Usability Checklist

Cambria Solutions

MS ADPQ Challenge

Sprint 2 Prototype

Hello Everyone –

Below please find the assigned platforms for the MS ADPQ Challenge Usability testing action for the Sprint 2 prototype. In the process of completing assigned testing, please keep in mind the original wire frames, as well as our user needs. Our goal is to create the most helpful tool we can for both parents and case workers, and our testing and evaluation should reflect that.

In order to effectively communicate testing findings to our technical team, we need to complete all testing by this evening, Tuesday, October 4, 2016.

Since we have multiple testers, please complete your testing using an offline version of the template, and then copy/paste your completed information in to the appropriate place in the shared worksheet.

Erik

Platform	Individual Assignments
Explorer	Casey
Chrome	Casey
Firefox	La Chelle
Safari	Erik
iPad	Nuli
Android Phone	Zach
iPhone	Denise

Usability Checklist

MSADPQ
Sprint 2
Date: [10/04/2016]
Time: [9:23 PM]
Platform Version: Version 11
Tester: Casey Skinner

Cambria Solutions

Testing Area	Performance	Comments
Please use the following testing areas in conjunction with planned wireframes to complete the usability testing review.	Please enter a performance rating for each testing area.	Please provide an explanation or any relevant information for the assigned performance score, such as a description of the issues found; enhancements or changes that can be made.

USER FEATURES

	Testing Area	Performance	Comments
1	UC1: As a Caseworker or Parent, I would like to search for childcare providers in my vicinity so that I can choose the best provider for a child.	Good	On the second screen, is it possible for the county name to hover over the county map? The second/bottom county drop down seems unnecessary Adams county is listed twice in both county drop downs.
2	UC2: As a Parent, I want to have a list of accredited childcare facilities that accept the Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidies so that I can use my Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidy and save time by only looking at qualifying facilities/providers.	Poor	On the first screen, the Search doesn't specify subsidized - does it return only subsidized providers? When enter zip code (39110) returns list of 500+, only one of which is in 39110, and doesn't correspond to locations on map. There's nothing on the screen that tells me that the listed providers are subsidized. Unclear how to adjust Distance in Miles Is there a reset button to clear the search parameters?
3	UC15: As a Parent, I want to easily find the contact information for a childcare provider so that I can save time and connect with the childcare facility sooner.	Fail	I used the Advanced Searrch to find a specific provider. I copy a Provider Name from the dataset into the Facility Name field in advanced search and return zero records. Is Provider Name and Facility Name the same thing?

4	UC13: As a Parent, I want to know that *the* childcare facility I have chosen is reputable and comes recommended so that I can feel confident in my childcare choice.	**Good**	Is the first screen Search option only for subsidized care? I used the search option, even though this UC is not for subsidized care. I chose more options and the Rated quality rating.Search returned 10 items, but only two appeared on the map. It seems that the ones shown on the map are usually at the bottom of the list of facilities returned.
5	UC6: As a Parent, I want to know more information about different childcare options like certifications or licensing so that it I can find the best fit for my son.	**Excellent**	By choosing the second screen, one can find links to niformation on certification and licensure.
6	Submit is clear, well labelled and appears clickable.	**Pass**	

STARTING PAGE

7	The starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	**Fail**	When I press Search in the black bar on the first screen, nothing happens. Have to scroll down to Search feature below. The Search function below appears at first to be only for Subsidized Childcare, but I assume its for all types because of all the "more options" functionality associated with it that is not anywhere else. Should be clarified.
8	The starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	**Fail**	See above
9	The starting page layout is clear and uncluttered.	**Moderate**	It's uncluttered but has some confusing aspects - see above

NAVIGATION

10	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	**Pass**	
11	The navigational menu is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	**Pass**	
12	The navigation has sufficient flexibility to allow users to navigate by their desired means (e.g. searching, browse by type, browse by name, most recent etc…).	**Pass**	

13	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	**Moderate**	It is unclear if the search function on the first screen is just for subsidized care or not. The search for all facilities is straightforward.
14	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	**Pass**	Please see comment above .
15	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	**Pass**	
16	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. highlighted menu item).	**Pass**	
17	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	**Pass**	There is no "reset" button on the search section of the first screen, which would make it easier to clear options and start over again.
18	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	**N/A**	
SEARCH			
19	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout all pages.	**Pass**	
20	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. locational search).	**Moderate**	The search on the second page (by county, by city) is OK. When searching by facility (provider?), only some "Centers" return information. Others do not. The search on the first page returns results in a list that do not correspond well to the items shown on the map. The "Distance in Miles" is a black box with no indication how to adjust the distance. The number 15 appears below the box. I cannot figure out how to adjust the distance.
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	**Moderate**	
FEEDBACK			
22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	**Pass**	

23	Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before commiting (e.g. before placing an order).	**Pass**	Resetting the first page search "more options" is clumsy. It would be nice to have a reset button to clear all options at once.
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	**Pass**	

ERRORS

25	Errors are clear and identifiable.	**N/A**	No error messages found
26	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	**N/A**	See above
27	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	**N/A**	See above

CONTENT

28	Content available (e.g. provider information) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	**Moderate**	Not all providers are accessed in a facility search. Perhaps only Centers are considered facilities.
29	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	**Excellent**	
30	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	**Excellent**	
31	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	**Excellent**	
32	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	**Excellent**	

PERFORMANCE

33	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	**Pass**	

| 34 | Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience. | Pass | |

Usability Checklist

MS ADPQ

Sprint 2

Date: 10/05/2016
Time: 09:08 AM
Platform Version: Firefox
Tester: La Chelle Heard

Cambria
Solutions

Testing Area	Performance	Comments
Please use the following testing areas in conjunction with planned wireframes to complete the usability testing review.	Please enter a performance rating for each testing area.	Please provide an explanation or any relevant information for the assigned performance score, such as a description of the issues found; enhancements or changes that can be made.

USER FEATURES

	Testing Area	Performance	Comments
1	UC1: As a Caseworker or Parent, I would like to search for childcare providers in my vicinity so that I can choose the best provider for a child.	Moderate	*Used the All Childcare Facilities hyperlink here . Taken to a page to serach for Licensed Child Care Facilities. Selected county of Hinds, clicked Find Childcare.* *List provided, however I had expected to be able to click on a provider name or address and a map appears.* *Would be nice to be able to click on a provider to receive a map. Would also be nice to be able to print the list.*
2	UC2: As a Parent, I want to have a list of accredited childcare facilities that accept the Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidies so that I can use my Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidy and save time by only looking at qualifying facilities/providers.	Moderate	*Searching from the Landing Page as the Subsidized Childcare box instructs to Search below, entered Jackson and received a list of providers and map provided. Numbering the list by alpha or numerics would be helpful.* *How do I know that the facilities returned are subsidized? Are the unfiltered results always ONLY subsidized facilities.*
3	UC15: As a Parent, I want to easily find the contact information for a childcare provider so that I can save time and connect with the childcare facility sooner.	Poor	*Clicking the here hyperlink, navigated to the Search for Licensed Child Care Facilities page, entered a city name of "Aberdeen" in the Advanced search, clicked Find Childcare button, a list of 5 providers returned.*

4	UC13: As a Parent, I want to know that childcare facility I have chosen is reputable and comes recommended so that I can feel confident in my childcare choice.	Poor	Entered city name of Jackson in the "Search Child Care Provider" section of the landing page, filtered on Distance in Miles of 15; Quality Rating of "Rated"; Provider Type of "Center"; Availability of "Yes"; Special Needs of "Yes". 88 Results returned. Numbering the results by alpha or numeric would be nice.
5	UC6: As a Parent, I want to know more information about different childcare options like certifications or licensing so that it I can find the best fit for my son.	Poor	Entered city name of Jackson in the "Search Child Care Provider" section of the landing page, filtered on Distance in Miles of 15; Quality Rating of "All"; Provider Type of "Center"; Availability of "Yes"; Special Needs of "Yes". 237 Results returned. Licensed is misspelled. Is Licensed or Certifications supposed to be a filter option? If not, would it make sense to add Licensed as a filter option? When clicking the here hyperlink, the page returned clearly states "Search for Licensed Child Care Facilities", however the box on the landing page does not give that information, it states ALL childcare facilities.
6	Submit is clear, well labelled and appears clickable.	Moderate	Search and Find Childcare are clear and clickable. The here hyperlink is clear and clickable.

7	The starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	Moderate	All Childcare Facilities here hyperlink takes user to a page stating its for Licensed Child Care Facilities not ALL child care facilities.
8	The starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	Moderate	The subsidized childcare directs user to search below. As a user how would I know that the results are only for subsidized childcare only. Also See number 7 above.
9	The starting page layout is clear and uncluttered.	Excellent	Agree, the starting page is clear and uncluttered.

NAVIGATION

10	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	**Excellent**	*Agree*
11	The navigational menu is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	**Excellent**	*Agree*
12	The navigation has sufficient flexibility to allow users to navigate by their desired means (e.g. searching, browse by type, browse by name, most recent etc…).	**Excellent**	*Agree*
13	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	**Good**	*Agree. See 7 and 8 above*
14	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	**Enter score**	*Agree*
15	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	**Excellent**	*Agree*
16	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. highlighted menu item).	**Excellent**	*Agree*
17	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	**Excellent**	*Agree*
18	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	**N/A**	*N/A*
SEARCH			
19	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout all pages.	**Fail**	*Search button on landing/starting page does not appear to be functional.I click it and nothing happens.*
20	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. locational search).	**Excellent**	*Agree*
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	**Poor**	*See 2, 5, 7 and 8 above.*
FEEDBACK			
22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	**Excellent**	*Agree*

23	Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before commiting (e.g. before placing an order).	**Excellent**	*Agree*
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	**Moderate**	*Not on the landing/starting page or the About page. There is a Contact Us link on the "Search for Licensed Child Care Facilities" page, this page is returned after clicking the here hyperlink in the All Childcare Facilities box on the landing/starting page.*

ERRORS

25	Errors are clear and identifiable.	**Fail**	*I only received an error on the landing/starting page when I clicked on the search button without entering any search criteria.* *I did not receive any errors on the "Search for Licensed Child Care Facilities page when I clicked on the Find Child Care button without entered any search criteria. I received a results list of 1524 facilities.*
26	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	**Excellent**	*Agree*
27	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	**Excellent**	*Agree*

CONTENT

28	Content available (e.g. provider information) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	**Moderate**	*See 2, 5, 7, and 8 above.*
29	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	**Excellent**	*Agree*
30	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	**Excellent**	*Agree*
31	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	**Moderate**	*On the landing/starting pagethe button is labeled "Search". On the Search for Licensed Child Care Facilities page the buttons are labeled "Find Childcare".*

32	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	**Excellent**	*Agree*

PERFORMANCE			
33	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	**Excellent**	*Agree*
34	Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.	**Excellent**	*Agree*

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

RECOMMENDED FEATURES

Usability Checklist

MSADPQ
Sprint 2
Date: [10/04/2016]
Time: [9:23 PM]
Platform Version: Version 53
Tester: Casey Skinner

Cambria Solutions

Testing Area	Performance	Comments
Please use the following testing areas in conjunction with planned wireframes to complete the usability testing review.	Please enter a performance rating for each testing area.	Please provide an explanation or any relevant information for the assigned performance score, such as a description of the issues found; enhancements or changes that can be made.

USER FEATURES

1	UC1: As a Caseworker or Parent, I would like to search for childcare providers in my vicinity so that I can choose the best provider for a child.	Good	On the second screen, Is it possible for the county name to hover over the county map? The second/bottom county drop down seems unnecessary Adams county is listed twice in both county drop downs.
2	UC2: As a Parent, I want to have a list of accredited childcare facilities that accept the Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidies so that I can use my Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidy and save time by only looking at qualifying facilities/providers.	Poor	First screen, the search doesn't specify subsidized - does it return only subsidized providers? When enter zip code (39110) returns list of 500+, only one of which is in 39110, and doesn't correspond to locations on map. There's nothing on the screen that tells me that the listed providers are subsidized. Unclear how to adjust Distance in Miles Is there a reset button to clear the search parameters?
3	UC15: As a Parent, I want to easily find the contact information for a childcare provider so that I can save time and connect with the childcare facility sooner.	Fail	I used the Advanced Searrch to find a specific provider. I copy a Provider Name from the dataset into the Facility Name field in advanced search and return zero records. Is Provider Name and Facility Name the same thing?

4	UC13: As a Parent, I want to know that *the* childcare facility I have chosen is reputable and comes recommended so that I can feel confident in my childcare choice.	**Good**	Is the First screen Search option only for subsidized care? I used the search option, even though this UC is not for subsidized care. I chose more options and the Rated quality rating.Search returned 10 items, but only two appeared on the map. It seems that the ones shown on the map are usually at the bottom of the list of facilities returned.
5	UC6: As a Parent, I want to know more information about different childcare options like certifications or licensing so that it I can find the best fit for my son.	**Excellent**	By choosing the second screen, one can find links to niformation on certification and licensure.
6	Submit is clear, well labelled and appears clickable.	**Pass**	

STARTING PAGE

7	The starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	**Fail**	When I press Search in the black bar on the first screen, nothing happens. Have to scroll down to Search feature below. The Search function below appears at first to be only for Subsidized Childcare, but I assume its for all types because of all the "more options" functionality associated with it that is not anywhere else. Should be clarified.
8	The starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	**Fail**	See above
9	The starting page layout is clear and uncluttered.	**Moderate**	It's uncluttered but has some confusing aspects - see above

NAVIGATION

10	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	**Pass**	
11	The navigational menu is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	**Pass**	
12	The navigation has sufficient flexibility to allow users to navigate by their desired means (e.g. searching, browse by type, browse by name, most recent etc…).	**Pass**	
13	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	**Moderate**	It is unclear if the search function on the first screen is just for subsidized care or not. The search for all facilities is straightforward.

14	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	Pass	Please see comment above .
15	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	Pass	
16	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. highlighted menu item).	Pass	
17	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	Pass	There is no "reset" button on the search section of the first screen, which would make it easier to clear options and start over again.
18	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	N/A	

19	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout all pages.	Pass	
20	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. locational search).	Good	The search on the second page (by county, by city) is OK. When searching by facility (provider?), only some "Centers" return information. Others do not. The search on the first page returns results in a list that do not correspond well to the items shown on the map. The "Distance in Miles" is an adjustable slider that is easy to use.
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	Moderate	

FEEDBACK

22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	Pass	
23	Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before commiting (e.g. before placing an order).	Pass	Resetting the first page search "more options" is clumsy. It would be nice to have a reset button to clear all options at once.
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	Pass	

ERRORS

25	Errors are clear and identifiable.	**N/A**	No error messages found
26	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	**N/A**	See above
27	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	**N/A**	See above

CONTENT

28	Content available (e.g. provider information) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	**Moderate**	Not all providers are accessed in a facility search. Perhaps only Centers are considered facilities.
29	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	**Excellent**	
30	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	**Excellent**	
31	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	**Excellent**	
32	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	**Excellent**	

PERFORMANCE

33	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	**Pass**	
34	Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.	**Pass**	

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

On first screen, text "If you are a parent or a social worker or looking for subsidizing day care facilities search below" should be "subsidized".

RECOMMENDED FEATURES

When searching, provide better correlation between the providers listed on the screen and those shown on the map.

Usability Checklist

MS ADPQ Challenge

Sprint 2 Prototype

Date: 10/4/2016
Time: 9:26PM PST
Platform Version: 9.1.2
Tester: Erik Newland

Cambria Solutions

	Testing Area	Performance	Comments
	Please use the following testing areas in conjunction with planned wireframes to complete the usability testing review.	Please enter a performance rating for each testing area.	Please provide an explanation or any relevant information for the assigned performance score, such as a description of the issues found; enhancements or changes that can be made.
	USER FEATURES		
1	UC1: As a Caseworker or Parent, I would like to search for childcare providers in my vicinity so that I can choose the best provider for a child.	**Moderate**	*When map points populate, the shown map points do not correlate with any of the provider information shown on the left.*
2	UC2: As a Parent, I want to have a list of accredited childcare facilities that accept the Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidies so that I can use my Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidy and save time by only looking at qualifying facilities/providers.	**Good**	
3	UC15: As a Parent, I want to easily find the contact information for a childcare provider so that I can save time and connect with the childcare facility sooner.	**Good**	*It would be nice to search by the number of stars. If I were a parent I could care less about stars 1-3. I want to be able to just look at stars 4-5, and not have to sift through all of ones with ratings. Please include ability to choose stars, and not just one, but multiple.*
4	UC13: As a Parent, I want to know that a childcare facility I have chosen is reputable and comes recommended so that I can feel confident in my childcare choice.	**Excellent**	

5	UC6: As a Parent, I want to know more information about different childcare options like certifications or licensing so that it I can find the best fit for my son.	**Good**	*What does licensed or unlicensed mean, is there any more information?*
6	Submit is clear, well labelled and appears clickable.	**Fail**	*The search button is, but it took me awhile to notice the more options button, and that really provides a lot of nice filtering componenets. Also the "more options" is not lined up with the search button and appears odd to me.*

STARTING PAGE

7	The starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	**Fail**	*There is no information about the filtering ability of the website on the starting page. If I cam to this website looking for only licensed childcare providers, then I might turn away immediately because from the starting page, I would not know that such filtering was even available.*
8	The starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	**Pass**	*Again with the filtering options clarity.*
9	The starting page layout is clear and uncluttered.	**Good**	*I would like to see the search functionality more prominent, with less focus on the link to non-subsidized options. Though that information is helpful, it is the first thing that draws my attention rather than the search functionality.*

NAVIGATION

10	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	**N/A**	
11	The navigational menu is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	**Pass**	
12	The navigation has sufficient flexibility to allow users to navigate by their desired means (e.g. searching, browse by type, browse by name, most recent etc…).	**Pass**	*It would be nice to search by provider name. If I am a parent, and I am given a list of recommended providers from a friend, I want to be able to search for just those providers to see if they are close to me, or to just get more information.*
13	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	**Excellent**	
14	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	**Pass**	

15	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	**Fail**	*I cannot go back to my previously generated search.*
16	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. highlighted menu item).	**N/A**	
17	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	**Pass**	
18	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	**N/A**	

SEARCH			
19	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout all pages.	**Pass**	
20	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. locational search).	**Excellent**	
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	**Moderate**	*Listed sites do not matchup*

FEEDBACK			
22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	**Pass**	
23	Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before commiting (e.g. before placing an order).	**Fail**	*Cannot go back to previous search*
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	**Fail**	*No feedback functionality. That is an RFP requirement.*

ERRORS			
25	Errors are clear and identifiable.	**Pass**	
26	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	**Pass**	

27	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	**Pass**	

CONTENT

28	Content available (e.g. provider information) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	**Good**	
29	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	**Moderate**	*Is the "all childcare facilities" the only relevent content to link to?*
30	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	**Excellent**	
31	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	**Excellent**	
32	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	**Excellent**	

PERFORMANCE

33	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	**Moderate**	
34	Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.	**Moderate**	

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

RECOMMENDED FEATURES

Usability Checklist

MS ADPQ

Sprint 2

Date: 10/04/2016
Time: 7pm
Platform Version: ?
Tester: Zach

Cambria Solutions

Testing Area	Performance	Comments
Please use the following testing areas in conjunction with planned wireframes to complete the usability testing review.	Please enter a performance rating for each testing area.	Please provide an explanation or any relevant information for the assigned performance score, such as a description of the issues found; enhancements or changes that can be made.

USER FEATURES

	Testing Area	Performance	Comments
1	UC1: As a Caseworker or Parent, I would like to search for childcare providers in my vicinity so that I can choose the best provider for a child.	**Moderate**	*Moderate - Suggest removing the "subsidized childcare" and "all childcare facilities" blocks. Search could be relabled "search for subsidized childcare" with a link below for "all childcare facilities.*
2	UC2: As a Parent, I want to have a list of accredited childcare facilities that accept the Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidies so that I can use my Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidy and save time by only looking at qualifying facilities/providers.	**Good**	*Good*
3	UC15: As a Parent, I want to easily find the contact information for a childcare provider so that I can save time and connect with the childcare facility sooner.	**Moderate**	*Moderate - Some text is bolded and some isnt; need to improve consistency. Selecting the phone number works fine. Selecting the email option doesn't populate the email correctly (i.e. the email address insnt populated in the "TO" line). Formatting should also be improved for consistency; some items are on their own row and some are grouped.*
4	UC13: As a Parent, I want to know that childcare facility I have chosen is reputable and comes recommended so that I can feel confident in my childcare choice.	**Poor**	*Poor - Quality rating is only a Yes or No. A star rating (1-5) would be better and more intuitive to the user.*

5	UC6: As a Parent, I want to know more information about different childcare options like certifications or licensing so that it I can find the best fit for my son.	**Good**	*Good*
6	Submit is clear, well labelled and appears clickable.	**Good**	*Good*

STARTING PAGE

7	The starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	**Poor**	*Poor - No search function on initial starting page; user required to scroll to the bottom of the screen.*
8	The starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	**Poor**	*Poor - No search function on initial starting page; user required to scroll to the bottom of the screen.*
9	The starting page layout is clear and uncluttered.	**Poor**	*Poor - unused white space at the top of the screen. Starting page image cuts off text undre MDHS logo.*

NAVIGATION

10	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	**Good**	*Good*
11	The navigational menu is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	**Good**	*Good*
12	The navigation has sufficient flexibility to allow users to navigate by their desired means (e.g. searching, browse by type, browse by name, most recent etc…).	**Poor**	*Poor - Results are difficult ot browse. The user must either scroll through all results to get to the map or select the small white space on the corners of the phone to navigate to the bottom of the screen. Suggest putting map at the top of the results and the list below.*
13	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	**Poor**	*See item #12.*
14	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	**Poor**	*Poor - When selecting the "View Location" link on the search results a blank screen is displayed. Map pins and list results arent labeled or numbered; no way to correlate map results to list.*
15	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	**Good**	*Good*

16	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. highlighted menu item).	**Poor**	*Poor - Current location isn't identified. This may be a user story that is missed. Should we allow users to create an account in order to search near this specific address?*
17	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	**Good**	*Good*
18	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	**Good**	*Good*

SEARCH

19	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout all pages.	**Moderate**	*Se UC 15, and items #7,8.,9.*
20	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. locational search).	**Moderate**	*Moderate - The "search" button and the "more options" button are different. This may be OK, but the styling in general with the interface doesn't appear consistent.*
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	**Moderate**	*Se UC 15, and items #7,8.,9.*

FEEDBACK

22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	**Poor**	*Poor - Application lags when selects a filter option. 10-30 seconds elapse before the selection is choosen. Also, the scroll bar for the "distancein Miles" function is unusable due to lag. A user is not able to drag the bar to select the desired miles. It appears this may be happening because the search results are dynamically changes as the "distance in miles" changes.*
23	Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before commiting (e.g. before placing an order).	**Moderate**	*Moderate - User can change filter options prior to committing. There were times where the search criteria was removed and I had to re-enter all information to edit my search.*
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	**N/A**	*N/A*

ERRORS

25	Errors are clear and identifiable.	**Moderate**	*Moderate - Received "over the query limit" errors, 404, and 500 errors earlier in the day. These errors appeared to be corrected in the evening.*
26	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	**Poor**	*Poor - Error messages were written in technical terms and were not user friendly.*
27	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	**Moderate**	*Moderate - User can change filter options prior to committing. There were times where the search criteria was removed and I had to re-enter all information to edit my search.*

CONTENT

28	Content available (e.g. provider information) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	**Moderate**	*See UC15 above.*
29	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	**Moderate**	*See UC15 above.*
30	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	**Moderate**	*See UC15 above.*
31	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	**Moderate**	*See UC15 above.*
32	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	**Moderate**	*See UC15 above.*

PERFORMANCE

33	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	**Poor**	*Poor - Application lags when selects a filter option. 10-30 seconds elapse before the selection is choosen.*
34	Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.	**Poor**	*Poor - the scroll bar for the "distancein Miles" function is unusable due to lag. A user is not able to drag the bar to select the desired miles. It appears this may be happening because the search results are dynamically changes as the "distance in miles" changes.*

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

RECOMMENDED FEATURES

Usability Checklist

MS ADPQ

Sprint 2

Date: 10/04/2016
Time: PM
Platform Version: 7.0.3
Tester: Venkata Nuli

Cambria Solutions

	Testing Area	Performance	Comments
	Please use the following testing areas in conjunction with planned wireframes to complete the usability testing review.	Please enter a performance rating for each testing area.	Please provide an explanation or any relevant information for the assigned performance score, such as a description of the issues found; enhancements or changes that can be made.

	USER FEATURES		
1	UC1: As a Caseworker or Parent, I would like to search for childcare providers in my vicinity so that I can choose the best provider for a child.	**Poor**	*Searched for a provider named 'Carolyn Shoop'. The application does not provide any results; nor it displays an error message* *Searched for a provider named 'Carolyn'. The application responds with 20 providers, but none of them have the provider name 'Carolyn Shoop'*
2	UC2: As a Parent, I want to have a list of accredited childcare facilities that accept the Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidies so that I can use my Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidy and save time by only looking at qualifying facilities/providers.	**Good**	
3	UC15: As a Parent, I want to easily find the contact information for a childcare provider so that I can save time and connect with the childcare facility sooner.	**Excellent**	
4	UC13: As a Parent, I want to know that childcare facility I have chosen is reputable and comes recommended so that I can feel confident in my childcare choice.	**Excellent**	

5	UC6: As a Parent, I want to know more information about different childcare options like certifications or licensing so that it I can find the best fit for my son.	**Excellent**	
6	Submit is clear, well labelled and appears clickable.	**Excellent**	

STARTING PAGE

7	The starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	**Excellent**	
8	The starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	**Excellent**	
9	The starting page layout is clear and uncluttered.	**Moderate**	*The application contains some white space on the top pf the application because of which the entire content is not rendered in one screen. The user is having to scroll down to search* *The MDHS logo is fluid in the sense that background image and the logo does not always line (Landscape vs Potrait)*

NAVIGATION

10	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	**Excellent**	*Since this is a prototype application, the URL stated is predictable*
11	The navigational menu is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	**Fail**	*The Search button on the black ribbon is not active; and therefore does not return any results*
12	The navigation has sufficient flexibility to allow users to navigate by their desired means (e.g. searching, browse by type, browse by name, most recent etc…).	**Poor**	*The wireframe contained the ability for the user to search by Provider Name, and Address. The application's search box does not contain the literature stating the user can search by Provider Name or Address.*
13	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	**Moderate**	*When in Lanscape mode, the user has to scroll down to perform the ONE function the application is designed to do - Search* *When in Potrait mode, if the user clicks on 'Search' on the black ribbon, the application refreshes but is rendered off screen; and the user is having to minimize the application for a best fit resolution*

14	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	**Excellent**	
15	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	**Moderate**	*When changing the iPad from Landscape to a Potrait mode, the application is rendered off screen; and thr user is having to minimize the application for a best fit resolution* *When in potrait mode, the Search button moves below the search box, even through there is enough real estate adjacent to the search box*
16	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. highlighted menu item).	**Excellent**	
17	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	**Excellent**	
18	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	**N/A**	

SEARCH

19	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout all pages.	**Good**	*Refer to 22*
20	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. locational search).	**Moderate**	*The Quality Rating drop down is cut off.* *The 'Distance in Miles' is not responsive in real time. There is a lag between when the user tries to scale the distance and the actual scale is updated.*
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	**Moderate**	*When the user searches by a place (i.e. Jackson), the application states '827 results for Jackson' but is not placed correctly on the screen* *The Quality Rating; and the Availability should either be right aligned; or on separate rows* *The Availability results 'YES' is bolded. The font should be non bolded*

FEEDBACK

22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	**Poor**	*The map does not contain a pin on the map for locations that are retuned based on the search*
23	Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before commiting (e.g. before placing an order).	**Moderate**	*When a user wants to email the results, clicking on the 'Email icon' should confirm if the user wants this information to be emailed for his/her reference.*
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	**N/A**	

ERRORS

25	Errors are clear and identifiable.	**Poor**	*Selected, Jackson, 15 miles, Provider Type - Center; the application states '400, Bad Request' and stalls.*
26	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	**Poor**	*Refer to 25*
27	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	**Poor**	*Refer to 25*

CONTENT

28	Content available (e.g. provider information) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	**Moderate**	*The list of the search results should map to the pins on the map via a reference number. The user is currently having to click on the specific provider to determine the location on the map*
29	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	**Moderate**	*Some links (ex: Carolyn Shoop's location details) does not work.* *The filter parameters should include a hover text to indicate the description of each filter. There could be some confusion related to the 'Quality Ratings' since there is no sort option*
30	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	**Excellent**	
31	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	**Excellent**	

32	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	**Excellent**	

PERFORMANCE

33	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	**Good**	*The performance of the search page could be better, but is satisfactory*
34	Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.	**Good**	

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

RECOMMENDED FEATURES

Usability Checklist

MS ADPQ Challenge
Sprint 2
Date: 10/5/2016
Time: PM
Platform Version:
Tester: Denise Tugade

Cambria Solutions

Testing Area	Performance	Comments
Please use the following testing areas in conjunction with planned wireframes to complete the usability testing review.	Please enter a performance rating for each testing area.	Please provide an explanation or any relevant information for the assigned performance score, such as a description of the issues found; enhancements or changes that can be made.

USER FEATURES

	Testing Area	Performance	Comments
1	UC1: As a Caseworker or Parent, I would like to search for childcare providers in my vicinity so that I can choose the best provider for a child.	**Excellent**	
2	UC2: As a Parent, I want to have a list of accredited childcare facilities that accept the Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidies so that I can use my Mississippi Childcare Payment System subsidy and save time by only looking at qualifying facilities/providers.	**Excellent**	
3	UC15: As a Parent, I want to easily find the contact information for a childcare provider so that I can save time and connect with the childcare facility sooner.	**Good**	*Would be nice to have a link to the website*
4	UC13: As a Parent, I want to know that childcare facility I have chosen is reputable and comes recommended so that I can feel confident in my childcare choice.	**Poor**	*Cannot access the "More Options" advanced search without first doing a basic search*
5	UC6: As a Parent, I want to know more information about different childcare options like certifications or licensing so that it I can find the best fit for my son.	**Moderate**	*No certification information.*

6	Submit is clear, well labelled and appears clickable.	**Moderate**	*Submit is a little unclear when adding "More Options" criteria*

STARTING PAGE

7	The starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	**Moderate**	*On iPhone the text under Subsidized Childcare indicating to "search below" doesn't make sense because the All Childcare Facilities box is underneath it.*
8	The starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	**Moderate**	*No title indicating what site you're on. On iPhone, photo only shows adult woman. From first view of page, would not have any indication of what the site is for. Mississippi Department of Human Services cannot be seen over the picture*
9	The starting page layout is clear and uncluttered.	**Moderate**	*Could have banner image larger- currently has extra padding at the top and sides*

NAVIGATION

10	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	**N/A**	*Assuming N/A for the prototype*
11	The navigational menu is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	**Moderate**	*Hamburger icon may be unclear for someone who is not tech savvy*
12	The navigation has sufficient flexibility to allow users to navigate by their desired means (e.g. searching, browse by type, browse by name, most recent etc…).	**Poor**	*Cannot search by provider name. Cannot browse by type, rating, etc. without first doing a basic search. If you click to go to Google Maps, can't hit back button to get back to search results- get stuck at a grey screen*
13	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	**Excellent**	
14	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	**Excellent**	
15	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	**Good**	*Scrolling gets a little weird if the top page and the search results are visible--may be difficult for someone not tech savvy/with dexterity issues. There's a lot of extra padding at the bottom*
16	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. highlighted menu item).	**Good**	*Current location not indicated, but fairly clear*

17	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	**Moderate**	*No home page button in navigation, should be able to click MDHS logo to link back to home.*
18	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	**Excellent**	

SEARCH			
19	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout all pages.	**N/A**	*No search feature across the site*
20	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. locational search).	**Moderate**	*Would be helpful to have the default search settings indicated, especially the search distance. More Options is very small and could be missed. May make sense to have the options visible or call it "Advanced Search". Also would be nice to have a button to clear the "More Options" and to clear the search bar.*
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	**Moderate**	*Not clear that you have to scroll to bottom to see map when provider is selected--may be cumbersome if there are a lot of search results. Would be nice to be able to sort results by rating or distance*

FEEDBACK			
22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	**Good**	
23	Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before commiting (e.g. before placing an order).	**Good**	
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	**Fail**	

ERRORS			
25	Errors are clear and identifiable.	**N/A**	
26	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	**Excellent**	

27	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	**Good**	*Good: would be helpful to have a way to clear More Options and the search bar*

CONTENT

28	Content available (e.g. provider information) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	**Moderate**	*Moderate: listings do no include the provider type*
29	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	**Good**	*Good: Would be helpful to link to the websites of the providers*
30	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	**Excellent**	*Excellent*
31	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	**Excellent**	*Excellent*
32	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	**Good**	*Good*

PERFORMANCE

33	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	**Good**	*Slider for distance is a difficult to use--may be easier to have radio buttons with standard distances, or to have a place to write-in the miles*
34	Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.	**Excellent**	

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

RECOMMENDED FEATURES