DETROIT AREA LIBRARY NETWORK: BRINGING UP ACQUISITIONS
B. Heath
October, 1990

Wayne State University Libraries belong to a consortium of 12
libraries in the greater Detroit area called DALNET (Detroit Area
Library Network). We are the largest library in the consortium,
and we were the first library to bring up acquisitions on NOTIS.
Acquisitions was brought up as a separate process from the
serials kardex and periodical checkin conversion. Each process
had its own separate staff, although there was considerable
cooperation and discussion between the two staffs and the heads
of the respective projects.

At the beginning of these processes, some thought was given to
the effect of Wayne's acquisitions decisions on the other
libraries in DALNET. We thought about the fact that there were
two kinds of standards we might discuss in our consortium
environment: standards which affect messages in the online
catalog, that librarians and patrons would see on a routine
basis, and standards affecting records which did not display to
the public but only to other Technical Services staff.

As other DALNET libraries began to be trained in acquisitions and
serials control, it became clear that we needed to discuss
standards, particularly for publicly-displayed records, on a more
structured and regular basis than we had been doing up to that
point. About eight months after Wayne began ordering and paying
on NOTIS, and a couple of months after our Kardex conversion
formally began, a committee with members from various DALNET
libraries was formed. The committee was given three charges: 1)
to develop standards for the shared vendor file; 2) to develop
standards for consistent display of acquisitions information in
the online catalog; and 3) to develop a list of management
reports that NOTIS did not provide and that our programmers would
develop for us using SAS software. The first charge is an
example of a standard which would affect a record that does not
display to the public. The second and third charges obviously do
have many public services implications, although there are
messages on the OPR, for example, which do not display to the
public.   .

The basic process was that the committee would meet and discuss
the issues referred to above. After a number of meetings,
written recommendations were submitted to the DALNET Project
Managers Board, whose members would read the reports and discuss
them, if necessary, with the staff at their own libraries. Then
they would vote to accept or not accept the proposals. I will

discuss implementing them at the end of my talk.

In this talk, I will discuss briefly the following:

1. the shared vendor file.
2. displays of acquisitions information in the online public catalog, including

- messages generated from the copy holdings record
- messages generated from the OPR
- messages generated from the VHLD
- content of provisional bibliographic records
3. management reports of various types that DALNET libraries wished to have.

1) THE VENDOR FILE

The shared vendor file is a feature of NOTIS that no one in a consortium seems to like. For those of you not in a consortium, sharing the file means that any library can edit, add to, or delete, any information on the vendor record of any other library. We saw many problems with this, and would have preferred to have a password structure making this kind of changing and editing impossible. Since, however, the structure of NOTIS passwords does not allow access to some vendor records while blocking access to others, we decided to approach the matter somewhat differently. In DALNET, each library's vendor codes start with a certain letter of the alphabet: Wayne's start with "z", so our codes read, for example, "zfaxon", "zbookhouse", zswets." Doing this makes it unlikely that a library would inadvertently call up the vendor record of another library and make changes to that record. The vendor list printing program was changed so that vendor lists print by processing unit (each library in DALNET is a separate processing unit). Vendor codes are developed by each library with no attempt to make the codes uniform after the first letter. In other words, our use of the shared vendor file is to act as though it consisted of separate and distinct unshared files. This is a file that the public has no access to, so no standards were developed beyond what I have described above.

2) DISPLAYS OF ACQUISITIONS INFORMATION IN THE ONLINE PUBLIC CATALOG
Acquisitions, or acquisitions-like, information comes basically from three records: the copy holdings, the OPR, and the volume holdings.

Messages generated from the Copy Holdings record (or from that record in combination with the OPR), which Acquisitions departments are responsible for, are: "IN THE PRE-ORDER PROCESS"; "ON ORDER, NOT YET RECEIVED", "IN PROCESS. TO HAVE CATALOGED FOR

YOUR USE, ASK AT CIRCULATION DESK"; and the infamous "THIS RECORD IS FOR STAFF USE." The committee discussed all four of these · messages and agreed that only one of them needed to be changed. We changed THIS RECORD IS FOR STAFF USE to THIS IS A LIBRARY STAFF PROCESSING RECORD because of the confusion, and even anger, that the former message seemed to generate.

Universal messages entered onto the Copy Holdings Record are worded clearly and are not coded in any way.

Information appearing in the public catalog from the OPR is primarily information from the R statements for serials and periodicals. We agreed upon three things: 1) we encouraged all libraries to use NISO punctuation standards; 2) if libraries wished R lines to display in the online catalog, they should make sure that serial type was set at p or n, even if it meant lying a little; and 3) libraries should not use receivers' initials or coded notes in these lines, as this practice would undoubtedly confuse both library patrons and public services librarians.

Since the Volume Holdings record can be created, and added to, by staff in various library units, not just Central Technical Services staff, our committee made rather detailed and careful recommendations for information keyed onto this record. Our recommendations were the following:

Volume holdings records should contain holdings and retention information, and more specific location information than is provided on the copy holdings record. In addition, notes should also be used to refer the patron to another copy held by the institution. Specifically, the following would be shown on the volume holdings records:
- Shelving title
- Holdings, including gaps and partially bound volumes
- Shelving location of complete or partial runs
- "Bound with" information
- Incomplete volumes
- Information about supplements and indexes
- Retention patterns
- Other copies in different formats
- Volumes in a series cataloged separately

Any other notes which would help the user to locate the title or a related title could be entered in this free text record.

Serial holdings would include captions (v., Bd., Lfg., etc.) and would be closed with the last bound volume, even if the title was still being currently received. This last decision was somewhat controversial and was discussed at length. Although the committee had recommended a certain amount of flexibility in other parts of displaying fields, we felt that the open vs closed decision had to be uniform because of the great confusion that

users would have otherwise.

Provisional bibliographic records are created in Acquisitions at time of ordering when a full cataloging record is not available. In DALNET (as in other NOTIS libraries), we also create brief "billing records" for purposes of paying blanket orders, and also to pay for series for which we create full individual bibliographic records at time of receipt or cataloging. As a consortium, we felt we needed to agree on minimum information to be put into such a record wherever possible.

For the first type of record (one that is intended to be replaced by a full record by a cataloger), we agreed to include·the following fields: Encoding level, date, author (checking the NOTIS bibliographic database first for latest form of name), title, edition if applicable, imprint, and series if easily determined.

For the "billing records", we agreed to be even briefer, including Format s, author (if desired), title, and possibly place of publication if necessary for clarity. The title on these records could vary: some of us use "billing record", some "payment record", some use "membership record", etc. Everything else was thought optional. We also agreed that these "billing records" would be coded for suppression in the online public catalog upon implementation of release 5.0.

To summarize our consortium decisions regarding acquisitions records which display messages to the public, we feel that the following general principles are important: Any message that displays in the public online catalog should be as clear and simple as possible. Coded and abbreviated messages should be avoided. Consistency on major issues is essential. Examples are closing serial holdings, showing gaps in holdings, the order of information keyed onto the VHLD, and the wording of "on order" and "in process" messages. Variations are allowed if they are such that they don't confuse the user, who will be going from the records input by one library to those of another.   If you are one library on a database, you only have to be concerned about internal consistency. If you are in a consortium, consistency in areas such as I have described above is even more important.

3) MANAGEMENT REPORTS

Finally, the taskforce discussed the issue of management reports at great length, made some recommendations, and presented them to members of the DALNET Project Managers Group, who presented them to their librarians and staff for additions and comments. We came up with the following rather short list. (Keeping it short was a deliberate decision: we felt we had a better chance of obtaining some of these reports if the list was manageable.)

New book list
List of journals and serials by fund
Ability to search by a vendor's invoice number (very important)
List of orders cancelled during a given period
List of titles received on memberships and blanket orders
List of journals within a given price range
Discount rate, system-wide and by vendor.

A few of these have been developed; many are still in process.

The issues I have discussed today are the result of our working
in a consortium environment and trying to achieve a certain
amount of consistency within that consortium. Implementing these
proposals has up til now been a rather informal affair, in that
the Systems Office incorporates them into their NOTIS
Acquisitions training, and questions are answered by that office
or by a WSU Acquisitions person as they are raised at each
library. We have not felt the need for any stricter enforcing
than that. As you can see, we have allowed for flexibility
wherever possible, and, of course, we rely on the goodwill of all
of us to achieve the standards that we have established. Our
consortium committees continue to meet as new issues surface or
as old ones need to be reworked. It has been an interesting
experience, and a wonderful opportunity to get to know staff from
other libraries and, indeed, to learn more about other libraries
in our area in general.