November 2006

Changing the way Libraries and Faculty Assess Periodical Collections in the Electronic Age

Jenica Rogers

SUNY Potsdam, rogersjp@potsdam.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>

Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rogers, Jenica (2006) "Changing the way Libraries and Faculty Assess Periodical Collections in the Electronic Age," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 18: Iss. 5, Article 9.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.5009>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

result searches can represent a negative user micro-interaction with a resource, and it would be encouraging to that user to have a system that is responsive to the need described in the search. We recognize that it may not be possible or desirable to eliminate zero result searches, and that was not the goal of the project.

One reason that null searches may have remained steady in spite of the growth of the digital resources in DLESE might be that during the time of this study, collection development changed from adding one record at a time to batch loading of collection, and in one example during this time, DLESE added over 1000 records with the same metadata. In that case, the numbers increased by 1000 but the variety did not. The kind of collection assessment described here focused on the need to add breadth to the collection rather than depth. Other factors in the steady state of the null search percents are the interaction of the user and the search system. It is possible that there is some sort of expected percent of zero result searches across time in this type of digital library.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Part of this work was funded by NSF grants DUE02-26233, DUE02-26292 and DUE02-85839. We thank John Weatherley and his staff at the DLESE Program Center for supplying the filtered data, and Kim Kastens and Neil Holzman of the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory at Columbia University for their work on creating graphs and charts (Neil) and for many productive and interesting discussions about trends in the data and what they mean for collection development (Kim).

REFERENCES CITED

DeFelice, B., Kastens, K., Rinaldo, C., & Weatherley, J. (2006). *Insights into Collections Gaps through Examination of Null Result Searches in DLESE*. Opening Information Horizons, the Sixth ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries, Chapel Hill, NC.

Gagnon, S., & Makuch, J. (2003). *Using Data from Web-server Logs to Develop a Concept-based Browse Set*. Navigating the Shoals: Evolving User Services in Aquatic and Marine Science Libraries, Proceedings of the 29th International Aquatic and Marine Science Libraries and Information Centers (IAMSLIC) Annual Conference, Mystic, CT.

Hall, B. H. (1985). *Collection Assessment Manual for College and University Libraries*. Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press.

Kastens, K., DeFelice, B., Devaul, H., DiLeonardo, C., Ginger, K., Larsen, S., et al. (2005). Questions & Challenges Arising in Building the Collection of a Digital Library for Education: Lessons from Five Years of DLESE. *D-LIB Magazine*, 11(11).

Manduca, C., & Mogk, D. (2000). *DLESE:*

Digital Library for Earth System Education A Community Plan. Boulder, CO: DLESE Program Center.

Nisonger, T. E. (1992). *Collection Evaluation in Academic Libraries: A Literature Guide and Annotated Bibliography*. Englewood, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited.

Richards, D. T., & Eakin, D. (1997). *Collection Development and Assessment in Health Sciences Libraries*. Scarecrow Press, Lanham, MD: Medical Library Association.

Rinaldo, C., & DeFelice, B. (2005). *DLESE, Digital Library for Earth System Education: Using Search Logs to Assess a Digital Library Collection*. Poster presented at the IAMSLIC Conference (International Association of Aquatic and Marine Science Libraries and Information Centers), Rome, Italy.

Constance Rinaldo

Librarian of the Ernst Mayr Library Museum of Comparative Zoology
Harvard University, 26 Oxford St., Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: (617) 495-4576 Fax: (617) 496-6838
<crinaldo@oeb.harvard.edu> <http://library.mcz.harvard.edu>

BORN & LIVED: Born Tacoma, Washington grew up in Boston MA; lived in Oregon, Illinois, Maryland, Vermont and New Hampshire (currently).

EDUCATION: BA in Biology and Anthropology, University of MA/Boston; MS in Zoology, University of Connecticut; MLS University of Maryland.

PROFESSIONAL CAREER AND ACTIVITIES: National Agricultural Library Intern 1988-1989, Dartmouth College Biomedical Libraries 1989-1999; Ernst Mayr Library of the Museum of Comparative Zoology 1999-present.

IN MY SPARE TIME I LIKE TO: Hike, garden, read and watch my kids perform in the circus.

FAVORITE BOOKS: *My Family and Other Animals* by Gerald Durrell; *All Creatures Great and Small* by James Herriot; *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen.

HOW/WHERE DO I SEE THE INDUSTRY IN FIVE YEARS: More social networking via libraries; increased educational functions, more and better filtering of information, better management of and access to electronic resources.

Changing the way Libraries and Faculty Assess Periodical Collections in the Electronic Age

by Jenica Rogers (Collection Development Coordinator and Technical Services Librarian, SUNY Potsdam) <rogersjp@potsdam.edu>

Background

Libraries have been struggling with a period of transition for the past ten years. It became clear in the mid 1990s that the emergence of the Internet as an information stream would reshape and reframe our professional values and practices, but for the most part libraries simply had to wait and see exactly how that would happen. As librarians have struggled to predict the future and act accordingly, we've had ample time to observe what has come to pass. We now know that the Internet had a profound effect on the production and distribution of scholarly information, and changed the user's expectation

of information delivery equally dramatically. At the same time, library budgets were strained by depressed economics in higher education, and the emergence of online information resources, coupled with the rising costs of periodicals, increased that constraint. As user expectations have changed, and purchasing power has shrunk, libraries have struggled to balance traditional collecting habits with emerging patterns in our information culture.

Speaking practically, as budgets remained flat and the need for online content increased, libraries curtailed monograph purchasing, and have been forced to cut their periodicals sub-

scriptions.

Each year, as prices rise, and acknowledging the overlap of most online resources with traditional print periodicals, libraries have turned to their print subscriptions to create budget flexibility, cutting the least used titles and the lower-demand niche titles from the collection.

Today many libraries have reached the point at which they can no longer comfortably or responsibly reduce their print periodical holdings

continued on page 40

— to reduce their subscriptions further would be damaging to campus research and learning — but they are continuing to face the same financial constraints, user expectations of quick access, and concerns about print versus online access that led to the need to cancel titles. Faculty at many institutions are becoming increasingly embittered by their libraries' need to cancel periodicals, and in some cases library-faculty relationships are suffering. Furthermore, these seemingly endless rounds of cuts have led to print collections created not by forethought and planning, but necessity — only protected titles remain, often with too little attention paid to the balance between print and online information, the uniqueness of each library's collection as it relates to the curriculum, or the emerging needs of digitally native users.

In light of the changes of the past decade and the new information horizon racing toward us, we felt that the time had come to change the SUNY Potsdam campus conversation about periodicals — and in doing so, change our perception about library periodical collections. The time had come to try something new.

The Old Way

Many libraries have shared a similar approach to reducing their periodicals budget — evaluating and cutting titles. Both anecdotal and published evidence support this assertion; the literature is full of interesting and useful articles describing how University X methodically approached their periodicals cutting exercise, and the conversation of serials or collection management librarians, gathered at a conference or workshop, will inevitably turn to "how we cut our subscriptions this year". The prevailing strategy, one we employed at Potsdam for many consecutive years, has been to provide selectors — be they librarians or faculty — with the list of current periodicals in a subject area, a collection of relevant data concerning use, price, and online availability, and then asking for opinions on which titles should be cancelled. Lists were generated, subscriptions were discussed, and the collection became leaner each year, inevitably favoring retention of high-use, low-cost print titles.

There were several unintended side-effects of this process. First, librarians had fallen out of the habit of considering any new titles — the process had become so focused on reducing expenditures that it was inadvertently blocking conversation about new periodicals, emerging curricular needs, or our changing student body. Second, continued cuts were creating an upwelling of frustration among teaching faculty who were simultaneously being given smaller resources for purchasing monographs (due to the increasing size of the electronic resources budget) and being asked to help us subscribe to fewer periodicals (to offset yearly price increases). They had come to view the periodicals cancellation process as a time when they must protect the traditional resources available in their subject area, rather than a chance to collaborate with the College Libraries. The prob-

against the grain people profile

Jenica Rogers-Urbank

Collection Development Coordinator
and Technical Services Librarian

Phone: (315)-267-3328 <rogersjp@potdams.edu>

BORN & LIVED: I was born and raised in northern Illinois, but spent summers with family in Rhode Island and the Adirondacks.

FAMILY: By the time this is published, I will be married!

EDUCATION: BA in English Literature from Trinity College in Hartford, CT, and MLIS from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

MOST MEANINGFUL CAREER ACHIEVEMENT: I love the challenge of starting a new project from the ground up, and I'm very proud that my colleagues recognize my ability to follow through and my willingness to take the risk.

FIRST JOB: Bindery assistant in a print shop. I've been working with the printed word since I was 15.

FAVORITE BOOKS: I recently read and loved Naomi Novik's *His Majesty's Dragon*.

PHILOSOPHY: To borrow from Ursula K. LeGuin, "When action grows unprofitable, gather information; when information grows unprofitable, sleep." And to borrow from Cameron Crowe, "Optimism is a revolutionary act."

lem was clear: the libraries were approaching the faculty with a yearly request for negative feedback about our collections, and they were providing us with exactly what we asked for.

The New Way

Several campus departments have had extensive faculty turnover due to retirements, and we chose two to approach as pilot participants. Because of their many new faculty members — with new curricular foci and new approaches to their field — these departments were eager to discuss our holdings in their areas of expertise. We were aware that we were stacking the deck in our favor by approaching eager new faculty with our changed approach, but felt that the benefit to the departments and the momentum gained by the libraries if the pilot proved successful justified our choices.

To get the project started, our Collection Development Coordinator explained the project in overview to the chair of each participating department, knowing that without engaged buy-in from departmental leadership, any project is likely to struggle. The Coordinator and chairs agreed that a librarian would conduct meetings with each department member (or, in larger departments, with one representative of each major area covered in the curriculum), and interview them about their periodical needs and usage. The librarians would compile a list of periodical recommendations based on their feedback, and then the department chair and librarians would meet to come to an agreement on a course of action. On the surface, that process is not remarkably different from the processes employed in the past — the difference lies in the questions asked during these interviews.

Past periodicals conversations had focused on currently-held titles, usage statistics, and cost, and had been accompanied by lengthy lists and spreadsheets, laden with valuable but complex data. How should a faculty member interpret use of current issues in relation to price? Librarians have productive conversations about such data, but this is not the faculty's area of expertise, and the data was not helping them make recommendations. The new interview process eliminated that portion of the conversation entirely. Hypothesizing that presentation of data and lists regarding the current state of affairs was pre-determining library-faculty communication about the collection, and that the initial statement of "what we have now" was preventing all parties from looking at the broader periodicals context, the new process focused on student learning (a key part of the libraries' collection development policy), and on print versus online access (an issue of ever-increasing relevance to both users and budgets). When librarians met with each faculty member in the target department, they asked a series of straightforward, jargon-free questions:

1. What courses do you teach regularly? Which courses do you teach infrequently? What courses do you have in development?
2. Considering those courses, what assignments do you give your students that require library research?
3. What journals are most appropriate when they do that research?
4. Does it matter to your course's learning objectives if those journals are in print or online?

continued on page 42

5. What student-accessible titles do you think we should have in print to provide a representative browsing collection in your discipline?

These questions are clearly tailored to one library's mission, and an institution with a greater focus on faculty research or with different unique strengths would ask dramatically different questions. The key as we perceived it was to finally ask the questions that we really wanted answers to — how do faculty use library resources in their classroom, and how do they view online resources?

The interviewing librarian recorded all of the answers given by the faculty member, and found that faculty could answer those questions on the spot, with no need for research, lists, or data. We were asking questions that get at the heart of what faculty at a liberal-arts teaching college do while still highlighting the digital information landscape and its effects on teaching and learning. Additionally, the simple act of soliciting positive responses — asking “what do you need?” rather than “is what we have good enough?” — brought a collaborative energy to the project that had been missing from past periodicals exercises.

Using the Data

After all faculty members had been interviewed, their responses were input into an Excel spreadsheet, sorted by requested format, and then compared to the College Libraries' current subscription list. (See Fig. 1.)

The lists were sorted, and areas of faculty consensus as well as unique requests were identified. After adding current subscription status, current online availability, and current price, librarians assessed the requests, making recommendations based on our responsibility for overall collection balance and our professional experience. We made changes, adding in general titles that faculty had not suggested for the print collection, but which we felt added value to the browsing collection. We also moved some titles to the “not recommended” list based on excessive cost or the irregularity with which the

subject matter is included in the curriculum. Additionally, it was amazing to see how many of the titles that faculty had vehemently declared “essential” and “must be kept” in previous years did not appear on the new list at all, backing up the hypothesis that decisions were being made in the wrong context in previous years.

What we presented to each department chair was a series of short lists:

1. **Cancellations.** This list consisted of print titles that could be cancelled, titles that no one requested, or because the title was desired only in online format, which we were already getting through an aggregator.
2. **Titles to retain in print.** These titles were perceived to be valuable in print, and faculty agreed that classroom assignments would foster that print use.
3. **New titles.** The final action list was of new subscriptions requested, either for online-only or print-only access, or both.
4. **Currently available online titles.** This list was included as an educational tool. Faculty requested many titles that they wanted to see available online — titles that the libraries were already providing access to. This list pointed out the need for better communication of our available online resources to our faculty.
5. **Titles not acted upon.** This list was also included as an educational tool, and was made up of suggestions from faculty members in which the librarians' opinions differed from theirs. We felt that there was a teachable moment in including this list, allowing us to talk openly with the faculty about how and why we make decisions about our collections.

Each list had an associated cost — \$X to be achieved by cancellations, \$Y to be spent on new titles, \$Z in current subscriptions. The Collection Development Coordinator worked with the department chair to balance those costs in light of the year's proposed subject allocation for periodicals. In each case, we were able

to find a compromise that worked for both the department and the College Libraries.

Drawbacks

The process is not without drawbacks. It is an extremely time-consuming way to approach periodicals subscriptions because of the personal interaction involved and the human resources required to conduct the many interviews the project calls for. However, based on the amount of goodwill generated by the process, and the amount of information gathered about the relevance, use, and composition of the libraries' collections, we have decided the human resources are well-spent on this endeavour.

There is also the potential, with these open-ended conversations, that the department will identify many more needs than the College Libraries can reasonably meet, and that the lists generated will produce a net increase in spending rather than a decrease. This is a chance we feel we must take — our responsibility is to provide adequate and appropriate resources to support the teaching and learning needs of our student body, not to simply manage budgets. If we learn that we are not supporting a portion of our learning community, it is our responsibility to address that inadequacy, and we are better off for knowing the scope of the problem. In the end, our detailed information gathering can provide the basis for requests for increased funding for the College Libraries, if that is what our assessment warrants. Good decisions must be based on all available information, and despite its drawbacks, this process provides us with far more information than the libraries had been gathering in the past.

Conclusion

The end result of this process was an understanding that, indeed, our approach to periodicals subscription management in the digital age must change. Informal questioning of the faculty who participated in the project indicated that they were pleased to have been consulted one-on-one, in person, and that they were satisfied with the decisions resulting from our conversations. Librarians agreed that it was very enlightening to discuss the teaching needs of the faculty and to gain a better understanding of their perspectives about information resources. We found that this was an excellent opportunity for us to realign our collections with current curricular initiatives, to shift our formats from print to online where appropriate, and to ensure that our periodicals dollars are being spent on the best possible mix of print and online titles for our users and our curriculum.

Collection managers and serials librarians must ask new questions in the new environment libraries operate in. We need to understand what resources our teaching faculty, intimately involved in the research life of a college, believe that their students will need to support teaching and learning. While many librarians will be quick to argue that we have been asking that question of the teaching faculty for years, that may be a false assumption. It appears that what many libraries are asking is “what journals need to be in the library?”, which is a very different question from “what resources, in which format, best support student learning?” That

continued on page 44

Figure 1

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Title Recommended by Faculty Member	Faculty	Wanted: Print or Online	Currently Available Online?	Currently Available in Print?	Cost	Comment
30	Interested in PRINT Access, Currently Subscribed in Print						
31	No action necessary, currently subscribed.						
32	Science	Multiple	Print	Y -- G (1 yr), PQ (1 yr), JS	Y	\$500.00	general fund, not Biology
33	Science News	Multiple	Print	Y -- G, E, PQ, W	Y	\$54.50	general fund, not Biology
34	Conservation Biology	GJ	Print	Y -- JS	Y	\$644.00	
35	Nature	Multiple	Print	Y -- Proprietary	Y	\$1,395.00	general fund, not Biology
36	Scientific American	LR	Print	Y -- W, EB	Y	\$39.95	general fund, not Biology
37							
38	Interested in Online or Print Access, Currently Available Online, ALSO Subscribed in Print						
39	Print subscriptions to these titles should be cancelled in lieu of the duplicated online access.						
40	American Journal of Botany	WC	Online	Y -- W, JS	Y	\$464.00	
41	American Midland Naturalist	Multiple	Online	Y -- BO, PQ, JS	Y	\$88.00	
42	American Naturalist	WC	Online	Y -- PQ, JS	Y	\$433.00	
43	Annual review of Ecology and Systematics	WR	Online	Y -- W, JS	Y	\$208.00	Standing order, not per.
44	Ecological Applications	GJ	Online	Y -- JS	Y	\$261.00	
45	Ecology	Multiple	Online	Y -- JS	Y	\$657.00	
46	Fishery Bulletin	WC	Online	Y -- G, W, Free	Y	\$0.00	
47	Genetics	JT	Online	Y -- PQ	Y	\$814.00	
48	Integrative and Comparative Biology (Am. Zool.)	WC	Online	Y -- BO, W	Y	\$527.00	
49	Journal of Wildlife Management	GJ	Online	Y -- PQ	Y	\$156.00	
50	Southeastern Naturalist	JT	Print	Y -- BO, EB	Y	\$78.00	

Reflections on the OCLC WorldCat Collection Analysis Tool: We Still Need the Next Step

by **Darby Orcutt** (Senior Collection Manager for Humanities and Social Sciences, North Carolina State University)
<Darby_Orcutt@ncsu.edu>

and **Tracy Powell** (Master of Science in Library Science Student, UNC-Chapel Hill) <tracy.n.powell@gmail.com>

Introduction

In March 2005, the **Online Computer Library Center (OCLC)** announced the **WorldCat Collection Analysis Tool (WCA)** as a means for libraries to “compare their collections with those of peer libraries, and compare, as a group, the level of overlap or uniqueness of their collections.”¹ At **North Carolina State University (NCSU)** we logged hundreds of hours over more than six months on a variety of analysis projects using **WCA**. Projects included comparing **North Carolina State University (NCSU) Libraries’** holdings against groups of other research universities in selected fields; comparing holdings across broad subject areas within our local **Triangle Research Library Network (TRLN)** consortium; identifying unique holdings versus the “**Google Five**”² as possibilities for digitization; and conducting (or at least attempting to conduct) a research project seeking to quantify minimum core collections needed at a university level for support of diverse disciplinary programs.

Among our other observations, we found that **WCA**, implicit to its design, privileges institution-level data, much better equipping librarians to conduct old-fashioned, single-institution analyses rather than the cross-institutional comparisons needed for the cooperative decision-making increasingly desired in practice. In this article we will examine **WCA’s** abilities and limitations before turning to an investigation of the capabilities which could make it a truly useful tool for twenty-first century collection analysis.

Abilities of the Tool

WCA enables several kinds of quick data-gathering. It provides easily-accessed **WorldCat** data limited to the user’s home institution (as defined by a single **OCLC** hold-

ings symbol) or with reference to a group of two to five other libraries. It collates the holdings of these comparison schools to produce data regarding overlap and uniqueness, both within the comparison group and as compared to the home institution. This function helped us to conduct quick assessments of the relative depth of collections in broad subject areas among institutions in our consortium, and allowed for the speedy production of charts and other marketing data geared toward researchers and administrators.

WCA greatly facilitates the examination of general trends, at least at larger scales where room exists for margins of error. In analyzing our own as well as **TRLN** holdings, we were able to conduct analyses of age of collections by subject area. This allowed us to generally assess the accuracy of collection assumptions and adherence to collection policies, as well as to see how collecting patterns had changed over time. Interestingly, some legendary “bad budget years” and “times of plenty” could be easily recognized when looking at size of collections by year of imprint.

The ability to quickly develop and export title lists into spreadsheet programs also proved very helpful. For example, we used **WCA** to examine our holdings in public history versus a group of four other institutions. After identifying relevant subject areas, we could readily compare the size of our collection against a calculated mean number of titles in each area. We could also produce title lists for potential acquisitions that, when compared to our catalog, identified items commonly held by other institutions but not our own. While the tool did not eliminate the work of manually assessing title lists in order to eliminate titles that were out-of-date, out-of-scope, or

held in other editions, it did quickly help narrow our focus to titles of likely interest. Sampling and manual analysis of other such lists across all subjects allowed us to identify potential areas and estimate numbers of titles of unique holdings (versus the “**Google Five**”) for potential digitization projects. In each of these cases, **WCA** provided an easy, quick-and-dirty starting point, even though the work required subsequent manipulation and informed human analysis.

As noted by **Phyllis Spies**, Vice-President of **OCLC Collection Management Services**, the tool “leverages the cooperative effort of thousands of librarians around the world who have built — and are continuing to build — **WorldCat**.”³ With more than one billion holdings records, **WorldCat** offers the largest and most comprehensive shared library catalog.

Limitations of the Tool

As any user of **WorldCat** knows, the data it contains is far from perfect, and even if perfect by the rules of **AACR2**, may not conform to certain needs. Thanks to differences in cataloging choices and practices, many bibliographically-like editions are represented by multiple records, each with its own **OCLC** accession number. Since **WCA** matches on accession number only, comparison studies over report uniqueness and underreport overlap. In addition, **AACR2** requires multiple records for many different editions of like titles, although in many collection situations, edition may not matter. The net effect of these two factors (cataloging practice and rules) should neither be presumed uniform nor underestimated. In the process of conducting the potential digitization project noted above (comparing to the “**Google Five**”), we discovered a much higher degree of consistency between **WCA** title lists and the libraries’ **Online Public Access Catalogs (OPACs)** in the sciences than in the social sciences, and dramatically less consistency in the humanities. In fact, across the subject area of Language & Literature (broad **LC** class P), only about 20% of titles reported as unique at the title level truly were.

When comparing **WorldCat** listings for our own collection against our **Endeca**-driven **OPAC**,⁴ we found consistent underreporting among **WCA** data. While some of this is attributable to differences in the pace of cataloging and updates between the tools, the degree of difference presents cause for caution when utilizing **WorldCat** data as the basis for institutional analysis. Several subcategories in sociology, for example, show differences of more than 1,000 titles between **NCSU Libraries** and **WorldCat** records — a sizeable percentage of difference within a set of 6,000 titles. Other

continued on page 46

Changing the way Libraries ... from page 42

change in language has the possibility of producing startling results.

By approaching teaching faculty bearing lists of titles, data on usage, charts showing the decline in periodical use, and asking them to tell us what they think we should get rid of, without clearly focusing on what resources the library may already provide online or asking what students truly need to succeed at our institutions, we have inadvertently fostered a sense that the scholarly literature so valued by

academia is less useful and less worthwhile in the eyes of the increasingly digitally oriented library. In order to reverse that perception, and instead foster a culture in which teaching faculty understand that the libraries are striving to provide the best, most vital and most relevant collection of print and online periodicals possible, we must ask new questions. We must probe for honest answers and reactions rather than cursory and negative responses to the same questions we’ve been asking for years. Our budget management, our collections, our relationships, and most of all our relevance to our users will benefit from a new approach. 🐭