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# **Abstract**

This document presents a comprehensive Unicef's website usability evaluation. Drawing upon established heuristic evaluation frameworks by Nielsen and Mile, the assessment aims to identify usability strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. The document analyzes various website pages, focusing on navigation, consistency, error prevention, and user satisfaction.

The website is undergoing systematic assessment against predefined usability principles; this phase facilitates the identification of usability issues, providing quantitative ratings to gauge overall usability performance. Subsequently, user testing is conducted to complement findings from the heuristic evaluation. Tasks have been designed to simulate generic user interactions to validate usability issues and explore user preferences.

These evaluations are described in the following report detailing identified usability issues, their severity levels, and recommended improvements. By synthesizing findings from both heuristic evaluation and user testing, the report offers actionable insights to enhance the experience of the website.

The potential of this document is to inform website designers, developers, and stakeholders about usability strengths and weaknesses. Website owners can optimize user interaction, satisfaction, and task completion rates.
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# **Introduction**

## Purpose and Scope

This document serves to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the usability of the website, outlining the main activities conducted and the desired outcomes. It aims to identify usability issues and propose redesign solutions for improved user experience. The report targets the general manager and design manager, offering clear insights into problems and their severity, supported by relevant examples.

## Reference Documents

* Unicef’s website: <https://www.unicef.org/>
* USABILITY Projects HYP 2023-24
* Course slide on WeeBeep

## Document structure

The structure of this document follows five main sections:

1. **Introduction:** presents the purpose and scope of the document, and also references the pertinent documents used in the analysis. Additionally, it provides a brief overview of the document's structure, giving readers a preview of the topics covered in subsequent chapters.
2. **Inspection**: provides a detailed account of the usability evaluation process for the website. It begins with an overview of the heuristics utilized, proceeds to describe the organization of the analysis conducted by the team, and presents the obtained results. These results are represented through tabulated data, highlighting the scores obtained for each heuristic. Finally, the chapter concludes with an in-depth analysis and commentary on the emerged results.
3. **User Testing:**
4. **Conclusion:**
5. **Annex:**
6. **Effort Spent**: keeps track of the time spent to complete the whole project including code and documentation. There is a table for the work done by the team and the others contain the effort spent by each team member.

# **Inspection**



## Method

In our analysis, we relied on usability evaluation heuristics to assess the website. Usability heuristics are guidelines or principles used to evaluate user interfaces. We primarily utilized two prominent heuristics, namely Nielsen's heuristics and Mile's heuristics, to evaluate the website's usability aspects.

### Nielsen

Nielsen's heuristics consist of ten key principles:

* *Visibility of system status*:

Ensure users are promptly informed of system activities through clear feedback.

* *Match between system and the real world*:

Make sure the system employs language and concepts familiar to users.

* *User control and freedom*:

Provide users with an easy way to backtrack or exit undesirable actions without hassle.

* *Consistency and standards*:

Maintain uniformity across the interface to avoid confusion regarding terminology and actions.

* *Error prevention*:

Design the system to proactively prevent errors, rather than relying solely on error messages.

* *Recognition rather than recall*:

Minimize the need for users to remember information by keeping relevant options visible.

* *Flexibility and efficiency of use*:

Implement shortcuts or hidden features to expedite interaction for experienced users.

* *Aesthetic and minimalist design*:

Streamline dialogues by excluding unnecessary or rarely used information.

* *Help users recognize, diagnose, and recover from errors*:

Present error messages in plain language, clearly identifying issues and offering solutions.

* *Help and documentation*:

While aiming for intuitive usability, provide supplementary help materials when necessary.

* 1. Mile

Mile's heuristics focus on three main aspects:

* *Navigation / Interaction*:

This aspect ensures consistent navigation and interaction within the website's interface, assessing ease of movement between pages, groups of items, and components. It also evaluates semantic navigation for accessibility and the effectiveness of landmarks in guiding users to key sections.

* *Content*:

This aspect evaluates content quality, balance, and organization on the website, ensuring users aren't overwhelmed. It examines consistency in presenting similar topics across pages and provides contextual information for user understanding. It also assesses hierarchical topic organization for logical navigation.

* *Presentation*:

This aspect evaluates website design for readability, intuitive interaction, consistency, and logical content grouping to ensure a cohesive user experience.



## Study design

This section outlines the organization of the website analysis, following the defined steps:

1. Definition of Heuristics: The team collectively decided to utilize the Nielsen and Mile heuristics for the analysis, omitting additional ones deemed unnecessary for the website.
2. Metrics Definition: Scores ranging from 0 to 10 were established to evaluate each aspect, where 0 indicates non-compliance, 5 partial compliance, and 10 full compliance. "NU" was used if the heuristic was not applicable to the website.
3. Inspection Sheet Preparation: An inspection sheet was created, incorporating all selected heuristics in a table format for use by all evaluators.
4. General Process Definition: Specific guidelines were set, including the selection of minimum pages for inspection and the minimum time allocated for inspection.
5. Inspection Execution: Evaluators individually conducted inspections using the prepared inspection sheet.
6. Results Discussion: Evaluation data from individual inspections were collaboratively reviewed to reach a consensus on comments and scores, which may not necessarily be the average of individual scores.
7. Material Organization and Reporting: Finally, all evaluation materials were organized, and the results were reported as outlined in the document structure. This involved active collaboration among team members to compile and present the findings effectively.

## Study execution

### Execution

### Data

<Tabella>

## Results

### Analysis

# **User Testing**
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## Usability Evaluation VS. User Testing

## Suggestions for Improvements

### Problems

### Suggestions

## Observations
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## Inspection

### Fabiana Marino

### Tommaso Pasini

### Dario Tedesco

## User Testing

### User’s survey

# **Effort Spent**

Team

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Time** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Fabiana Marino

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Time** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Tommaso Pasini

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Time** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Dario Tedesco

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Time** |
|  |  |
|  |  |