

# Usability review

erranT

Score



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

## Features & functionality

- 1 Features and functionality meet common user goals and objectives.
- 2 Features and functionality support users desired workflows.
- 3 Frequently-used tasks are readily available (e.g. easily accessible from the homepage) and well supported (e.g. short cuts are available).
- 4 Users are adequately supported according to their level of expertise (e.g. short cuts for expert users, help and instructions for novice users).
- 5 Call to actions (e.g. register, add to basket, submit) are clear, well labelled and appear clickable.

Good

Moderate

Good

Good

Excellent

## Homepage / starting page

- 6 The Homepage / starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.

Poor

7 The home page / starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.

**Moderate**

8 The homepage / starting page layout is clear and uncluttered with sufficient 'white space'.

**Good**

## Navigation

9 Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).

**Excellent**

10 The navigational scheme (e.g. menu) is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.

**Moderate**

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...).

**N/A**

12 The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.

**Excellent**

13 Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.

**Excellent**

14 Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.

**Excellent**

15 The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. breadcrumb, highlighted menu item).

**Poor**

16 Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.

Moderate

17 A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).

N/A

## Search

18 A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout (where desirable).

Good

19 The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. multi-parameter, prioritised results, filtering search results).

Very poor

20 The search facility deals well with common searches (e.g. showing most popular results), misspellings and abbreviations.

Very poor

21 Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.

Good

## Control & 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 committing (e.g. before placing an order).

Moderate

- 24 Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).

Excellent

## 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.

N/A

- 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

- 27 Required and optional form fields are clearly indicated.

Moderate

- 28 Appropriate input fields (e.g. calendar for date selection, drop down for selection) are used and required formats are indicated.

N/A

- 29 Help and instructions (e.g. examples, information required) are provided where necessary.

N/A

## Errors

- 30 Errors are clear, easily identifiable and appear in appropriate location (e.g. adjacent to data entry field, adjacent to form, etc.).

Excellent

- 31 Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.

Poor

32 Common user errors (e.g. missing fields, invalid formats, invalid selections) have been taken into consideration and where possible prevented.

N/A

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

N/A

## Content & text

34 Content available (e.g. text, images, video) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.

Poor

35 Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.

Good

36 Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.

Good

37 Terms, language and tone used are consistent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).

Good

38 Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.

Good

## Help

39 Online help is provided and is suitable for the user base (e.g. is written in easy to understand language and only uses recognised terms). Where appropriate contextual help is provided.

N/A

40	Online help is concise, easy to read and written in easy to understand language.	N/A	
41	Accessing online help does not impede users (i.e. they can resume work where they left off after accessing help).	N/A	
42	Users can easily get further help (e.g. telephone or email address).	N/A	

## Performance

43	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	Excellent	
44	Errors and reliability issues don't inhibit the user experience.	Excellent	
45	Possible user configurations (e.g. browsers, resolutions, computer specs) are supported.	Good	

Overall usability score (out of 100) *	74	-
--	----	---

\* Very poor (less than 29) - Users are likely to experience very significant difficulties using this site or system and might not be able to

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

\* Moderate (between 49 and 69) - Users should be able to use this site or system and complete most important tasks, however the u

\* 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 v

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

# Comments

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.

	Weighting (out of 5)	Weighting ratio	Rating (0 - 5)	Score	Out of
	5	100%	4	4	5
No se ha estipulado un flujo de trabajo concreto, pero se asume que el usuario que consume la página buscará precios e información sobre las oficinas antes de contactar con las mismas mediante el formulario de contacto.	5	100%	3	3	5
Las versiones en español e inglés son diferentes. Algo confusas. El menú se mantiene para ambas, así que ese elemento común le da cierta estabilidad a ambas versiones.	4	80%	4	3,2	4
No se expresa información sobre coworking, se considera que ya se sabe.	3	60%	4	2,4	3
Los formularios constan de un botón de dimensiones considerables para enviar.	3	60%	5	3	3
Las versiones en español e inglés varían. La versión en inglés tiene errores en carga de imágenes.	3	60%	2	1,2	3



4 80% 3 2,4 4



3 60% 4 2,4 3



2 40% 5 2 2

*Menú situado en la parte superior de la página. No acompaña al bajar sobre la página, por lo que hace que pierdas el sentido de la navegación a medida que bajas en la página. En la versión móvil pasa igual.*

4 80% 3 2,4 4



3 60% 0 0 0



5 100% 5 5 5



3 60% 5 3 3



4 80% 5 4 4

*Resaltado el ítem en el menú, pero de nuevo se pierde si bajamos en la página.*

2 40% 2 0,8 2





*El logo se sitúa a la izquierda del menú y es de tamaño considerable. Redirige a la página principal. Se pierde con el menú a medida que bajamos la página.*

2 40% 3 1,2 2

*No contiene sitemap ni índice pero no lo considero oportuno teniendo en cuenta la escala de la página.*

1 20% 0 0 0

*Botón de búsqueda algo pequeño, situado en la parte superior de la página.*

4 80% 4 3,2 4

*No contiene filtros adicionales. Tampoco especifica sobre qué se va a hacer la búsqueda.*

4 80% 1 0,8 4

*No se gestiona.*

2 40% 1 0,4 2

4 80% 4 3,2 4

4 80% 4 3,2 4

*No se ofrece opción de confirmación al completar el formulario de contacto.*

3 60% 3 1,8 3

Formulario de contacto disponible en la mayoría de páginas.

1 20% 5 1 1

Se requiere de poca información, básica, para enviar un formulario.

2 40% 5 2 2

Sólo te indica cuando presionar el botón de enviar y te has dejado un campo sin rellenar. No hay elementos visuales previos que te indiquen que un campo es obligatorio.

2 40% 3 1,2 2

3 60% 0 0 0

3 60% 0 0 0

4 80% 5 4 4

Los errores referentes al formulario se muestran siempre en inglés, independientemente de que tengamos seleccionado como idioma el español.

3 60% 2 1,2 3

3 60% 0 0 0

3 60% 0 0 0

*La versión en inglés tiene varios fallos con imágenes*

5 100% 2 2 5

*Redes sociales generalmente.*

2 40% 4 1,6 2

4 80% 4 3,2 4

3 60% 4 2,4 3

3 60% 4 2,4 3

*No aplica al no tener formularios críticos (registro, inicio de sesión, compra de artículos...)*

4 80% 0 0 0

No aplica al no tener formularios críticos (registro, inicio de sesión, compra de artículos...)

3 60% 0 0 0

No aplica al no tener formularios críticos (registro, inicio de sesión, compra de artículos...)

3 60% 0 0 0

No aplica al no tener formularios críticos (registro, inicio de sesión, compra de artículos...)

2 40% 0 0 0

4 80% 5 4 4

4 80% 5 4 4

Interfaz móvil mejorable.

3 60% 4 2,4 3

Good

5 84 113

o complete a significant number of important tasks.  
ete some important tasks.  
ser experience could be significantly improved.  
rast majority of important tasks.  
l important tasks on the site or system.