Usability review

Artesanía Nazarí

Score   **Comments**

ℹ️ Hover over a guideline for more information, examples of good practice and importance to the overall user experience.

N/A = not applicable or can't be assessed

Optional - Provide a short rational for the score, such as a description of the issues found; examples of good practice and the likely impact for users.

Features & functionality

#	Guideline	Score	Comments	Weighting (out of 5)	Weighting ratio	Rating (0 - 5)	Score	Out of
1	Features and functionality meet common user goals and objectives.	Moderate	*El sitio web incluye todos sus servicios, pero no se destacan visualmente en la página o dejan que desear*	5	100%	3	3	5
2	Features and functionality support users desired workflows.	Good	*La tienda guarda tu carrito si sales de la página*	5	100%	4	4	5
3	Frequently-used tasks are readily available (e.g. easily accessible from the homepage) and well supported (e.g. short cuts are available).	Poor	*Hay cosas que fallan (por ejemplo, dos opciones llevan a la misma página), el botón del Instagram la barra de menús no sigue la vista del usuario, esto se aplica a varias páginas web*	4	80%	2	1,6	4
4	Users are adequately supported according to their level of expertise (e.g. short cuts for expert users, help and instructions for novice users).	N/A		3	60%	0	0	0
5	Call to actions (e.g. register, add to basket, submit) are clear, well labelled and appear clickable.	Good		3	60%	4	2,4	3

Homepage / starting page

#	Guideline	Score	Comments	Weighting (out of 5)	Weighting ratio	Rating (0 - 5)	Score	Out of
6	The Homepage / starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	Good	*Contiene un vídeo, una breve descripción, ubicación y menús con lo que ofrece el sitio*	3	60%	4	2,4	3
7	The home page / starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	N/A		4	80%	0	0	0
8	The homepage / starting page layout is clear and uncluttered with sufficient 'white space'.	Good	*Los diseños de las páginas son mejores en los dispositivos móviles que en los navegadores de ordenador, pero lo demás está bien*	3	60%	4	2,4	3

Navigation

#	Guideline	Score	Comments	Weighting (out of 5)	Weighting ratio	Rating (0 - 5)	Score	Out of
9	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	Excellent	*La URL es sencilla y está en primer lugar en Google*	2	40%	5	2	2
10	The navigational scheme (e.g. menu) is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	Good		4	80%	4	3,2	4
11	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…).	Good	*Solo aplicable a la tienda*	3	60%	4	2,4	3

12	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	**Good**						
				5	100%	4	4	5
13	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	**Moderate**						
				3	60%	3	1,8	3
14	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	**Excellent**						
				4	80%	5	4	4
15	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. breadcrumb, highlighted menu item).	**Moderate**	*Hay varios enlaces que llevan a sitios externos al taller y esto no es indica*					
				2	40%	3	1,2	2
16	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	**Good**	*En algunas páginas este aspecto es peor que en el resto*					
				2	40%	4	1,6	2
17	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	**Poor**	*El texto es muy pequeño, y no es interactivo excepto en la tienda*					
				1	20%	2	0,4	1

Search

18	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout (where desirable).	**Very poor**	*Solo existe en unas pocas páginas de la tienda*					
				4	80%	1	0,8	4
19	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. multi-parameter, prioritised results, filtering search results).	**Good**						
				4	80%	4	3,2	4
20	The search facility deals well with common searches, misspellings and abbreviations	**N/A**						
				2	40%	0	0	0
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	**Good**						
				4	80%	4	3,2	4

Control & feedback

22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	**Poor**	*Debería contrastar más con el resto de elementos de la web, para que se vea que tiene importancia (rojo sobre blanco en vez de blanco sobre blanco)*					
				4	80%	2	1,6	4
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**						
				3	60%	4	2,4	3
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	**Good**						
				1	20%	4	0,8	1

Forms

#	Criterion	Rating	Comment					
25	Complex forms and processes are broken up into readily understood steps and sections. Where a process is used a progress indicator is present with clear numbers or named stages.	**Moderate**		3	60%	3	1,8	3
26	A minimal amount of information is requested and where required justification is given for asking for information (e.g. date of birth, telephone number).	**N/A**		2	40%	0	0	0
27	Required and optional form fields are clearly indicated.	**Moderate**		2	40%	3	1,2	2
28	Appropriate input fields (e.g. calendar for date selection, drop down for selection) are used and required formats are indicated.	**Poor**		3	60%	2	1,2	3
29	Help and instructions (e.g. examples, information required) are provided where necessary.	**N/A**		3	60%	0	0	0

Errors

#	Criterion	Rating	Comment					
30	Errors are clear, easily identifiable and appear in appropriate location (e.g. adjacent to data entry field, adjacent to form, etc.).	**Poor**	*Los errores salen a la hora de hacer el pago*	4	80%	2	1,6	4
31	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	**Moderate**		3	60%	3	1,8	3
32	Common user errors (e.g. missing fields, invalid formats, invalid selections) have been taken into consideration and where possible prevented.	**Very poor**	*Puedo usar datos ficticios, por ejemplo, en la provincia*	3	60%	1	0,6	3
33	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	**Very poor**	*No puedes volver atrás*	3	60%	1	0,6	3

Content & text

#	Criterion	Rating	Comment					
34	Content available (e.g. text, images, video) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	**Moderate**	*Los videos se presentan bien, pero no existe ninguno sobre los talleres, para ver más medios acerca del taller tiene que ser a través de imágenes Google*	5	100%	3	3	5
35	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	**Good**		2	40%	4	1,6	2
36	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	**Excellent**	*Varios idiomas, pero utiliza el traductor de Google, que no es muy adecuado*	4	80%	5	4	4
37	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	**Moderate**	*Utiliza el traductor de Google*	3	60%	3	1,8	3
38	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	**Good**		3	60%	4	2,4	3

Help

39	Online help is provided and is suitable for the user base (e.g. is written in easy to understand langugage and only uses recognised terms). Where appropriate contextual help is provided.	N/A		4	80%	0	0	0
40	Online help is concise, easy to read and written in easy to understand language.	N/A		3	60%	0	0	0
41	Accessing online help does not impede users (i.e. they can can resume work where they left off after accessing help).	N/A		3	60%	0	0	0
42	Users can easily get further help (e.g. telephone or email address).	Excellent	*Whatsapp*	2	40%	5	2	2

Performance

43	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	Moderate	*La página es un poco lenta, podría llegar a tener problemas si existiese saturación*	4	80%	3	2,4	4
44	Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.	Poor	*No puedes volver atrás en los datos de compra si te equivocas en algo*	4	80%	2	1,6	4
45	Possible user configurations (e.g. browsers, resolutions, computer specs) are supported.	Good	*La tienda no soporta lectores oscuros*	3	60%	4	2,4	3

Overall usability score (out of 100) *	65	-	Moderate	5			78,4	120

* Very poor (less than 29) - Users are likely to experience very significant difficulties using this site or system and might not be able to complete a significant number of important tasks.

* Poor (between 29 and 49) - Users are likely to experience some difficulties using this site or system and might not be able to complete some important tasks.

* Moderate (between 49 and 69) - Users should be able to use this site or system and complete most important tasks, however the user experience could be significantly improved.

* Good (between 69 and 89) - Users should be able to use this site or system with relative ease and should be able to complete the vast majority of important tasks.

* Excellent (more than 89) - This site or system provides an excellent user experience for users. Users should be able to complete all important tasks on the site or system.