[Name of Web Application/Site] Test

[Name of Report Writer]

[Report Date]

Table of Contents

[insert Table of Contents]

Introduction

[Include and introduction about the Web site or application and the purpose of the site.]
For example:
AIDS.gov serves as an information gateway to drive traffic to Federal domestic HIV/AIDS information and resources. AIDS.gov provides a central repository of information across government resources providing users easy access to federal information resources.

A usability test is intended to determine the extent an interface facilitates a user's ability to complete routine tasks. Typically the test is conducted with a group of potential users either in a usability lab, remotely (using e-meeting software and telephone connection), or on-site with portable equipment. Users are asked to complete a series of routine tasks. Sessions are recorded and analyzed to identify potential areas for improvement to the web site.

[Provide a summary about who conducted the test and what they used. Include a brief summary about the session data.]
For example:
The AIDS.gov usability engineers conducted an onsite usability test using a live version of AIDS.gov located on the test administrator's laptop. Two laptops using Morae software captured the participant's face, comments, navigation choices and the data logger's notes. The test administrator and data logger were present in the testing room. The session captured each participant's navigational choices, task completion rates, comments, overall satisfaction ratings, questions and feedback.

Executive Summary

[The Executive Summary should describe when and where the usability test took place. Describe the purpose of the test. Include the number of participants and the length of the sessions. Provide any additional information about the test.

Provide a brief overview of the results. Include a glimpse of the overall ease of use and some of the participant demographic information. Provide a bulleted list of the problems.

Provide a paragraph describing what is included in the document.]
For example:
The AIDS.gov project team conducted an onsite usability test at the HIV Prevention Leadership Conference (HPLA) in New Orleans on May 21st and May 22nd, 2007. HPLA is the country's largest HIV/AIDS prevention conference. The purpose of the test was to assess the usability of the web interface design, information flow, and information architecture.

Seven conference attendees participated in Test 1 and six in Test 2. Typically, a total of eight to 10 participants are involved in a usability test to ensure stable results. Each individual session lasted approximately one hour. Test scenarios differed over the two test days to meet OMB guidelines.

In general all participants found the AIDS.gov web site to be clear, straightforward, and 92% thought the web site was easy to use. Ten of the 13 participants (77%) used federal government web sites at least once a month to find HIV/AIDS information.

The test identified only a few minor problems including:

- The lack of categorization of topics on the funding pages.
- Confusion over apparent duplicative treatment and care information.
- Lack of a fact sheet/brochure category section.
- Lack of HIPAA category section.
- Lack of a Mental Health category section.
- Lack of a site index.
- Lack of any categorization of news items on the news page.
- Lack of a section for HIV+ data (e.g., number of individuals infected)

This document contains the participant feedback, satisfactions ratings, task completion rates, ease or difficulty of completion ratings, time on task, errors, and recommendations for improvements. A copy of the scenarios and questionnaires are included in the Attachments' section.

Methodology

Sessions
[Describe how the participants were recruited. Describe the individual sessions – length of time and what happened during those sessions. Explain what the participant was asked to do and what happened post test session. Describe any pre- or post-test questionnaires. Include the subjective and overall questionnaires in the attachments' section.]

For example:
The test administrator contacted and recruited participants via AIDS.gov from the HPLA conference attendee list. The test administrator sent e-mails to attendees informing them of the test logistics and requesting their availability and participation. Participants responded with an appropriate date and time. Each individual session lasted approximately one hour. During the session, the test administrator explained the test session and asked the participant to fill out a brief background questionnaire (see Attachment A). Participants read the task scenarios and tried to find the information on the website.

After each task, the administrator asked the participant to rate the interface on a 5-point Likert Scale with measures ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Post-task scenario subjective measures included (see Attachment B):

- How easy it was to find the information from the home page.
- Ability to keep track of their location in the website.
- Accurateness of predicting which section of the website contained the information.

After the last task was completed, the test administrator asked the participant to rate the website overall by using a 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) for eight subjective measures including:

- Ease of use
- Frequency of use
- Difficulty to keep track of location in website
- Learn ability - how easy it would be for most users to learn to use the website
- Information facilitation – how quickly participant could find information
- Look & feel appeal – homepage's content makes me want to explore the site further
- Site content – site's content would keep me coming back
- Site organization

In addition, the test administrator asked the participants the following overall website questions:

- What the participant liked most.
- What the participant liked least.
- Recommendations for improvement.

See Attachment C for the subjective and overall questionnaires.

Participants
[Provide a description of the participants. Include the number of participants, dates and the number of participants on each testing day.

Provide a summary of the results from the demographic/background questionnaire and display this information in a table.]

For example:
All participants were attendees at the HPLA Conference and HIV/AIDS community professionals.
Sixteen participants were scheduled over the two testing dates. Thirteen of the sixteen participants completed the test. Seven participants were involved in testing on May 21st and six on May 22nd. Of the thirteen participants, six were male and seven were female.

Role in HIV/AIDS Community
Participants selected their role in the HIV/AIDS community from a general list. Roles included Federal Agencies, State and Public Health Departments, grantees, and research institutions. Some participants were involved in multiple roles.

Example of table

Role

Federal Staff/Agency	State / Public Health Department	Federal Grantee	Medical Institution	Research Institution	* Other Organization
1	3	2	-	2	7

Evaluation Tasks/Scenarios
[Explain who created the task scenarios. Display the task titles in a bulleted list.]

For Example
Test participants attempted completion of the following tasks (see Attachment D for complete test scenarios/tasks and each participant completed a self-directed task (i.e., a task of their choice) :
- Find a news item about transitional housing in NYC.
- Find federal funding for organizations.
- Find HIV/AIDS positive in-home treatment information.
- Find HIPAA information.
- Find National HIV Testing Day date.
- Find HIV+ veterans brochures.

Results

Task Completion Success Rate
[Explain who recorded the participant's ability to complete the tasks without prompting. The task success rate is the number of successes divided by the number of participants completing the task.

Describe the results by: explaining any task that had 100% completion rates. Follow this with the tasks that had the next highest completion rates. Then describe the tasks with the poor completion rates. Display the task completion rates in a table that shows the participant by task completion rates and the mean rate across task (see example table).]

For example:
All participants successfully completed Task 1 (find a news item). Six of the seven (86%) completed Task 5 (find HIV Testing Day). Approximately half (57%) of participants were able to complete Task 4 (find HIPAA information) and 29% were able to complete Task 2 (find funding information). None of the participants were able to complete Task 6 which required them to find brochures for VA providers and patients.

Task Completion Rates

Participant	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6
1	√	-	√	-	√	-
2	√	-	√	√	√	-
3	√	√	√	√	√	-
4	√	√	√	√	√	-
5	√	-	-	-	√	-
6	√	-	-	√	√	-
Success	7	2	5	4	6	0
Completion Rates	100%	29%	71%	57%	86%	0%

Task Ratings

After the completion of each task, participants rated the ease or difficult of completing the task for three factors:

- It was easy to find my way to this information from the homepage.
- As I was searching for this information, I was able to keep track of where I was in the website.
- I was able to accurately predict which section of the website contained this information.

The 5-point rating scale ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Agree ratings are the agree and strongly agree ratings combined with a mean agreement ratings of > 4.0 considered as the user agrees that the information was easy to find, that they could keep track of their location and predict the section to find the information.

Ease in Finding Information
[Describe the results for this rating variable. Begin with the highest mean rating tasks followed by the lowest mean rating tasks.]

For example:
All participants agreed it was easy to find treatment information (mean agreement rating = 4.7) and 86% found it easy to find the HIV Testing day (mean agreement rating = 4.3). Only 29% of participants found it easy to find brochures (mean agreement rating = 2.4) and only 43% found it easy to find funding information (mean agreement rating = 2.9).

Keeping Track of Location in Site
[Describe the results for this rating variable. Begin with the highest mean rating tasks followed by the lowest mean rating tasks.]

For example:
All the participants found it easy to keep track of their location in the site while finding treatment information (mean agreement rating = 4.7) and finding the HIV Testing Day (mean agreement rating = 4.7). In addition, 86% found it easy to keep track of their location while finding a news item (mean agreement rating = 4.0). However, only 67% of participants found it easy to keep track of their location while finding brochures (mean agreement rating = 2.9).

Predicting Information Section
[Describe the results for this rating variable. Begin with the highest mean rating tasks followed by the lowest mean rating tasks.]

For example:
All the participants agreed it was easy to predict where to find treatment information (mean agreement rating = 4.7) and 85% agreed it was easy to predict where to find HIV Testing day information (mean agreement rating = 4.6). However, only 29% agreed that it was easy to predict where to find

brochures (mean agreement rating = 2.3) and only 44% agreed they could predict where to find funding information (mean agreement rating = 2.6).

[Display the results in a table (see example tabular display).]

Test 1 – Mean Task Ratings & Percent Agree

Task	Ease – Finding Info	Location in Site	Predict Section	Overall
1 – Find News Item	3.6 (57%)	4.0 (86%)	3.0 (29%)	3.5
2 – Obtain Funding	2.9 (43%)	3.9 (72%)	2.6 (44%)	2.9
3 – Find Treatment Info	4.7 (100%)	4.7 (100%)	4.7 (100%)	4.7
4 – Find FAQ (HIPAA)	3.6 (57%)	3.3 (83%)	3.3 (57%)	3.6
5 – Find Testing Day	4.3 (86%)	4.7 (100%)	4.6 (86%)	4.5
6 – Find Brochures	2.4 (29%)	2.9 (67%)	2.3 (29%)	2.7

Percent Agree (%) = Agree & Strongly Agree Responses combined

Time on Task
The testing software recorded the time on task for each participant. Some tasks were inherently more difficult to complete than others and is reflected by the average time on task.

[Provide a task by task description – include the task title or goal and the mean time to complete. Provide the range of completion times.]

For example:
Task 6 required participants to find brochures and took the longest time to complete (mean = 210 seconds). However, completion times ranged from 110 (approximately 2 minutes) to 465 seconds (more than 7 minutes) with most times less than 200 seconds (less than 4 minutes).

[Display the time data in participant by task table and include the mean total time by task.]

For example:
Time on Task

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	Avg. TOT*
Task 1	65	95	61	**310**	210	71	50	123.1
Task 2	130	**370**	50	200	110	55	**390**	**186.4**
Task 3	20	215	15	80	120	30	35	73.6
Task 4	150	65	55	150	180	67	240	129.6
Task 5	43	127	29	60	79	30	115	69.0
Task 6	146	110	120	**465**	130	175	**325**	**210.1**

Errors

[Insert who captured the errors here] captured the number of errors participants made while trying to complete the task scenarios.

[Describe the task in which participants made the most errors. Describe any tasks that were made without a non-critical error. Provide the results in a table showing number of errors by participant and task.] A non-critical error is an error that does not prevent successful completion of the scenario.

Summary of Data

The table below displays a summary of the test data. Low completion rates and satisfaction ratings and high errors and time on tasks are highlighted in red.

For example:

Summary of Completion, Errors, Time on Task, Mean Satisfaction

Task	Task Completion	Errors	Time on Task	Satisfaction*
1	7	4	123	3.52
2	2	10	186	2.90
3	5	2	74	4.70
4	4	9	130	3.57
5	6	3	69	4.52
6	0	14	210	2.67

* Satisfaction = Mean combined rating across three post-task measures: ease of finding the information, ability to keep track of location in site, and site information prediction accuracy.

Overall Metrics

Overall Ratings

After task session completion, participants rated the site for eight overall measures (See Attachment insert attachment letter here). These measures include:

- Ease of use
- Frequency of use
- Difficulty of keeping track of where they were in the site
- How quickly most people would learn to use the site
- Getting information quickly
- Homepage's content facilities exploration
- Relevancy of site content
- Site organization

[Describe the highest percent of 'agreed' satisfaction ratings first. Combine the strongly agree and agreed ratings into an agreed ratings. Then describe the variables that received the lowest satisfaction ratings. Display the results in a table]

For example:
Most of the participants (92%) agreed (i.e., agree or strongly agree) that the website was easy to use. The majority of participants (85%) agreed they would use the site frequently and that the site's content would keep them coming back. Even though participants' average agreement rating was 3.9,

only 54% (due to 5 neutral and 5 strongly agree responses) agreed that the homepage's content would make them want to explore the site.

See table below.

Post-Task Overall Questionnaire

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean Rating	Percent Agree
Thought Website was easy to use			1	12		3.9	92%
Would use website frequently			2	6	5	4.2	85%
Found it difficult to keep track of where they were in website	3	6	3	1		2.1	8%
Thought most people would learn to use website quickly			5	8		3.6	62%
Can get information quickly		1	2	8	2	3.9	77%
Homepage's content makes me want to explore site		1	5	2	5	3.9	54%
Site's content would keep me coming back			2	6	5	4.2	85%
Website is well organized			5	6	2	3.8	62%

*Percent Agree (%) = Agree & Strongly Agree Responses combined

4.6.2 Likes, Dislikes, Participant Recommendations
Upon completion of the tasks, participants provided feedback for what they liked most and least about the website, and recommendations for improving the website.

Liked Most
The following comments capture what the participants liked most:
[insert liked most comments here]

Liked Least
The following comments capture what the participants liked the least:
[insert liked least comments here]

Recommendations for Improvement
[insert recommendations here]

Recommendations
The recommendations section provides recommended changes and justifications driven by the participant success rate, behaviors, and comments. Each recommendation includes a severity rating. The following recommendations will improve the overall ease of use and address the areas

where participants experienced problems or found the interface/information architecture unclear.

[Provide the task title and an overview of the task. In a table, present the change, justification for the change and the severity rating for the change. Do this for each recommendation]

For example:

Find Organizational or Individual Funding Information (Task 2)
Task 2 required participants to find organization funding (Test 1) or individual funding (Test 2).

Change	Justification	Severity
• Add categories to funding pages. • Add additional descriptive text on funding Opportunities home page.	Participants across both tests rated the ease of finding funding information with 2.9 (out of 5) and only 38% agreed that it was easy to find funding information. Funding information is not categorized and requires users to read through all the funding opportunities to find one of interest. Participant comments also included categorizing funding in a more concise manner so it is easier to find.	High

Conclusion

[Provide a short conclusion paragraph. Begin with an overall statement of what the participants found and what is key about the Web site/application]. Implementing the recommendations and continuing to work with users (i.e., real lay persons) will ensure a continued user-centered website.

For example:

Most of the participants found AIDS.gov to be well-organized, comprehensive, clean and uncluttered, very useful, and easy to use. Having a centralized site to find information is key to many if not all of the participants. Implementing the recommendations and continuing to work with users (i.e., real lay persons) will ensure a continued user-centered website.

[Add Attachments. Attachments may include: Attachment A – Background Questionnaire, Attachment B – Post-Task Questionnaire, Attachment C – Post-session Overall Subjective Questionnaire, Attachment D – Task Scenarios]