Classwork: Website Usability Evaluation Assignment

Published | Assign To | Edit | ⋮

Objective:
The goal of this assignment is to evaluate the usability and design of three different websites using a usability evaluation tool. You will perform a comparative analysis of the designs, focusing on aspects such as navigation, layout, accessibility, and user experience.

Websites to Evaluate:

1. **Craig (Craigslist)** – https://www.craigslist.org (https://www.craigslist.org/)
2. **Virginia Tech Official Website** – https://www.vt.edu (https://www.vt.edu/)
3. **Kroger's Online Store** – https://www.kroger.com (https://www.kroger.com/)

Tool:

Use Google PageSpeed Insights (https://pagespeed.web.dev/) usability evaluation tool to assess these websites based on their **design**, **performance**, and **accessibility**.

Instructions:

1. **Use this template:** Website Usability Evaluation Report Template-1-1.docx (https://canvas.vt.edu/courses/204793/files/38843400?wrap=1)
2. **Evaluate the Websites:**
   - By using the evaluation tool to assess each of the three websites.
   - Focus on key usability metrics such as navigation ease, loading speed, accessibility issues, and mobile responsiveness.
   - Gather data from the evaluation tool, including performance reports, accessibility scores, and any identified issues.
3. **Comparative Analysis Table:**
   - Create a **comparative analysis table** that summarizes your findings across the three websites. Your table should include the following columns:
     - **Usability Metric** (e.g., Navigation, Accessibility, Mobile Responsiveness, Load Time)
     - **Craig** (Evaluation Results)
     - **VT** (Evaluation Results)

- **Kroger** (Evaluation Results)
- **Observations/Comments** (Note specific issues or design choices)

4. Example table format:

Comparative Analysis Table

Usability Metric	**Craig (Craigslist)**	**VT (Virginia Tech)**	**Kroger (Kroger's Online Store)**	**Observations/Comments**
Performance (Desktop)	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Summarize design, ease of use, or issues]
Performance (Mobile)	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Summarize design, ease of use, or issues]
Accessibility (Desktop)	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Summarize key accessibility findings]
Accessibility (Mobile)	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Summarize key accessibility findings]
Best Practices (Desktop)	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Describe the reasonings for these scores]
Best Practices (Mobile)	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Describe the reasonings for these scores]
SEO (Desktop)	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Mention any loading speed problems]
SEO (Mobile)	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Insert score or notes]	[Mention any loading speed problems]

5. **Recommendations:** Based on the evaluation, suggest potential improvements for each website, especially in areas where websites have low scores.

Points	50
Submitting	a file upload
File Types	pdf and docx

Due	For	Available from	Until
Apr 3	Everyone else	Apr 3 at 12am	Apr 3 at 11:59pm
Apr 4	CS_2104_13317_202501	Apr 4 at 12am	Apr 4 at 11:59pm
Apr 4	CS_2104_13319_202501	Apr 4 at 12am	Apr 4 at 11:59pm
Apr 4	1 student	-	Apr 4 at 11:59pm
Apr 13	1 student	Apr 7 at 12am	Apr 13 at 11:59pm

Classwork:
Website Usability Evaluation Assignment Rubric

You've already rated students with this rubric. Any major changes could affect their assessment results.

Criteria	Ratings			Pts
Honor & Generative AI Use Statement	**5 pts** **Includes both the honor statement and the required AI usage disclosure.**	**3 pts** **One of the statements is unclear or partially complete.**	**0 pts** **Missing statements**	5 pts
Comparative	**30 pts**	**20 pts**	**10 pts**	**0 pts**	

Analysis Table	**Table is complete, with all required usability metrics, findings for all three sites, and thoughtful observations/comments.**	**The table is mostly complete. One metric or one website's data may be partially missing or vague. Observations are present for most rows but may be general or somewhat shallow. Minor formatting or clarity issues may be present.**	**The table is partially complete. Two or more metrics are missing or incomplete, or findings for one or more websites are unclear or inaccurate. Observations may be missing or overly superficial. Table may be disorganized or hard to interpret.**	**Table is incomplete or missing. Most required metrics and/or websites are not evaluated. Observations are absent or irrelevant. Little evidence of effort or understanding of the evaluation task.**	30 pts
Recommendations	**15 pts** **Clear, specific, and relevant improvement suggestions are given for each site, especially for low-scoring areas.**	**8 pts** **General suggestions are made; not fully aligned with evaluation results.**	**0 pts** **Recommendations are vague, off-topic, or missing.**		15 pts
					Total Points: 50