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Executive Summary
HIKE (Huddersfield, Intota, KB+ Evaluation) is a Jisc funded project managed by Computing and Library Services at the University of Huddersfield and the Knowledge Base Plus (KB+) project at JISC Collections. We are also working closely with Serials Solutions and their Intota development team.

The aim of the Jisc HIKE project is to evaluate the suitability of Intota and KB+ for the UK higher education (HE) marketplace and provide recommendations for further developments of both products. The representation of the University of Huddersfield on the Community and Technical Advisory Groups of KB+, and on the Serial Solutions Advisory Board and UK User Group make the institution ideally placed to carry out this evaluation. In order to assess the success of the project we identified several measurable targets:

Workflows
The approach the project took was that in order to evaluate the suitability and potential of both KB+ and Intota as a replacement for the traditional Library Management System (LMS) we had to understand the issues that arise from the workflows and processes that we have in place for the current LMS and related university systems. Understanding these workflows allows us to define what we want – and want to avoid – in a new system.

Much of the groundwork relating to the journals workflow had been carried out as part of the SCONUL Shared ERM and TERMS projects. Therefore, the project team concentrated on the Acquisitions workflow, including PDA and reading list requests, much of which is still fairly new to the team. These workflows are discussed in greater detail in section 6.0, while section 10.3 outlines some potential new workflows. All workflows are available in Appendices I-III.

After investigation of the Acquisitions workflows it was possible to create a ‘wish list’ which highlighted a number of features and efficiencies for consideration by Serials Solutions for the development of Intota.

The workflows and evaluation of the products were highlighted and discussed with KB+ and Serial Solutions in a number of reports, face-to-face meetings and blog posts throughout the project and brought together in this final project report.

Knowledge Base+ evaluation
The project team worked alongside the KB+ team at JISC Collections in testing the system. Particular attention was paid to populating KB+ with licence information and data. The project looked critically at whether adoption of KB+ into the Huddersfield workflows would create efficiencies. A number of recommendations were made that the project felt would enhance KB+.

The team also spent time testing and reporting back on the KB+ renewals feature, again, this was critically assessed, with a number of further recommendations being made regarding this feature.

Finally we compared KB+ against 360 Resource Manager, the ERM option form Serials Solutions. The outcomes of the comparison will also be of use to those universities which subscribe to ERMs from alternative providers. The project fully supports the use of both KB+ and commercial ERM. Each system has its own individual strengths, while also complimenting each other. However, the project believes that full integration, via an API, is required in order for the maximum efficiencies to be
made. Section 6.0 discusses this further and makes a number of recommendations (see also section 3.0).

As a result of our work with the KB+ team, we firmly believe that KB+ will reduce duplication of staff time and effort in the population and on-going maintenance of individual knowledge bases and will foster shared community activity and partnership to reduce the amount of work undertaken by each institution.

**Intota Evaluation**
We investigated the requirement for Intota to be interoperable with other systems in order to be attractive for the UK marketplace. We began by identifying the systems with which interoperability was desired before moving on to evaluating the importance of each system to the running of the library. We then considered the interoperability of Intota with Dawson Books, Patron-Driven Acquisition and HE financial systems in more depth. We held a HIKE day in February 2013 as a way of crowdsourcing the work we had done. After producing a substantial list of requirements for interoperability we grouped them and assessed the dependency of the library on these external systems. As a result, the project made a number of recommendations for the development of Intota, section 8.0 discusses this further and makes a number of recommendations (see also section 3.0).

**Management of Change**
We investigated the cultural change required to successfully implement such an innovative system as Intota; however, this is not an objective of the project that can easily be measured as a success or failure. Therefore we made a number of observations on the management of cultural change during the implementation of a new system in order to ensure that all staff are happy and comfortable with the change.

**Dissemination**
The HIKE project has a blog, which will continue to be updated after the project’s completion at: [http://library.hud.ac.uk/blogs/projects/hike/](http://library.hud.ac.uk/blogs/projects/hike/)

This final project report is also available at: [http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/17976](http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/17976)

**Recommendations**

**Recommendations for JISC Collections and KB+**

**Recommendation 1:**  *We recommend that a link to the licence properties and PDF of the licence that relates to the subscription is included.*

**Recommendation 2:**  *We recommend that the default setting of the subscription homepage is altered so that the subscription detail is automatically open and the details are visible.*

**Recommendation 3:**  *We recommend that it would be beneficial to have a comparison tool within KB+ (or as an extension of ELCAT), which would allow us to compare any licence on KB+, whether nationally or individually agreed, in any format with another.*

**Recommendation 4:**  *We recommend that the renewals spreadsheet also include reasons as to why some of the titles are missing year on year, e.g. if they have ceased publication, transferred to another publisher, combined with another journal etc.*
Recommendation 5: We recommend that the renewals spreadsheet identify which journal titles are hybrid (subscription and OA) and which are OA.

Recommendation 6: We recommend that the renewals spreadsheet that is uploaded into KB+ is tweaked in order for it to be able to be uploaded into Serial Solutions to amend the knowledgebase to accurately reflect our new holdings.

Recommendation 7: We recommend that the JUSP (Journals Usage Statistics Portal) information should be included or linked to on the comparison spreadsheet.

Recommendation 8: We recommend that UK Serials Solutions subscribers populate the following fields in 360 Resource Manager:

- Fair clause – permitted uses of the published material such as ILL
- Scholarly sharing – non-systematic classroom use e.g. the printing of a section of a journal by a tutor for their class as a one off.
- Electronic link – VLE or wiki
- Perpetual access holdings - indicate the dates of our perpetual access e.g. 1996 – 2000
- Governing law/copyright/governing jurisdiction = UK/US copyright
- Execution date – date the licence was signed and agreed
- There are also a number of fields relating to the use of published material and repositories which may also be useful. However, this would require integration with SHERPA.

Recommendation 9: We recommend that both systems are used but for different purposes:

- 360 Resource Manager will help the Information Resources team in the management of electronic resources in an active way
- KB+ will provide an ideal reference tool for answering enquiries relating to the access and use of e-resources and the administration of NESLi2 subscriptions.

Recommendation 10: For KB+ and Serials Solutions subscribers we recommend that the information about the licences and the changes to identify the core titles and access dates etc. should be enacted in KB+ first and then exported to 360 Resource Manager to save the duplication of work.

Recommendation 11: We recommend that exports from KB+ must be able to reflect ALL the locally made amendments by each institution to the subscriptions.

Recommendation 12: We recommend that both systems need to be able to display the same fields – or at least a set of core fields.

Recommendation 13: In order for this proposed data transfer between the two systems to be achieved, we recommend that KB+ develop an API to enable the transfer of data between KB+ and commercial ERMs.

Recommendations for Serials Solutions and Intota

Recommendation 14: We recommend that Intota would need to find a standard way of displaying the data from all of the different suppliers.
Recommendation 15: It is **recommended that Intota develops a series of default settings which can be amended by individual libraries** to ensure that if the book is available from any of the chosen suppliers they are shown immediately and the search is only widened if there are no results from the chosen suppliers or the library manually chooses to widen it.

Recommendation 16: We recommend that a notification or pop-up be introduced after the order has been sent to confirm the number of items ordered.

Recommendation 17: We recommend that Intota is able to receive this feed and display the information within a dashboard.

Recommendation 18: We recommend that Serial Solutions consider the possibility of poor records when developing Intota.

Recommendation 19: We recommend that immediate access, alongside real-time invoicing, must be available to institutions through Intota.

Recommendation 20: We recommend that Intota develops out of print purchasing workflows between out of print suppliers and approved book suppliers with shelf ready capabilities.

Recommendation 21: We recommend Intota develop a mechanism to see whether an item is in the system already.

Recommendation 22: We recommend that Intota create a way to track e-book purchases against aggregated e-book collections in conjunction with KB+.

Recommendation 23: We recommend that Intota develop an integrated ILL/PDA system, which allows users choice and provides detailed management reports.

Recommendation 24: We recommend that Intota provides a complete set of reports for libraries to assess the success of PDA against traditional collection development processes.

Recommendation 25: We recommend that in order to be a valid proposal for the UK HE community, Intota must integrate with Agresso (and any other financial systems on offer).

Recommendation 26: We recommend that an API between Intota and Agresso is developed to pull data into a dashboard.
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