

Website Evaluation Form

Instructions for use:

This form is intended to serve as a starting point for the form you will distribute to your web site evaluators.

Before you distribute this form to your evaluators, you should complete Section I General Information with the URL of your web site and your name.

I. General Information

1. URL of site evaluated:
https://krhenuber.github.io/pilotwebsite/homepage.html_____
2. Author of site evaluated: _Kaitlyn Henuber_____
3. Evaluator's first name:_____Jill_____

II. Web site was evaluated on the following system

1. Type of computer (Provide as much information as possible, i.e., Sony PC running Windows 7, Intel Pentium 4 , 2.80 GHz, 4 MB RAM):
Macbook Air
2. Browser (e.g., Internet Explorer 10.0, Safari 7.0)
Google Chrome
3. Internet connection (e.g., cable modem, DSL, corporate or institutional):
Cable Modem

III Design and Development

Instruction: For each of the questions below, rate your answer between one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree), and **explain your rating for the clarification**. Please take the time to explain your rationale in this form as it will help me write my Evaluation Report.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
DESIGN					
1. Document is subdivided into logical supporting pages or, if presented as a single page, it offers a table of contents with section links to avoid scrolling through entire document. <u>Please explain your feedback</u> Each page is different and makes sense why it is where it is for the concept of the website	1	2	3	4	5
2. The site displays sound design principles, including uncluttered space, subdued backgrounds, and coordinated colors. <u>Please explain your feedback</u> Design is simple but effective.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Navigation is intuitive, easy to understand, and provides flexibility in movement. <u>Please explain your feedback</u> Navigation is easy to use and always at the top	1	2	3	4	5
4. Homepage is linked from all subsequent pages. <u>Please explain your feedback</u> Can easily click on the home page and get back.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Multimedia elements have a clear purpose. <u>Please explain your feedback</u> There is only a picture and it is not really doing anything, there could be a better item to put there	1	2	3	4	5
6. Multimedia elements load quickly or file size is indicated with user option to download. <u>Please explain your feedback</u> Even though there isn't much it isn't a massive file	1	2	3	4	5
7. Images include alt, height, and width attributes and offer initial thumbnail graphic if file size is large. <u>Please explain your feedback</u> It isn't a huge file, but there is only one.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Text is easy to read and contrasts with background. <u>Please explain your feedback</u> No problems with text, it is easy to read against the background	1	2	3	4	5
9. Site content is widely accessible or appropriate adaptations or explanations have been made. <u>Please explain your feedback</u> For the concept, it is not. But there may be ways to make it comprehensive for another idea in the end.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
CONTENT					
1. Pages have clear and appropriate title in title bar.	1	2	3	4	5

Please explain your feedback

All the pages make sense, and are easy to access

2. Links are appropriate, clearly labeled, and have a definite purpose.	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

Please explain your feedback

None seem to be out of place and are easy to reach.

3. Links are up-to-date and functional.	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

Please explain your feedback

There don't seem to be any external links, but all of the internal links work.

4. Useful content is embedded no further than two layers deep.	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Please explain your feedback

This is very surface level work, so nothing is buried.

5. Site contains in-depth content that encourages users to return.	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Please explain your feedback

While the concept was nice, there is nothing backing it up. There could easily be fix if the concept is updated to be more substantive and interesting.

6. Information is accurate and current.	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

Please explain your feedback

Don't think this applies very well

7. Site stimulates thinking and reflection or serves a useful purpose for an identified audience.	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

Please explain your feedback

If updated this website could be incredibly useful, it just needs a new concept.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
CREDIBILITY					
1. Credibility is established by including information regarding author, affiliations, and credentials.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Please explain your feedback</u> I don't see anything that looks like it credits anyone					
2. Contact person with e-mail address is included.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Please explain your feedback</u> Nothing is shown					
3. Site is bias-free or explicitly states point of view.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Please explain your feedback</u> Nothing seems to be biased in anyway					
4. Material is original or includes appropriate citations with no copyright infringement.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Please explain your feedback</u> Everything looks to be made by the author					
5. Correct punctuation, spelling, and grammar indicate care and attention to detail.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Please explain your feedback</u> There are a few mistakes here and there, but nothing terribly outstanding to deter readers.					
6. Site indicates date(s) that material was created or updated.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Please explain your feedback</u> I don't think there is anything like that on here.					