

Multivolume Parts for AV

Proposed Change to Policy:

Submitted by Elaine Hardy, PINES and Collaborative Projects Manager

Brief summary:

Currently, PINES has implemented multivolume parts for only print materials. If holds restrictions are removed for music, audiobooks, DVDs, and video cassettes, implementing part labelling for these materials will allow holds on specific volumes of a multivolume AV set.

Detailed proposal:

<https://pines.georgialibraries.org/sites/default/files/AI-2%20Multivolume%20Parts%20for%20AV.pdf>

Survey Results

The following summary is based on survey results from 44 PINES Subcommittee members and Directors representing 34 library systems. One question was asked.

- 1. If holds restrictions are lifted for all or specific audiovisual circulation modifiers, should PINES implement monographic parts for those audio-visual circulation modifiers?**

Overall Responses:

	Responses	Percentage
Yes	34	77%
No	7	16%
Not Sure	3	7%

Responses by Cataloging Subcommittee Members Only:

	Responses	Percentage
Yes	8	89%
No	1	11%

Responses from Other Subcommittee Members:

	Responses	Percentage
Yes	14	88%
No	2	12%

Responses from Directors who are not subcommittee members:

	Responses	Percentage
Yes	12	63%
No	4	21%
Not Sure	3	16%

Comments

- Another reason NOT to lift hold restrictions on AV
- If patrons are putting items on hold they should be able to get exactly what they need.
- My tech services staff provided feedback - they feel that adding monographic parts modifiers going forward won't add to their workload significantly, but any change that involves a lot of recon work (having to go back and identify and add modifiers to items already in the collection) would be burdensome.
- Pros and cons aside, to not allow patrons to request parts of multi-part AV materials, as is done for books, would defeat the fundamental purpose of providing AV materials to PINES users.
- The details described for this action item are a bit confusing to me. It is my understanding that the reason we are changing graphic novels to individual records is to make placing holds easier. This policy that is being proposed seems like we'd be adjusting how PINES works to allow for patrons to place copy holds on multi volume sets. If that is the case, what then is the reasoning for changing how we catalog graphic novels?
- We don't catalog in parts, and do not want to do so. We'd rather lose the whole series than be left with half an item when the other half goes long overdue.
- While this is undoubtedly necessary if the associated proposal carries, this proposal is incomplete. It fails to specify by whom and how this will be accomplished. Will individual library systems be responsible for updating their own items? If so, will there be a time frame/limit imposed by when this must be accomplished? Will PINES?