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Usability Core Group
2 year term

- 1 chair
- 4 core members

Usability Task Force (UTF)
- short term (4-6 months)
  - 2 core members
  - + 3-4 members
  - + 1 stakeholder

Usability Task Force (UTF)
Usability

• History of the group
• Past projects
• Usability is more an art than a science
• Goal is to collect more data to use alongside usage/log data and testimonials from staff who work directly with users
• It's about learning what users like, how they think, what they want
• Methods & types of results
• It's iterative
Library Website Usability Task Force

- Project Managers: Kat Hagedorn & Ken Varnum
- Stakeholder(s): Mike Creech, Karen Reiman-Sendi
- Members: Gillian Mayman, Devon Persing, Val Waldron, Sue Wortman
- Winter 2009 - Spring 2010
- 4 evaluations completed using 3 different methods
- BIG thanks to this group for all their hard work!
Library Website Usability Task Force

Project priorities:

• Gain a better understanding of user's perception and use of the "new" library website (it's now 1 year old!)

• Pinpoint problem areas

• Evaluate problem areas
Gateway
Participatory Design

All members of the Core group, UTF, plus ULA Ellen Wilson participated in this evaluation.

Goal: to gain a better understanding of which parts of the gateway users find most and least useful... and to help inform our follow-up evaluations.

36 Participants:
- 15 Undergrads
- 5 Grad Students
- 2 Faculty
- 15 Library Staff
Gateway
Participatory Design

X/O Instructions:
1. Circle the things you find useful
2. Put an X through the things you don't find useful
3. Add a note for anything that's missing
Gateway
Participatory Design

Ideal Design Instructions: Draw your ideal library website.
Gateway (left column)
Participatory Design-Findings

Undergraduate Students
(15 participants)

Graduate Students
(5 participants)

Faculty
(2 participants)

Library Staff
(15 participants)
Gateway (spotlight)  
Participatory Design-Findings

- **Undergraduate Students**
  - (15 participants)

- **Graduate Students**
  - (5 participants)

- **Faculty**
  - (2 participants)

- **Library Staff**
  - (15 participants)
Gateway (search/browse)

Participatory Design-Findings

- **Undergraduate Students** (15 participants)
  - 12
  - Search: 1
  - Browse: 2

- **Graduate Students** (5 participants)
  - 4
  - Search: 1
  - Browse: 3

- **Faculty** (2 participants)
  - 2
  - Search: 1
  - Browse: 1

- **Library Staff** (15 participants)
  - 9
  - Search: 1
  - Browse: 3

---
Gateway (top nav)

Participatory Design-Findings

Undergraduate Students
(15 participants)

Graduate Students
(5 participants)

Faculty
(2 participants)

Library Staff
(15 participants)
Gateway (quick links)
Participatory Design Findings

Undergraduate Students
(15 participants)

Graduate Students
(5 participants)

Faculty
(2 participants)

Library Staff
(15 participants)
We have used this method for many years. We call this "guerrilla testing" because we hope to get quick and short answers to quick and short questions. Five minutes is our goal!

Participants are often found "in the wild" in reference areas, the fish bowl, Diag, etc.
Quick Links
Guerrilla Testing

Goal: Fine-tune the contents & labels for Quick Links.

The Test:
• 20 participants: undergrads, grad students
• Participants were shown the current Quick Links section without its title-- asked to name the section and describe where each link went
• Then asked what links they would most like to see in a grouping of links like this one
Quick Links
Guerrilla Testing-Findings

• "Outages" not understood or considered to be useful.

• More than half of users requested addition of Webmail link.

• Quick Links label works well.
Quick Links
Guerrilla Testing-Outcomes

Before:

Quick Links

My Account
EJournals
Library Hours
Outages
CTools
Wolverine Access

After:

Quick Links

My Library Account
Online Journal List
Library Hours
Webmail
CTools
Wolverine Access

• Removed/added several links
• Rearranged links
• Retitled 'Ejournals' -> 'Online Journals' (throughout site)
Goal: Determine the order of sections on search & browse results pages. Impetus for testing was feedback from library staff.

The Test:
- 12 participants (undergrad/grad)
- Asked to search or browse on a topic of interest to them
- Then asked to view results, reorder the headings, and
- Suggest alternative headings
Search & Browse
Guerrilla Testing-Findings

• Most participants preferred a different order.

• Section labels found to be confusing (and inconsistent with browse results page).

• Not enough metadata is displayed for catalog results.
### Search Results Column 1
- Catalog (Mirlyn)
- Electronic Journals
- Databases

### Search Results Column 2
- Website: Research Guides
- Website
- Website: Collections
- Website: Government Documents
- Deep Blue (Institutional Repository)

### Browse Results Column 1
- Electronic Journals
- Databases

### Browse Results Column 2
- Research Guides
- MLibrary Website
- New Books
## Search & Browse

**Guerrilla Testing-After**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Results Column 1</th>
<th>Search Results Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>Research Guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog (Mirlyn)</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Journals</td>
<td>Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deep Blue (Institutional Repository)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Browse Results Column 1</th>
<th>Browse Results Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Journals</td>
<td>Research Guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>MLibrary Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Search & Browse
Guerrilla Testing-After

Added more information about catalog results
Card sorting is a method that helps increase a system's findability. The process involves sorting a series of cards, each labeled with a piece of content or functionality, into groups that make sense to participants.

As with guerrilla testing, participants are often found "in the wild" in reference areas, the fish bowl, Diag, etc.
Goal: recategorize content on the web site currently grouped under Services, Departments and Libraries.

Group Paper Card Sort w. Students
- 18 participants: undergrads, grad students (divided into 4 groups)
- Organized 84 cards representing half of this content
- Allowed us to see interaction among students, hear thought processes, and better understand confusing labels

Individual Online Card Sort w. Staff
- Purchased license to OptimalSort allowing us to place in front of many individuals
- 140 staff completed exercise
- Provided more data, but didn't expose the thought process
Services/Departments/Libraries

Card Sorting

Group paper card sort

OptimalSort online card sort
Several similarities between categories surfaced across the various participant groups performing the card sort, whether performing a paper sort or using the online tool.

- **Physical Locations**: libraries and/or services with a physical location and hours of operation.
- **Publishing**: MPublishing, SPO and University of Michigan Press.
- **Services**: a broad category used by all groups which ranged from getting help with library resources to internal services for library staff.
- **Administration**: background support for library staff or as one student said, “Stuff that students wouldn’t necessarily need.”
Task Force also came up with "unified" categories, based on the categories the participants created, as well as the comments they made during the card sort.

- **Administration.** Card examples: Library Finance, Desktop Support Services, Library Information Technology
- **Libraries/Locations.** Card examples: Taubman Health Sciences Library, SAND, Weill Hall Reading Room
- **Publishing.** Card examples: MPublishing, Copyright, Deep Blue, SPO
- **Getting help.** Card examples: Ask a Librarian, Instruction and Workshops, Knowledge Navigation Center
- **Getting things.** Card examples: ILL, Circulation, Serials, Course Reserves
Both the similar groupings across participant groups and the "unified" categories the Task Force came up with were suggested as bases for further tests.

Results shared with Library Web Team, who will work with the User Experience Dept.

Implementing changes will be a large-scale change that would add significant complexities for users and staff.

Has both technical and design implications.

Will need further conversations and evaluations.
Questions?

All past reports: www.lib.umich.edu/usability

Next week:
Mirlyn Feedback Session for Staff
Wednesday, August 4th, from 3:00-4:00 pm in 806