

## **InfoAnyTime Evaluation Report Summary**

**Friday, March 16, 2007**

**Amy Terlaga**

### **Transcript Evaluations**

The InfoAnyTime Transcript Evaluation committee meeting was formed shortly after the launch of the InfoAnyTime statewide virtual reference service. The committee's purpose was to evaluate the performance of Tutor.com's AskALibrarian virtual reference staff as they assisted Connecticut public library patrons and students.

At our initial meeting, the committee agreed to review **100 transcripts total**, with a **59/41 public/academic library split**.<sup>\*</sup> The transcripts were chosen at random, but it was important to evaluate those transcripts that showed a complete reference interview. In other words, those transcripts that showed a dropped connection before the reference interview was completed were not chosen for evaluation.

Committee members asked themselves the following questions as they rated each transcript for **accuracy (1-10), reference interview (1-10), and patron satisfaction (-1, 0, 1)**.

### **Questions**

1. Did the reference librarian use open-ended questions used at the outset of the transaction to clarify the information need?
2. Did the reference librarian confirm what other resources the user has already checked?
3. Is there a closed-ended question at the end of the initial interview confirming that the reference librarian understood the user's inquiry?
4. Did the reference librarian tell the user what they were doing as the transaction progressed?
5. Did the reference librarian use some variation of this closed-ended question "Did this answer your question" at the end of the transaction?
6. Is there an overall impression of a courteous and professional disposition?
7. Is the session duration appropriate to the query (or too long or too short)?
8. Is the question answered correctly?
  - a) if the question is not fully answered, is the user referred to an appropriate resource, e.g., local resource if applicable?
  - b) if the question is answered, is the user given a specific, authoritative source(s) to support the librarian's answer?
9. Is there evidence of the user's satisfaction?

The committee completed their evaluation of 100 InfoAnyTime virtual reference transcripts on February 1, 2007.

---

<sup>\*</sup>(This is a correction from the previous report's 60/40 split reporting.)

The final results:

ACCURACY	REFERENCE INTERVIEW	PATRON SATISFACTION
7.58	7.40	<b>.66</b> Corrected from previous report's .67 rating

These final results did not deviate greatly from the last time that Tutor.com's virtual reference transcripts were evaluated as one of three services providing virtual reference in CT. This first evaluation was conducted in the Spring of 2005. During this first evaluation, 100 transcripts were also considered and the same rating system was employed with one minor difference; patron satisfaction was rated on a 1-10 point scale, instead of the -1, 0, 1 score favored by this most recent evaluation. Final results of this first evaluation gave Tutor.com librarians a **7.63 in accuracy**, a **7.00 in reference interview**, and a **7.37 in patron satisfaction**. It is important to note that Tutor.com received the highest marks of all three vendors in each category.

**Final Results – Breakdown by Category**

**PUBLIC LIBRARY TRANSCRIPTS**  
**59 Transcripts TOTAL**

ACCURACY	REFERENCE INTERVIEW	PATRON SATISFACTION
7.62	7.38	.68

**ACADEMIC LIBRARY TRANSCRIPTS**  
**41 Transcripts TOTAL**

ACCURACY	REFERENCE INTERVIEW	PATRON SATISFACTION
7.52	7.43	.63

There statistical difference is minimal between the scores when comparing the public library transcript scores to the academic library transcript scores. The public library transcripts were rated slightly higher in accuracy (.1 difference), while the academic transcripts were rated slightly higher in the reference interview (.05 difference). Public library patrons were viewed as a little more satisfied than the academic users (.05 difference).

It is also important to note that only two evaluators from this first evaluation continued on to serve on the InfoAnyTime Transcript Evaluation Committee for the statewide service. (Their names are asterisked below.)

**InfoAnyTime Transcript Evaluation Committee Members:**

Amy Terlaga, Bibliomation (Chair)  
 Valerie Annis, Minor Memorial Library, Roxbury\*  
 Paula Cook, Manchester Community College\*  
 Mary Dixey, Rensselaer at Hartford  
 Jessica Rogoz, Edith Wheeler Memorial Library, Monroe  
 Rob Walsh, Capital Community College  
 Janice Wilson, Eastern CT State University

**Patron Survey Results**

Since September 1, 2006, there have been **5061** user sessions, with **487** survey responses received. (Survey results data were generated on March 5, 2007, at 2:11pm.)

Patron survey questions include the following:

*“Would you recommend this service to a friend?”*

YES	NO
446	41

*“How helpful was the information you received?”*

<b>5 = Very Helpful</b>	284
<b>4</b>	77
<b>3</b>	52
<b>2</b>	23
<b>1 = Not Helpful</b>	51

*“How did you hear about the service?”*

<b>Community Groups</b>	6
<b>Friends / Family</b>	29
<b>Library Webpage</b>	284
<b>Newspaper / Radio</b>	9
<b>Online (ex: MySpace)</b>	12
<b>Other</b>	66
<b>Teacher / School</b>	77



*“The system and service was”*

<b>1 = slow</b>	29
<b>2</b>	25
<b>3</b>	86
<b>4</b>	132
<b>5 = fast</b>	206

*“Did this help you identify a new source of information?”*

<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
384	84

*Any questions regarding this evaluation report summary can be sent to me at [terlaga@biblio.org](mailto:terlaga@biblio.org).*