

Standing Orders/Continuations in Voyager

The primary issue of using the Voyager acquisitions client to order and receive standing orders is the difficulty with the subscription pattern. Many standing order volumes have captions, enumeration, chronology and frequencies that are not accurately or easily captured by Voyager's standard publication patterns. The results are mixed, with some simple patterns easily generated—Annual, yr; Annual, vol., yr—and others needing substantial editing as volumes are received—8-10 volumes/year, 2 parts/volume; Annual, yr/yr. Some volumes may have no enumeration or chronology, therefore no subscription pattern, but a library may still want to track its ordering, payment and receipt history with the acquisitions client (for example, a publisher's series where each volume is cataloged separately as a unique title).

Starting in version 6.1 the acquisitions client introduced a new publication pattern functionality in the form of "Complex Publication Patterns." This feature allows greater flexibility in creating difficult-to-describe publication patterns and can reduce the amount of editing necessary as individual volumes are received. See the *Voyager Acquisitions User's Guide* pages 8-68 – 8-92 for more information on this feature.

This document is intended to suggest guidelines for some approaches to these issues. It is not intended as a complete set of solutions for all libraries. Acquisitions/serials work is in many ways a local process and libraries may choose to implement whatever approach(es) best suits their staff and patrons. It should be noted, however, that the display of holdings information is a consortial concern and the adherence to national standards is strongly recommended.

Definition of Standing Order/Continuation

For the purposes of this document the terms standing orders and continuations are interchangeable. They are meant to define a type of serial, monographic series or monographic set, by its general frequency and payment structure. Standing orders or continuations are titles issued in successive parts, received annually or less frequently, and paid for as they are received. This is clearly a broad definition as there are many titles that are much more frequent, or paid for as a "subscription", that a library may want to treat as a standing order or continuation.

Four options:

1. Use Voyager acquisitions client for ordering and receiving standing orders, display checked-in issues in WebVoyage.
2. Use Voyager acquisitions client for ordering and receiving standing orders, suppress issues from WebVoyage and use the MFHD in the Cataloging client for generating your holdings display in WebVoyage.
3. Use Voyager acquisitions client for ordering standing orders and use the MFHD in the Cataloging client for receiving and for generating your holdings display in WebVoyage.
4. Order and receive standing orders outside of Voyager and use the MFHD to reflect holdings and generating your holdings display in WebVoyage.

Some libraries may have started to use the Voyager acquisitions client for ordering and receiving standing orders (Option 1 or 2) and are now choosing to use the Voyager acquisitions client for ordering only and using the MFHD for check-in (Option 3). There are specific issues related to changing processes which will also be discussed below.

Option 1 – Use Voyager acquisitions client for ordering and receiving standing orders, display checked-in issues in WebVoyage.

- Pros
 - Optimized use of integrated library system
 - Volumes/issues can be immediately displayed as they are checked in
 - Checking in volumes/issues via the acquisitions client will generate a "received" date and detailed receipt history
 - Claiming is facilitated by being integrated with check-in functions
 - Acquisitions staff need little, if any, additional training in the Cataloging client or MFHD
 - Staff use only one client for ordering and receiving, possibly simplifying acquisitions/serials workflow
- Cons
 - Difficulty in generating correct frequencies, captions and subscription patterns
 - Substantial editing of volumes/issues may be needed as they are checked in or additional work may also need to be done in the MFHD
 - Nature of material may complicate workflows (are these types of materials "different" than regular subscriptions for periodicals and involve different staff?)
- Sample pattern problems with possible solutions
 - Year/year or Volume (Year/yr), e.g., 2003/2004 or v. 1 (2003/2004)
 - Use a frequency of Annual, yr. or Annual, v., yr. and start your prediction
 - Change the first volume to yr/yr. When volume is checked in, change the next expected volume to yr/yr.
 - Volume and/or year issued in multiple parts:
 - 2004, v.1; 2004, v. 2; 2004, v. 3
 - Use a prediction pattern of Annual, yr. Do not use Annual v., yr.
 - Start your predication and add v.1 to the first issue
 - Add issues for the other volumes
 - Repeat for the next expected volumes
 - v.1 (2004), pt. 1; v.1 (2004), pt. 2
 - Use a frequency of Annual, yr.
- Things to consider
 - Are the holdings as they are generated from the Voyager acquisitions client acceptable to your patrons and staff? Are serial/monographic set holdings also being added or edited directly in the MFHD from the cataloging client? If so, are they consistent with each other?
 - Do you want to collapse volumes to generate holdings? If yes, then you need to check-in using the Voyager acquisitions client.
 - Is the work needed to manually edit volumes at check-in for a percentage of your standing orders reasonable for your staff as compared for the work needed to manually edit a MFHD? Are serials staff trained (and authorized) to edit MFHDs?

Option 2 – Use Voyager acquisitions client for ordering and receiving standing orders, suppress issues from WebVoyage and use the MFHD in the Cataloging client for display

- Pros
 - Optimized use of integrated library system
 - Checking in volumes/issues via the acquisitions client will generate a "received" date and detailed receipt history
 - Claiming is facilitated by being integrated with check-in functions
- Cons
 - Processes are duplicated as substantial editing of volumes/issues may still need to be done in the acquisitions client and the MFHD.
 - Nature of material may complicate workflows (are these types of materials "different" than regular subscriptions for periodicals and involve different staff? That is, is editing MFHDs a "cataloging" function at your institution as opposed to an "acquisitions" function?)
- Things to consider
 - Is a detailed receipt history in the check-in module critical to your staff? Would Payment History give you an adequate receipt history?

Option 3 – Use the Voyager Acquisitions client for ordering and paying standing orders and use the MFHD in the Cataloging client for receiving

- Pros
 - More flexibility with holdings variables—frequency, captions, enumeration, chronology. Consequently holdings can be more accurately represented in many cases.
 - Holdings can be very detailed (853/863) or summarized (866). Holdings would need to be very detailed (853/863) to replicate the receipt history in the acquisitions client.
 - You can control the order of the volumes (reverse chronology)
- Cons
 - Ordering and receiving functions are not connected (require separate workflow, maybe different staff)
 - Holdings must be manually entered in the MFHD using the Cataloging client. Additional work is required to "replicate" level of detail in the acquisitions client.
 - If Items are also created, item records will also have to be manually created.
 - Need separate workflow for claiming. Claiming process may involve other variables outside of the Voyager acquisitions client, e.g., shipping reports from vendors. Claiming history will need to be manually added to the acquisitions client.
 - Staff workflow may need to be modified to accommodate working with the Cataloging client. Additional training related to the MFHD may also be needed.
 - No "received" date in MFHD
- Problems w/ solutions
 - Claiming
 - Work very closely with your vendor to regularly receive shipping reports and publication schedules OR
 - Develop MS Access reports to pull invoice information (with volume information) from purchase orders OR
 - Other methods for generating possible claims outside Voyager check-in?

Any method of generating possible claims also requires

- Developing schedule for reviewing reports and claiming
- Developing processes for tracking claims
- If tracking is done in the Line Item Notes, develop input standards (Access reports using "Notes" criteria are optimized if notes are standardized.)
- No "received" date in the MFHD
 - Use "received" information from invoice—invoice date or paid date
- Things to consider
 - Do you have staff that is experienced with working with the MFHD and holdings data standards? If not, additional training is required.
 - Do you wish to replicate the holdings level you get from the client (holdings level 4, possibly frequency and pattern fields in 853/863)? If so, additional MFHD work is required.

Option 4 – Order and receive standing orders outside of Voyager and use the MFHD to reflect holdings

- Pros
 - More flexibility with holdings variables—frequency, captions, enumeration, chronology. Consequently, holdings can be more accurately represented in many cases.
 - Holdings can be very detailed (853/863) or summarized (866). Holdings would need to be very detailed (853/863 and fixed fields) to replicate the receipt history in the acquisitions client.
 - You can control the order of the volumes (reverse chronology)
- Cons
 - No acquisitions/serials processes are integrated with other clients or OPAC
 - Must maintain a separate system and acquisitions/check-in records for acquisitions/serials functions
 - No additional check-in functions in Voyager, i.e., collapsing, binding,
 - All holdings must be manually entered in the MFHD
- Other things to consider
 - You may be replicating processes by receiving material in some other system.
 - Claiming - Same considerations as Option 3 above.

Changing from Option 1 or 2 to Option 3

- Process
 - Have a clear understanding of when the process changes (workflow, exact date, etc.) so that you know where and how to get a complete picture of your holdings.
 - Verify that your processes are replicating the level of detail from the acquisitions client that you wish to maintain.
 - Decide and document the coding level you are using in the MFHD to replicate holdings information you would have in the acquisitions client.
 - Transfer the volumes you have received via the client to the MFHD
 - Collapse issues in client and edit the MFHD OR
 - Enter issues/volumes directly in MFHD
 - Delete issues from Acquisitions client after MFHD is complete so that holdings are not duplicated in WebVoyage OR
 - Suppress issues if you wish to keep the existing receipt history in the acquisitions client.
- Things to consider
 - Do you wish to transfer all issues to the MFHD at once or do you want to do it title by title as you receive new issues? Use a combination of both methods, that is, start title by title and then finish the process when a percentage of the titles are completed?

Standing orders for unnumbered series or series that are cataloged separately

- All options above can apply but if volumes are cataloged separately there will be no single MFHD with holdings. Checking in volumes/issues in Acquisitions client may be best method for tracking receipt history (Option 2 above).
- Usually irregular (and in some cases, no enumeration or chronology, e.g., World of Art (publishers' series)) so there will be a need for a non-predictive pattern in the acquisitions title.
- Claiming may need to involve some of the claiming processes described in Option 3 above if volumes/issues are irregular or have no enumeration or chronology.