

# Usability Review

## ApplicantStack Desktop UX



Hover over a guideline for more information, examples of good practice and importance to the overall user experience.

### Score

N/A = not applicable or can't be assessed

### Comments

Optional - Provide a short rationale for the score, such as a description of the issues found; examples of good practice and the likely impact for users.

### Features & functionality

|   |  |           |   |
|---|--|-----------|---|
| 1 | Features and functionality meet common user goals and objectives.  | Excellent | I was able to accomplish the critical tasks put forth in scenarios.   |
| 2 | Features and functionality support users desired workflows.  | Moderate  | Though tasks were ultimately completed, there were some snags hit during workflows. For example, when filling out a form, a user may need to update something elsewhere and is prompted to do so, but is not prompted to save the progress on their form, resulting in the loss of that process.                    |
| 3 | Frequently-used tasks are readily available (e.g. easily accessible from the homepage) and well supported (e.g. short cuts are available).       | Poor      | Critical tasks like 'post a job' should have prominent calls to action right on the homepage. The current homepage provides notifications (view email, view outstanding tasks) and the pipeline summary, but there aren't a lot of CTAs to take an actual action (reply to a recent email, create / assign a task). |
| 4 | Users are adequately supported according to their level of expertise (e.g. short cuts for expert users, help and instructions for novice users). | Moderate  | For novices, help is readily available in video, documentation, assistive text, etc., but there are no real shortcuts or expedited paths for experts.   |
| 5 | Call to actions (e.g. register, add to basket, submit) are clear, well labelled and appear clickable.  | Very poor | There should be more of a visual hierarchy where primary calls to action appear as buttons. Some critical calls to action are missing (e.g. Post a Job, Send an email, Create a Task). Some calls-to-action are located in a right sidebar that changes from page-to-page.  |

### Homepage / starting page

|   |   |      |   |
|---|---|------|---|
| 6 | The Homepage / starting page provides a clear snapshot and overview of the content, features and functionality available. | Good | The homepage does offer snapshots of features like emails, events, tasks and the general pipeline. It also provides lots of help documentation links and some functionality in the sidebar.   |
| 7 | The home page / starting page is effective in orienting and directing users to their desired information and tasks.       | Poor | The layout of the page could be improved to clarify (1) what options are available to me (2) how I can move forward through the app.  |
| 8 | The homepage / starting page layout is clear and uncluttered with sufficient 'white space'.                               | Good | The page is cleanly designed with relevant content broken out into 'boxes' that help the user focus on each set of content. There is a lot going on in the top right. Some items in the sidebar and the 'switch accounts grid' could be folded into the dropdown that appears when I click my username (manage billing, update settings). What links need to be always visible vs. could be placed in-context or in the Username drop-down? |

### Navigation

|    |   |           |   |
|----|---|-----------|---|
| 9  | Users can easily access the site or application (e.g. the URL is predictable and is returned by search engines).  | Excellent | Logical use of subdomains and intuitively named directories.  |
| 10 | The navigational scheme (e.g. menu) is easy to find, intuitive and consistent.  | Moderate  | Would be excellent if it were not for the sidebar. The choices are inconsistent from page to page, out-of-context for their purpose, and some labels are hard to understand. (e.g. Being on a candidate detail page and having links to Run report (of what data?), Search (search for what exactly? - apparently it depends what page you are on... not intuitive.))   |
| 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      | Tables sort, filters are present when needed and search for candidates is consistently displayed in the expected location. We should look into whether users ever need to search through emails (or other types of information). I could see a user wanting to search for an email from a particular candidate straight from the homepage or at least the main email screen.  |
| 12 | The site or application structure is clear, easily understood and addresses common user goals.  | Moderate  | The main choices and user flows through processes are generally straightforward. The changes that occur in the sidebar from page to page are not intuitive. Users should know exactly what those links do.  |
| 13 | Links are clear, descriptive and well labelled.   | Moderate  | Links are obviously links, but are only sometimes descriptive and well-labelled. For example, the pipeline summary has a grid of linked numbers. Right now, I only have 3 jobs on the y axis and still it is a little hard to know which number to click to see what I want, so if I could get some assistive alt text on hover could be helpful. This section has a potential to be incredibly useful. I would like to hear more from users about how they interact with it. |

|    |   |      |   |
|----|---|------|---|
| 14 | Browser standard functions (e.g. 'back', 'forward', 'bookmark') are supported.      | Good | <i>If the user is in the middle of a process that should be saved before using back and forward, they need to be notified that they are leaving the process and prompted to save.</i>   |
| 15 | The current location is clearly indicated (e.g. breadcrumb, highlighted menu item). | Good | <i>There are no breadcrumbs, but the site is not terribly deep (in the interactions I have been testing). Active menu items are highlighted.</i>  |
| 16 | Users can easily get back to the homepage or a relevant start point.                | Good | <i>Users should be able to click the homepage logo to get back to home. This is an easy fix and a UX best practice. <a href="https://www.nngroup.com/articles/homepage-links/">https://www.nngroup.com/articles/homepage-links/</a></i> |
| 17 | A clear and well structured site map or index is provided (where necessary).        | N/A  |   |

**Search**

|    |   |          |  |
|----|---|----------|--|
| 18 | A consistent, easy to find and easy to use search function is available throughout (where desirable).                         | Moderate | <i>The 'search for candidates' input is easy to find. This would be even more powerful if the user could choose what they are searching from this bar through a filter. Choices could be (email, job, library, etc.)</i>   |
| 19 | The search interface is appropriate to meet user goals (e.g. multi-parameter, prioritised results, filtering search results). | Moderate | <i>Plenty of parameters are available for search. Filtering of results should happen on the results page. The user shouldn't have to go back and forth between multiple pages to refine search. There should also be a way to clear all filters.</i>   |
| 20 | The search facility deals well with common searches (e.g. showing most popular results), misspellings and abbreviations.      | Good     | <i>The search auto-suggests George M. Blake if I start typing his name in, that's great! What would be really nice is if it happened a little sooner. Typing G should bring up all names that start with 'G', then the suggestions should continue to narrow as I continue typing 'Geo.'. It does not handle misspellings well, but this more aggressive auto-suggestion could help with that.</i> |
| 21 | Search results are relevant, comprehensive, precise, and well displayed.  | Poor     | <i>I typed 'bill' and 'robert' into the 'search for candidates' input, hit enter, and the page just reloaded. No error or messaging. There should be a notice to the user that there is no 'bill' or 'robert' in the system.</i>   |

**Control & feedback**

|    |  |           |  |
|----|--|-----------|--|
| 22 | Prompt and appropriate feedback is given (e.g. following a successful or unsuccessful action).   | Moderate  | <i>Sometimes I get good feedback. Send an email gives me a green success message (although it appears in a new page which is not ideal). Sometimes there is no error given (I typed 'bill' and 'robert' into the 'search for candidates' input, hit enter, and the page just reloaded. No error or messaging. There should be a notice to the user that there is no 'bill' or 'robert' in the system.)</i> |
| 23 | Users can easily undo, go back and change or cancel actions; or are at least given the chance to confirm an action before committing (e.g. before placing an order). | Good      | <i>Most processes I encountered had a way to change status and undo. Delete does let me confirm, before deletion, but there are other actions that cannot be undone, like sending an email, where you should be able to preview / send a test, or at least confirm before you complete the action.</i>   |
| 24 | Users can easily give feedback (e.g. via email or an online feedback / contact us form).   | Excellent | <i>Ask a question' is easily accessible in the expected location.</i>  |

**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  | <i>Some forms are long and research / testing should be conducted to see whether users would prefer a multi-step form experience. No progress indicators are used.</i>  |
| 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).                         | Moderate  | <i>When creating a candidate, too many fields are required. I should be able to save the candidate without inputting too much (their physical address may not be critical, for example) and update the candidate later when I have info to add.</i> |
| 27 | Required and optional form fields are clearly indicated.  | Excellent |   |
| 28 | Appropriate input fields (e.g. calendar for date selection, drop down for selection) are used and required formats are indicated.   | Moderate  | <i>No formatting is given for things like phone number or address. It may not be critical, but providing an input that already has ( ) _ - _ is the preferred UX.</i>   |

29 Help and instructions (e.g. examples, information required) are provided where necessary.

Moderate

*There is such a thing as too much of a good thing. You provide too much instruction in some cases. For example, when editing a job, the notation next to the job type input just repeats what the choices are. The microcopy given to help does not actually offer insight, context or help. I recommend only including help text when something helpful can be said. Also consider only showing this help microcopy when the field is in focus or to cut down on visual noise. By giving the user so much help text to look over, you run the risk of information overload and mental exhaustion on one extreme and the user choosing to ignore on the other extreme.*

## Errors

30 Errors are clear, easily identifiable and appear in appropriate location (e.g. adjacent to data entry field, adjacent to form, etc.).

Poor

*Form errors should appear next to the field where the error occurred. Validation should take place in-form while the user moves through it. For example, if the user types 'jim@company' in the email field and then moves off to the next input, the form should return a message that tells the user that the email format is incorrect.*

31 Error messages are concise, written in easy to understand language and describe what's occurred and what action is necessary.

Excellent

32 Common user errors (e.g. missing fields, invalid formats, invalid selections) have been taken into consideration and where possible prevented.

Poor

*I was able to save a candidate that had an email as 'asfwe.com' and phone as '922' Validation should take place in-form while the user moves through it. For example, if the user types 'jim@company' in the email field and then moves off to the next input, the form should return a message that tells the user that the email format is not valid.*

33 Users are able to easily recover (i.e. not have to start again) from errors.

Excellent

*Everything can be edited and changed as expected.*

## Content & text

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

Excellent

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

Good

*Links to help and job board are available. Quick links to job boards on 3rd party platforms might be something users want (would have to be confirmed by research).*

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

Moderate

*There is no set tone to the language. Demographics indicate that users might prefer a friendlier, more conversational tone for microcopy. 'Set Stage' seems like a developer choice. Does the user think of it as a stage or a status? Maybe even something else. Help notation on forms is useful sometimes, but sometime it gets dense or is not necessary ('Location' label should be 'Job Location' and the help text can go away).*

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

Excellent

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

Moderate

*There could be greater care given to typography to help clarify sections of a page. Headlines should be larger than body copy. Most body copy is a little too small. Your body text is set to 12px and UX guidelines suggest body text should be 14-16px and up. Anything smaller than that should be reserved for fine print.*

## Help

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

Excellent

*Contextual help is presented, usually at the top of each page.*

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

Good

*Could be more concise. Remove introductory marketing language and just get to the help. e.g <https://help.applicantstack.com/hc/en-us/articles/115000715074-Hiring-Manager-s-Guide-Recruit->*

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

Excellent

*Help opens in a new page or modal.*

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

Moderate

*Email is easy, but there is no phone or chat function. This means getting help is easy, but not if they need it immediately.*

## Performance

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

Excellent

*I never noticed any lag during my walkthrough.*

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

**Excellent**

*No errors occurred (outside of user error). Only thing that could be an issue is that when you do a 'candidate search' for a name that is not in the DB, it does not return an error. A simple alert or message in the auto-suggest area that says 'name not found' would be appropriate.*

45 Possible user configurations (e.g. browsers, resolutions, computer specs) are supported.

**Good**

*Mobile experience is usable, but could use a redesign of it's navigational elements (sidebar should be revealed on gesture (drawer UI), the logo should be in top left and link to home, etc.)*

**Overall usability score (out of 100) \***

**72**

-

**Good**

\* 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.