



Journal Usage Statistics Portal (JUSP) feedback from new libraries - March 2012

The following provides a brief summary of the responses to the JUSP new joiners survey during the six month period October 2011 – March 2012. There were 22 responses to the survey during this time.

1. Which usage report within JUSP do you consider to be most useful?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
JR1 and JR1a Reports	40%	8
JR1 reports including gateways and intermediaries	5%	1
JR1 reports excluding backfile usage	10%	2
SCONUL returns	40%	8
Summary of publisher usage	0%	0
Summary use of gateway and host intermediaries	0%	0
Summary use of backfiles	0%	0
Number of titles and requests in various usage ranges	0%	0
Trends over time	0%	0
Titles with the highest use	5%	1
Individual journal search and usage by keyword and/or ISSN	0%	0
Breakdown of publisher usage by title and year	0%	0
Extra report	0%	0

The JR1 and JR1a Report and the SCONUL returns were the most commonly cited reports. Respondents were asked to justify their answer. The 20 respondents who had answered this question all provided more information:

JR1 and JR1a reports

- More efficient than extracting statistics from many publisher sites
- Basic, straight forward and useful.
- It is useful to have a single source for JR1 reports from many publishers.
- Single place for statistics rather than going to many places.
- Saves staff time on collecting this data, but the summary of publisher usage report is also useful and provides a nicely presented overview.

- Will save time in gathering the info from elsewhere
- For this year it was useful to compare with results from the publishers' sites as stats collection had already started for SCONUL
- These give the metrics that we normally use for value for money calculations.

JR1 report including gateways and intermediaries

- Most useful for SCONUL return.

JR1 reports excluding backfile usage

- We regularly check usage of journals and report on them - and the JR1 is used most frequently to complete this work. At present, we don't have many backfiles.
- These are the key reports we use for current subscription usage analysis

SCONUL return

- This should be a massive time saver when we start to collate info for SCONUL returns
- Useful for filling in SCONUL forms, as it covers the correct time period of data
- I have only used this so far.
- It's the only report I've really looked at so far
- Will save time when preparing figures for the SCONUL annual return
- SCONUL returns are a drain on our resources to complete, and we are not the only institution that struggles, JUSP is a hopeful development even though in practice the current numbers of deals we have are quite small.

Titles with the highest use

- Enables you to ensure the titles that should be used are getting used!

2. Which other reports do you use or intend to use? Please tick all that apply.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
JR1 and JR1a Reports	77%	17
JR1 reports including gateways and intermediaries	45%	10
JR1 reports excluding backfile usage	32%	7
SCONUL returns	50%	11
Summary of publisher usage	36%	8
Summary use of gateway and host intermediaries	32%	7
Summary use of backfiles	9%	2
Number of titles and requests in various usage ranges	18%	4
Trends over time	55%	12
Titles with the highest use	68%	15
Individual journal search and usage by keyword and/or ISSN	27%	6
Breakdown of publisher usage by title and year	32%	7

The following 5 reports were cited by 10 or more of the 22 respondents:

- JR1 and JR1a Reports
- JR1 reports including gateways and intermediaries
- SCONUL returns
- Titles with the highest use
- Trends over time

Respondents were asked to justify their answers and the following general themes emerged:

Justifying subscriptions

- To help justify subscriptions to journals and publishers
- In general these reports inform usage analysis and subscription decisions.
- To gather stats to help decide if a resource is offering good value for money.
- These will help us to make better use of the raw data and contribute to an improved decision making process regarding subscriptions.
- Reports on publisher usage are useful as it'll help academics see that the packages the library buys are being used - even though the publisher concerned may be 'unpopular'....

Helping with collection management

- Individual journal use could possibly be of use for collection management decisions
- To provide information to users about usage to further promote our collections.
- Its early days but we hope to use JUSP to help us make informed decisions on collections and individual titles.
- To get usage stats for this year later on.
- To inform future purchasing

Assisting with renewals

- Trend reports are always useful e.g. helps us keep track of new/old areas of research.
- Trends over time can help to identify emerging and diminishing usage areas.

The value of specific types of report was highlighted by other respondents:

Backfile use

- We'll be buying more backfiles in future (budget permitting) so any reports on them will be key (and will hopefully justify the high spend).

Gateways and intermediaries

- The JR1 reports including gateways and intermediaries will be useful as it will save me having to add the ingenta stats to publishers' JR1 reports.

Titles with highest use

- Up to now I've been sorting the publishers' JR1 reports myself to get titles with highest use.

SCONUL return

- To help with SCONUL stats.
- JR1 again for SCONUL
- Although not used this year we will use JUSP for our SCONUL Return next year.
- The SCONUL returns are useful - it will save time once a year.

Other respondents needed more time to explore the other reports fully:

- The other reports look useful and I hope to have time to use them!
- Currently only use JR1 reports to gain knowledge on usage. Will look at others (if get time) to see how useful they are.

3. Have you any suggestions for additional reports you would like to see included?

Four respondents provided an answer to the question:

- DB1?
- Merge with ebooks. Ebooks are eresources too! As many SCONUL reports as possible
- I would like to be able to customise reports on a title-by-title basis, with an easy form for selecting/deselecting titles. As a small library we do not take many big multi-title deals, so in some cases, e.g. with Springer reports that include all titles, we have to edit out a lot of unsubscribed noise. *[note: this will form part of the JUSP titles v deals enhancement]*
- We currently record pdf downloads as well as the total, so it would be useful to get them too.

4. Which aspect of the portal do you consider most successful?

13 respondents provided an answer to this question. The following comments were made:

Ease of use

- Easy to access the portal and to see what reports are available
- Its ease of use
- Ease of use
- Easy access to the information, nicely presented and saves staff time
- It quickly gives the data in response to query. It looks clean.
- I really like the portal and find it easy to use

Everything in one place

- Instant stats
- gathering everything together in one place
- Very convenient to be able to access stats in one place
- Having statistics for major publishers at one source
- The providing of data across publishers

Benchmarking potential

- I think an innovative approach to reporting usage and analysis at a national level is potentially very useful for institutions wishing to make informed decisions about

subscriptions. Development of benchmarking functionality may be helpful.

Specific reports mentioned were:

- Ability to run JR1 reports including gateways and intermediaries and JR1 and JR1a Reports.
- Titles with the highest use as this is not always easy to find clearly on publishers' individual websites.

5. How easy do you find it to use JUSP?

Respondents were asked to rate how easy they found JUSP to use. 20 respondents provided a rating. The average rating was 4.

Answer Options	Difficult	1	2	3	4	Easy	5	Rating Average	Response Count
Ease of use	0	1	5	9	5	4	20		

Respondents were asked to justify their answers and the following responses were given:

As new users, several had not yet had the time to fully explore JUSP:

- I have only a very limited experience of using JUSP
- I am still getting to grips with it all!
- We have not had a lot of opportunity to use the Portal
- Haven't yet had enough time to interrogate it in full
- Only just started to use so still feeling my way around

Those who made comments had generally found JUSP easy to use:

- Pretty intuitive how to run reports.
- Good layout, not over-complicated
- So far pretty easy to use.
- Generally quite clear

Some suggestions were made:

- The only bit I found difficult understanding is SUSHI, need a bit more help with the fish stuff, as we haven't used it much yet
- Editing deals is a bit awkward. I think the distinct areas of the home page could be set off visually a bit more - there's a lot of white
- Too many sign in stages.
- Link to return to home page not that visible after amending List Deals.

6. Since joining JUSP have you used the portal as much as you would have hoped?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
----------------	------------------	----------------

Yes	23%	4
No	81%	17

21 respondents answered this question. 17 indicated that they had not used the portal as much as they would have hoped since joining JUSP. 19 respondents provided additional information to justify their response. Lack of time was the most commonly cited reason for not sign the portal as much as hoped for:

- Still trying out the system (only a member for 1 month) but impressed so far with the results
- Under great deal of time pressure to return SCONUL report. Didn't have time to experiment. Haven't had time since!
- As we are a small site, I get involved in various aspects of library work - journals is one area, but I am also the systems librarian and web officer - so I get pulled in so many directions, I can't always get to use sites as much as hoped.
- Other work priorities have not allowed the time to fully use and investigate JUSP as much as I would have liked.
- Not enough time
- Lack of time
- Lack of time - other pressures of work.
- Staff shortages and involvement in other projects have delayed our use.
- Time constraints
- It's just timing - I'd finished my Sconul reports when we got JUSP up and running and won't download more until January, we only do stuff with usage data twice a year here.

Others cited a lack of coverage for a smaller library:

- We are a very small library, so we mainly have subscribed titles rather than deals and there just isn't that much data available for us. I signed up to JUSP when I first started in my job role and I didn't really appreciate how few of our journal titles would be covered.

And for one using UStat:

- I already collect SUSHI data using Ex Libris' Ustat, and this includes non-NESLI publishers' data. I also harvest ad hoc a fair amount as not all publishers' are SUSHI-enabled.

Specific issues raised were:

- One thing I did not really appreciate at the time was that titles accessed through ingentaconnect would only be included if the actual publisher was on the list.
- Another thing that I am puzzled by is that we take some Wiley titles but these stats do not appear. I have updated our information on the portal to ensure Wiley is listed. Is there some further action that I need to take? *[Note: Wiley data is expected at the beginning of April]*

Early problems had been identified and dealt with:

- We had a problem with logging in and this was resolved just before Xmas.
- It took me a while to sort out our login, I could only see dummy data at first and assumed it was taking some time to add our data but once I queried this the problem

was solved straightaway.

7. What improvements can you suggest?

Respondents were asked to if they had any improvements to suggest. Four respondents wanted to see more publishers, including open access publishers:

Add more publishers

- Wider Coverage of publishers
- It would be beneficial if the range of publishers could be expanded but I'm sure you are aware of this.
- It would be great if JSTOR sign up
- Would be interested to have usage statistics for major open access publishers e.g. PLoS and BMC to compare with our paid subscriptions

Individual respondents made the following suggestions:

Add pricing information

- The million dollar question.... adding pricing info so that we can get price per download figures. I realise the difficulty of doing this centrally, but could lib staff be given the means to upload their library's pricing info?

Other

- It would be helpful if the other reports could have the option of covering the academic year as well the calendar year
- Make it easier to login.
- Record pdf downloads separately
- Improve labelling of pie chart in SCONUL report.