WEBSITE BENCHMARKING

## SITE NAME: Yosemite Mariposa County Tourism Bureau

URL:  https://www.yosemite.com/

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ELEMENT | CRITERIA | SCORE  [give a numeric score 0 – 5 for each criterion;  each bullet point is a single criterion] | COMMENTS  [ if you write short comments in this column while analysing each criterion it will help you to explain your findings at the end in the Summary] |
| Home page. | * How informative is the home page? * Does it set the proper context for visitors? * Is it just an annoying splash page with multimedia? How fast does it load? | * 4 * 4 * 4 | * Very informative – provides many options. * Yes – colours are representative of the area/culture. * Loads well, informative. |
| Navigation. | * Is the global navigation consistent from page to page? * Do major sections have local navigation? * Is it consistent? | * 5 * 5 * 4 | * Yes. * Yes. * Mostly. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site organization (Information Architecture). | * Is the site organization intuitive and easy to understand? | * 4 | * Easy to understand. Categorised well. Perhaps too much information in some sections. |
| Links and labels. | * Are labels on section headers and content groupings easy to understand? * Are links easy to distinguish from each other? Or are they ambiguous and uninformative ("click here" or "white paper")? * Are links spread out in documents, or gathered conveniently in sidebars or other groupings? | * 5 * 5 * 5 | * Yes – pictures used to reinforce the message. * Easy to distinguish. Rollover used extensively. * Spread out – but this does not seem to detract from the organisation of the information. |
| Search and search results. | * Is the search engine easy to use? * Are there basic and advanced search functions? * What about search results? * Are they organized and easy to understand? * Do they give relevance weightings or provide context? * Do the search results remind you what you searched for? | * 4 * 2 * 4 * 4 * 0 * 5 | * Yes – supports Boolean searches. Search icon could be better designed. * No advanced search functions. * Only displayed as a list. No ordering. * Understandable. * None. * Yes – search criteria displayed. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Readability. | * Is the font easy to read? * Are line lengths acceptable? * Is the site easy to scan, with chunked information, or is it just solid blocks of text? | * 3 * 4 * 4 | * Uses serif fonts for headings – detracts from readability. * Data well encapsulated. * Interesting content – mixture of text and images. |
| Performance. | * Overall, do pages load slowly or quickly? * Are graphics and applications like search and multimedia presentations optimized for easy Web viewing? | * 5 * 4 | * Load quickly. * Optimised for mobile viewing. |
| Content. | * Is there sufficient depth and breadth of content offerings? * Does the content seem to match the mission of the organization and the needs of the audience? * Is the site developing its own content or syndicating other sources? | * 4 * 5 * 5 | * Content for most potential visitors. * Yes – encourages visitors to explore the park and surrounds. * Develops own content. |
| TOTAL [add all criteria scores] | | 98 /120 | |

## Summary:

The site rates well for navigation links and labels. Information architecture is consistent with World Wide Web Consortium standards, but some pages offer a lot of information which can overload the user. Search facilities are limited but seem to be suited to a site such as this where users are looking for a simple summary. The content loads quickly and utilises responsive design which translates well to mobile browsers. The overall colour scheme is quite unique and seems to reflect the natural environment. Overall the site is usable and suited to purpose.