



EAHIL 2016



Biblioteca Virtual
del Sistema Sanitario Público de Andalucía

Knowledge, Research, Innovation ...



15th EAHIL 2016 Conference 6 - 11 June, Seville, Spain

A set of quality indicators for eHealth libraries

Idoia Gaminde^{1,5}, Silvia Sastre-Suarez^{2,5}; Victoria Barragan^{3,5}; Pilar Roque-Castella^{4,5}; Virgili Paez^{2,5}; Veronica Juan-Quilis^{3,5}

¹ Virtual Health Sciences of the Navarrese Department of Health, Navarra, Spain; ² Virtual Health Sciences Library of the Balearic Islands (Bibliosalut), Palma de Mallorca, Spain; ³ Andalusian eHealth Library. Ministry of Health of the Regional Government of Andalusia, Sevilla, Spain; ⁴ Health Sciences Library of Catalonia. Ministry of Health of the Regional Government of Catalonia, Barcelona, Spain; ⁵ Rebisalud, Spain

INTRODUCTION

- This is a cooperation project whereby the group of eHealth library members of Rebisalud (eHealth Libraries Network – <http://www.rebisalud.org>) have developed a core set of quality indicators to measure and evaluate the services provided by the newly implemented eHealth libraries in Spain.
- This core set will help us to understand objectively the functioning of the different services provided by the libraries, as well as facilitate the comparison of our libraries to learn from each other in order to improve our services.

- To develop a core set of quality indicators to measure and evaluate the services provided by the newly implemented eHealth libraries in Spain.

METHODS

1. The norm ISO 11620 (Library performance indicators) was revised.
2. A classification scale to screen the indicators focusing on virtual libraries was developed
3. Three independent reviewers rated each indicator with that scale to assess their feasibility
4. Benchmarking exercise with the indicators selected.
5. Finally a consensus was reached among the leaders of the eHealth libraries members of Rebisalud.

RESULTS

A	Viabile. Automatic calculation
B	To be discussed by the group. Key indicators that have to be calculated manually. No backwards data. The effort has to be considered worthy
C	Numerator or denominator has to be redefined
D	Irrelevant for eHealth libraries

Table 1. Screening scale to classify indicators



	Number of Indicators					Disagreement
	Total	A	B	C	D	
B.1: Resources, access and infrastructure						
B.1.1 Collection	5	2	2	0	1	
B.1.2 Access	8	2	1	0	5	
B.1.3 Facilities	4	0	0	0	4	
B.1.4 Staff	1					AAC (No agreement)
B.2 Use						
B.2.1 Collection	5	1			1	2ACB/1CD (No agreement)
B.2.2 Access	5				1	4ABA (No agreement)
B.2.3 Facilities	1				1	
B.2.4 General	3		2			A questionnaire has to be constructed 1
B.3 Efficiency						
B.3.1 Collection	3					3ACB (No agreement)
B.3.2 Access	2				2	
B.3.3 Staff	6	2		1	1	2
B.3.4 General	2	2				
B.4 Potentials and Development						
B.4.1 Collection	1				1	
B.4.2 Staff	4	1	1			2
B.4.3 General	2	1			1	
	52	11	6	1	18	16

Table 2. ISO's indicators adequacy to Virtual Libraries according to our classification

- With the classification scale to screen ISO's performance indicators:
 - 21% (11/52) were classified as A – easy to calculate;
 - 11% (6/52) as B – difficult to calculate but if interesting worth recommending;
 - 2% (1/52) as C – problems with the definition;
 - 34% (18/52) not applicable to Virtual Libraries;
 - And, there was no agreement for 30% (16/52)

- As a result of this first stage 17 out of 52 indicators were selected
- Most of the indicators rejected were related to non-virtuality, i.e. like physical facilities, shelving, and internet access.
- We found important problems with definitions or concepts, as well as problems with the terms used among our libraries.

Library	Cost
A	7,07 €
B	5,75 €
C	9,76 €

Table 3. Cost per visit to the library (2014)



- The benchmarking exercise lead us to redefine some of the definitions of numerators and denominators of the indicators selected, i.e. costs, visits to the library.
 - what sort of costs were going to be considered and whether we were able to conform to them.
 - the number of visits to the library webpage probably were not a good answer to library visits in physical terms.

- Each indicator is described by name, code, definition, aim, method, interpretation, and information source.
- Indicators are classified in terms of: structure (human and economic resources, electronic collection), process (use of resources, access) and results (efficiency, user satisfaction).

CONCLUSIONS

- This is just a tiny step towards quality measurement, but our learning during the process has been huge, and we hope to be able to take a step forward with the first benchmarking exercise for our network (Rebisalud).
- Future Steps:
 - Development of a users' satisfaction questionnaire.
 - Balanced Scorecard
 - Impact of our libraries