



Project Information			
<b>Project Acronym</b>	eNova		
<b>Project Title</b>	eNova		
<b>Start Date</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2011	<b>End Date</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> December 2011
<b>Lead Institution</b>	University for the Creative Arts		
<b>Project Director</b>	Leigh Garrett, VADS Director		
<b>Project Manager &amp; contact details</b>	Marie-Therese Gramstadt, VADS Projects Officer mtg@vads.ac.uk		
<b>Partner Institutions</b>	University of the Arts London		
<b>Project Web URL</b>	<a href="http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/projects/enova/index.html">http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/projects/enova/index.html</a>		
<b>Programme Name</b>	<i>JISC Repositories: Take-up and Embedding</i>		
<b>Programme Manager</b>	Balviar Notay		

Document Name			
<b>Document Title</b>	<i>eNova user feedback report</i>		
<b>Author(s) &amp; project role</b>	Marie-Therese Gramstadt, eNova Project Manager		
<b>Date</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> January 2012	<b>Filename</b>	2011_eNova_user_feedback.doc
<b>URL</b>	<a href="http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/2011_eNova_user_feedback.pdf">http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/2011_eNova_user_feedback.pdf</a>		
<b>Access</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General dissemination	

Document History		
Version	Date	Comments
1	23 <sup>rd</sup> June 2011	Initial version based on presentation of data analysis given to eNova project team.
1.1	15 <sup>th</sup> December 2011	Draft working version.
1.2	16 <sup>th</sup> January 2012	Final version incorporating all appendices.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction .....	3
1.1. Background .....	3
1.2. Research Methodology .....	3
2. eNova User Needs Analysis .....	4
2.1. Preparation: Environmental Assessment .....	4
2.2. Stage One: Scoping User Needs.....	6
2.2.1. Findings .....	6
2.3. Stage Two: eNova wireframes .....	8
2.4. Stage Three: Usability Testing .....	8
2.4.1. Entering data into the staff research Profile page .....	9
2.4.2. Adding content to the Gallery and Outputs pages .....	9
2.4.3. Microsoft Desirability Reaction Words .....	10
2.4.4. How we addressed the feedback .....	11
2.5. Future work in this area.....	12
3. Conclusion .....	12
4. References .....	13
5. Appendices .....	14
5.1. Appendix A: generic wireframes for enhanced MePrints.....	14
5.2. Appendix B: Modifications to MePrints (2nd August 2011) .....	16

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. BACKGROUND

The overall objective of the JISC funded eNova project was to encourage embedding and take-up of institutional research repositories by using arts researchers' feedback to produce a 'kulturised' MePrints tool. In this situation the term 'kulturised' means enhancing software to better fit the needs of visual arts researchers and is based on the previous JISC funded KULTUR (2007-09) project. eNova makes use of the existing MePrints tool, which enables a personal working area for depositors into the EPrints repository and a public-facing research profile page. The enhancements focused on two main aspects: improving the functions of the tool; and improving the aesthetics of the tool. There were three main stages: scope user needs prior to re-imagining MePrints; test the resulting designs prior to beginning development work; and finally testing a working version of the enhanced MePrints. The eNova project partners were University for the Creative Arts and University of the Arts London, and the resources included Repository Managers at each institution as well as a Project Manager from the Visual Arts Data Service. Almost half of the project funding was set aside to pay for the development work which provided a clear focus for the project.

### 1.2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order to ensure that the enhanced MePrints met the needs of arts researchers, a user needs methodology document<sup>1</sup> was produced by the eNova Project Manager at the beginning of the project. The data produced during the project was anonymised and considered as a whole i.e. not separated out into the separate institutions as the aim was to produce a single enhanced tool that could be applicable to either institution, as well as to other specialist arts institutions or multidisciplinary institutions with arts departments.

JISC in their Project Planning recommendations note the importance of considering the 'process view of human collaboration' (JISC 2011) referring Project Managers to the agile software development methodology. One of the recommendations in the Manifesto for Agile Software Development<sup>2</sup> is 'Responding to change over following a plan'; this means that you consult your users throughout the development process and not just once at the beginning. Nielsen (2000) also states that regarding usability:

'You want to run multiple tests because the real goal of usability engineering is to improve the design and not just to document its weaknesses.'<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> eNova user needs methodology. Available from:

[http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/20110405\\_eNova\\_user\\_needs\\_methodology.pdf](http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/20110405_eNova_user_needs_methodology.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Manifesto for Agile Software Development. Available from: <http://agilemanifesto.org/>

<sup>3</sup> Nielsen, Jakob. 19<sup>th</sup> March 2000. Why You Only Need to Test with 5 Users. Available from:

<http://www.useit.com/alertbox/20000319.html>

In the aforementioned article, Nielson (2000) showed good results from carrying out three tests with five users; this suited the eNova project timescale and approach. Although the Repository Managers circulated the initial call for participation widely, via email and University internal channels, in the end through participant self-selection we had three iterations of feedback within a group of ten researchers. The participants were informed from the beginning about the nature of the commitment that they would be contacted three times, and what would be required on each of these occasions. At each point of contact they were able to choose whether to participate or not and this was clearly outlined during the first face-to-face meeting at which project information sheets and consent forms were signed.

The methodology defined a 'user' to be:

'...any person affiliated to University for the Creative Arts or University of the Arts London who has, or in the future will be, depositing research in the institutional repository AND who has, or will have, a staff research page profile.'<sup>4</sup>

The users were self-selecting, as all researchers who responded within the time frame were invited to participate. The resulting demographic of the ten respondents was varied both in the subject disciplines covered and the researchers themselves. The participants included two males and eight females; there was also a range of experience including a professor, two readers, a senior research fellow, and two senior lecturers. Subject disciplines covered included: cultural studies, sculpture, animation/film/video, media and communication, fashion, history and theory, fine art, and design.

The subsequent stages and the findings at each stage are outlined in more detail below.

## 2. ENOVA USER NEEDS ANALYSIS

### 2.1. PREPARATION: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The project team began by familiarising themselves with the functionality of the existing MePrints tool using the demonstrator service maintained by the University of Southampton<sup>5</sup>. This was really useful and enabled a greater understanding of the potential of MePrints. The next stage was to consider MePrints in use at other institutions, both in terms of its practical usage as well as the look-and-feel. Unfortunately there is not an available list of who is using MePrints so the Project Manager emailed the UK Council of Research Repositories (UKCoRR) JISC Mail list; tweeted about the eNova project; and spoke to repository staff at external events to find out more. An example user profile is also available in the MePrints demonstrator service.

We also considered what alternatives there were to MePrints, and the Project Manager carried out research looking at the following broad categories: existing research profiles at the eNova partner institutions; researcher profiles at other institutions; researchers' personal websites (external to the institutions); and social networking tools that enabled the creation of a personal profile or visual curriculum vitae.

---

<sup>4</sup> eNova user needs methodology. Available from:

[http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/20110405\\_eNova\\_user\\_needs\\_methodology.pdf](http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/20110405_eNova_user_needs_methodology.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> MePrints Demonstrator Service. Available from: <http://allaboutme.eprints.org/>

At the eNova partner institutions the research profile pages consisted of a series of static web pages that were updated by Research Office staff or Departmental Administrators. The majority of pages included a section about the researcher and a section or separate page listing research outputs. Both institutions pages primarily consisted of text, with only a selection of pages including any visual media. Hyperlinks were used for both internal and external websites, but even in the cases when research outputs existed in the institutional repositories these weren't linked to. The institutional research repositories at both eNova partner institutions were visual and the project aimed to incorporate this into the enhanced MePrints tool. The eNova project also coincided with the formation of the University for the Creative Arts Research Institute which involved the creation of new up-to-date research profiles for all members. Therefore the headings for the new staff research profiles were also considered as part of the design for the enhanced MePrints tool, with an early prototype of the tool installed and used for the University for the Creative Arts research profiles<sup>6</sup>.

Miggie Pickton, Research Support Librarian at the University of Northampton, in an email to the closed UKCoRR list<sup>7</sup> asked other repository managers to outline how they were making lists of publications available via research profile pages at other institutions (excluding use of MePrints). The ten institutions listed were looked at and considered in terms of the headings, layout, and aesthetics. It should also be noted that a previous meeting of the Kultur II Group (28/02/11) had included discussion about using RSS feeds to create dynamic research profile pages. This was discounted by the eNova project as we were advised that this meant that a list of links to papers would be ordered by most recent deposit rather than by date of publication.

Researchers from both eNova partner institutions have personal websites that are external to the institutions, a selection of these was considered for the following: aesthetics; headings for information; and hosting information (where available).

Finally the following social networking tools were investigated for functionality, aesthetics and headings for information, and also searched to locate any examples from existing researchers at the eNova partner institutions: Facebook<sup>8</sup>; Academia<sup>9</sup>; Mendeley<sup>10</sup>; Zotero<sup>11</sup>; LinkedIn<sup>12</sup>; VisualCV<sup>13</sup>; about.me<sup>14</sup>; flavours.me<sup>15</sup>; FriendFeed<sup>16</sup>; and the National Fine Art Education Digital Collection<sup>17</sup>. This

---

<sup>6</sup> UCA Research Staff profiles are available here: [http://ucreative.ac.uk/research\\_profiles](http://ucreative.ac.uk/research_profiles) a recommended example is available here: <http://www.research.ucreative.ac.uk/profile/517>

<sup>7</sup> Email available via the JISCMail archive for all UKCoRR subscribers, dated 16/03/2011 with subject line: 'Publication lists on Staff Profiles', followed up by a summary email on the 17/03/2011 listing members responses with the subject line: 'Publications on Staff Profiles - summary'.

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.facebook.com/>

<sup>9</sup> <http://academia.edu/>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.mendeley.com/>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.zotero.org/>

<sup>12</sup> <http://uk.linkedin.com/>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.visualcv.com/>

<sup>14</sup> <https://about.me/>

<sup>15</sup> <http://flavors.me/>

research was carried out by the Project Manager in parallel to the work of the Project Officers who were interviewing arts researchers as part of stage one below.

## 2.2. STAGE ONE: SCOPING USER NEEDS

Ten researchers took part in short, approximately 30 minutes, face-to-face interviews with the eNova Projects Officers (Repository Managers), conducted at the researcher's place of work. The eNova Project Officers had paper forms which were filled in and then submitted to the eNova Project Manager. Each researcher was asked the following questions:

1. Please tell us about the tools and technology that you use?
2. Please tell us if you have already deposited in UCA/UAL Research Online?
3. If yes, what did you like/dislike about UCA/UAL Research Online?
4. Please tell us if you have a staff research page profile?
5. If yes, what do you like/dislike about the staff research page profile?
6. How do you currently showcase your research?
7. What do you like/dislike about these?
8. What would make your research life easier?
9. Any other comments or feedback?

---

### 2.2.1. FINDINGS

1. **Technical enhancements must be cross-platform, and especially Mac compatible.** Of the seven respondents who provided information about the operating system used; five used Macs. It is also a natural part of the process to test any technical enhancements to MePrints on a Mac as well as PC platforms. The other tools and technology that were mentioned included: Microsoft Office, Audacity, Adobe software, Final Cut Pro, Studio Pro, iTunes, Facebook, Twitter, personal websites and/or blogs, LinkedIn, Flickr.
2. **Integrating the staff research profile pages with the repository should encourage engagement with the institutional research repositories (IRR) as only three respondents have deposited in the IRR.** The users were mostly inexperienced or new to using the research repository (three are planning to use the IRR in the future). The three who had deposited in the IRR had deposited between 2 and 8 items each.
3. Of the three respondents who had deposited in the IRR:
  - a. **Likes:** Researcher C liked the features and found it 'straightforward', also interested to see what colleagues were doing; and Researcher G wanted to use the IRR to bring colleagues together within the institution, but felt this wasn't happening at the moment.
  - b. **Dislikes:** Researcher C thought that staff needed to be made more aware of the IRR; Researcher G found it difficult to search for their research and also felt it was 'just another institutional administrative thing to do'; and Researcher F found the process was a 'chore not a pleasure', the 'subject categories weren't appropriate to my work' and they wanted better clarity about how the institution would use some of the information.

---

<sup>16</sup> <http://friendfeed.com/>

<sup>17</sup> <http://fineart.ac.uk/>

4. **The concept of a research profile page was familiar and straight forward to all respondents.** Nine respondents had a research profile page currently, and one had one at a previous institution.
5. Of the respondents who answered this section:
  - a. **Likes:** three out of five respondents who answered this question mentioned links, such as links to their own website; the other two liked finding out about what other researchers are doing.
  - b. **Dislikes:** four out of six respondents who answered this question disliked the fact that their profile pages were out-of-date (in two cases by between 3 and 5 years out-of-date).
6. **Nine out of ten respondents either had a website or would like to have one.** Two respondents would like to have a personal website; four respondents had personal websites; one respondent had a personal website that was currently offline; one respondent had a project website; and the other respondent was in the process of setting up a project website.
7. Of the respondents who answered this section:
  - a. **Likes:** two out of the five respondents who answered this question liked to have 'control' over these external websites - 'it isn't institutional' which makes it more straightforward, 'personal freedom'.
  - b. **Dislikes:** three out of the five respondents who answered this question mentioned the expense of paying for the websites themselves; the other two respondents mentioned that aspects could be time consuming e.g. when preparing exhibitions, the time taken to update their website and blog.
8. Research life would be easier if: Researcher A asked for help with IPR and copyright issues; Researcher B commented 'a presence [a high result in Google] is vital for the international academic circuit'; Researcher D asked for 'more time'; Researcher E wanted technical and PR support; Researchers E, F, G, and I all wanted a central system for data to be entered once and then sent to different systems as required; and Researchers H and J mentioned ease of access and a 'reduction in the number of clicks required'.
9. Researcher A mentioned that they didn't have time to use social networking tools; and Researcher H was very against using Facebook (reason not supplied).

The eNova project was disseminated at every Kultur II Group meeting between end of February and end of December 2011. Feedback was sought from the Kultur II Group; Jonathan Warner, Head of Computing at the Royal College of Art, made the following points<sup>18</sup>:

1. MePrints needs visual enhancement
2. More meaningful labels for widgets and 'help' info on each widget e.g. Issues and Inbox are not clear
3. There is no point filling MePrints with 'cool features' such as social networking - may not be useful
4. In the future it would be good if users could upload a portfolio of draft documents, and curate them, prior to upload into the repository for publication
5. Add a widget providing a list of project containers (based on the JISC funded Kultivate project containers feature)
6. Add a widget with a list of research collaborators/co-authors could also be derived from the project containers

These points were raised at the project team meeting on 23rd June and set in the context of the feedback from researchers (above). The project team agreed with points 1 to 3, which were echoed in the research findings, but it was decided that points 4 to 6 were out of scope due to the eNova timescale and resources.

---

<sup>18</sup> Email communication sent from Jonathan Warner on 26/5/2011 to the eNova Project Manager

Following extensive discussion amongst the project team, spreadsheets were produced in Google Docs for the team to annotate with notes and a priority scale. The enhancements were prioritised as follows: first priority was improvements to the existing functionality of MePrints and second priority was new extra features. A combined score was derived from an average calculated from the priority scores of both Repository Managers and the Project Manager.

### 2.3. STAGE TWO: ENOVA WIREFRAMES

The first step was to produce visualisations to give an impression of how the research profile pages might look with each institution's existing branding, to enable them to imagine the enhanced MePrints in use. These images were sent to the Research Office staff for comment; the final generic wireframes (Appendix A) incorporated feedback received. Due to unexpected human resource issues the Project Manager undertook to create the eNova wireframes and technical specification for the development work.

The plain eNova wireframes were sent with an explanatory email to the ten respondents from stage one. Due to the timing for the project, feedback was requested by email. Feedback was received from six out of the ten respondents.

Comments on the wireframes from the researchers:

- **Likes:** Researcher A liked the arrangement/juxtaposition of the image and text; Researcher B said 'importantly it looks simple to upload and enter material'; Researcher C commented 'This looks good'; Researcher D thought it looked 'good, clean and clear' and liked 'the idea of the YouTube insert'; Researcher E found the layout 'simple and effective'; and Researcher I commented 'I like the changes'.
- **Dislikes:** Researcher C thought that the text headings were 'a bit heavy/bold'; Researcher D commented that 'The profile page I feel is a little cluttered but may look clearer/cleaner when populated with actual data'.

During August and September Peter West from EPrints Services worked to enhance MePrints according to our specification and with discussion amongst the project team. During August Peter and Carlos also worked on amending University for the Creative Arts Research Online to include an early version of the eNova enhanced MePrints. This was undertaken outside the auspices of the eNova project although it had a direct benefit to eNova in terms of the enhanced working relationship with the Research Office and also provided a test-bed for the development work itself. A conversation developed via email between the project team (represented by the Project Manager) and EPrints Services with the assistance of Carlos Silva, VADS Technical Planning and Development Manager. This then led to the Beta version of the development work being made available via the VADS Demonstrator service; at this point it was possible to set-up usability testing with the researchers.

### 2.4. STAGE THREE: USABILITY TESTING

The eNova Project Officers (Repository Managers) re-contacted the same researchers in order to arrange the usability testing with them. Throughout the project the Repository Managers were the only point of contact with the participants as this was important for continuity as well as in order to build a relationship of trust and support that could be maintained after the end of the project. The Project Manager prepared the methodology and a user testing sheet, which included screenshots on using

the system.<sup>19</sup> Five participants were able to attend usability testing; they were invited to bring their own copyright-cleared material to upload, or to make use of some neutral text and dummy deposits for testing purposes.

---

#### 2.4.1. ENTERING DATA INTO THE STAFF RESEARCH PROFILE PAGE

##### **About the process**

Three out of the five participants mentioned the problem with text formatting when switching from edit to view mode. This hadn't been picked up despite the project team testing the system prior to conducting the usability testing with the researchers. A few of the fields needed better help text to explain what the boundaries were e.g.

"lack of clarity over what 'external examinations' refer to e.g. PhD, undergraduate or MAs, past or current examinations"

The help text can be entered easily by the institutional repository manager once they have installed the eNova plugins. The exact meaning would relate to the individual institution.

Two participants noted that the 'External Examinations' field was too small in comparison to other fields and the text was limited which caused functional problems.

In addition, Researcher G noted the following: the field 'statement' should be called 'research statement'; and the 'help buttons should be next to each field (i.e. left) not at the other end of the field'. Researcher D asked for the URL field to include a prompt for http:// as otherwise when saving this field it gives an error message.

##### **About the look-and-feel**

Three of the five participants responded to this question, they all were positive, for example: 'good design...looked academic' (A); 'nice, clean, uncluttered' (D); and 'laid out really nicely...can edit really quickly, I like the 'more...' feature' (I). The 'more...' feature was an idea from Peter West of EPrints Services to ensure that the Research Statement didn't take up too much space on the profile page. Researcher I was 'uncomfortable with the order of the fields'; it is assumed that each institution would customise and standardise these according to their purposes.

---

#### 2.4.2. ADDING CONTENT TO THE GALLERY AND OUTPUTS PAGES

##### **About the process**

Four out of the five participants responded to this question, and again they were all positive, for example: 'nice and easy to add content' (D); 'additional information is really useful' (I); 'wasn't too time consuming'(E); and 'Outputs is a useful tab as I don't have to migrate existing outputs from the repository to my profile.'(G).

Two participants noted that the name of the inputter is not recorded; this has to be added again. This was also requested for the Copy Request email field; however the project team chose not to include

---

<sup>19</sup> Available from: <http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/eNova-user-testing-sheet.pdf>

this in the specification because there are cases when the creator uses a separate email address or different contact person for this field.

**About the look-and-feel**

Three participants provided general positive comments, however two participants didn't like the carousel aspect of the Gallery tab. For example:

"why is it a carousel? Who will be staring at a screen waiting for images to change for 30 seconds?"

and

"how do I stop the carousel? How do I pause it?"

The intention with the carousel was to enable thumbnails of either images, video stills, or even PDF documents to display, the user should click on one and see it larger, then decide if they want to visit that research output to find out more or not. It is taken from the design for the JISC funded Kultur project (2007-09) home page which intended to provide something visual rather than the usual list of text-only hyperlinks. The feedback of the two participants was taken seriously and we wanted to improve the functionality of the carousel in order to make its features clearer, but with investigation by EPrints Services it was discovered that this would take up a lot of development time. This is noted as something for future development work in section 2.6. below.

---

#### 2.4.3. MICROSOFT DESIRABILITY REACTION WORDS

Following recommendation at a Pure Usability workshop attended by the eNova Project Manager, it was decided to ask each participant for five words out of a selection of Microsoft Desirability Reaction words. Benedek and Miner (2002) reproduced a table of words in their 'Figure 2: Selected words from the set of 118 product reaction cards'<sup>20</sup>. The researchers were asked: 'What do you think about the template for the staff research profile page/s, or how does it make you feel?'. Their chosen words are expressed in a Wordle<sup>21</sup> (below); the top choices were: 'straight forward', 'efficient' and 'organised'.

---

<sup>20</sup> All the words used are shown in the eNova user testing sheet, available from: <http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/eNova-user-testing-sheet.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> Wordle is available from: <http://www.wordle.net/>



For an academic research profile page this can be considered overall positive feedback. It would be interesting to do more work using the Microsoft Desirability Reaction words.

---

#### 2.4.4. HOW WE ADDRESSED THE FEEDBACK

The Project Manager pulled all the feedback together and at this stage in the project the priorities were by quick fixes unless there were elements which impeded the effective use of the system. Peter West from EPrints Services again worked on the development work providing continuity across the whole project. The following developments occurred following the user feedback:

1. Font formatting fixed between edit and view modes.
2. When an item is created by following the 'Upload' link from the profile the user is added as the first creator of the item, including their name and email address.
3. The phrase 'homepage' is replaced by the text 'My Research Profile'.
4. The phrase 'Statement' is replaced by the text 'Research Statement'.
5. Help icons have been added to all items.
6. The help icons have been relocated to be next to the label.
7. The input boxes have been re-sized to reflect the amount of text to be added (per comments received).
8. The first unused entry in the links has the URL preset to 'http://' ready for the user to complete the URL or to overwrite it.
9. Supervision and External Examinations fields now allow more text.
10. Creation year is now displayed in parenthesis at the start of the output list (if no date then '(n.d.)' is displayed).
11. The gallery has been centre aligned. The eNova project is unable to spend extra time improving the viewer unfortunately.
12. The ability to add a YouTube video to the profile has been developed. It is necessary for the user to confirm the right to use the video before it is displayed on their profile. To use this feature simply add the URL of the YouTube item and confirm that you have the rights to use the video. The video will then appear at the top of the profile tab. Users can have either a YouTube video OR a thumbnail image.
13. A 'C.V.' button has been added to allow the user to download their profile to a Microsoft Word document.

## 2.5. FUTURE WORK IN THIS AREA

The eNova project team were very pleased with the work undertaken by EPrints Services, however if it was possible to pay for more development work in the future, the following areas would be addressed:

- Testing of the YouTube feature and integrating this within the same area as the 'profile image'.
- More work on the Gallery page: the carousel (strip of images at the bottom) to have left and right arrows. The arrows would simply allow the thumbnails to move forwards and back, this could replace the automatic 'carousel' function, although this would probably need more consideration. For example:



It would also be interesting to follow up the suggestions made under section 2.2.1. by Jonathan Warner, Head of Computing at the Royal College of Art, i.e.:

- In the future it would be good if users could upload a portfolio of draft documents, and curate them, prior to upload into the repository for publication
- A widget providing a list of project containers (based on the JISC funded Kultivate project containers feature)
- A widget with a list of research collaborators/co-authors could also be derived from the project containers

The eNova project team were interested in how the research profiles could feed information for the Research Excellence Framework 2014, however this was out-of-scope.

## 3. CONCLUSION

- The eNova approach to involving the users throughout the project has enabled the building of relationships which will be sustained in the future and enrich future projects and working practices.
- The iterative approach was successful; however it would be useful to find out more about the agile software development technique specifically as this may improve the approach of future projects.
- Although human resource factors were the most challenging aspects of this research; they also made the most significant and valuable contribution to the research and project.
- It would be useful to do more work with visual and creative arts researchers to build-on and update the work of the Kultur (2007-09) project and to encompass a wider selection of research participants to gain richer information.

## 4. REFERENCES

Benedek, Joey and Miner, Trish. 2002. Measuring Desirability: New methods for evaluating desirability in a usability lab setting. Reprinted with permission, Usability Professionals' Association, 2002 Conference Proceedings. Available from:  
<http://www.microsoft.com/usability/uepostings/desirabilitytoolkit.doc>

British Educational Research Association (2004) Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research. <http://www.bera.ac.uk/files/guidelines/ethica1.pdf> (8 March 2011).

Cooper, A., Reimann, R., and Cronin, D. 2007. About Face 3: The Essentials of Interaction Design. Indianapolis: Wiley.

eNova user needs methodology. Available from:  
[http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/20110405\\_eNova\\_user\\_needs\\_methodology.pdf](http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/20110405_eNova_user_needs_methodology.pdf)

eNova user testing sheet. Available from: <http://www.vads.ac.uk/kultur2group/downloads/eNova-user-testing-sheet.pdf>

Hoekman, Robert. 2007. Designing the Obvious: A Common Sense Approach to Web Application Design. Berkeley, CA: New Riders.

JISC. Last updated on 17/05/11 by Lisa Clifford. *Project planning: Project management*. Available from: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/fundingopportunities/projectmanagement/planning/management.aspx>

Kultivate blog. 15<sup>th</sup> November 2011. *eNova developments for visual research profile pages*. Available from: <http://vads.ac.uk/kultivate/news/?p=108>

Kultur. 2007-2009. User Analysis documents available from: <http://kultur.eprints.org/documents.htm> (8 March 2011)

Manifesto for Agile Software Development. Available from: <http://agilemanifesto.org/>

MePrints demonstrator service is available here: <http://allaboutme.eprints.org/>

Nielsen, Jakob. 19<sup>th</sup> March 2000. Why You Only Need to Test with 5 Users  
<http://www.useit.com/alertbox/20000319.html> (8 March 2011)

Pure Usability. 2010. Understanding User-Centred Design. A JISC workshop held at Brettenham House, London on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2010.

Scott, Bill, and Neil, Theresa. 2009. Designing Web Interfaces. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly.

Web Accessibility Initiative <http://www.w3.org/WAI/> (8 March 2011)

## 5. APPENDICES

### 5.1. APPENDIX A: GENERIC WIREFRAMES FOR ENHANCED MEPRINTS

**Honorific Firstname Lastname, Job Title, Department**  
[email@address.ac.uk](mailto:email@address.ac.uk) Edit Preview Upload ?

Profile Outputs Gallery

**Research Statement**  
Between 200 and 300 words - current research profile/statement, manually entered text

**Esteem and Impact**  
Field requested by UAL, manually entered text (max 300 words)

**Qualifications**  
Manually entered text (abbreviated not in full)

**Research Interests**  
controlled AHRC keyword/s, controlled AHRC keyword/s

**Research Grants and Awards**  
Manually entered text

**Professional Memberships**  
Manually entered list of associations

**Research Degree Expertise**  
Key themes  
freetext keyword/s, freetext keyword/s  
Supervision  
Manually entered text  
External Examinations  
Manually entered text

**Links**  
Manually entered text with hyperlinks

Profile page to include image or multimedia item that represents researcher e.g. could be item of research, photo of them, or short YouTube video

Title and copyright for image

**Honorific Firstname Lastname, Job Title, Department**  
[email@address.ac.uk](mailto:email@address.ac.uk)

**Profile**   Outputs   **Gallery**

**Publications**  
Art/Design Item:  
[Lastname, Firstname](#) (year) *Title of work* [Art/Design Item]  
Other:  
[Lastname, Firstname](#) (year) *Title of work*, UNSPECIFIED.

**Exhibitions**  
Group:  
[Lastname, Firstname](#) and [Name of Group or other contributor](#) (year) *Title of work*. [Show/Exhibition]  
Solo:  
[Lastname, Firstname](#) (year) *Title of work*. [Show/Exhibition]

**Conferences**  
Conference contribution:  
[Lastname, Firstname](#) (year) *Title of work*. [Conference/Workshop Item]

**Honorific Firstname Lastname, Job Title, Department**  
[email@address.ac.uk](mailto:email@address.ac.uk)

**Profile**   **Outputs**   Gallery

**Sample works**



[Clark, Judith and Stoppini, Lucy and Gray, Richard \(2006\) Anna Plazzi: Fashionology](#). [Show/Exhibition]



## 5.2. APPENDIX B: MODIFICATIONS TO MEPRINTS (2ND AUGUST 2011)

### Quick Wins

- Replace 'homepage' with 'My Research Profile'.
- Remove 'Saved Searches' from MePrints so this doesn't display in sidebar or in work/profile area.
- Remove 'User History' button.
- Remove 'Inbox'.
- Remove the widgets: 'Most Viewed Items' and 'Issues'.
- Remove 'Add/Remove' widget and 'Reset profile' buttons, essentially all that should display is Latest Additions and Quick Upload, these also will be fixed and not movable. Please refer to separate document 'generic layout' for enhanced MePrints as in the future 'Latest Additions' will be replaced with the 'Outputs' tab.
- Remove 'Profile Picture' button now if this can be integrated within the section 'Modify Profile', otherwise remove at later date once this functionality has been integrated into 'Modify Profile' section. Please also refer to separate document 'generic layout' for enhanced MePrints.
- In 'Modify Profile' section i.e. in edit mode the following changes:
  - 'Statement' removed as this currently does not seem to display anyway.
  - 'Biography' changed to 'Research Statement' and a word limit set of 300 words.
  - Rename 'Expertise' to 'Key Themes' (freetext keywords).
  - In time the 'Personal Details' section should be removed as this data should come via the unique LDAP login, however for the moment the following can be removed: Organisation, Address, Country, Homepage URL
  - 'Qualifications' should be set with a word limit of 200 words and help guidance note that this is for abbreviations of academic qualifications only i.e. not every certificate or course attended, only key ones.

### Layout and other changes

- Improve workflow for the Upload widget: currently both buttons display at once – this should instead be: 'choose file' button only, then when file is chosen 'upload' button appears (in place of 'choose file' button after the file name of the uploaded item).
- Profile image: once image exists then 'change image' button appears next to image in work area (enables new image or image to be removed). Ability to upload/embed moving image e.g. YouTube video instead of just an image.
- Improve layout of profile page - please refer to separate document 'generic layout' for enhanced MePrints.
- Profile visibility should be automatically set and not editable: to 'Public' for all creators and to 'Private' for other staff e.g. repository staff.
- Ability for user to 'download' an editable file (or at a minimum a printable version) of their Profile and Outputs in one document.
- Three tabs:
  - **Profile** - similar to current MePrints functionality with some enhancements in layout and some additions
  - **Outputs** - an enhancement based on the functionality of the 'Latest Additions' widget
  - **Gallery** - automatically generated, not editable, based on 'Kultur' extension home page but specific to that researcher