original title, provide accurate, complete ISSN information, include title histories, utilize numbering systems, and to standardize the provision of digital content.

Raising consciousness of the issues was the first step for PIE-J. Draft recommendations will be released for public review on 5 July 2012. Once comments have been collected, arrangements for completion and publication of the report - along with ongoing maintenance - will be finalized.

To subscribe to the NISO newsline, where you can learn how to volunteer for workgroups or committees, register for webinars, forums, or teleconferences and receive standards updates, send an email to newsline-subscribe@list.niso.org. Type "subscribe newsline" in the subject line.

To learn more about ODI, visit www.niso.org/workrooms/odi.

To learn more about PIE-J, visit www.niso.org/workrooms/piej.

Scholarly Video Journals to Increase Productivity in Research and Education

Moshe Pritsker, Journal of Visualized Experiments

Reported by Wilhelmina Randtke

New technology in scholarly communications is most often envisioned as providing faster, wider, lower cost access to traditional scholarship - journal articles, notes, etc. The Journal of Visualized Experiments (JoVE) uses technology to show experimental techniques visually, in a way that a traditional written article cannot.

The need to better illustrate experimental techniques became apparent to Moshe Pritsker while he was finishing his PhD in molecular biology. His research was delayed by failed attempts to grow a culture in his lab in Princeton, NJ, in order to recreate an experiment. Even a fellow researcher with "golden hands" could not grow the culture. Finally, Pritsker's advisor provided travel funding to go to Edinburgh, United Kingdom, to observe the research team which had conducted the original experiment. Watching the procedure provided critical details which allowed him to reproduce the experiment. As they fixed the culture, researchers warmed it slightly and revealed a few other small details which had not been described in the published paper.

Reproducibility is a huge problem in biology and the sciences. It is very difficult to transfer knowledge between labs. Recent studies in the field show that over 60% of biology research cannot be reproduced. Pritsker believes this is because of the limitations of written descriptions. To illustrate, he read a description of a scientific technique out loud, and then showed a video of the same technique. The written description included phrases like "hold at 3 o'clock" and "aspirate lightly." The video took only a few seconds, and was understandable even to the nontechnical audience.

Based on his experiences in PhD research, Pritsker pursued the idea of publishing videos showing experimental techniques. Because there was no existing publication like this, he became involved in a start-up to produce JoVE.

JoVE publishes videos of laboratory techniques. Scientists submit proposals for 15 to 20 minute videos which summarize techniques used in experiments. Research findings are published elsewhere in a traditional scientific article format. Videos compliment articles, and are intended to facilitate recreating experimental techniques. JoVE currently accepts and produces 50 videos per month across five research areas.

When a video is accepted, JoVE schedules a photographer from the scientists' city to work with the scientists and spend about a day filming and video. Originally, some videos were attempted with scientists filming, but this could not be done because scientists had poor or inconsistent access to video equipment and found video editing frustrating.

At this time, the real costs to produce a video are about $8,000 per video. High production costs were a key barrier to making JoVE open access, as Pritsker originally wanted. In an open access model where author fees support the journal, the highest fees currently charged are by the Public Library of Science at about $3,000 per article – not enough to finance a video.

Despite high production costs, videos likely save money and allow some experiments to be reproduced which otherwise could not be. Pritsker was able to travel to Edinburgh to witness experiments and learn techniques for his PhD, but travel funding is not always available. Pritsker estimates that it costs about $10,000 to reproduce an experiment in biology because of wasted time and resources for failed attempts, and travel time to view experiments. Availability of tools like videos better allows techniques to be recreated and saves money for the research system overall.

Strategic Collection Management through Statistical Analysis

Stephanie H. Wical, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

Reported by Paula Sullenger

Wical, the periodicals and electronic resources librarian at University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, wanted to get a picture of what academic libraries in Wisconsin are doing as a group in collecting and using usage data for electronic resources. She and her research partner, Hans Kishel, identified academic libraries in Wisconsin of all kinds, public and private, technical colleges, two-year colleges, and for-profit. They surveyed librarians they believed to have a role in electronic resource management. They emailed 139 surveys and received sixty-four completed back, for a 45% completion rate. They attribute this high return to the fact that they contacted the survey recipients to alert them that the survey was on its way and to its purpose. They conducted telephone interviews with twenty-eight of the respondents to elicit more detailed information. A few questions from both surveys are highlighted here.

The survey asked questions about the types of statistics collected and which are considered when evaluating electronic resources. Searches, sessions, full-text downloads, and cost-per-use all ranked highly for both questions. Thirty-nine percent consider these measures once a year, while twice a year, monthly, and "other" rated sixteen percent each. Seventy-four percent consider these measures to be either "important" or "very important" in decisions to renew or cancel resources and 81% report that they have canceled an electronic resource because of low use.

When asked if usage statistics are reported outside the library, 50% said they were, 24% said they weren't, and the remainder weren't sure. Inside the library, 48% said their dean/director received them, 21% said they reported them to everyone in the library, 16% said they reported to reference librarians and 11% said the statistics weren't reported anywhere.

In the follow-up telephone interviews, 68% look at cost-per-use for their electronic resources. When asked why they are using these measures to evaluate, 25% said for budget reasons, 28% because they always do it that way or because it is what they have to work with, and 18% said they wanted to get an idea of that the students are using. When asked what they should be doing with this usage data, 19% thought they should be used for making informed renewal decisions, another 19% thought they should be communicating the usage statistics to others, and 15% thought they should assess the "bang for the buck" that libraries are getting. Half of the respondents expressed some dissatisfaction with the measures used and noted that not all data is COUNTER compliant, it can't always be looked at across vendors, and the data do not account for a lot of variables.

Wical ended her presentation with a suggestion that others conduct similar surveys in their states or consortia to help get a better view of what usage data librarians collect and the purposes these data are put to.