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British bacteriologist and Nobel laureate, discoverer of penicillin
The OhioLINK Dilemma

- The serials problem is not a shortage of money, but diminished bang for the buck
  - Paying more, getting less
- False solutions
  - Reduce the price of journals
  - Reduce the amount of money being spent
- OhioLINK goal
  - Significantly increase access to journal literature
  - Paying more is ok
Proportion of Journal Literature Available in Ohio Higher Education

Cumulative Percent of Titles Held at Each University For 18 publishers representing over 4000 titles

YSU: 8.9%, UD: 10.1%, CSU: 16.3%, UA: 16.9%, BGSU: 16.0%, UT: 19.4%, KSU: 23.4%, Average: 24.1%, MU: 24.3%, WSU: 26.4%, OU: 27.2%, CWRU: 30.8%, UC: 38.7%, Of: 53.2%
The OhioLINK Model

- A consortial, i.e. state-wide, deal
- Price: Sum of all member’s present print subscriptions plus an additional amount
- Receive: Each library continues to receive their ongoing print copies, plus access to all the publisher’s journals electronically
Library “Win”

- Expanded access to the journal literature
- Established control over inflationary costs
- Created universal ownership (w/in state)
- Eliminated ILL costs (w/in state)
Publisher “Win”

- Stopped steady cancellation of journal titles
- Increased overall revenue stream
- Expanded access to their journals
- Established predictability and stability in the market
Partial List of OhioLINK Publisher Partners

- Academic Press
- Elsevier
- Kluwer
- Springer
- Wiley
- Project MUSE

- American Physical Society
- MCB Press
- Royal Society of Chemistry
- Institute of Physics
- American Chemical Society
Consortial Purchasing is Monetarily Significant

- OhioLINK spends over $16,000,000 annually on these deals
- University of Cincinnati spends about a quarter of its collection budget on consortial purchases
OhioLINK Model is a Win-Win for Libraries and Publishers

But the model focused on mass additions to increase our journal access;
Rather than on a thoughtful selectivity taking into account university instruction, research and service
The Research Question:

How much use were these newly available journals getting compared to current, ongoing subscriptions?
The Research Context

- The data investigated were article downloads
  - View the article on screen, OR
  - Print the article off in hard copy
  - A use was any step past viewing the abstract
What was Available

- April, 1998: Academic and Elsevier titles
- Early 1999: Project Muse titles
- Spring 2000: MCB Press and Royal Society of Chemistry titles
- Summer 2000: Institute of Physics and American Chemical Society titles
Electronic Use Started Strong and Built Rapidly

- **Weekly Downloads:**
  - Spring/Summer 1998: 2-3,000 articles
  - End of first 12 month period: 12,500 articles
  - Fall 1999: 22,800 articles
  - Winter 1999: 30,100 articles
- **12 Month Downloads**
  - 1\textsuperscript{st}: 280,000
  - 2\textsuperscript{nd}: 740,000
OhioLINK User Population

- All institutions of higher education in Ohio
  - 77 libraries
  - Carnegie I Research Universities to small community and technical colleges
  - Both public and privately supported schools
- Over 500,000 students, faculty, staff
- Over 4,500 simultaneous users in more than 104 library locations may use the system at any given time
Journal Use Patterns are Consistent, but not 80-20
Proportional Use of Available Articles by Publisher

Articles/downloads for a 6 month period (1/1/00-6/11/00); Am.Phy.Soc. (.021) not shown
Articles/Journals not Interchangeable

Annual EJC Downloads by Publisher

- Elsevier Science
- Academic Press
- All other publishers

c. OhioLINK 2000
We were surprised!

Access is more important than selection?!
Access Trumps Selection

- June 1999 through May 2000, 865,000 articles were downloaded
- Comparison between downloads of articles in journals selected vs unselected in each institution
  - Overall, 58% (502,000) articles were from journals not selected vs 42% from previously selected journals
  - Universities, 51% not selected vs 49% selected
  - Small 4 year/2 year schools, 90%+ not selected
Articles From Non-selected Journals (%)
Can There Be Confounding Factors?

- **Unresolved Issues**
  - Selected journals at each institution had print copies available
  - Some libraries charge patrons for printing out copies
Selection is Useful, but Seriously Incomplete

- A comparison of the average article downloads for selected journals as UC versus non-selected journals showed:
  - Selected journals – 51 downloads/title
  - Non-selected journals – 23 downloads/title
Doing Better Than We Expected

Apr 99 - Mar 00 EJC Titles

- Journal Titles Downloaded from EJC
- Total journal titles held in print by Library

Titles for institutions:
- YSU
- CSU
- UD
- MU
- BG
- KSU
- OU
- UA
- WSU
- UT
- CWRU
- UC
- OSU

c. OhioLINK 2000
Transforming Collection Development
Old virtues may be modern vices (they may focus us on the wrong agenda)

Redefining “selection”
- From library commissar to rich environment
- From individual titles to general profiles (as with approval plans)
- Patron does selecting
- Selection is done when need arises
Increasing Access is More Important than Better Selection

Sifting the flour twice won’t increase the number of pancakes it’ll make
Finding the Cost Effective Mix

- From single strategy to complex strategy
  - Not sufficient to just spend the budget
  - Meet the information need in a variety of ways
    - Institutional Purchase
    - Commercial Document Delivery
    - Consortial Purchase
    - Consortial coordinated collection development
    - ILL
Drive Down Per Use Costs

- The OhioLINK model works for both publishers and librarians (increasing revenues while expanding library access) because it is a formula for lowering per use costs.
How Do We Continue a Winning Approach?

- We need to continue to drive down per use costs
  - In Ohio we’ve expanded the market available to publishers via consortial deal
  - Is the next step to go to all digital journals?
Repricing, not Cancellation

- Is “use” the only way to price a publisher’s profile?
- From yes-no to sliding scale
  - Publishers have tested the top
  - Librarians now have the data to test the bottom
The Importance of Consortia

- Consortia provide both librarians and publishers an important new mechanism for increasing access and profitability.
- National and even international super consortia and deals are beginning to appear:
  - Academic Universe deal
  - Oxford English Dictionary deal
In Conclusion…

- Increased access is more important than better selection
- Traditional purchase is not the only way for libraries to increase access
- Driving down per use costs is the key to increased access and profitability
- Replacing cancellation with repricing
- Consortia are an important new opportunity for both librarians and publishers