

**User Experience Advisory Group  
Minutes  
Zoom  
February 2, 2021 // 9:30 - 11:30 AM**

Attended by: M. Morgan (Winnetka-Northfield), M. Beach (Highland Park), Z. Yeatman (Park Ridge), E. Munoz (Lake Villa), M. Golembiewski (Prospect Heights), M. Bourgeois (Ela), P. Ramirez (Crystal Lake), A. Richio (Fremont), K. Weiss (CCS), R. Fischer (CCS)

Absent: A. Rachmaciej (Park Ridge)

### **1. Innovative Updates**

K. Weiss (CCS) explained that Innovative has conducted an accessibility audit for Leap and made recommendations to increase the usability of the software. K. Weiss (CCS) explained the audit uses Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 standards for compliance. Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 define how to make web content more accessible to people with disabilities. The audit flagged color contrast, pop-up messages that disappear too quickly, and formatting as examples of non-compliance.

### **2. Recommendation to Include Cookie Acceptance Alert from 6.6 Upgrade**

K. Weiss (CCS) explained that the Polaris 6.6 upgrade includes the option to add a cookie acceptance alert to PowerPAC to notify patrons that cookies are in use on the website. K. Weiss (CCS) asked the user experience advisory group about whether they supported the inclusion of the cookie acceptance alert.

Members explained that they have questions and concerns about the cookie acceptance alert. Members said it would be helpful for the message to include (1) an explanation of what cookies do, (2) why the cookies ought to be accepted, and (3) an option to accept or decline cookies. Members discussed whether cookies would help or hinder the patron experience. From an ethics standpoint, transparency is valued. However, a cookie acceptance alert is also another thing for patron “to have to click” to use the catalog. Members wondered how often patrons would have to accept cookies. Members also discussed how the cookie acceptance alert would behave on a patron’s personal device versus a library OPAC.

Members requested the option to view the cookie acceptance alert in the training PAC before making a recommendation about the inclusion of the cookie alert notification. Members also ask that K. Weiss (CCS) prepare an FAQ about the cookie acceptance alert based on the group discussions.

### **3. Auto-Renewal Notice Activity**

K. Weiss (CCS) explained that throughout 2021 the User Experience Advisory Group will perform a competitive analysis for the most common CCS email notices using Nielsen Norman’s attributes for

transactional email: <https://www.nngroup.com/reports/ecommerce-transactional-email-confirmation-message/>

CCS notices will be compared with other library consortia notices. This will help CCS:

- understand how competitors have customized their Notices.
- determine the strengths and weaknesses of competitor’s Notices.
- determine which competitor strengths to apply to CCS Notices development.
- determine which competitor weaknesses to avoid in CCS Notices development.

To kick off the competitive analysis, three examples of auto-renewal notices were assessed by the user experience advisory group from CCS, SWAN, and Chicago Public Library.

Each member was emailed an auto-renewal notice from CCS, SWAN, And Chicago Public Library. For each notice, members spent ten minutes assessing the notice on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 is the lowest score, 5 is the highest score) for the following attributes:

- Trust
- Completeness
- Timing
- Value
- Ease of use
- Content
- Design

Scores were averaged to determine the final score for each attribute. Members also made notes explaining their scoring. After accessing each notice, members discussed the rationale for each score. In addition to the score sheet, members also discussed how notices display on mobile devices.

Final scores are below:

<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>CPL Notice</b>	<b>SWAN Notice</b>	<b>CCS Notice</b>
<b>Purpose</b>	Can you determine the purpose of this email?	3.6	3.4	4.1
<b>Trust</b>	Rate the credibility of the email.	4.6	4.9	3.9
<b>Completeness</b>	Rate whether the email contains all the necessary information you need to know.	4.1	3.9	4.1
<b>Timing</b>	Rate the timeliness of the information contained in the email.	-	-	-
<b>Value</b>	Rate the value and helpfulness of the information contained in the email.	4.1	3.4	4
<b>Ease of use</b>	Rate the ease of use in reading the email.	3.6	3.3	4
<b>Content</b>	Rate the word choice in this email.	3.9	3.5	3.9
<b>Design</b>	Rate the layout and format of the email.	3.1	2.8	3.6

#### 4. Full Display

K. Weiss (CCS) shared the User Experience Report - Behavior Analysis for Full Display. Before determining which fields to include, CCS sought to determine the extent to which Full Display is utilized. Using Google Analytics, CCS conducted a behavior analysis of 12,864 webpage views in the Glencoe Public Library PowerPAC from January 10, 2021–January 16, 2021 and January 12, 2020–January 18, 2020. The report contained a behavior analysis of the Glencoe PowerPAC and resulted in the following recommendation.

Given that less than 5% of all pageviews are Full Display and the large amount of variance in descriptive metadata for library materials, it is recommended that CCS pause exploratory research on Full Display in PowerPAC at this time. As CCS moves to a Vega trial it is worth noting that Full Display may look vastly different in a future discovery product.

**Next meeting is March 4, 2021 at 9:30 AM on Zoom.**