ELUNA learns Resource Sharing Session Q & A

How could indocs align with RapidILL?

INCDocs and RapidILL share some overlapping attributes so it would be unlikely that they would likely be deployed in the same resource sharing environment. We are not marketing it as a competitor to RapidILL but instead making it available for groups of libraries where understanding each other's holdings - particularly in a heterogenous group where some folks are using Alma, others EBSCO, others OCLC and so on - could prove useful in accelerating lending.

Can you note more of what is included in the analytics for INCdoc?

INCDocs analytics contain both the original item that was looked up by the staff member (some items may be locally filled so do not graduate to become lending/borrowing transactions), then the number and detail about what was requested and from whom and how long the fulfillment process took.

I want to ask the tired old question of whether there's been any development at NLM for Pubmed to integrate the way ILLiad does as you presented. Our desire is to have availability shown on the label of the Outside tool linkout link , that would indicate availability. This *is* something that Libkey Nomad does well, but our Health Sciences has indicated they don't want to go the route of having users install the extension, whish isn't' ideal of course anyway.

Thanks! I appreciate the question. NLM continues to not be interested in a "native" integration. Using a combination of LibKey Nomad and promoting that or site installing it and using LibKey Link in the outside tool provides the most robust and comprehensive LibKey experience in PubMed.

Can you give us some details on Unpaywall and how you coded to ignore it for your license lookups?

Unpaywall is a free resource aggregator (think Google Scholar) that shows as a result in Primo. When we get a result back from Primo, there is a section in the XML written as "Is_free" with a true/false value. If that is true, then we ignore that section. We try to fill from the University of Minnesota collection first. We want to use the resources we pay for. After that, if it is only available as free, then we double-check to make sure the resource is truly free. There are many resources that say they are free, but require you to accept a TOS, or are given "freely" to universities. We check each free resource behind a proxy if it is not a known free entity like Archive.org

How would LibKey handle articles that might be provided to the library through different publishers? Say if we have access to an article through EBSCO and a society publisher's site? Is that even a concern?

This is not a concern. Part of LibKey's general operating principles is to follow a cascading waterfall of decisions which are informed both by its own Open Access Version of Record database as well as a frequently synchronized snapshot of a library's electronic holdings including publisher and aggregator holdings. These are all evaluated first and the entitlements are compared against each other to come up with the best link for access which LibKey provides.

UNM isn't a Rapid library, is that correct?

The University of Minnesota is a Rapid member. Minitex is a multi-type consortium. We get requests from public libraries, academics, medical, K-12, and specialty libraires. Most of these institutions do not use Rapid. This question was likely asked due to Rapid doing license checks on the material. This process described in the webinar is outside of that.

So that is separate system or part of this?

Answered above. The members we serve do not use Rapid. Although Minitex is the lending arm of the University of Minnesota, Rapid is an extremely small part of the requests we handle.

How do you send eBooks to other libraries again?

In our license data we have a select number of publishers that allow us to send entire eBooks through ILL. These publishers specifically allow us to send PDFs downloaded directly from them. We use Article Exchange (OCLC product) or Alma Digital Delivery to deliver all of our e-deliveries. We don't use any special DRM or CDL.

Did you limit your eBook purchases to those that could be licensed for unlimited concurrent users? And did you run into any cases where the bookstore bundled the textbook with courseware that was required to pass the course?

We prefer to license unlimited concurrent users, but for this project we have also experimented with 3 simultaneous users when there were no unlimited options to license. Since our project also runs matches on existing holdings, we included titles we already licensed even when they included just 1 or 3 simultaneous users, with the idea that some access for students is better than no access. This is an open question for us, though, and we may change our practice as our understanding about how students use the books evolves. Regarding required courseware, yes, there are instances where there are required materials just not licensed to libraries for institutional use. In some ways, it has allowed us to help educate the campus about how the market for library licenses works, and drawn attention to this unique affordability challenge our students are facing that will take a solution from multiple stakeholders, not just the library.

You must get pretty clean and accurate citations from your faculty. Or is ChatGPT pretty good at parsing incomplete or improperly formatted citations?

Citations from faculty range in format, accuracy, and state of completion. Some faculty provide us with thorough citations in a consistent format, whereas others might provide only very basic

information. In the latter case, we rely on staff to either fill in the blanks through basic searching, or work with faculty to get clarification. ChatGPT is quite good at sorting the citation information that is provided into spreadsheet format with each piece of information in the right column, but we don't expect it to accurately add missing details if, say, the faculty only provide us with the title of a work.

An additional caveat here is that the Lookup Tool works best when the citation matches exactly the metadata we have in our catalog, which is not always complete or totally accurate. For example, we've seen instances where a streaming film in our catalog has a date provided by a vendor that reflects its most recent re-release, not its creation date, which isn't very helpful when a professor is requesting a film from the 1930s. Because of this, staff need to sometimes tweak citation info to better match what we have in our catalog, or to leave out fields that could lead to a failed match.

These have been good reminders that even with automation tools, there still needs to be human intervention. The goal with our automation tools is to cut down on the repetitive tasks so that staff have more time to work directly with faculty on those requests that require clarification or more complex problem-solving.