

Design Group
Report of Teleconference*
May 9, 2007
8:30 – 9:30 a.m. CT

Participants:

Ulrike Dieterle, Ebling Library, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Molly Moore, Amputee Coalition of America
Mark Scully, Northern Wisconsin Area Health Education Center

Design Group members reviewed and discussed the following websites to identify Design Positives (good attributes) and Design Negatives (bad attributes).

1. Hmong Health

<http://www.hmonghealth.blogspot.com/>

2. Refugee Health Information Network

<http://sis.nlm.nih.gov/outreach/rhin.html>

3. Refugee Health Information Network

<http://sis.nlm.nih.gov/outreach/rhin.html>

4. GANFYD

<http://www.ganfyd.org>

5. Library of Congress

<http://www.loc.gov/index.html>

6. Columbus Children's Research Institute

[http://columbuschildrens.com/GD/Templates/Pages/Childrens/Research/ResearchLandin
g.aspx?page=3787](http://columbuschildrens.com/GD/Templates/Pages/Childrens/Research/ResearchLandin
g.aspx?page=3787)

**7. Active Living Network
Designing Living Communities**

<http://www.activeliving.org/>

8. Smart Growth Planning

<http://www.smartgrowthplanning.org/>

**These are the revised minutes of the Design Group's teleconference of May 9, 2007. The purpose of this revision was to reformat the contents of the original minutes into a clearer layout that would be easier to implement.*

Design Positives (Examples of good attributes)

Clean, readable appearance; good use of white space (Sites 1 and 7)

Clear, logical page organization (Sites 2 and 6)

Page easy to navigate; good navigation menu (Sites 2 and 4)

Content of site is rich and extensive (Site 2)

Design Groups suggests a “classis wiki” with discussion tabs (Sites 3 and 4)

Site should facilitate social networking, allow discussion of issues, advice-seeking, and posting of PowerPoint and other types of files (Site 3)

Site should permit sharing of teaching materials, class handouts, etc. (Site 3)

Provide a good “page toolbox” (Site 3)

Permit classified (subject) access to site content (Site 3)

Build in an RSS capability (Site 3)

Feature a good “How to Use” tutorial (Site 3)

Provide the ability to present contributors’ profiles with option for a personal photo (Site 3)

Permit the tracking of changes made to particular site pages/sections (Site 3)

Offer a good list of contents, browsability, and access points (Site 4)

Search box should be clearly tagged and positioned to be obvious (Site 4)

Easy access to articles and discussion tabs (Site 4)

Have a good balance of text and graphics (Site 5)

Make graphics clear and effective for linking (Site 5)

Select a good array of categories to present (Site 5)

As much as possible, use buttons and symbols (rather than text) to achieve simplicity and space economy (Site 7)

Consider using scenes depicting sky and nature, which are appealing and relaxing (Site 7)
In general, rounded contours are more appealing than sharp angles for design purposes (Site 8)

Design Negatives (Examples of bad attributes)

Provides chronological, but not classified (subject), access to past postings (Site 1)

Page is too dense with text; should use some graphics to “lighten it up” (Site 2)

Poor graphics (Site 3)

Annoying advertisements (Site 3)

The large graphics overpower the sponsor’s *brand* or identity (Site 5)

Page is aesthetically unbalanced (Site 6)

Left navigation bar is too stark (Site 6)

Buttons at top of page should be made more prominent (Site 6)

Items for Discussion

Should there be any controls on posting new content to the site? Or should anyone be able to logon and post comments without restriction? Should contributors be required to register on the site before they can post comments?

The Design Group’s preference is for a wiki rather than a blog. Wiki is more of a dynamic model, while the blog is relatively static.

Anticipate the demographics of the audience. For example, older users might be more text oriented, while young people tend to prefer graphics.

A page depicting “sky and nature” might serve as a common theme for a consolidated site that covers a variety of organizations and cultures.

Is the *medicine wheel* a generic symbol that might be used?

Are there certain cultural taboos that we should avoid using as symbols?

Consider bandwidth implications. When a page takes too long to load, users become frustrated.

Submitted: July 9, 2007