation 1: Add data from the 3 remaining institutions.

Responses were received from 33 of 36 institutions. In order to have a complete set of data, responses from the remaining 3 institutions (Central Oregon Community College, Mt. Hood Community College, and Southern Oregon University) should be sought and added to the results. It was noted that Oregon State University catalogs materials for Central Oregon
Community College. However, it is not known if there are other areas of this survey (e.g. book selection) where Central Oregon’s operations or workflow may vary from OSU.

**Recommendation 2: Identify and survey department or divisional libraries**

The AC&C Working group requested a single response from each institution. However, there are some institutions that have additional departments or divisional libraries, such as Law Libraries that may have different acquisitions and/or cataloging workflows. While we received some comments from one institution where practices between their main and divisional libraries differed, this pattern was not consistent among all institutions, nor was it clear in the survey instructions if department and divisional libraries should respond. The department and divisional libraries need to be identified and this survey should be administered to these groups.

**Recommendation 3: Continue to survey institutions for other formats or order types**

In preparing the questions for this survey the AC&A working group made the decision to focus this survey on 1 time purchases of print books. While we would have liked to have included additional questions on other formats (media, ebooks, etc.,) or order types of materials (i.e. serials, standing orders, etc.,) we were also mindful of the time needed to fill in various Alliance surveys and felt that the additional questions would best be handled in future surveys. Each of these formats and/or order types have their own set of vendors, workflows, end-processing, etc., To try to be more comprehensive would have resulted in an unwieldy and lengthy survey. Future CTST’s should continue to survey the institutions to focus on various formats or order types. This survey could be used as a framework for additional surveys.

**Recommendation 4: Distribute survey results to Alliance Members:**

The survey results provide an environmental scan of specific information on automated acquisition and cataloging practices at individual institutions as well as an overall look at practices among the Alliance libraries. Distribution of the survey directly to institutions as well as on the Alliance website will:

- provide member libraries thinking about implementing or changing current acquisition or cataloging workflows a list of specific institutions that may have already implemented the practice (i.e. WorldCat Partners.)
- identify the use (or nonuse) of certain workflows or practices that could be used by the Alliance or members to determine additional areas of further collaboration.
Executive Charts

Institutions participating in survey

Q1: Institution Response -- # of Institutions

- YES: 3
- NO: 33

Q1: Institution Response -- % Rate

- YES: 92%
- NO: 8%

Selection Process

Selection tools

Q2: Are you using YBP’s GOBI for selection? (# of Libraries)

- YES: 8
- NO: 22
- NO DATA: 25

Q2: Are you using YBP’s GOBI for selection? (% of Libraries)

- YES: 70%
- NO: 22%
- NO DATA: 8%

Q3: If no to using GOBI: Are you planning to use it in the next 12 months

- YES: 3
- NO: 5

Q4: Are selectors submitting orders using a selection management system from another vendor?

- YES: 3
- NO: 4
- NO DATA: 29
Selection participants (i.e. who are the selectors)

Q5: Estimate the percentage of monograph orders selected by:

- Librarians / Bibliographers
- External (Faculty, etc.)
- Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Librarians</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Order submission process

Q6: Estimate the percentage of monograph orders received by acquisitions through:

- Selection Manager System
- Email
- Print, Order cards
- Other
**Pre-order Searching**

**Q7: Does your Library do a pre-order search to verify duplicate orders or bibliographic information?**

[Pie chart showing distribution of responses]

- **ALL ORDERS**
- **SOME ORDERS**
- **NO DATA**

**Q8: If you do pre-searching, who does the pre-order search? (Check all that apply) - # of libraries**

![Bar chart showing distribution of responses]

- Selectors
- Acquisitions
- Other

**Q8: If you do pre-order searching, who does the pre-order search? (Check all that apply) - # of libraries -- Combinations**

![Bar chart showing distribution of responses]

- Acquisitions Only
- Selectors Only
- Selectors & Acquisitions
- Aquisitions & Other
- Selectors, Acquisitions & Other
Q9: Do you have an Approval Plan (not including e-slips or announcements, but actual shipment of books)? # of Libraries

- YES: 3
- NO: 12
- NO DATA: 21

Q11: If yes to Approval Plans, Estimate the percentage of monographs received through...

Q12: If yes to Approval Plan: Do selectors (or faculty) review Approval books before adding them to the collection?

- ALL: 5
- SOME: 3
- NONE: 4
Interlibrary loan redirects to purchase

Q13: Is your library redirecting any InterLibrary Loan requests to “just in time” or “purchase on demand” acquisitions?

Order Process

Workflow for libraries using YBP as primary vendor

Q14: Is YBP your primary vendor for ordering print monographs in English?

Q15: If your primary vendor is YBP, is your library also using selection manager systems from vendors other than YBP to place and manage orders?

Q16: Are you using YBP’s “Library Holdings Load Service” (i.e. uploading ISBN’s into Gobi for items purchased from other vendors or publishers)
Q18: If you are not using YBP: Are you planning to switch your primary vendor to YBP in the next 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concordia:</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOU:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fox University:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla University Library:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19: If not using YBP, who is your primary vendor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concordia:</td>
<td>Amazon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOU:</td>
<td>Midwest &amp; Bookhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fox University:</td>
<td>Midwest. We may switch to YBP since they include e-books and Midwest doesn’t, but I can’t say it will happen in the next 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College:</td>
<td>Midwest - we also use Baker &amp; Taylor; we plan to add more volume to YBP in the next year, but it’s unlikely they’ll become the primary vendor at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology:</td>
<td>We use Amazon for a few titles but because we have not ordered very much the last 3 years, we really do not have a vendor currently. We restructured our fund codes and can now proceed to set up with YBP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla University Library:</td>
<td>Midwest Library Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20: If you are not using YBP: Are you using a selection management system from your current vendor to place and manage orders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concordia:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOU:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fox University:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla University Library:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q21: Please estimate the percent of monograph ordering that goes direct to the publisher vs. through vendor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Oregon Community College</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Washington University</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemeketa Community College</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark College</td>
<td>12% Publishers, 88% vendors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern WA University</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOU</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fox University</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Community College</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College</td>
<td>15-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylhurst University</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hood Community College</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health &amp; Science University</td>
<td>95% vendor; 5% publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>When we did have a budget for monographs about 98% were ordered through a vendor (Blackwell's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University Libraries</td>
<td>About 10 percent go directly to publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University Library</td>
<td>5% goes direct to publisher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed College Library</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Martin’s University</td>
<td>Due to staff shortages, we do not currently order anything we can't get from YBP. So at present, 100% of orders go through a vendor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Pacific University</td>
<td>Publisher: 5%, vendor: 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon Community College</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Evergreen State College Library</td>
<td>15% (YBP is not our primary vendor for firm orders, but it is one of them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Washington</td>
<td>Vendor 99%, publisher 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Knight: less than 1%  Law: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Portland</td>
<td>5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla University Library</td>
<td>15 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Pacific College Library</td>
<td>3% or less. Rarely happens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>30% of orders go somewhere other than YBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>5 vs 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette University</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Automation products, processes and Millennium for loading records

Q22: Does your library use Innovative Extended Approval Plan Interface (product 409) sometimes known as the “PromptCat Loader?”

- **YES**: 3
- **NO**: 21
- **NO DATA**: 12

Q23: As part of the initial ordering process, does your library batch load bibliographic records from your primary vendor via Millennium’s Data Exchange?

- **YES**: 3
- **NO**: 14
- **NO DATA**: 19

Q24: If yes, to using Data Exchange, for your primary vendor, do you use a loader profile which includes the creation of order records?

- **YES**: 1
- **NO**: 18

Q25: If yes to using Data Exchange, for your primary vendor do you use a loader profile which includes the creation of item records?

- **YES**: 10
- **NO**: 9

Q26: As part of the initial ordering process, does your library batch load bibliographic records from your secondary vendors via Millennium’s Data?

- **SOME**: 3
- **NONE**: 7
- **NO DATA**: 26

Q27: If some to Data Exchange: For your secondary vendors, do you use a loader profile which includes the creation of order records?

- **YES**: 3
- **NO**: 4
**Invoicing and Payment**

**Electronic invoicing**

**Q28:** If some to Data Exchange: For your secondary vendors, do you use a loader profile which includes the creation of item records?

- **YES:** 3
- **NO:** 4

**Q29:** Are you using electronic invoicing with your primary vendor?

- **YES:** 12
- **NO:** 21
- **NO DATA:** 3

**Q30:** If no, Are you planning to implement electronic invoicing with your primary vendor in the next 12 months?

- **YES:** 2
- **NO:** 19

**Q31:** Are you doing electronic invoicing with your secondary monographic vendors?

- **All:** 1
- **Some:** 5
- **None:** 3
- **No Data:** 27
Credit or procurement cards

Q32: Is your library using a credit/procurement card for some of your monograph purchasing?

- YES
- NO
- NO DATA

Automation products, processes and Millennium for invoicing

Q34: Are you using Innovative Product 414 “Output Accounting Information” to output invoice data to your Accounts Payable or Controllers Office?

- YES
- NO
- NO DATA
WorldCat Cataloging Partners (WCP)

WCP participation

Q35: Is your library using the WorldCat Cataloging Partners (WCP) services from OCLC?

- YES: 14
- NO: 3
- NO DATA: 19

Question 36: Are you using WCP with YBP?

- YES: 13
- NO: 1

Question 37: Are you using WCP with vendors other than YBP?

- YES: 6
- NO: 8

WCP profiling process

Q38: YBP provides extensive support in profiling WCP. If you use WCP with other vendors, were you satisfied with the level of support?

- YES: 3
- NO: 2
- VARIES: 0
- N/A: 9

Q39: Did you create any WCP profile(s) yourself with any primary or secondary vendors?

- YES: 5
- NO: 9
WCP profile parameters: cataloging levels and sources

Q40: Does your use of WCP include delivery of catalog records

- Basic Level: 9
- 100% (first enhanced level): 2
- Customized (100% plus local specs): 3

Q41: Catalog source includes: # of Libraries

- LC: 14
- NLM: 9
- UKM: 9
- Other: 8

Q41: Catalog Source includes: % of Libraries

- LC: 35%
- NLM: 23%
- UKM: 22%
- Other: 20%

Q42: Encoding levels - # of libraries using each encoding level

- Full (BLANK, 1,4,1,L): 14
- CIP (8): 9
- Not full (7,5,2,K,M): 8

Q42: Encoding levels - % of each encoding level used

- Full (BLANK, 1,4,1,L): 100%
- CIP (8): 64%
- Not full (7,5,2,K,M): 57%
WCP workflow in library

Q43: Does your library use WCP with:
- Firm Orders (14)
- Approval Orders (6)

Q43: Does your library use WCP with:
- Firm Orders Only (8)
- Approval Orders Only (0)
- Approval and Firm Orders (6)

Q44: If your library receives WCP cataloging, what unit of the library handles it?
- Cataloging (6)
- Acquisitions (3)
- Both (5)

Automation products, processes and Millennium for working with WCP

Q45: Is your library batch loading WCP bibliographic records via the import invoice module?
- YES (5)
- NO (9)

Q46: Do you load order data during the batch loading of WCP bibliographic records via the import invoice? (check all that apply)
- Firms (6)
- Approvals (7)
Q46: Do you load order data during the batch loading of WCP bibliographic records via the import invoice? Combinations

- Firms Only: 3
- Approvals Only: 2
- Firm & Approvals: 4

Q47: Do you load item data during the batch loading of WCP bibliographic records via the import invoice? (check all that apply)

- Firms: 8
- Approvals: 5
- No: 1

Q48: Is your library batch loading WCP bibliographic records via Data exchange?

- Yes: 7
- No: 7

Q49: Do you load order data during the batch loading of WCP bibliographic records via Data exchange?

- Firms: 2
- Approvals: 1
- No: 5

Q49: Do you load order data during the batch loading of WCP bibliographic records via Data exchange? Combinations

- Firms Only: 1
- Approvals Only: 1
- Firms and Approvals: 2
- No: 5

Q50: Do you load item data during the batch loading of WCP bibliographic records via Data exchange? (check all that apply)

- Firms: 3
- Approvals: 4
- No: 1
Non-participants with WCP

Q51: If you are not using WorldCat Cataloging Partners (WCP) at this time, do you plan to begin within the next 12 months?

- YES: 5
- NO: 14

Cataloging – General Cataloging Workflows

Acquisitions sorting into cataloging workflows

Q52: Does your Acquisitions unit sort received materials into different cataloging workflows?

- YES: 5
- NO: 13
- NO DATA: 20
Q53: Please estimate the percentage of original cataloging done for one time purchases (firm orders) of print monographs in English Language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% of original cataloging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Oregon Community College</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Washington University</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemeketa Community College</td>
<td>less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark College</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern WA University</td>
<td>less than 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOU</td>
<td>less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fox University</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Community College</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College</td>
<td>less than 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylhurst University</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hood Community College</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health &amp; Science University</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>5, when ordering. This is an estimate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University Libraries</td>
<td>About 2 to 5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University Library</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed College Library</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Martin’s University</td>
<td>less than 5 titles per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Pacific University</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon Community College</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Evergreen State College Library</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Washington</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Portland</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla University Library</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Pacific College Library</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>1% for the narrowly defined subset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>less than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette University</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of cataloging

Q54: For print monographs, are you using any other sources besides OCLC to load records?

- YES: 3
- NO: 4
- NO DATA: 29

Cataloging approval books

Q55: If you have an Approval Plan, are you loading bibliographic records at the point of shipment?

- Yes: 3
- No: 3
- Other: 10
- Not Applicable: 18
- No Data: 2

Participation in PCC (Program for Cooperative Cataloging)

Q56: Is your library a PCC (Program for Cooperative Cataloging) Member?

- Yes: 6
- No: 3
- Other: 2
- No Data: 25
Single record for print and electronic resources

Q57: Are you using a single record for a monograph received in both print and ebook formats?

- YES: 6
- NO: 3
- NO DATA: 27

Brief records and OCLC

Q58: Do you load brief records into OCLC?

- YES: 3
- NO: 3
- NO DATA: 30

MARCEdit experience

Q59: Do you have staff with experience using MARCEdit tools (i.e. MARCBreaker and MARCMaker)?

- YES: 4
- NO: 3
- NO DATA: 29
Adoption of RDA cataloging rules

Q60: Do you plan to adopt RDA?
- Already begun
- Yes
- Don’t know
- Waiting for Alliance to tell us
- Waiting for National Library decision
- Other, please explain
- No Data

Authority control practices

Q61: Does your library maintain some level of authority control on name and subject headings?
- YES
- NO
- NO DATA

Q62: Does your library contract with a vendor for automatic authority control?
- YES
- NO

Q63: If you contract with vendor: What vendor do you use?
- Backstage
- LTI

xxii – Orbis Cascade Alliance – AC&A Survey Report (Part 1)
### Q64: Frequency for notifications:

### Q65: Frequency for sending records:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Q64: At what frequency do you receive notification for new/changed/deleted authority records?</th>
<th>Q65: At what frequency do you send your records to vendor for processing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern WA University</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOU</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fox University</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis &amp; Clark</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>3 times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylhurst University</td>
<td>Not Applicable; we do not do this.</td>
<td>Once per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health &amp; Science University</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University Libraries</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University Library</td>
<td>We used to receive these twice per year. For the last couple of years we have only been getting those that come through with our twice-yearly Backstage Current Cataloging Service.</td>
<td>Twice per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed College Library</td>
<td>semi-annually</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Martin's University</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Pacific University</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Every 1-2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Evergreen State College Library</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Washington</td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Portland</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>Quarterly (based on previously distributed authority records); Weekly (based on weekly processing of bib records)</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette University</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q66: Are you maintaining authority records through OCLC or Library of Congress?

- YES: 9
- NO: 19

### Q67: If you do not maintain some level of authority: Do you plan in the next 12 months to implement some level of authority control? (either in-house or contract with a vendor.)

- YES: 2
- NO: 3
Table of contents practices

Q68: Do you contract with a vendor for Table Of Contents (TOCs) enhancement services?

- YES: 3
- NO: 4
- NO DATA: 29

End Processing

Shelf-ready processing

Q71: Does your library contract with any of your vendor(s) to have print monographs processed completely shelf-ready?

- YES: 3
- NO: 9
- NO DATA: 24

Q72: Does your library contract with any of your vendor(s) to have print monographs processed partially shelf-ready?

- YES: 3
- NO: 4
- NO DATA: 29

Paperback binding and book jackets

Q74: Do you contract with your vendor to have paperback editions bound prior to receipt?

- YES: 4
- NO: 3
- BOTH: 3
- NO DATA: 26

Q75: Do you retain the book jacket on your hardbound books? Please check all that apply

- ALL: 6
- SOME: 3
- NONE: 14
- NO DATA: 13
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Binding decisions at receipt of material

Q76: Do you make any additional binding decisions at time of receipt? (e.g., reinforce paperback covers, rebind spiral or stapled items)

- YES
- NO
- NO DATA

Unique processing needs by school

Q77: Do you have any unique processing needs for your print monographs?

- YES
- NO
- NO DATA

Different processing by collection

Q78: Are there monographic collections in your library that are processed differently than those in your regular, circulating collection?

- YES
- NO
- NO DATA

Security devices
Q79: What type of security devices does your library use on items (check all that apply):

- None
- Magnetic Strips
- None & Magnetic Strips
- RFID & Magnetic Strips
- No Data

Total: 32