

## Rubric for Evaluating AI Tools for Library Staff

This tool was developed with the intention of evaluating publisher and vendor AI search tools for study and research purposes in an academic setting. This work is adapted from and builds upon the *Rubric for Evaluating AI Tools: Fundamental Criteria* by Kyle Mackie and Erin Aspenlieder, copyright 2024:

<https://ecampusontario.pressbooks.pub/app/uploads/sites/3696/2024/02/Rubric-for-AI-Tool-Evaluation-Fundamental.pdf>

It is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License,

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

**Attribution:** "[Rubric for Evaluating AI Tools for Library Staff](#)" by Erin Montagu, 2025, Modifications: Additional and edited criteria is licensed under [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0](#) / A derivative from the [original work](#)

Category	Criteria	Works Well	Minor Concerns	Serious Concerns	Not applicable
Functionality	Accuracy	The AI provides accurate and thorough responses to queries, with no hallucinations or assumptions.	Occasional inaccuracies, assumptions or hallucinations in AI responses.	Frequent inaccuracies and hallucinations hindering the learning process.	
	Ease of Use	The AI interface is intuitive, with little to no learning curve for new users.	Some users require assistance to navigate or understand AI functionalities.	Users find the interface confusing, leading to a significant barrier to effective use.	
	Transparency	The AI provides clear explanations for its outputs, in-line citations are provided and verifiable, Boolean search string is available.	Some level of transparency is provided, such as citations, but how they relate to the output is not clear. Boolean search string may not be provided or difficult to find.	The output process is opaque, and users have little to no understanding of how output is generated.	
	Reliability	The source articles provided are verifiable, peer-reviewed, published by reputable journals/databases. Retracted and unreliable sources are actively filtered.	Source articles are provided but their reliability or accuracy may be more difficult to verify eg. Articles are not subject to rigorous acceptance requirements or uploaded by unknown users.	The source of generated content is unknown and difficult to verify or uses content from general internet sources.	

	Relevancy	All source articles provided are directly relevant to the generated output and ranked in order of importance/relevancy.	Source articles are provided, but not all are relevant to the query or used in generated output. Sources are not necessarily ranked in order of importance.	Source articles frequently have no relevancy to the query or are not provided at all.	
Accessibility	Accessibility standards	The AI tool complies with international accessibility standards and includes features like text-to-speech, alternative text for images, and screen reader compatibility.	The tool has some limited capacity to meet accessibility guidelines.	The tool fails to meet basic accessibility standards, making it difficult or impossible for users with disabilities to utilize it effectively.	
	Cost of Use	The AI tool is free or offers significant value for its cost, with transparent pricing models.	The tool has some cost barriers, but discounts or institutional licenses can reduce expenses.	The high cost of the tool significantly limits its accessibility to a broader user base.	
Technical	Operating Systems & Browsers	The AI tool is compatible with a wide range of operating systems, mobile devices and browsers and does not require extensive resources.	The tool works on most systems but is optimized for certain operating systems/browsers, which could limit some users.	Compatibility is limited to a few operating systems/browsers, excluding users.	
	Additional Downloads	No additional downloads are required to use the AI tool, or any required software is lightweight and easy to install.	Some additional downloads are necessary, but they do not significantly impact the ease of setup or use.	The tool requires multiple or resource-intensive downloads, complicating setup and use, and possibly violating institutional IT policies.	

	Administrative workload	Some training and providing of support materials required initially. Little to no ongoing maintenance of tool is required by Library staff.	Tool will require a implementation project and development of support resources initially. Some ongoing maintenance would be required.	Tool would require extensive funding, training of staff, and ongoing support required.	
<b>Privacy, Data Protection, and Rights</b>	Sign Up/ Sign In	The AI tool uses secure authentication methods and offers options for anonymity where appropriate.	The tool requires some personal information for sign-up but has transparent policies on data usage.	The sign-up process lacks secure authentication or unnecessarily requires extensive personal information.	
	User Control Over Data	Users have full control over their data, with options to modify, delete, export, or restrict processing of their data.	Users have some control, but there may be limitations on how they can manage their data within the AI system.	Users have little to no control over their data once it is entered into the AI system.	
<b>Ethics</b>	Bias and Fairness	The AI tool has been audited for bias, and mechanisms are in place to ensure fairness across diverse user groups.	Efforts to mitigate bias are in place, but occasional issues may arise that require manual correction.	The tool has known biases or has not been audited for bias, potentially perpetuating systemic inequalities.	
	Copyright considerations	The AI tool does not allow for the upload of documents and uses genuine citations of sources.	The AI tool allows for some upload of documents or content, but content is not used to train AI, or used beyond the institution.	The AI tool allows for the upload of documents and content, without attribution. The content may be used by the AI tool for training purposes and reuse.	

	Ethics of parent company	The parent company/publisher of the AI tool provides clear information on responsible development of AI, user privacy, transparency etc.	The parent company provides some or limited information on ethical issues/concerns of AI.	The parent company does not provide any information on ethical or responsible use and development of AI and their tools.	
Environment	Energy Efficiency	The AI tool is designed for high energy efficiency, with optimization to reduce power consumption during both training and inference.	The tool is reasonably energy-efficient but could be improved with further optimization.	The tool requires a significant amount of power with no apparent efforts to improve energy efficiency, leading to high operational costs and environmental impact.	

### Rubric for Evaluating AI Tools (Academics and researchers)

Category	Criteria	Works Well	Minor Concerns	Serious Concerns	Not applicable
Functionality	Accuracy	The AI tool provides accurate and thorough responses to queries, with no hallucinations or assumptions.	Occasional inaccuracies, assumptions or hallucinations in AI responses.	Frequent inaccuracies and hallucinations hindering the learning process.	
	Ease of Use	The AI interface is intuitive, with little to no learning curve for new users.	Some users require assistance to navigate or understand AI functionalities.	Users find the interface confusing, leading to a significant barrier to effective use.	
	Transparency	The AI provides clear explanations for its outputs, in-line citations are provided and verifiable, Boolean search string is available.	Some level of transparency is provided, such as citations, but how they relate to the output is not clear. Boolean search string may not be provided or difficult to find.	The output process is opaque, and users have little to no understanding of how output is generated.	
	Reliability	The source articles	Source articles are provided	The source of generated	

		provided are verifiable, peer-reviewed, published by reputable journals/databases. Retracted and unreliable sources are actively filtered.	but their reliability or accuracy may be more difficult to verify eg. Articles are not subject to rigorous acceptance requirements or uploaded by unknown users.	content is unknown and difficult to verify or uses content from general internet sources.	
	Relevancy	All source articles provided are directly relevant to the generated output and ranked in order of importance/relevancy.	Source articles are provided, but not all are relevant to the query or used in generated output. Sources are not necessarily ranked in order of importance.	Source articles frequently have no relevancy to the query or are not provided at all.	
	Completeness	The summary or output contains the key information on the topic.	The summary of output contains most of the key points on the subject.	The summary or output is missing key information on understanding this topic.	
	Reproducibility	Running the same prompt/query produces the exact same set of results.	Running the same prompt/query produces similar results with some variation in citations or output produced.	Running the same prompt/query produces greatly varying results.	

Also provide long answer question on Usefulness, would this tool provide value to the tester's research or teaching at Murdoch? How can you see you or your students using this tool?