Journal Usage Statistics Portal (JUSP): results from December 2010 survey

Introduction

A JUSP user survey was conducted during November and December 2010 to obtain feedback from participating institutions on JUSP developments to date. The survey sought to gather opinions about reports currently available, technical aspects, interface design, strengths, weaknesses and suggested improvements.

The survey was circulated via the JUSP libraries list on 22nd November and closed on 10th December. The survey had a good response rate with feedback from 16 institutions out of a possible 22 with data in the portal, and 26 represented on the list.

The surveys provided a useful review of opinions on work to date. While detailed discussions are required to explore some of the issues raised in more depth, a number of suggestions have already been acted upon. Data from the survey is being used to inform further discussions as well as enhancements and future developments.

Summary

The main reports were generally well received, especially the JR1 and JR1a reports, the JR1 excluding backfiles and the SCONUL return. Respondents especially liked those reports that saved time and added value. There was a more mixed response to some of the experimental reports and work is continuing to develop these. Other tables suggested and which will be included in future plans include:
- Tables and graphs in different formats
- Benchmarking and comparison reports
- Zero and/or low use titles

Successful aspects of the portal include:
- Ease of navigating portal
- User interface
- SUSHI harvesting
- Ability to compare and combine reports
- All usage data loaded in one place
- Ability to look at both calendar and academic years

Respondents would also like to see more NESLi2 publishers (we hope to include them all by the end of 2011) and also non-NESLi2 publishers (this will be for later consideration) and the ability to upload data, and collate cost and usage data. Although JUSP won't include cost data, facilities to support libraries in using JUSP with their own institutional data will be explored.

Survey Overview

Section 1: Reports

Libraries were asked to rate the usefulness of a range of reports currently available in the portal ranging from 'very useful', 'fairly useful', 'useless' and 'no opinion'. The main reports were generally well received, particularly the 'JR1 and JR1A' and 'JR1 excluding backfiles' reports. 'JR1 including gateways and hosts' and 'Summary use of gateways and hosts' had a less positive response; this may be due to some libraries not using gateways and hosts. Unsurprisingly the experimental reports generally had a more mixed response although 'Titles v NESLi2 deals' received a very positive response from 11 of the 16 respondents.

At least one library that has recently joined the list as part of the new phase of development responded. The limited functionality available to a user accessing dummy data may have led to the negative response in connection with two questions: **1.e.** Summary use of gateways and hosts & **1.f.** Summary use of backfiles.

1. How useful are the following general reports?
1.a. JR1 and JR1A

Very useful:	81.2%	13
Fairly useful:	18.8%	3
Useless:	0.0%	0
No opinion:	0.0%	0

1.b. JR1 including gateways and hosts

Very useful:	68.8%	11
Fairly useful:	31.2%	5
Useless:	0.0%	0
No opinion:	0.0%	0

1.c. JR1 excluding backfiles

Very useful:	87.5%	14
Fairly useful:	6.2%	1
Useless:	0.0%	0
No opinion:	6.2%	1

1.d. SCONUL return

Very useful:	75.0%	12
Fairly useful:	18.8%	3
Useless:	6.2%	1
No opinion:	0.0%	0

1.e. Summary use of gateways and hosts

Very useful:	37.5%	6
Fairly useful:	50.0%	8
Useless:	6.2%	1

No opinion: 6.2%   1

1.f. Summary use of backfiles

Very useful:	43.8%	7
Fairly useful:	43.8%	7
Useless:	6.2%	1
No opinion:	6.2%	1

1.g. Tables and graphs

Very useful:	37.5%	6
Fairly useful:	56.2%	9
Useless:	6.2%	1
No opinion:	0.0%	0

1.h. Which titles have the highest use

Very useful:	66.7%	10
Fairly useful:	26.7%	4
Useless:	0.0%	0
No opinion:	6.7%	1

2. JUSP also includes some experimental reports. How useful are these reports?

2.a. Additional figures (total requests, average, maximum etc)

Very useful:	37.5%	6
Fairly useful:	50.0%	8
Useless:	6.2%	1
No opinion:	6.2%	1

2.b. NESLi2 deals

Very useful:	43.8%	7
Fairly useful:	43.8%	7
Useless:	0.0%	0
No opinion:	12.5%	2

2.c. Titles v NESLi2 deals

Very useful:	68.8%	11
Fairly useful:	6.2%	1
Useless:	6.2%	1
No opinion:	18.8%	3

3. Do you have comments that you'd like to make about any of the reports?
  i.   2c. Titles v NESLi2 deals: At the minute this is difficult to use. It might help if you could just pull out the zero use titles, or sort by usage, so you can see all the zero use ones together,
  ii.   All the reports when they are working properly - highest use ALL only includes 2 publishers at the moment - will be useful.
  iii.   Export facility would be useful eg Titles v Nesli2

iv.   graphical element really needs to be downloadable and customizable to be of any use. Ustats is a good example.

v.   I have so far had only a cursory look at the reports

vi.   I'd be interested to know where the title lists that are used in the NESLi2 deals reports come from: in providing title lists to our link resolver, we've found that publishers aren't always able to provide correct lists, even for the NESLi2 deals, so I'd be wary of the accuracy of them. But if you're able to get accurate lists, that's great.

vii.   It is difficult to assess the usefulness as our institution's statistics have not yet been uploaded.

viii.   The most useful reports are the ones that would be difficult to generate outside of JUSP, i.e. those that present added value. This will vary depending on the capability and interest of institutions. The SCONUL return report in JUSP is 'Useless' at the moment because the dataset is incomplete. I'm also not sure it could ever be complete enough via JUSP. The 'Title v. NESLi2 deals', 'Summary use of backfiles', and 'Additional figures' reports are most useful currently because they save most time and present most added value from our perspective.

ix.   The NESLi2 deals report is fairly useful, though this information is available in a number of places already, i.e., publisher website, JISC Collections Catalogue, linkresolver knowledgebase, etc.

x.   The SCONUL report doesn't seem to include all the publishers.

xi.   Would be good to be able to create a quick table in JUSP from the data that is made available in a s/sheet.

4. Have you any other suggestions for reports you would like to see included?

i.   A new COUNTER report which provides details of the number of turnaways p/mth. The current JR2 & JR3 reports aren't very useful as they only provide turnaway data related to concurrent usage limits. It would be much more useful to libraries if these reports provided data on the number of turnaways due to a library not subscribing to a particular title or backfile. Publishers such as T&F have this data so why can't we use it?

ii.   I usually produce a report that includes monthly totals for the SCONUL period for each publisher - it would be great if I could just get that, and add in the other publishers. Also, the ability to compare totals across years for SCONUL figures.

iii.   Ideally it would be good to collate cost and usage data; and in time it would be very useful to include non-NESLi2 data

iv.   If the aim of the portal is to provide a basic "one-stop shop" where libraries can go to view and download their own usage reports then will content/publishers that sits outside of NESLi2 publisher agreements be included at some point. If not then we are always likely to require an additional way of handling these reports. Might it be possible for users of the portal to upload reports themselves, or set up additional SUSHI accounts.

v.   It'd be useful to see the tables and graphs in different formats, in the fullness of time.

vi.   Titles which have the lowest usage Titles used by only one/very few host(s)

vii.   What we would really like to see are benchmarking and comparison reports with other institutions, and reports which compare usage with cost. Obviously, both present challenges for JUSP but are where the value of this shared service actually lies.

viii.   Zero use and / or low use titles

Section 2: Technical

The speed of accessing the portal was considered adequate by 10 out of 16, whereas two people noted that speed via Open Athens can sometimes be slow. Mimas are investigating this point.

5. Have you had any problems logging into the portal?

Yes:	6.2%	1
No:	68.8%	11
Other *(please specify)*:	25.0%	4

    i. Initially yes but this was solved although it can be slow to respond
    ii. Not used yet,
    iii. Our institution's data has not yet been uploaded, so there is as yet no data to look at except the "dummy" data.

6. Is the speed of logging into the portal adequate?

Yes:	62.5%	10
No:	18.8%	3
Other *(please specify)*:	18.8%	3

    i. A bit slow for Athens authentication
    ii. No - it can be very slow through open Athens although this appears to be an intermittent problem- see above.
    iii. Not used yet,

7. Is the speed of loading the reports adequate?

Yes:	56.2%	9
No:	6.2%	1
Other *(please specify)*:	37.5%	6

    i. It seems to be fairly slow the first time you load a report but the speed improves thereafter but it is acceptable.
    ii. Loading reports was fast but the first time I tried to download a report it got nowhere and I had to come out of the browser altogether. A second try was OK.
    iii. Not bad but faster would be good!
    iv. Not used yet.
    v. Once into the portal loading speed seems OK
    vi. Slow today - but first time I've encountered this. Will speed deteriorate as data load increases?

Section 3: Interface

The ease of navigating the portal was highlighted by 15 out of 16 respondents, and several commented on the clear and intuitive user interface.

8. Is the portal easy to navigate?

Yes:	93.8%	1
No:	6.2%	

9. Do you have any further comments about the interface and design?
  i.   Generally it seems nice and simple.
  ii.   I like it - clear and easy to use.
  iii. Intuitive and clean.
  iv.   It's very clear & easy to use
  v.   It's very clear.
  vi.   The 'Additional figures' reports need to explain what concepts such as 'median' and 'standard deviation' are. Not all serials librarians will be familiar with these terms. Also, is the 'Average' figure a per month figure? If it is, then maybe you should say 'Average use p/mth' instead of just 'Average' in the table.

Section 4: Summary

10. Which aspect of the portal do you consider most successful?
  i.   Combined reports
  ii.   It delivers quickly ad clearly what I need in one place
  iii.   It's a tie between 'which journals have the highest usage' report and the 'SCONUL Return' report. Very clear and very useful. The SCONUL Return report will save staff from having to do this manually.
  iv.   Loading all the usage data in one place and being able to easily manipulate it to compare.
  v.   Not used yet.
  vi.   Presentation of reports & collation of statistics
  vii.   So far, that so much data has been provided by so many institutions and that SUSHI is working for some reports. This illustrates the value of JUSP as a shared service to support decision-making and help demonstrate value.
  viii. Speed with which you can see reports, all in one place - great for quick answers.
  ix.   The ability to compare and combine reports - JR1 excluding JR1a, JR1 including gateways and hosts, tables and graphs to show usage year-on-year. It could potentially save us a great deal of manual work every year.
  x.   The ability to go from calendar year to Sconul year. This is brilliant!
  xi.   The automation, i.e., SUSHI.
  xii.   The clean and simple UI
  xiii. The combination of publisher and other reports. Though if this matches only on ISBN it probably misses some stats
  xiv.   The data analyses, not least the SCONUL summary.
  xv.   The sushi implementation AND the aggregation of data.
  xvi.   Using SUSHI to automatically update our stats on a monthly basis.

11. Which aspect of the portal do you consider least successful?
  i.   Can't think of any negative aspect as yet.
  ii.   Can't think of any.
  iii.   Downloading
  iv.   Graphs
  v.   Having to select a date range
  vi.   I guess that it would be limited to Nesli deals !
  vii.   It's not unsuccessful, but data from more publishers would be good
  viii. N/k

ix.   No ability to export reports to csv or Excel.

x.   Not used yet.

xi.   Other than bits that aren't currently working properly yet e.g. highest use All

xii.   Slowness of log-in

xiii.   So far, the lack of reports which compare data between institutions and the lack of related financial data.

xiv.   The 'Nesli2 Deals' & 'Titles v Neslis2 Deals' reports are not very useful - they're just a massive page of stats which you can't easily get your head around. The tables and graphs need improvement. They're ok for a quick overview of usage - but it would be better if you could generate a graph from, for example, the Elsevier usage from Jan 2009 to Dec 2009. At present, you only get a s/sheet of data. I could download the CSV file and create a graph within Excel - but this is a faff.

xv.   The fact that only a percentage of our subscriptions are handled within

xvi.   The fact there are only a few publishers in the portal so far, although I know this is planned to change.

12. What improvements can you suggest?

i.   Batch downloads - ie ability to export more than one publisher at a time or more than one time period

ii.   Export function.

iii.   Institution/site configurable current/last/last+1 academic year and calendar year buttons for picking dates

iv.   It would be good to be able alter data when it's clear that the data is incorrect - when misuse seems likely due to unusual activity on a particular title. The ability to download the results into excel could be useful.

v.   It's a bit cumbersome scrolling through very long lists - slide bars within slide bars. Not sure how it can be improved, but export facility would help.

vi.   Make more publishers stats available via the portal (hopefully using SUSHI). If possible allow libraries to add their own stats for content that isn't included in the portal. Enable pricing information to be added to a library's account, so cost per use calculations can be carried out within the portal.

vii.   See above comment re having a more relevant turnaway report as well as improving tables/graphs. Also, Selection Support have a new option where libraries can put journals together into packages e.g. you can bunch all relevant T&F titles into a package and then assess it's usage. It would be good if JUSP offered something similar.