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Print and E-Journal Comparison Report – Process:

- Collection Development
- Student Assistant(s)
- Art Librarian
- Faculty

Relationships:
- Collection Development to Student Assistant(s)
- Collection Development to Art Librarian
- Art Librarian to Faculty
- Student Assistant(s) to Art Librarian
- Faculty to Collection Development
Print and E-Journal Comparison Report – Method:

- Supply list of journals to evaluate.
- Take latest issue from the shelf
- Look up journal in OPAC; note databases in which it is available
- Access the corresponding electronic issue via first database listed
- Conduct a page-by-page comparison:
  - Note all omissions
  - Describe and Evaluate the quality of the e-version
- Summarize findings; give preliminary recommendation
Print and E-Journal Comparison Report – **Method:**

**Considerations for the page-by-page comparison:**

*Does the E-version reproduce the print version faithfully?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The E-version is complete:</td>
<td>Color images are reproduced in color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover(s), table of contents, letter(s) from</td>
<td>Colors match closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the editor, main articles, regular features,</td>
<td>Text is crisp and legible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ads, organization info., classified etc.</td>
<td>Images are clear; no details are obscured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is missing?*  

*What is lost?*
EXAMPLE:

**Journal** (ISSN); FY08 $147.56
from 12/01/2000 to present in Database X
from 03/01/2003 to present in Database Y
from 04/01/2003 to present in Database Z

**Comparison Issue:** *Journal*—(Call #) vol.1, no. 1 (Jan/Feb 2008)
**Database:** Database X

**Omissions:**
Front cover (image not reproduced elsewhere)
Table of Contents
P7 museum ad (Museum X)
P10 gallery ad (Gallery X)
P23 gallery ad (Gallery Y)
P40 gallery ad (Gallery Z)
P41-4 book reviews

**Summary:** Core content (only) is accounted for in the e-version; Though text is readable, most images have lost details due to poor contrast in scanning.
Print and E-Journal Comparison Report – **Method:**

- Review comments, provide feedback
- Read through student report, making changes as needed.
- Determine library’s recommendation and submit this to faculty.
- Finalize report, considering faculty input.
**EXAMPLE:**

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Librarian Rec.</th>
<th>Faculty Rec.</th>
<th>Final Rec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal W</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>$190.64</td>
<td>Cancel</td>
<td>Save (3)</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal X</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$39.87</td>
<td>Save</td>
<td>Save</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Y</td>
<td>Arch.</td>
<td>$155.25</td>
<td>Cancel</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>Cancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Z</td>
<td>Urban Plan.</td>
<td>$40.63</td>
<td>Save</td>
<td>Save/Cancel</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Print and E-Journal Comparison Report – **Results:**

**Canceled Print-Subscriptions**

Of 39 journal titles under consideration, the print subscriptions of 16 were canceled at the conclusion of the study, for the following reasons:

- E-version deemed adequate
- Not primarily visual
- Infrequent usage
- Subject not emphasized in curriculum
- No comment from faculty
Print and E-Journal Comparison Report – **Results:**

**Saved Print-Subscriptions**

The print-subscription was retained for 22 journal titles, primarily for the following reasons:

- **Unacceptable Image Quality**
- **Title’s Importance in Field**
- **Student Browsing**
- **Loss of content**
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* Unacceptable image quality includes instances where the journal is used as a source for images (teaching).
* Loss of content = poor job indexing OR Ads, *most cases*- (would be losing indexed content).
Recommendations / Further Considerations

- **Document** the comparison (key for supporting decisions)
- Develop a rubric for more consistent evaluation
  (ARLIS/NA standard?, or on the basis of one’s individual institution)

- Has the quality of E-journals improved since the study?
  - If the process is improved, will past issues be included/affected?

adam.s.robinson9@gmail.com

*Develop a Rubric for use in the evaluation: (lack of precedent in literature...)*