"Dealing With Journal Cuts - Magnificent Future?!"



Objective: This poster illustrates how the Duke Medical Center Library dealt with a one-year journal budget cut of 32%. While much smaller budget cuts and escalating costs prompted journal reviews in 1980 and 1993, the \$800,000 reduction in the Library's total budget for 2002/03-2003/04 necessitated a more extensive review.

Methods: A comprehensive journal database was built with criteria such as ISI impact factor, number of times a Duke University author published in or cited a title, availability online, number of ILL requests, and cost for each of the 1,757 subscriptions. Sixty-five subject groups geared to Duke interests were devised; titles were assigned to appropriate groups and added to the database. The Library actively solicited involvement from Medical Center departments to serve as external reviewers. The response was quite good with contacts established for 58 of 62 departments. Lists of journals were prepared by discipline in order to rank titles by the appropriate departmental contacts. A six member Library committee reviewed the departmental rankings and selected titles for cancellation, with additional input from neighboring libraries. The list of potential cancellations was widely publicized in various formats for feedback from faculty and other users.

Results: Some 532 journals were canceled, representing 30% of the Library's current subscriptions and 32% of the journal budget. As a result of the publicity campaign, users became much more aware of scholarly publishing costs and issues. Ongoing relationships were established with many of the departmental reviewers. The Library used the cuts as an opportunity to leverage the influence of its consortium for development of new models for licensing of electronic journals.

Conclusion: Though the review took a great deal of time and involved a number of participants for more than a year, the hard work, attention to detail, and strong publicity efforts paid off in a generally smooth transition to a greatly scaled back journal collection. User complaints were limited to a few faculty members, with most users quite sympathetic to the Library's reduction in funding.

http://www.mclibrary.duke.edu/dukemla05/journalreview.pdf

Background

Journal Cancellations

- Necessitated by 1.1 million dollar budget cut: proposed 37% decrease in funding over 3-yr period
- Most foreign language and shared campus titles cut in 2002-03
- More significant cuts required in 2003-04

Faculty Input

- Sent letters to department heads requesting assistance in reviewing titles
- Received good response with contacts established for 58 of 62 departments

Subject Groups

- Created 69 subject groups according to Duke interests and departments
- Categorized 1,757 journal titles by groups
- Used subject groups to categorize e-journals on the Website





Data Gathering & Analysis

Comprehensive Excel Database

Fields included: title, cost, publisher, subscription agent, availability online, ISSN, order number, subjects, interlibrary loans per year, impact factor, # Duke articles published per year, # Duke cites per year

Review Lists

- Arranged by subject groups extracted from database
- Included relevant
 database elements with a
 grid for ranking titles on
 a 1 to 5 scale
- Sent to reviewers in paper and digital formats

Titles Cancellation List

- Faculty rankings added to database
- Titles examined by 5-member Journal Review Committee
- Cancellations based on this input and that from other Duke and neighboring academic libraries

Publicity and Outcomes

Publicizing Potential Cancellations

- List of cancellations
 - Included in Library newsletter
 - Posted on Library Website
 - Distributed via flyers in Library



- Checuta Characteristic Characteristi
 - Attached cancellation notes to current journal shelves
 - Developed "Tough Choices" column on journal pricing issues for Library newsletter

mmmmmmm Outcomes mmmmmmmm

Bad News

Canceled 532 journals (30% of total titles; 32% of budgeted funds)

Received some complaints from vocal minority about the cuts

Coping with inflation in addition to cuts

Good News 😊

Reinstated some titles based on patron response

Built ongoing relationships with many faculty, who are now more aware of publication issues and costs

We survived and avoided a potential third year of cuts!