Action Item 2

Multivolume Parts Implementation

Called monographic parts in Evergreen, multivolume parts implementation will allow holds on specific volumes of a multivolume set. The Cataloging subcommittee is recommending limited implementation of this functionality.

For DVDs and other audio-visual materials, some libraries process mult-volume sets as one part, others as multi-parts. Current PINES cataloging policies leave such processing decisions to local policy. There is no current way to distinguish specific part designations by library during holds placement meaning that patrons would have no way of knowing which part represented their local library until they could successfully place a hold.

In general, print multivolume sets are processed consistently throughout PINES, making holds placement on specific volumes less confusing for patrons and staff. It is the recommendation of the Cataloging Subcommittee that multivolume parts implementation initially be limited to print multivolume sets and that AV implementation be postponed. This would give PINES libraries the chance to access the overall functionality without the problems caused by differing processing of multivolume AV sets. Print multivolume works would include graphic novel serials, encyclopedias and annual compilations such as Southern Living annual recipes.

1) Should PINES implement monographic parts for print multivolume sets?

Cataloging subcommittee vote:

> 5 yes
> 3 – No response

2) Parts are created for the whole consortium. Should PINES use a controlled terminology for parts designations? (For example: Vols. for volumes, Pt. for parts). Note: Volume designations as part of the call number would still be up to local policy.

Cataloging subcommittee vote:

> 5 yes
> 3 – No response

Committee Discussion:

> Controlled vocabulary is a must!!!!!!

3) A major issue with PINES implementation is the retrospective work to get existing multi-part titles assigned part designations. Given the disparity in how PINES libraries indicate (or don't) volumes, PINES staff cannot determine a way to batch process the change. As a result, retrospective changes would likely need to be done by local cataloging staff.

3a) Should it be up to the individual library whether to implement retrospectively?

Cataloging subcommittee vote:

> 5 Yes
> 3 – No response

Committee Discussion:

- Think all should be strongly encouraged to implement retrospectively
- Retroactive implementation should be up to the individual system. Depending on how many items would be affected by this, it might place too much of an undue burden on some systems who have extremely limited staff and time.
- Should be left up to the individual library and thus, individual systems should be encouraged but not required to edit existing titles.
- Libraries should be encouraged, not required to edit.
- Up to the individual library but encouraged by PINES.

3b) Should individual systems be encouraged or required to edit existing titles in a specific time frame?

Cataloging Subcommittee recommends that libraries be encouraged to edit in a specific time frame. No recommendation for the time frame.

Committee Discussion:

- I think a time frame is good, but I'd prefer the "encouraged to edit" rather than "required to edit."
- Specific time frame, yes but not sure how long it should be – otherwise it will be put off forever.
- As for a specific time frame, I'd say a long ways out. Retro work takes a lot of time. Some library systems (like mine) only have one Cat1 and no other cataloging staff.