



Revising, Improving and Using a Locally-Developed Worksheet for Multiple Journal Requests to Simplify the Review Process

STEVEN W. BROWN, SERIALS AND SYSTEMS LIBRARIAN; KATHE OBRIG, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, COLLECTIONS AND ACCESS SERVICES; HIMMELFARB HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARY; THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER, WASHINGTON, DC

OBJECTIVE

- To implement revisions to a previously developed worksheet used to aid in more effectively and expeditiously making collection development decisions by committee.
- The worksheet as originally developed was used effectively, but subsequent questions and further input encouraged the developer to identify alternative parameters to measure, thus improving on the original worksheet.

METHODOLOGY

- Sixty-four new journal requests from twenty departments were received through a faculty survey.
- Microsoft Excel was used to determine the review order based on the number of current subscriptions by department versus the number of MEDLINE-indexed journals in that department's corresponding MeSH subject heading list in NLM's Broad Subject Terms for Indexed Journals (<http://www.wcf.nlm.nih.gov/serials/journals/index.cfm>).
- This evaluation metric was originally based on journals per faculty in each department.
- To prioritize departments with weaker journal coverage, departments were listed on the spreadsheet in order of lowest to highest departmental coverage compared to coverage of all journal titles in that subject area as identified through the Medline listing.
- Survey return rate was included for reviewers' reference.
- Departmental journal requests were listed on the worksheet with entries for price, vendor, indexing, Eigenfactor and other notes that were essential to making a sound collection development decision.
- Journals that were requested by multiple departments were prioritized at the top of the list and relisted again for reference under each individual requesting department.

Department	Faculty-based Ranking	MEDLINE-based Ranking	Difference	Original Ranking
Endocrinology and Metabolism	17	2	-15	Unchanged in original ranking
Environmental Occupational Health	16	4	-12	Unchanged in original ranking
Neurological Surgery & Neurology	18	10	-8	Unchanged in original ranking
Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences	14	8	-6	Unchanged in original ranking
Orthopaedic Surgery	19	10	-9	Unchanged in original ranking
Exercise Science	20	17	-3	Unchanged in original ranking
Global Health	5	3	-2	Unchanged in original ranking
Health Policy	2	1	-1	Unchanged in original ranking
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	15	14	-1	Unchanged in original ranking
Pharmacology & Physiology	9	9	0	Unchanged in original ranking
Prevention and Community Health	4	5	1	Overvalued in original ranking
Anatomy and Regenerative Biology	6	7	1	Overvalued in original ranking
Nursing Education	6	6	0	Overvalued in original ranking
Medicine	3	6	3	Overvalued in original ranking
Microbiology, Immunology, and Tropical Medicine	7	11	4	Overvalued in original ranking
Pediatrics	11	15	4	Overvalued in original ranking
Cardiology	13	18	5	Overvalued in original ranking
Surgery	12	19	7	Overvalued in original ranking
Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine	1	13	12	Overvalued in original ranking
Health Care Sciences	8	20	12	Overvalued in original ranking

Emergency Medicine	Rheumatology
Epidemiology and Biostatistics	Urology
Renal Hypertension (Nephrology)	Geriatrics and Palliative Care
Radiology	Infectious Diseases
Pulmonary Crit Care Med and Allergy	Dermatology
Ophthalmology	Health Services Management and Leadership
Pathology	Clinical Management & Leadership
Gastroenterology and Liver Diseases	Hematology and Oncology
Obstetrics and Gynecology	

Department	Faculty	Dept Subscriptions	Coverage Ratio
Emergency Medicine	26	0	0.00
Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine	28	13	0.46
Cardiology	25	36	1.44
Health Policy	24	0	0.00
Medicine	58	81	1.40
Renal Hypertension (Nephrology)	12	1	0.08
Neurology	18	27	1.50
Prevention and Community Health	17	27	1.59
Global Health	16	24	1.50
Pulmonary Crit Care Med and Allergy	8	13	1.63
Cardiology	15	24	1.60
Orthopaedic Surgery	13	21	1.62
Anatomy and Regenerative Biology	15	27	1.80
Gastroenterology and Liver Diseases	8	16	2.00
Obstetrics and Gynecology	15	30	2.00
Rheumatology	5	12	2.40
Urology	4	10	2.50
Microbiology, Immunology, and Tropical Medicine	21	56	2.67
Health Care Sciences	19	50	2.63
Geriatrics and Palliative Care	8	27	3.38
Infectious Diseases	8	27	3.38
Pharmacology & Physiology	10	30	3.00
Nursing Education	12	47	3.92
Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences	17	72	4.24
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	12	57	4.75
Environmental Occupational Health	22	33	1.50
Endocrinology and Metabolism	20	31	1.55
Dermatology	3	15	5.00
Neurological Surgery & Neurology	11	60	5.45
Orthopaedic Surgery	6	30	5.00
Cardiology	11	60	5.45
Health Services Management and Leadership	6	48	8.00
Exercise Science	6	60	10.00
Clinical Management & Leadership	6	30	5.00
Hematology and Oncology	6	30	5.00
Total	518	1396	2.69

Department	Faculty	Dept Subscriptions	Coverage Ratio	Faculty-based Ranking	MEDLINE-based Ranking	Difference	Original Ranking
Endocrinology and Metabolism	17	2	0.12	17	2	-15	17
Environmental Occupational Health	16	4	0.25	16	4	-12	16
Neurological Surgery & Neurology	18	10	0.56	18	10	-8	18
Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences	14	8	0.57	14	8	-6	14
Orthopaedic Surgery	19	10	0.53	19	10	-9	19
Exercise Science	20	17	0.85	20	17	-3	20
Global Health	5	3	0.60	5	3	-2	5
Health Policy	2	1	0.50	2	1	-1	2
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	15	14	0.93	15	14	-1	15
Pharmacology & Physiology	9	9	1.00	9	9	0	9
Prevention and Community Health	4	5	1.25	4	5	1	4
Anatomy and Regenerative Biology	6	7	1.17	6	7	1	6
Nursing Education	6	6	1.00	6	6	0	6
Medicine	3	6	2.00	3	6	3	3
Microbiology, Immunology, and Tropical Medicine	7	11	1.57	7	11	4	7
Pediatrics	11	15	1.36	11	15	4	11
Cardiology	13	18	1.38	13	18	5	13
Surgery	12	19	1.58	12	19	7	12
Anesthesiology and Critical Care Medicine	1	13	13.00	1	13	12	1
Health Care Sciences	8	20	2.50	8	20	12	8

Department	Title	Total Titles	Cost	Vendor	Indexing	Eigenfactor	Surveys Sent	Surveys Returned	Return Rate
105	1 Journals that faculty/students have requested for addition to the collection								
106	Department: Pediatrics	33				139	n/a	n/a	n/a
107	23.74%								
108									
109	Pediatrics in Review		\$ xxx.xx	EBSCO	MedLine, Scopus	0.00111			Y/N
110	Department: Orthopaedic Surgery	30				103	5	4	80%
111	29.10%								
112	Spine Journal		See above						
113	European Spine Journal		\$ xx.xx	Springer	MedLine, Scopus	0.01345		One year embargo on free content	
114	Journal of Arthroplasty		\$ xx.xx	Elsevier	MedLine, Scopus, and Global Health	0.01462			
115									
116	Department: Exercise Science	48				114	6	6	100%
117	42.11%								
118	Journal of Physical Activity & Health		\$ xx.xx	EBSCO	MedLine, Scopus, and PsycInfo	n/a			
119	Annals of Nutrition & Metabolism		\$ xx.xx	EBSCO	MedLine, Scopus, and Global Health	n/a		One year embargo on free content	
120	Obesity		\$ xx.xx	NEBL	Medline, PsycINFO, Science Citation Index	0.01254		Obesity Research had a title change after 2005. Is now called Obesity (2005-Present)	
121									
122	Department: Cardiology	68				145	11	6	55%
123	46.90%								
124	JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging		\$ xx.xx	Elsevier	Scopus	n/a			Y/N
125									
126	Department: Surgery	99				183	20	5	25%
127	54.10%								
128	American Journal of Rhinology & Allergy (2)		\$ xx.xx	EBSCO	MedLine, Scopus, and Global Health	0.00504			Y/N
129									

RESULTS

- Analysis of the revised worksheet indicated that the parameters used in the first version remained useful for review.
- While not used for review prioritization, the ratio of journal coverage per number of faculty in that department remained useful for awareness in review.
- Use of the MEDLINE-indexed metric moved the review prioritization of ten departments higher and nine lower than in the initial review based on journals-per-faculty ratio.
- Not all departments matched up well with MeSH Headings, requiring additional attention in review of the titles making up the journal counts for some departments.

CONCLUSION

- Both metrics provide valuable options for review of large batches of journal requests.
- For purposes of review prioritization, the MEDLINE-based metric better indicates the degree of subject need.
- The faculty-based metric measure better indicates which departments have fewer titles by size of the department and may require augmentation.
- The collection development worksheet can be updated easily and expedites quality committee review with all parameters easily available.