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.
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**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.
CONCLUSIONS:

- Improved understanding of existing collection and goals for next five years.
- Extensive staff time has been required for the numerous activities needed to make the effort adequately informative and worthwhile.
- Made first steps in migration from print to electronic collection: priorities and roadmap.
- Faculty publication patterns weigh positively for title's renewal/adoption.
- Electronic usage statistics not as useful as anticipated due to difficulty in collecting and comparing.
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