User Experience Advisory Group Agenda
September 5, 2019
9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Location: CCS / 3355 N. Arlington Heights Road /Arlington Heights, IL 60004-7706

Attended by: M. Bero (Lincolnwood), J. Katsion (Fox River Valley), S. Kobel (Wilmette), A. Kong (Fremont), J. Lavalie (Des Plaines), S. Quish (Winnetka), M. Russell (Lake Forest), E. Steffensen (Huntley), K. Weiss (CCS), D. Wischmeyer (CCS)

K. Weiss presented the role of User Experience Advisory Group in making recommendations. K. Weiss outlined the usability testing timeline. September and October usability testing will prioritize testing staff feedback. November usability will prioritize measuring usability of core tasks.

September	October	November
• Des Plaines Public Library • Huntley Area Public Library • Highland Park Public Library	• Glenview Public Library • Prospect Heights Public Library • Lake Forest library • Niles-Maine District Library	• Morton Grove Public Library • Northbrook Public Library

The User Experience Advisory Group reviewed the staff suggestions to be tested: summary notes in brief display, MARC fields that display in PAC, holds terminology, facets, series holds, and SMS renewal notices.

The User Experience Advisory Group ranked the core tasks patrons should be able to perform in the PowerPAC.

1. Search for a specific item and/or perform research on a subject
2. Distinguish between formats
3. Determine shelf status (whether item is available)
4. Locate item within library
5. Place a hold
6. Account Management (log in, renew items, see current checkouts, pay overdue fines)

SCRAP recently requested additional fields be indexed during the Indian Trail migration. The User Experience Advisory Group reviewed the requests, discussed how they may affect patrons, and participated in a straw poll about whether to index each field. The following recommendations were made:

- Index 586 field as a keyword search
  - Recommendation: No. Indexing awards would produce search results that were out of context with users' objectives. Other options, such as creating a promotion that links to existing award-winner record sets would be a better way to help patrons find award-winning materials.
- Index 245$n and $p as a browse > title search:

- o Yes. Less than 2% of PAC searches are browse > title searches. Indexing additional title fields would not significantly impact the patron experience in PAC. Users who are performing browse searches are savvy users who know what they are looking for and how to navigate the browse interface. Making the browse index more granular could be helpful to those patrons. Indexing these additional subfields is recommended if it will assist staff in searching.
- Index 753$a,b,c as a browse > keyword search:
  - o Yes. Library staff could benefit from indexing this field.