

Waterloo Content Management System (WCMS) Project

User Acceptance Testing Report

It takes only five users to uncover 80 percent of high-level usability problems.
Jakob Nielsen

Testing dates

June 13-24, 2011

Purpose

Gauge the ease of use, and identify any issues, for content contributors of the WCMS.

Who we tested

9 people from across campus were invited to participate. 5 people accepted and partook in testing.

Area

Faculty – 2

Department/School - 1

Support Unit - 2

Current web role(s)

Content Author/Editor – All

Site Manager/Administrator – 3

Site Developer – 1

Current web software tool(s)

Contribute – 3

Dreamweaver – 4

vi – 2

Drupal – 1

CMS use

Drupal: 1

WordPress: 1

Joomla!: 0

Other: 1

The testing process

Participants were guided through completing 3 tasks. Participants filled out a questionnaire after completing each task.

Task 1 involved creating a brand new piece of content, a news item, at the end of which they saw their news item in the News and Events section of the site as well as in the Latest News section on the home page.

The 2nd task involved creating another new piece of content, a web page, by cutting and pasting text from an existing site, this web page was added to a menu. The second part of this task required them to move this page up to the top of the menu structure.

In task 3 participants edited an existing piece of content and added and aligned an image.

A questionnaire about the user interface was completed at the end of the session and a random word list was presented in which the participants chose as many words as they felt applied to the user interface.

User Interface Questionnaire responses

What, if anything, did you *like* about the user interface?

1. It's nice and clean. It appears simple.
2. Clear/clean. Lots of white space – easy to see sections and follow steps – logical.
3. Like that everything can be done inside the browser (no other software required). Found that the user interface, on the most part, presents things well and is fairly intuitive.
4. Easy to use – almost like working in Word.
5. Fairly clear/defined sections and text (except image aligning).

What, if anything, did you *dislike* about the user interface?

1. I think that some elements would need brief explanations on how to use.
2. No comment
3. Nothing to dislike about the UI, but I can see where users may have some troubles until they are familiar with it.
4. No comment
5. Remove anything not needed from view to avoid confusion.

Do you have any suggestions for improvements?

1. Tiny help files.
2. No comment
3. No comment
4. Add a save button at the top as well for less scrolling.
5. Add help text or link to documentation.

Is there any functionality or features that you would expect to see that you didn't see here today?

1. Possibly separate input forms for writers/edits and page creators/technicians.
2. No comment
3. May want some features, such as moving the order of menu items as a drag-and-drop.
4. No comment
5. No comment

Rating of the overall ease of use of the interface:

0	0	0	4	1
Very difficult to use	Difficult to use	Neither easy or difficult	Easy to use	Very easy to use

Our takeaways – how we can improve the user experience

1. Make the admin menu bar more obvious.
2. Hide extra functionality that most users don't need.
3. Create short how-to documentation accessible from the UI (already intended).
4. Improve tools for adding and aligning an image. Can we force alt text?
5. Remove the grey box that appears under the settings group when only one or two options are available (confusing).
6. Make the task of moving a menu item easier (weight in menu settings is confusing).

Random word list results:

