Usability review

Civitatis	Score			Comments				
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					Weighting (out of 5)	Weighting ratio	Rating (0 - 5)	Score
1 Features and functionality meet common user goals and objectives.	**Excellent**			*Cumple perfectamente las exigencias de los usuarios que visitan esta página, provee las herramientas necesarias para buscar lo que el usuario necesita.*	5	100%	5	500%
2 Features and functionality support users desired workflows.	**Good**				5	100%	4	400%
3 Frequently-used tasks are readily available (e.g. easily accessible from the homepage) and well supported (e.g. short cuts are available).	**Moderate**			*La página está orientada siempre al mismo workflow, hay algunas recomendaciones pero por lo general no se adaptan al usuario que entra en la página.*	4	80%	3	240%
4 Users are adequately supported according to their level of expertise (e.g. short cuts for expert users, help and instructions for novice users).	**Good**			*No hay diferenciación entre usuarios más avanzados y usuarios recién llegados a la página, aunque para estos últimos existe un servicio de atención al cliente 24/7*	3	60%	4	240%
5 Call to actions (e.g. register, add to basket, submit) are clear, well labelled and appear clickable.	**Good**				3	60%	4	240%
Homepage / starting page								
6 The Homepage / starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	**Good**				3	60%	4	240%
7 The home page / starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	**Excellent**			*Lo primero que te aparece es un buscador y debajo tus últimas búsquedas.*	4	80%	5	400%
8 The homepage / starting page layout is clear and uncluttered with sufficient 'white space'.	**Good**			*No está recargada con demasiada información que puede hacer perderse al usuario.*	3	60%	4	240%
Navigation								
9 Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	**Excellent**				2	40%	5	200%
10 The navigational scheme (e.g. menu) is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	**Moderate**			*Son solo iconos y puede ser difícil de entender para ciertos grupos de usuarios.*	4	80%	3	240%

#	Criterion	Rating	Comment			
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…).	**Excellent**		3	60%	5	300%
12	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	**Good**		5	100%	4	400%
13	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	**Good**	*Están bien descritos y no molestan en la experiencia con la web.*	3	60%	4	240%
14	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	**Excellent**		4	80%	5	400%
15	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. breadcrumb, highlighted menu item).	**Excellent**	*La zona donde buscas actividades se indica claramente.*	2	40%	5	200%
16	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	**Good**		2	40%	4	160%
17	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	**Good**	*Cuando buscas tours en una ciudad, en la parte superior te aparece la misma y el país de esta*	1	20%	4	80%

Search

#	Criterion	Rating	Comment			
18	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout (where desirable).	**Excellent**		4	80%	5	400%
19	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. multi-parameter, prioritised results, filtering search results).	**Good**	*Solo puedes buscar por palabras claves o ciudades, aunque después de realizar la busqueda si que permite establecer filtros*	4	80%	4	320%
20	The search facility deals well with common searchs (e.g. showing most popular results), misspellings and abbreviations.	**Good**	*Muestra las ciudades más buscadas*	2	40%	4	160%
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	**Good**		4	80%	4	320%

Control & feedback

#	Criterion	Rating	Comment			
22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	**Good**		4	80%	4	320%
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	240%

		Rating			Notes				
24	Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).	Excellent							
						1	20%	5	100%
Forms									
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.	Good							
						3	60%	4	240%
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).	Excellent			*Se aprecia en el registro de usuarios*				
						2	40%	5	200%
27	Required and optional form fields are clearly indicated.	Good							
						2	40%	4	160%
28	Appropriate input fields (e.g. calendar for date selection, drop down for selection) are used and required formats are indicated.	Excellent			*Se aprecia en la eleccion de fechas*				
						3	60%	5	300%
29	Help and instructions (e.g. examples, information required) are provided where necessary.	Good							
						3	60%	4	240%
Errors									
30	Errors are clear, easily identifiable and appear in appropriate location (e.g. adjacent to data entry field, adjacent to form, etc.).	N/A			*No se han detectado errores*				
						4	80%	0	0%
31	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	N/A			*No se han obtenido errores*				
						3	60%	0	0%
32	Common user errors (e.g. missing fields, invalid formats, invalid selections) have been taken into consideration and where possible prevented.	Good			*Se puede consultar un foro de dudas y errores que han tenido los usuarios*				
						3	60%	4	240%
33	Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.	Excellent			*Sabemos que errores de peticiones se solucionan sin que el usuario las detecte*				
						3	60%	5	300%
Content & text									
34	Content available (e.g. text, images, video) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	Good							
						5	100%	4	400%
35	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	Poor			*Apenas hay páginas externas y si hay más estan muy escondidas*				
						2	40%	2	80%

#	Criteria	Rating			Comments		Score	%	Score2	%2
36	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	**Good**					4	80%	4	320%
37	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	**Good**					3	60%	4	240%
38	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	**Moderate**			*Rosa+blanco no creo que sea la mejor combinacion*		3	60%	3	180%
Help										
39	Online help is provided and is suitable for the user base (e.g. is written in easy to understand languuage and only uses recognised terms). Where appropriate contextual help is provided.	**Good**			*Responde al idioma que le escribas, es posible que si se escribe muy extraño no contesten*		4	80%	4	320%
40	Online help is concise, easy to read and written in easy to understand language.	**Good**					3	60%	4	240%
41	Accessing online help does not impede users (i.e. they can can resume work where they left off after accessing help).	**Excellent**			*Disponibilidad 24/7*		3	60%	5	300%
42	Users can easily get further help (e.g. telephone or email address).	**Excellent**			*Se le pueden contactar en numerosas redes sociales*		2	40%	5	200%
Performance										
43	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	**Excellent**			*La web siempre ha estado disponible y actua con bastante rapidez*		4	80%	5	400%
44	Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.	**Excellent**			*Si se ha logrado hacer sería excelente ya que no es posible darse cuenta de si lo hace*		4	80%	5	400%
45	Possible user configurations (e.g. browsers, resolutions, computer specs) are supported.	**Moderate**			*La página se adapta a los recursos que tenga el usuario, pero no es personalizable*		3	60%	3	180%
Overall usability score (out of 100) *		**84**		**-**	**Good**		5			*11520%*

* 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.

Out of							
500%							
500%							
400%							
300%							
300%							
300%							
400%							
300%							
200%							
400%							

300%						
500%						
300%						
400%						
200%						
200%						
100%						
4						
4						
2						
4						
4						
3						

1							
3							
2							
2							
3							
3							
0							
0							
3							
3							
5							
2							

4						
3						
3						
4						
3						
3						
2						
4						
4						
3						
13700%						