**Past Grants UX**

Part 1 – Heuristics (revisited)

**Summary**

On review of my initial heuristic analysis in light of additional research channels, I recommend the following to improve the overall experience of using this tool.

* Update title to offer better orientation and expectation. Explore information architecture and terminology.
* Update intro text to provide more clarity and timely helpfulness. Improve optimism of message and remove reference to WIP. Take the opportunity to define what is meant by; grants, awards, funding, programmes, projects
* Include search box when improving language and IA
* Improve IA and organisation of search result item by grouping types of information more logically, labelling more instructively and managing expectations where drilldown is not deliverable
* Include filter tool in IA improvements, ensuring categories have consistent internal logic, add Active as a filter
* Improving information architecture across these areas

Part 2 – Hotjar

**Summary**

Heatmap and mouse movement recording suggest that the vast majority of visitors are using the tool as intended. User activity is focused around running searches, adjusting filters and scrolling down to read the results. Hot areas that suggest potential improvement are:

* GrantNav link may not be as relevant as it was previously and could be de-prioritised
* ‘Active’ flag on result items misleadingly looks like a button and might best be indicated differently. Also, could be linked to Active filter mentioned above
* Of 6k pageviews there were only 450 searches. It is a little mysterious but could suggest simply that visitors are more often navigating without searching which could also happen following the initial search. I will try to address this question with Google Analytics.

Part 3 – Feedback

**Summary**

I managed to increase the data set from 15 to 47 by including drilldowns in the search. Comments can be grouped primarily into two groups.

**Group A** are generally looking for some specific information; a certain project, details about a project or other personal information. Much of the information will be unavailable or may also be inappropriate to share, but we do currently suggest that details are available.

* This should be addressed by improving available information and managing expectations.

**Group B** are looking for funding for an area of interest. There is some confusion about what a grant is, with many expecting to find a grant for their area of interest available to apply for.

* Terminology should be clarified and IA reviewed for consistency and intuitiveness.

There is also a third group of visitors that are properly confused about where they are, but indifferent ways. They may think we are offering training, or they are looking for a list of winners, or they think they are on a gaming site.

* Improved orienting text and IA could help, but no additional response is recommended due to the variety of confusion.

Part 4 – Google Analytics

**Summary**

CCSF opening resulted in a huge spike in general traffic, but there was little noticeable affect for the past grants page. There was no spike and only modest build towards the launch and afterwards. The reason for the disconnect is not clear, but it could suggest that applicants felt they knew enough to complete the CCSF applications because it has a narrowly focused remit.

In fact, the visits to Past grants fell significantly at 30 March and remained down from the beginning of June. Hypothesis: I might speculate that CCSF narrowed the range of possibilities and thereby the need for research, or this may be linked to an overall reduction in users considering funding (visits to <>10k appear to maintain levels).

We should ask ourselves if there is anything that could bring other application journeys closer to this level of simplicity, clarity and confidence for users.

* Are some visitors discounting themselves if they do not find reassuring matches in Past grants?
* Should Past grants be helping visitors to find their way to applying for funding?
* Is Past grants passive approach appropriate?
* Answers to these questions may suggest that the Funding programme should be highlighted more prominently.

**Behaviour flow**

Of 206K visitors to Past grants (between Aug 2019 and Aug 2020):

68K came from another page on the site

* 40K of which were related to funding

64K continued to another page

* 35K of which were related to funding
* 8.8K returned to grants again
* And 22.6K to either over/under 10K or programmes

These numbers indicate that finding funding is a significant interest for users visiting Past grants.

* I therefore recommend that we make this purpose central to any improvements.

Morning Colin. It's really great to see past grants getting the love it deserves!

I'll have a proper read through today.

With regards to the IA research, I don't think we've got anything that deep. We did some site-wide IA but that won't really help here. There might possibly be some research somewhere about the terms we use (grants, awards, funding etc) but if there is, it'll probably be scattered and need analysing. It's probably worth you thinking about what you'd like to test and how you might go about it. Happy to offer feedback/thoughts if you need it. The URs are stacked at the moment so I doubt they'd have capacity to help but they have done a fair amount of remote testing recently so we could always pick their brains.

The level of detail has always been tricky. We're limited to what info the comms guys (I believe, but it could be FOs) added to FMS and now GMS.

We are able to add more info though by attaching case studies to the entries (like this - <https://www.tnlcommunityfund.org.uk/funding/grants/0031052971>). Then we're able to put as much info in that first box as we'd want. It's just the fact that it's a manual test and is left mostly to Hannah Lewis and co

**[24/09 16:31] Lynsey Reynolds**

Sorry I'm late looking at your doc about past grants. It's GREAT, like really great!

There's some really good points on there that feel like no brainers e.g. the active label looks too much like a button. They'd be good to work up in your designs.

Great questions, like whether past grants should link people to appropriate funding programmes. They absolutely should and it's not always working like that right now. There's also the opportunity to embed past grants entries into funding programme pages more often. We have this functionality but we just don't use it! It might help customers decide if a funding programme is for them though.

Testing goals:

* What do visitors understand “Grants” to mean?
* Is Grants the best label for this page/tool, and Past grants the best title?
* What words would visitors use to describe their goals or what there are trying to accomplish/find

I would also want to understand and ambitiously to narrow down what terms/words we use internally

Would it be beneficial to explicitly or implicitly define the terms in relation to the Fund?

Other Questions:

* What information can/should we publish about projects and grants