MAKING A LIST AND CHECKING IT TWICE: creating a sustainable future in user experience

Katy Kavanagh Webb & Tamara Rhodes
March 27, 2015

acrl 2015 *peer revered*

East Carolina UNIVERSITY

IRB & IRB TRAINING

- IRB was considered because the group wanted to publish the findings.
- Consultant suggested each task force member should be co-investigators on IRB
- Each person took the CITI IRB training
- Two librarians completed the IRB paperwork, including creating the script and legal documentation.
- Wording was used from the consultant's concurrent UX project.
- Lessons Learned: IRB came to be seen as a hurdle when it came to making changes to questions

STAFFING MODELS

CONSULTANT AND TASK FORCE

- Consultant was a professor at the university hired to teach UX
- Task force was made up of 9 faculty and staff members from varying departments and from the two university libraries:

  Joyner Library - main library
  Head, Electronic & Continuing Resources Acquisitions
  Head, Application & Discovery Services (ADS)
  Head, Research & Instructional Services
  Assistant Director, Discovery & Technology Services
  Online Learning Librarian, Research & Instructional Services
  User Interface Designer, ADS

  Joyner and Laupus Library
  Webmaster, ADS

  Laupus Library - Health Sciences Library
  Assistant Director for User Services
  Instructional Design Librarian & Liaison to the School of Dental Medicine

LARGE GROUP

Due to the inability of the consultant to continue with the study, the task force carried out the pilot

SMALLER GROUP

2-3 of the original task force remained and decisions were consulted using the larger Discovery Advisory Board that was already in place for other discovery issues

CHARGE

The task force was called together by the leadership of the library system and charged with the following:

The task force will develop a comprehensive UX strategy for the ECU Libraries. In order to provide a sustainable strategy, the group will assess staffing responsibilities, guidelines, processes, and data gathering procedures. Best practices will be investigated and limitations and barriers will be identified. The group will pilot the strategy by identifying a high-need area common to both Libraries' infrastructure and will work to improve user experiences within the scope of that area (i.e. usability of specific resources, workflow of users within a particular system, etc.). In addition, the pilot will test the effectiveness of the framework, and serve to identify areas of weakness that can be improved in future iterations.

SCRIPT

IRB-Related Boilerplate

10 initial questions about themselves and prior knowledge

8 tasks using the website

10 follow up questions asking their opinions about the website

Lessons Learned
Pretesting of questions is important

Considerable effort was placed on the outcomes of the study when making the questions, but the group was comprised mainly of novice researchers in the UX field
Once testing started, it was clear that some of the questions did not result in meaningful data, however, it was hard to change the questions due to the IRB

SOFTWARE

Share Drive and Wiki-Google Drive & PB Wiki
Used to share information among group members

Spreadsheets
Used to code responses after user testing

User Testing Software
- Used the Morae Software by Techsmith--this is software made for user testing
- 5 licenses were purchased by the library
- Morae was installed on 3 laptops owned by the library
- Cheaper options include Jing (free) and Camtasia. Both can be used to record the screen.

TRAINING

- Lessons from consultant's instructional courses on UX during hour-long presentations to the task force Workshop on UX by expert
- Two members of the task force and the consultant traveled to take part in a day-long workshop done by an internationally known UX expert, Whitney Quesenberry
- Consultant was involved in another UX project related to a university initiative. It provided real-life examples and framework for conducting UX work for novice task force members

RECRUITING PARTICIPANTS

PARTICIPANTS

7 undergraduates
7 graduate students
8 faculty members

RECRUITMENT

Faculty Governance Library group
Student workers
Librarian contacts

LESSONS LEARNED

- Leverage existing relationships
- Even a small sample can be helpful

TESTING LOCATIONS

- Group study rooms
- Offices of librarians and faculty members tested

LESSONS LEARNED

- Make sure to test
  Sound is important when coding responses

ANALYSIS

Method of analysis
2 task force members watched the videos and recorded answers on a Google spreadsheet along with any notes on what was viewed

RESULTS

What we learned from testing our database

- Big gap between our faculty and undergraduates regarding:
  a. The definition of the library
  b. Use and understanding of the resources

- Gaining access to resources varied greatly
  a. Bookmarks -- library homepage -- navigation from various university webpages

- Experience with library instruction was low

Specific Database List issues

- Half of participants were not familiar with it
- Access to the databases was not clear
- Once within the list, most thought it was easy to use and layout made sense
- There were taxonomy and terminology issues
  a. Most users had trouble with the term Multidisciplinary
  b. The "Database List" was not actually a list of databases

Design changes suggested

- Design Hierarchy
- Labeling of resources

NEXT STEPS

- Persona project
- A-B Testing with DB List
- Write and Submit Article

(Signpost labels: SUZHOU 5,815 Mi. / 82 Mi., CHARGE, RECRUITING PARTICIPANTS 6,726 Mi., LILLEHAMMER 4,614 Mi. / 17 Mi., ZOO, CASABLANCA 5,643 Mi, CRATER LK. 245 Mi., STAFFING MODELS 4,446 Mi. / 1.2 Mi., TESTING 70 Mi, LOCATIONS, 72 Mi., PORTLANDIA 5 Blks., ANALYSIS 2,035 Mi., TRI-MET INFO 54 Yds., RESULTS 1,497 Mi., NEXT STEPS 2,530 Mi., TRAINING 4,456 Mi / 10,115 Mi., TOOLS)