## Usability review

BioEncasa	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					
1 Features and functionality meet common user goals and objectives.	Excellent				
2 Features and functionality support users desired workflows.	Excellent				
Frequently-used tasks are readily available (e.g. easily accessible from the homepage) and well supported (e.g. short cuts are available).	Excellent				
Users are adequately supported according to their level of expertise (e.g. short cuts for expert users, help and instructions for novice users).	Very poor				
Call to actions (e.g. register, add to basket, submit) are clear, well labelled and appear clickable.	Moderate				
Homepage / starting page					
The Homepage / starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	Excellent				

8		
	The homepage / starting page layout is clear and uncluttered with sufficient 'white space'.	Moderate
Nav	rigation	
9	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	N/A
10	The navigational scheme (e.g. menu) is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	Excellent
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).	Moderate
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.	Good
14	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	N/A

15	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. breadcrumb, highlighted menu item).	Moderate	
16	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	Good	
17	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	Poor	
Sea	urch		
18	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout (where desirable).	Poor	
19	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. multi-parameter, prioritised results, filtering search results).	Moderate	
20	The search facility deals well with common searchs (e.g. showing most popular results), misspellings and abbreviations.	Poor	
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	Good	
Co	ntrol & feedback		
22	Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).	N/A	

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  Vers can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).  Good  Forms  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.  A minimal amount of information is requested and where required
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.  26 A minimal amount of information is requested and where required
<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>A minimal amount of information is requested and where required</li> </ul>
steps and sections. Where a process is used a progress indicator is present with clear numbers or named stages.  A minimal amount of information is requested and where required
justification is given for asking for information (e.g. date of birth, telephone number).
27 Required and optional form fields are clearly indicated.  Poor
Appropriate input fields (e.g. calendar for date selection, drop down for selection) are used and required formats are indicated.  Good
Help and instructions (e.g. examples, information required) are provided where necessary.  Poor
Errors
Errors are clear, easily identifiable and appear in appropriate location (e.g. adjacent to data entry field, adjacent to form, etc.).

31	Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.	Very 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.	Poor
Co	ntent & text	
34	Content available (e.g. text, images, video) is appropriate and sufficiently relevant, and detailed to meet user goals.	Good
35	Links to other useful and relevant content (e.g. related pages or external websites) are available and shown in context.	N/A
36	Language, terminology and tone used is appropriate and readily understood by the target audience.	Excellent
37	Terms, language and tone used are consitent (e.g. the same term is used throughout).	Excellent
38	Text and content is legible and scanable, with good typography and visual contrast.	Excellent

## 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 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).	Excellent		
Per	formance			
43	Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).	Excellent		
44	Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.	Excellent		
45	Possible user configurations (e.g. browsers, resolutions, computer specs)			
	are supported.	Very poor		
		7.0		
	verall usability score (out of 100) *	76	-	Good

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

<sup>\*</sup> 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.