Editorial: Next Steps

Mary Beth Weber

Welcome to the inaugural issue of the e-only *Library Resources and Technical Services* (*LRTS*)! We are starting the year with a new publication model for *LRTS*. The content and quality of the journal will remain constant, as will the submission criteria and review process. The difference is that you will no longer receive a print copy of the journal, and it will instead be delivered directly to your e-mail. Transitioning to e-only provides new opportunities. It removes page limits required for print and will enable full color copy (perfect for viewing *LRTS* covers and illustrative matter that accompanies papers). It will also enable us to explore new publication models used by other e-only scholarly journals. I am confident things will proceed smoothly under the watch of Tim Clifford of ALA Production Services, *LRTS*'s production editor, and Christine McConnell of ALCTS, *LRTS*'s manager. Tim has handled other ALA journals' transition to e-only, and Christine has addressed issues related to subscriptions and publicity. I rest assured it will be a seamless transition.

Regarding the quality of *LRTS*, I am pleased to note that the journal was cited in Judith M. Nixon's paper "Core Journals in Library and Information Science: Developing a Methodology for Ranking LIS Journals" as one of the top ten journals as cited by library directors and deans.[1] As a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, papers submitted to *LRTS* undergo a double-blind review by the expert reviewers who serve on the *LRTS* Editorial Board. This is true for all submissions, including those submitted by members of the editorial board.

Eliminating the costs of printing the journal and postage will save ALCTS money and will also enable ALCTS to deliver your copy of *LRTS* directly to your e-mail. However, moving to e-only will not speed up the processes associated with reviewing papers and preparing issues of *LRTS*. It may seem as if papers submitted to *LRTS* undergo a long journey from submission to publication, yet there are a number of important processes that take place along the way. Papers are submitted via the Editorial Manager manuscript-submission system after authors have registered themselves in the system. Once received, the paper is carefully matched with two reviewers who work independently of each other. The editorial board consists of ALCTS members with writing and subject expertise and includes representation from ALCTS's various divisions. Reviewers are given about twenty-one days to review a paper and submit their comments in Editorial Manager, and I am alerted when all reviews are complete. I then compile the reviewers' comments and convey them, along with a marked up copy of the paper, to the author(s). At this point, the author is asked to revise the paper and resubmit it. I should note that I have yet to receive a paper, regardless of how well written and researched it might be, that does not require some type of revision. Some papers undergo one revision and are accepted for publication. Others may require a second round of double blind review and the author will resubmit a second revision.

In my January 2014 annual report to the ALCTS board of directors, I reported that for the period of June 2013 to January 2014, thirty-nine papers were submitted to *LRTS*. From that number, nineteen (46 percent) were rejected. This is

testament to the rigorous review given to papers submitted to the journal. My work includes reviewing and copyediting papers, in addition to the review provided by editorial board members. I check each citation to ensure that it has been properly formatted and is accurate. The authors may receive several inquiries during the review process.

To generate content, I do extensive outreach to potential authors when I attend conferences and presentations. I also subscribe to a number of discussion lists and have contacted individuals about writing a paper based on the surveys or research they are doing. Additionally, I welcome emails from individuals with potential paper topics (and I frequently receive these types of inquiries). I am happy to mentor potential authors, as are members of the editorial board. ALCTS has a strong publications program and several venues where authors can publish, including the ALCTS News and the Paper Series. The ALCTS Publications Committee is developing a mentoring program for authors, and I am proud to be part of that effort. Publications are an outgrowth of one's work and as professionals. We benefit from sharing our findings and insights with others.

In closing, I would like to highlight this issue's contents:

- In "Spilling Out of the Funnel: How Serials Cancellations Affect Interlibrary Loan Use and Patron Access to Materials," Steven A. Knowlton, Iulia Kristanciuk, and Matthew J. Jabaily discuss interlibrary loan (ILL) as an alternative means for academic library patrons to access serial titles that their library has canceled. They conducted a study that examined how serials cancellations affect ILL usage, and how reliance on ILL affects patron's access to content.
- Jason C. Dewland and Andrew See discuss the lack of metrics to evaluate Patron Driven Acquisitions (PDA) programs in "Patron Driven Acquisitions: Determining the Metrics for Success." Their paper details how the University of Arizona developed metrics for their PDA, including a list of key metrics that they argue every library with a PDA program should monitor.

- "One Title, Hundreds of Volumes, Thousands of Documents: Collaborating to Describe the Congressional Serial Set" chronicles Purdue University Libraries' participation in the Google Books government documents scanning project. The University of Iowa used a template developed by Purdue and joined as partners in a collaborative process. Suzanne Ward, Patricia Glasson, and Randall Roeder relate the details of the project and how it reached a successful conclusion.
- Academic librarians frequently use citation studies and analyses of usage statistics to determine if their journal collections satisfactorily support the needs of research faculty. In "Combining Citation Studies and Usage Statistics to Build a Stronger Collection," Stephanie H. Wical and R. Todd Vandenbark discuss how they compiled a list of faculty journal publications that covered a thirteen year span from four academic departments at their small regional liberal arts college to generate a list of the journals that faculty cited. They combined an analysis of usage statistics with citation analysis to more strategically look at a Big Deal Package.
- Violeta Ilik provides an overview of the open source web application Viewshare in "Visual Representation of Academic Communities through Viewshare." Her paper summarizes how she generated and customized unique views of data about faculty members at Texas A&M University, specifically their areas of research and data such as PHD granting institution and Virtual International Authority File authority records.

I hope that you enjoy this issue of *LRTS*!

Rererence

1. Judith M. Nixon, "Core Journals in Library and Information Science: Developing a Methodology for Ranking LIS Journals," *College & Research Libraries* 75, no. 1 (2014): 68.

Erratum

Information in v. 58, no. 4 for one of the authors cited in "Positioning Libraries for a New Bibliographic Universe" by Kristin Martin and Kavita Mundle is incorrect. The author's name is Ellen Greenblatt, not Helen Greenblatt. We apologize for the error.