

MORE Operations Committee meeting materials

February 15, 2023

7. Clarify Damaged Billing Guidelines' criteria for "old" items

[MORE's guidelines for damaged item billing](#) categorize items as "new" or "old" based on number of circulations or the item's "created" date. If a library adds an older, used item to their collection, perhaps by way of a donation, the item record's number of circulations and "created" date may qualify it as a "new" item and thus expand the potential for damage to be charged for.

Is this the group's intent, or do items added in not-new condition need special consideration?

8. Staff training topics for tutorials available via Niche Academy

Seeking ideas for and assistance with content suitable for tutorials for library staff using the Niche Academy learning platform. Find a few tutorials for staff near the top of this page:

<https://www.ifls.lib.wi.us/knowledge-base/more-training-video-demos/>

9. Standardize the procedure for returned mail/indicating an incorrect mailing address in patron records

What is the best way to indicate that the address in a patron record is not correct so that libraries do not attempt to send mail to the patron at that address more than once?

10. Revisit "missed, chargeable damage" procedure

This comes up when a damaged item is returned to and checked in at a library where the damage is not identified, then sent to the owning library. When received at the owning library, they determine the damage should be charged for. In the [MORE Damaged Items Procedure](#), the path is: Damaged item arrived in courier > Damage does not appear to have occurred while in-transit > Item is owned by your library but no damage form is attached > Damage is chargeable.

The current procedure says:

1. Determine the library that sent your item back to you ("the library of last transaction"). Open an IFLS Help Desk ticket if you need help figuring out which library that was.
2. Work with the sending/check-in library to determine responsibility for the item replacement. Options include [adding a bill to the patron record](#) or requesting payment from that library. [This form \(.docx\) can be customized and sent with the damaged item back to the sending/check-in library](#)

3. If the patron will be billed, the sending/check-in library should notify their patron to expect the bill.

For cases where the form linked in #2 is used, at least one library takes issue with applying the bill to the patron record (if the library opts to charge their patron rather than intercept the charge), suggesting "Each library needs to do their own billing on Sierra for items they own."

Does the committee consider the current procedure sound, or in need of adjustment?