Usability review

[Enter product name]

Score

Comments

Features & functionality

		Score	Comments	Weighting (out of 5)	Weighting ratio	Rating (0 - 5)	Score	Out of
1	Features and functionality meet common user goals and objectives.	Poor	*La promoción de actividades es muy escasa y la revista de eventos queda ocultada por el resto de servicios de la web.*	5	100%	2	2	5
2	Features and functionality support users desired workflows.	Moderate		5	100%	3	3	5
3	Frequently-used tasks are readily available (e.g. easily accessible from the homepage) and well supported (e.g. short cuts are available).	Moderate	*Se encuentran en el menu principal pero no están detalladas*	4	80%	3	2,4	4
4	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	*No dispone de ningún tipo de instrucciones*	3	60%	1	0,6	3
5	Call to actions (e.g. register, add to basket, submit) are clear, well labelled and appear clickable.	Poor	*El botón de login es visible pero no queda claro que es solo requerido para aquellos usuarios que sean promotores de eventos*	3	60%	2	1,2	3

Homepage / starting page

		Score	Comments	Weighting (out of 5)	Weighting ratio	Rating (0 - 5)	Score	Out of
6	The Homepage / starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available.	Very poor	*No, de hecho la página de inicio no refleja los objetivos de la web*	3	60%	1	0,6	3
7	The home page / starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.	Poor	*Solo contiene opiniones, los usuarios se deben guiar por sus instintos y el menú*	4	80%	2	1,6	4
8	The homepage / starting page layout is clear and uncluttered with sufficient 'white space'.	Moderate	*No es muy extensa, pero tampoco es funcional*	3	60%	3	1,8	3

Navigation

		Score	Comments	Weighting (out of 5)	Weighting ratio	Rating (0 - 5)	Score	Out of
9	Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).	Good		2	40%	4	1,6	2

#	Question	Rating	Comment					
10	The navigational scheme (e.g. menu) is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.	Good		4	80%	4	3,2	4
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…).	Good		3	60%	4	2,4	3
12	The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.	Moderate		5	100%	3	3	5
13	Links are clear, descriptive and and well labelled.	Good		3	60%	4	2,4	3
14	Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.	N/A		4	80%	0	0	0
15	The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. breadcrumb, highlighted menu item).	Poor	*Solo por la url*	2	40%	2	0,8	2
16	Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.	Excellent	*El logo y menu forman parte de un header común a todas las páginas por lo que si es fácilmente accesible*	2	40%	5	2	2
17	A clear and well structure site map or index is provided (where necessary).	Very poor	*No hay ningún mapa del sistio ni un índice*	1	20%	1	0,2	1

Search

#	Question	Rating	Comment					
18	A consitent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout (where desirable).	Good	*La busqueda también forma parte del header común por lo que es fácilmente accesible también*	4	80%	4	3,2	4
19	The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. multi-parameter, prioritised results, filtering search results).	Good		4	80%	4	3,2	4
20	The search facility deals well with common searchs (e.g. showing most popular results), misspellings and abbreviations.	Moderate		2	40%	3	1,2	2
21	Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.	Moderate		4	80%	3	2,4	4

Control & feedback

| 22 | Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action). | **Good** | | | 4 | 80% | 4 | 3,2 | 4 |

| 23 | Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before commiting (e.g. before placing an order). | **N/A** | | | 3 | 60% | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| 24 | Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form). | **Excellent** | | | 1 | 20% | 5 | 1 | 1 |

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. | **Moderate** | | | 3 | 60% | 3 | 1,8 | 3 |

| 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). | **Good** | | | 2 | 40% | 4 | 1,6 | 2 |

| 27 | Required and optional form fields are clearly indicated. | **Very poor** | *No hay ninguna marca para los campos obligatorios* | | 2 | 40% | 1 | 0,4 | 2 |

| 28 | Appropriate input fields (e.g. calendar for date selection, drop down for selection) are used and required formats are indicated. | **Good** | | | 3 | 60% | 4 | 2,4 | 3 |

| 29 | Help and instructions (e.g. examples, information required) are provided where necessary. | **Very poor** | | | 3 | 60% | 1 | 0,6 | 3 |

Errors

| 30 | Errors are clear, easily identifiable and appear in appropriate location (e.g. adjacent to data entry field, adjacent to form, etc.). | **Moderate** | | | 4 | 80% | 3 | 2,4 | 4 |

| 31 | Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary. | **Moderate** | | | 3 | 60% | 3 | 1,8 | 3 |

| 32 | Common user errors (e.g. missing fields, invalid formats, invalid selections) have been taken into consideration and where possible prevented. | **Good** | | | 3 | 60% | 4 | 2,4 | 3 |

| 33 | Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors. | **Moderate** | | | 3 | 60% | 3 | 1,8 | 3 |

Content & text

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

Poor

No hay una galeria de fotos de los eventos, únicamente hay una foto en la mayoría de los casos

5	100%	2	2	5

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

Moderate

2	40%	3	1,2	2

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

Good

4	80%	4	3,2	4

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

Good

3	60%	4	2,4	3

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

Poor

En algunos casos el contraste de colores hace dificil distinguir bien el texto y algunas partes importantes como la fecha de lso eventos está en un tono claro

3	60%	2	1,2	3

Help

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

Very poor

No hay ningún tipo de ayuda online directa

4	80%	1	0,8	4

40 Online help is concise, easy to read and written in easy to understand language.

Very poor

3	60%	1	0,6	3

41 Accessing online help does not impede users (i.e. they can can resume work where they left off after accessing help).

Moderate

La unica ayuda online es indirecta a través de whatsapp o formulario de contacto

3	60%	3	1,8	3

42 Users can easily get further help (e.g. telephone or email address).

Good

2	40%	4	1,6	2

Performance

43 Site or application performance doesn't inhibit the user experience (e.g. slow page downloads, long delays).

Good

4	80%	4	3,2	4

44 Errors and reliabilty issues don't inhibit the user experience.

Moderate

4	80%	3	2,4	4

45	Possible user configurations (e.g. browsers, resolutions, computer specs) are supported.	Very poor	No es reponsive el diseño	3	60%	1	0,6	3

Overall usability score (out of 100) *	58	-	Moderate

	5		79,2	137

* 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.

* 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.

* 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.