University of Arkansas Libraries  
Web Development Group – 1/5/11  
Present: Boyd, Brown, Candido, Cantrell, Ganson, Gilbertson, Juhl, Lennertz Jetton, Morgan, Nutt

Action items in Yellow.

1. New Web Page Design  
Juhl distributed comments received so far on the new web page (launched Tuesday, 1/4). Most were positive, and some suggestions, such as adding a link up front to Top Ten, have already been addressed.

The group discussed possible changes in light of comments received. One concern reflected the lack of a direct connection to InfoLinks on the main tab. After discussion, it was agreed that we should try the journals first tab for at least one semester and collect feedback.

Morgan will work on converting internal pages to the new design while Juhl will work on LibGuides (done), InfoLinks, and ILLiad.

2. LibGuides and Electronic Resources by Subject  
Juhl reported on a request from a subject librarian to do away with the databases by subject for her area, and to instead redirect to the subject LibGuide for that topic. The group discussed the pros and cons for moving in this direction:

- **Reasons for moving away from central web site to a Libguides environment:**
  - Easier for subject librarians to maintain (1 place)
  - More creativity and flexibility in organizing and presenting content.

- **Reasons to continue two environments:**
  - Currently, a student (or a reference librarian) familiar with one subject area knows how to find parallel materials in another subject area. That consistency and robustness are not yet available in LibGuides.
    - Not all subject areas are represented by a LibGuide
    - LibGuides are very inconsistent in organization and depth of coverage
  - Eresources by subject are highly integrated in the rest of the web site (e.g., subject librarian lists, handouts, and videos).
  - Many LibGuides authors feel that broad subject guides are not as effective as course- or assignment-specific guides. Existing LibGuides are not meant to cover an entire discipline or they are not meant to be an orientation to an entire field for the beginning student.

It was agreed that we should continue the two platforms for now, with a LibGuides discussion to be arranged by the Learning Collaborative to continue to explore these issues. Juhl suggested that she could take on more management responsibilities for the subject librarians, if keeping their eresources up to date is burdensome.

3. Videos on Web Page and YouTube
   [http://www.youtube.com/user/UARKLIB](http://www.youtube.com/user/UARKLIB)

Lennertz Jetton described the current workflow for placing library videos on the web site (in Flash Format) and on YouTube (in MP4 format). The group discussed the benefits and drawbacks of consolidating videos on YouTube, and just linking to them or embedding them on our own site. Some of the benefits of YouTube as a platform include the social aspects and discoverability, mobile access, and the reduction of processing time for Lennertz Jetton. Some of the drawbacks include the lack of a
“permalink” (in that once a video is updated, the address gets updated as well) and some decline in video quality. Google Analytics on the library site capture more useful user data than the YouTube statistics. Some consideration would have to be given to the maintenance of and integration of transcripts and video links into the site.

While reaching no firm conclusion, the group agreed that reduction of duplication is a worthy goal. Lennertz Jetton will discuss options with the Learning Collaborative.

Lennertz Jetton also reported that, with the changing web page, she will be taking down many outdated videos until they can be updated.

4. “Webometrics” and measuring our impact
The group discussed the draft report (see reports section on committee web site) that Juhl had forwarded to Ganson regarding this strategic initiative for 2011. While efforts such as the Search Engine Optimization project at SUNY Binghamton are intriguing, they would also be very labor intensive. Ganson suggested that she confer with the directors and dean before we undertake any extensive projects.

Juhl mentioned in the meeting the MINES (Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services) project conducted by several ARL libraries, including the University of Connecticut. The web page with project reports can be found here: http://www.arl.org/stats/initiatives/mines/index.shtml

Next Web Group Meeting: Tuesday, February 1st
Respectfully submitted,

B. Juhl