Start Your Engines

OBJECTIVES:
• Develop a plan to respond to flat budgets, skyrocketing serials costs, and patron pressure for increased access to electronic journals prior to 2005 serials renewal.
• Create interdepartmental committee with representatives from serials, electronic resources, library operations, interlibrary loan, and library administration.
• Assess environment and criteria for print and electronic subscriptions.

BENCHMARKING:
• Consult libraries that have considered these issues to assess their plans and outcomes.
• Review published literature.
• Attend relevant sessions at professional meetings.
• Discuss issues with academics, publishers, and other librarians at National Academy of Sciences meeting and FASEB regional meeting.
• Assess e-journals management systems at vendor demonstrations.

EARLY STRUGGLES:
• How to handle electronic licenses that prohibit interlibrary loan?
• How are e-journals archived? What will the impact be on the library in 10 years?
• How to handle license ambiguity and variety?
• How will electronic subscriptions affect workload of current staff?
• How will electronic licensing address proxy use? Distance education? Electronic reserves?

POLICIES:
• Revised collection development policies for print and electronic resources.
• Created model electronic license based on NERL’s model license.
• Developed e-journals licensing checklist which included required and allowed terms.
• Will not negotiate for aggregate collections of titles because of lack of control over specific titles and coverage dates.

SAMPLE FACULTY SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magazine/Title</th>
<th>Value of Title</th>
<th>Preferred Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENTAL SURVEY RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print Only: 50% Electronic: 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORE TITLE SURVEY 20 RESPONSES

| Print Only: 60% Electronic: 40% |

PREFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED FORMAT OF JOURNALS DEEMED ESSENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print Only: 50% Electronic: 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED FORMAT FOR JOURNALS DEEMED IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print only: 60% Electronic only: 37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparing for Liftoff

**Faculty Survey:**
- Journal titles pertinent to each department were sent to department heads.
- Department heads were asked to evaluate usefulness of each title (essential, important, useful, and cancel) and preferred format (print only, electronic only, print and electronic).
- Responses were compiled and analyzed for patterns of title value and format preference.

**“Top 3 Titles” Survey:**
- Asked faculty to identify three journals that are most critical to their research, patient care, and educational activities.
- Faculty also asked to state preference for print only or electronic only or print plus electronic access.
- Results:
  - 136 responses requested 249 journal titles.
  - Titles most frequently requested: NEJM, JAMA, Lancet.
  - 70 preferred electronic only, 40 preferred print and electronic, 10 preferred print only, and 16 did not indicate a preference.

**Faculty Publication Pattern Analysis:**
- Accessed existing database of GWUMC faculty publications.
- Analyzed data from 2002 and determined number of publications per journal title, if title exists in collection, and if title is indexed in MEDLINE.
- Results:
  - Identified 313 journal titles.
  - Current subscriptions to 178 journal titles.
  - Titles not indexed in MEDLINE: 48.
  - Titles to consider for addition to collection: 87.

**Interlibrary Loan Usage Study:**
- Data analyzed through reports from QuickDoc "Reports" feature.
- Reviewed annual report of Titles Borrowed to identify titles to add to our collection.
- Reviewed annual report of Titles Loaned and compared the report to identified possible cancellations and/or online-only subscriptions.
- Results:
  - Titles borrowed were for articles in older years only so didn’t provide suggestions for new subscriptions.
  - Interlibrary loan use of journals not a major factor in making print vs. electronic subscription decisions.
**APPLICATION:**

- “Top 3 Titles” all included in serials renewal.
- Faculty survey:
  - Positive information (title to renew/add) very useful and titles included in renewal.
  - Negative information much less useful as one department would recommend cancellation of titles critical to another department.
- Usage statistics:
  - For low-use titles (less than 10), check MEDLINE indexing.
  - Cancel all titles that receive low-use and are not MEDLINE-indexed.
  - For MEDLINE-indexed but low-use titles, assess possible value to collection as electronic subscription.
  - Faculty publication patterns weigh positively for title’s renewal/addition.
  - Electronic usage statistics not as useful as anticipated due to difficulty in collecting and comparing.
  - Compare proffered licenses with model license and begin negotiations.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

- Improved understanding of existing collection and goals for next five years.
- Made first steps in migration from print to electronic collection: priorities and roadmap.
- Difficult to make predictions and decisions because of fluctuating pricing algorithms.
- Need to establish plan to incorporate some review of serials collection on annual basis.
- Hope to expand collection within current budget framework by reducing multiple format costs.
- Extensive staff time has been required for the numerous activities needed to make the effort adequately informative and worthwhile.