MINERVA

Ministerial Network for

Valorising activities in digitisation

Quality criteria for Public Cultural Web Applications

Recommendations and Guidelines

I n d e x

MINERVA - IST-2001-35461

Document Number	5.2
Document Title	Index of Quality criteria for Public Cultural Web Applications - Recommendations and Guidelines
Document Type	Report
Responsible Partner	Ministère de la Communauté Française, Belgium
Authors	*Minerva Quality Working Group*
Status	Public
Submission Date	18 March 2003 (draft)
Notes	None

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Rationale 4

Introduction 5

Definitions, Principles and basic Recommendations 6
- Definitions 6
- Principles 6
- Basic Recommendations: policies and strategies 7

General Quality Criteria for Web Applications 8
- Content criteria 8
- Navigation criteria 8
- Presentation criteria 8
- Highlights in presentation criteria guidelines 9
- Accessibility criteria 9
- Minerva Quality Criteria for Web applications in the user perspective : categories of criteria and criteria. 10

Specific Quality Criteria for Public Cultural Web Applications (PCWA) 12
- PCWA goals 12
- PCWA quality criteria 12
- PCWA quality criteria framework 14

Annexes 15
- Validation methods 15
- Repertory of national rules on web applications 15

Rationale

- **December 1999** : eEurope initiative : An Information Society for All
- **June 2000** : eEurope 2002 Action Plan
- **4 April 2001** : The Lund Principles
- **5 November 2001** : Resolution " Culture and Knowledge Society"
- **11 December 2001** : The Brussels Quality Framework : Quality standards for cultural sites accessible on the web
- **1 March 2002** : The Minerva project
- **6 Mai 2002 :** Working Group "Identification of user needs, content and quality framework for common access points"
- **February 2003 :** first deliverable
- **March 2003** : Index of the Handbook : Quality Criteria for Public Cultural Web Application – Recommendations and Guidelines

Introduction

Presentation

Documents of Reference :

- The Brussels Quality Framework – December 2001
- The first deliverable of the Minerva Working Group on quality – February 2003
- The Greek WG5 questionnaire on quality – November 2002
- The *Italian WG5 draft document #1 – January 2003*

Target

- Developers of Public Cultural Web Applications
- Evaluators (internals or externals)

Purpose

The quality framework : a set of criteria to be used at the difference stages of development of a cultural web site, i.e.:

- for the development of new cultural web sites

- to measure the quality of a project under development, in order to possibly restyle weak components,

- to validate and assess complete projects.

These criteria and the associated methodology will be the content of deliverable D5.1.

The contents of D5.1 will be

- the basis for the development of a set of recommendations for Institutions dealing with development of cultural web sites.
- published in the form of a Handbook as part of the Minerva Editorial Line.
  The draft of the Handbook will be presented within a seminar to the NRG participants in Corfu (June 2003).
  Further, the publications will be distributed for adoption at the NRG meeting in Parma (November 2003).

Definitions, Principles and basic Recommendations

Definitions

- **Public Cultural Entity (PCE)**

  PCE identity specificity (mission, content, management structure)

  PCE goals

  PCE categories

  - Archives
  - Cinema production and valorisation centres
  - Conservation departments (art, archaeology, architectural, archival, audiovisual, bibliographical, historical, landscape, scientific, demo-ethno-anthropological, …)
  - Libraries
  - Live show production and valorisation centres
  - Monuments/sites/parks/reserves
  - Museums /exhibitions
  - Research/training institutes
- **Users**

  User needs
- **Public Cultural Web Application (PCWA)**

  PCWA goals

Principles

(definitions and commentaries)

- **Widest diffusion of culture**
- **Community of cultural entities**
- **Innovative channel of communication's effectiveness**
- **A suitable use of web applications**
- **Quality as a process with the agreement between PCE and Users' goals**

Basic Recommendations: policies and strategies

(definitions, recommendations and references)

- **Networks and thematic access points**
- **PCWA domain and validation**
- **PCE coordination between internal and external information flow**
- **PCE communication channels coordination**
- **PCWA process: project, development and management**
- **IPR and privacy control of PCWA contents**
- **PCWA archiving**

General Quality Criteria for Web Applications

Content criteria

(definition, commentary and examples)

- Consistency
- Currency
- Accuracy
- Content responsibility
- Advertising policy
- Objectivity
- Content organization evidence
- Content membership evidence

Navigation criteria

(definition, commentary and examples)

- Link evidence
- Link soundness
- Link coverage
- Backtracking soundness
- Context evidence
- Media control soundness
- Media control evidence

Presentation criteria

(definition, commentary and examples)

- Scannability
- Similarity
- Proximity
- Consistency
- Minimalism

Highlights in presentation criteria guidelines

- Color
- Images
- Text
- Interaction elements
- Active media
- Composition (spatial organization)

Accessibility criteria

(from WAI Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0 - W3C Recommendation 5-May-1999)

- Provide equivalent alternatives to auditory and visual content.
- Don't rely on colour alone.
- Use mark-up and style sheets and do so properly.
- Clarify natural language usage
- Create tables that transform gracefully.
- Ensure that pages featuring new technologies transform gracefully.
- Ensure user control of time-sensitive content changes.
- Ensure direct accessibility of embedded user interfaces.
- Design for device-independence.
- Use interim solutions.
- Use W3C technologies and guidelines.
- Provide context and orientation information.
- Provide clear navigation mechanisms.
- Ensure that documents are clear and simple.

- **Accessibility validation tools**

Minerva Quality Criteria for Web applications in the user perspective : categories of criteria and criteria.

Content	Content sources criteria	- Consistency - Currency - Completeness - Comprehensiveness - Conciseness - Richness - Soundness of dynamic media - Multilinguism - Accuracy	- Institution content criteria	- Institution image - Institution responsibility - IPR Policy - Advertising policy
			- Domain content criteria	- Authority / Responsibility - Objectivity - Uniqueness
			- Application content criteria	- Application mission evidence - Application responsibility - Maintenance strategy evidence - Technical strategy evidence
	Content organization criteria	- Appropriateness of Grouping - Appropriateness of Nesting - Appropriateness of Splitting - Organization evidence - Membership evidence		
Navigation		- Link evidence - Link soundness - Link coverage - Backtracking soundness - Context evidence		

		- Media Control soundness - Media Control evidence - Search usability	- Comprehensiveness of the query specification language - Comprehensiveness of the query result - Navigability of query results	
Operations and Services				
Presentation	General presentation criteria	- Scannability - Similarity - Proximity - Consistency - Minimalism		
	Presentation guidelines	- Color - Images - Text - Interaction elements - Active media - Composition (Spatial organization)		

Accessibility				
Technical criteria		- Performance - Configuration independence		

Specific Quality Criteria for Public Cultural Web Applications (PCWA)

Besides the attention to general quality criteria, the specific mission of public cultural web applications require specific quality criteria.

Those quality criteria may change according to each **PCWA goal**. Each PCWA goal descends from the **agreement between PCE goals and users needs**.

For **each goal** are defined and commented the **proper quality criteria**, both for PCWA content and for its technical characteristics.

The quality criteria are intended as **valid for all PCE categories** defined above.

Nevertheless, in some cases the quality criteria will be better clarified according to the **specificity of each PCE category**.

This document offers a list of PCWA goals, a list of PCWA quality criteria and an example framework of their crossing.

PCWA goals

1- PCE identity representation

2- PCE activity transparency

3- PCWA mission transparency

4- PCWA effectiveness in thematic networks

5- thematic set of legal rules and standards

6- cultural contents

7- cultural tourism contents

8- educational services

9- scientific research services

10-culture-related professional services

11- reservation and commerce services

12- thematic communities

PCWA quality criteria

Content criteria

1- Completeness

2- Comprehensiveness

3- Conciseness
4- Richness of information
5- Multilinguism
6- Authority/Responsibility
7- Uniqueness

Application content criteria

8- Application mission evidence
9- Application responsibility
10- Maintenance strategy evidence
11-Technical strategy evidence

Content organization criteria

12- Appropriateness of grouping
13- Appropriateness of nesting
14- Appropriateness of splitting

Search usability criteria

15- Comprehensiveness of query specification language
16- Comprehensiveness of query results
17- Navigability of query results
18- Possibility to save query/search results

PCWA quality criteria framework

Example #1

SECTION#1 – **PCWA GOAL**

Item	1
Title	**PCE identity representation**
Definition	The identity of a PCE is represented by its history, its physical location, its mission and by the cultural content it produces, conserves, diffuses and/or safeguards
Commentary	The PCWA should include all information needed to give to the user a view of what the PCE is, its history, its mission, its initiatives, its organization. These information contribute to create a sense of trust on the institution, and support the establishment of the right *image* of the institution itself.
See also	PCWA goals #2 and #3.

SECTION#2 – **QUALITY CRITERIA**. The section #2 will be repeated for each quality criteria

Item		**1**
Quality criteria title		**Completeness**
Definition		Completeness defines the level of information coverage of the application
Commentary		An application should not omit "crucial" informations (needed by all possible users) especially about the identity of the PCE at its origin. The amount of available resources should be appropriate and well balanced. It should cover all relevant aspects of the topic and lead into the appropriate level of details, but the appropriateness of the depth of a specific topic must be relative to users choice. The typical subtopics are: PCE mission, history, building, rules, management structure.
Examples and references		**…**
PCE categories specifications		
• Museum /exhibition	?	
• Conservation department	?	
• Monument/site/ park/reserve	?	
• Research/training institute	?	
• Archives	I I	Sometimes the identity depends on some special records, but **completeness** of information about them depends also on the national privacy and public access rules to records and documents.
• Cinema - Live show	?	
• Library	?	

Annexes

- ***Validation methods***

Quality criteria must be complemented by *evaluation methods*, i.e., guidelines and procedure that define how the quality of a cultural web application can be measured.

- ***Repertory of national rules on web applications***