# EAASI – a Gender and Diversity Sensitive Usability Evaluation Tool

# The TInnGO ‘EAASI’ Product Evaluation Template

## Introduction

This template is in three parts:

Part A ensures that the product is described with both text and images, and any links to source documents or websites.

Part B is a series of prompts for the evaluator to fill in, one for each ‘Indicator’ with an overall rating at the end of each section.

Part C is a Summary Evaluation

We have tried to provide all instructions on the form. This is a blank checklist. There is a worked example also available. These are Word documents – so we advise creating a copy, and then clearing the entries or overtyping the worked example.

## Evaluator(s)

How you use this checklist is up to you. You may have one evaluator, or several independent evaluators, whose findings can then be brought together in a summary report, or it could be completed during a workshop with co-evaluators using one form between them.

If using as a design tool – the design team could work through the checklist as a self-check exercise, to understand how they could make their product more Gender and Diversity Smart.

If using several independent evaluators, give them each a copy, and they can add their name below. In some circumstances you could anonymise the names when the report is given back to the designers – such as Evaluator A, B C or as preferred.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator Name | *Dr Janet Saunders* |
| Affiliation | *CU* |

# Part A: Product Description

This section ensures that the product is defined, i.e., the ‘problem definition’ which should include details about the ‘scenario of use’ AND any key target users, (such may be available in a design brief), bearing in mind this is intended to be ‘inclusive design’. This serves two purposes:

1. As part of a design process, with designers completing the evaluation tool as a means of prompting thoughts about the TInnGO gender and diversity-smart mobility indicators

Or

1. For completion by an evaluator who has been asked to appraise a design or actual product in the marketplace – and using secondary sources such as marketing material or press articles to discover as much as they can about the design or product.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product Description** | Type your answers below |
| **Name of product or brief summary if it doesn’t have a Name** |  |
| **Source organisation or design source** |  |
| **Product Goal / problem definition/ purpose / USP**  *Describe briefly what the product is for, who it is for, what problem it solves. (This can be developed further in the following questions)* |  |
| **What part of this product are you evaluating?** *Be specific about what is being evaluated, e.g. if this is a vehicle – is it only the interior, or does this include the exterior also. Is there a service design component?* |  |
| **Is a design brief available?** *If Yes, please attach it or provide a link* |  |
| **Do we know anything about the design process?** *Was there any co-creation or user involvement? Were diverse groups included?* |  |
| **User groups, primary and secondary, plus others - may include the service provider or other people who may be affected or share space with the product** |  |
| **Task Context**  *Describe any specific task requirements, think about e.g. the street environment, time of day, lighting, weather, user luggage needs, journey distances…* |  |
| **User needs**  *Describe any specific user requirements* |  |
| **Images of the product**  *Paste one or more images of the product into the column on the right, up to 3 is suggested* | *Image 1 – main image* |
|  | *Image 2 – additional image* |
|  | *Image 3 – additional image* |

# Part B: EAASI Indicators

The following sections consider the product in terms of each of the TInnGO ‘Gender and Diversity Smart Indicators’, which are briefly explained at the start of each section. Working through each indicator has 4 steps – goal setting; evaluating; evaluating for user groups; overall evaluation.

## **Indicator 1: Effective: Does it deliver what it promises? Does it produce the intended result from the perspective of both user and provider?**

‘Effectiveness’ means how far does the product produce the intended result for both user and provider. It requires thinking about the ‘user task’, as defined in the initial assessment of goals for the product, and the provider goals, and assessing whether the desired end result would be achieved.

For TInnGO, ‘Effectiveness’ ALSO means thinking about the user task from the point of view of a range of users, and women in particular. In relation to gender dimensions, it’s important to remember that ‘single trips’ are more often made by men, while women tend to make more multiple trips and ‘chained trips’ for different purposes – e.g. dropping children off at care, school, picking up groceries on way to/ from work. Other kinds of trip chaining could apply to either gender – visiting a gym or swimming pool after work for example, but we have learned that women typically do more chained trips. Travel purposes vary immensely across group intersections: to work, care, medical appointments, shopping, leisure.

### Step 1: Goals - The product has been designed to be effective in the following ways:

*Please complete the product goals per user groups.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Group**  *(add target users AND other citizens who use the same city space)* | **How would it be effective for end users?** |
| *e.g. Commuters / workers / tourists/ young people* |  |
|  |  |
| *e.g.Other groups of citizens* |  |
|  |  |
| **Providers**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How would it be effective for providers?** |
| Local Councils |  |
| Charities |  |
| Businesses |  |

### Step 2: How well does it meet the ‘Effectiveness’ goals described above?

***Please complete using what information you have available from your design sources***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Goal** | **Does it meet the goal?** |
| *e.g. Enable commuters, tourists, young able-bodied people move speedily around the city* |  |
| *Does not overly impact safety and enjoyment of others* |  |
| *Easy to maintain, adequate supply, can earn a profit* |  |
| **‘Gender and Diversity Smart’ Effectiveness** |  |
| **Is it effective for commuters?** |  |
| **Is it effective for leisure visitors?** |  |
| **Is it effective for single trips?** |  |
| **Is it effective for chained or multiple trips?** |  |
| **Is it effective for care related trips travelling with children or a dependent adult? E.g. to nursery, day-care, hospitals, schools?** |  |
| **Is it effective for trips with luggage or shopping?** |  |
| **Does it impinge on others enjoyment or perceptions of safety in the city?** |  |

### Step 3: Effectiveness for Social groups and Providers – consider needs and intersections where relevant – some could be left blank

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Score percentage** | **‘Effectiveness’ considerations** |
| Work commuters |  |  |
| Leisure / off peak travellers |  |  |
| Women in general |  |  |
| Women or others making multiple / chained trips |  |  |
| Adults travelling with dependent children or carers |  |  |
| Low income groups, people on welfare |  |  |
| Young people and students |  |  |
| School-children travelling independently |  |  |
| Older people |  |  |
| People with disabilities, physical or cognitive |  |  |
| People travelling from or to remote locations |  |  |
| Minority ethnic groups |  |  |
| People feeling vulnerable in public spaces |  |  |
| Transport Providers |  |  |
| **Conclusions (Total % / n of applicable groups)** |  |  |

### Step 4: Effectiveness: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Effective for who? Is it effective for the citizens it is aimed at?** |  |
| **Not Effective for who?** |  |
| **Percentage Score** |  |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Key:

**Indicator 2. Attractive – appealing in terms of implementation, use and benefit from both provider and user perspective**

‘Attractive’ Mobility is set within the context of providing safe and accessible solutions for a broad and diverse range of people. It includes how far ‘the solution’ can be customised and made comfortable, and factors such as clean, safe and convenient. There should be scope here to consider attractiveness according to age, gender and other factors such as social grouping, ethnicity, personality. Also consider the impact on, and of, surrounding areas such as bus stops, hubs, rail stations. How is the artefact adaptable to users’ needs and wishes? Note: With adaptability, there is some overlap with the criteria of ‘Inclusive’ (discussed later) where adaptability and accessibility can be commented on in more detail.

### Step 1: Goals: The product has been designed to be attractive in the following ways:

**Please complete below how the product has been designed to be attractive for users and providers.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target user group**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How will it be attractive to end users?** |
| *e.g.Commuters / workers* |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Providers**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How will it be attractive to providers?** |
| Local Councils |  |
| Charities |  |
| Businesses |  |

### Step 2: How well does it meet ‘Attractiveness’ goals?

***Please complete using what information you have available from your design sources***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attractiveness Goal** | **Does it meet the goal?** |
| *Enable commuters, tourists, young able-bodied people to move speedily around the city, in a fun way* |  |
| *Local Council’s and 3rd parties’ goals* |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Gender and Diversity Smart ‘Attractiveness’ questions** |  | | **Safety:**  Does it feel safe to a range of groups? E.g. waiting at stops, stations and deserted areas  Is it safe to actually use? What are the safety issues?  Are there safety issues for other transport users or pedestrians? |  | | **Clean and Hygienic:**  Can it be kept clean or cleaned for next user? |  | | **Convenient:**  Can it be accessed in a convenient location? |  | | **Adaptability:**  Is it adaptable to users of different sizes in weight and height?  Can it be used in different ways e.g. Sit / stand?  Is there any luggage storage?  Is this information provided in the design? |  | | **Comfort:**  Does it offer comfort? Is the design comfortable to hold / sit on or sit in? Are controls within reach for everyone?  Consider shelter from elements, seating, waiting area, toilets? |  | | **Interest, Novelty and Usefulness:**  Does it offer something interesting? Timetable information; entertainment; fun; local information; city event updates |  | |  |  |  Step 3: Attractiveness to Social groups and Providers – consider needs and intersections where relevant – some could be left blank  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Group** | **Score %** | **‘Attractiveness’ considerations** | | Work commuters |  |  | | Leisure / off peak travellers |  |  | | Women in general |  |  | | Women or others making multiple / chained trips |  |  | | Adults travelling with dependent children or carers |  |  | | Low income groups, people on welfare |  |  | | Young people and students |  |  | | School-children travelling independently |  |  | | Older people |  |  | | People with disabilities, physical or cognitive |  |  | | People travelling from or to remote locations |  |  | | Minority ethnic groups |  |  | | People feeling vulnerable in public spaces |  |  | | Transport Providers |  |  | | **Conclusions (Total % / n of applicable groups)** |  |  | |

### Step 4: Attractiveness: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Attractive to who?** |  |
| **Not Attractive to who?** |  |
| **Percentage Score** |  |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key

## **Indicator 3: Affordable – cost-effective in terms of acquisition/implementation and maintenance from both provider and user perspectives**

Does this transport solution contribute to ending transport ‘accessibility poverty’? This assesses whether people can reach their basic daily activities within a reasonable time, ease and cost – and relates to key activities that support life chances such as employment, education, health visits.

For the TInnGO project, this incudes affordability from the point of view of public transport – so the public investment of the provider must support a solution that will be used by a wide base of users. It can also be assessed from the point of view of Affordability for individuals. This can be very subjective – e.g. a taxi could be an everyday item for people with plenty of disposable income, but a luxury for those on lower incomes. If a transport solution is likely to be adopted, it needs to be ‘affordable’ to the majority of everyday citizens, *regardless of income* – otherwise it is not an equitable choice. It should be kept in mind that the gender pay gap means women have fewer economic resources than men.

Affordability for the transport provider, involves a discussion about investment and long-term goals, and it is important that designers consider this perspective. A distinction could be made between cost to the user of hiring/sharing or owning their own means of transport e.g. cycles. Public authorities can provide shared means of transport or facilities for parking of privately owned items. If hire vehicles are in a central hub, affordability of getting to the hub from an out-of-city location could also be considered.

### Step 1: The product has been designed to be affordable in the following ways:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Group**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How is it affordable to end users?** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Providers**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How is it affordable to providers?** |
| Local Councils |  |
| Charities |  |
| Businesses |  |

### Step 2: How well does it meet ‘Affordability’ goals?

**Please add evaluations based on the goals outlined above and complete the additional questions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Affordability Goals as defined above** | ***Answers – please complete using what information you have available from your design sources*** |
| Commuters / workers / tourists/ young people |  |
| Providers and Businesses |  |
| **Gender and Diversity Smart ‘Affordability’ Questions** |  |
| Is an affordable alternative provided? – e.g. a walking route |  |
| Is it affordable for the transport provider? Is there a break-even level? |  |
| In the case of ‘shared transport’ - Will users’ own vehicles’ be permitted (e.g. personal bikes, e-scooters) ? |  |
| Does this solution allow access to basic daily activities within reasonable time and cost? Consider e.g. bus routes, employment sites, education access, health visits. |  |

### Step 3: Affordability for Social groups and Providers – consider needs and intersections where relevant – some could be left blank

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Score percentage** | **‘Affordability’ considerations** |
| Work commuters |  |  |
| Leisure / off peak travellers |  |  |
| Women in general |  |  |
| Women or others making multiple / chained trips |  |  |
| Adults travelling with dependent children or carers |  |  |
| Low income groups, people on welfare |  |  |
| Young people and students |  |  |
| School-children travelling independently |  |  |
| Older people |  |  |
| People with disabilities, physical or cognitive |  |  |
| People travelling from or to remote locations |  |  |
| Minority ethnic groups |  |  |
| People feeling vulnerable in public spaces |  |  |
| Transport Providers |  |  |
| **Conclusions (Total % / n of applicable groups)** |  |  |

### Step 4: Affordability: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Affordable for who? Is it affordable for most citizens?** |  |
| **Not Affordable to who?** |  |
| **Percentage Score** |  |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key

## **Indicator 4: Sustainable: Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.**

One key goal of sustainable travel is to reduce CO2 emissions, and enhance travel in an environmentally friendly and ‘green’ way, whether this is a mode of travel, or an infrastructure product. For example, utilising new ‘Smart’ technology may provide an advantage to the users in terms of ease of use or access to better information, improving traffic flow and reducing congestion. Sustainability should be offered to a wide group of users, offering green transport opportunities both now and for the future. Sustainability may also take into account the use of materials, energy and the life and maintenance of the product, from both user and provider perspective, (UN Goal 12).

### Step 1: The product has been designed to be sustainable in the following ways:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Group**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How is it sustainable to end users?** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Providers**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How is it sustainable for providers?** |
| Local Councils |  |
| Charities |  |
| Businesses |  |

### Step 2: How well does it meet the ‘Sustainable’ goals?

Please add evaluations based on the goals outlined above and complete the additional questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sustainable Goals as defined above** | **Answers *– please complete using what information you have available from your design sources*** |
| *e.g. Reduces need for commuters to drive within city,*  *reduce numbers needing bus transport* |  |
| *e.g. provider goals* |  |
| e.g. made from sustainable materials |  |
| e.g. encourages users to use buses less |  |
| e.g. encourages users to use public transport and/or e-scooter leaving car at home |  |
| Easy to maintain |  |
| Long life of product |  |
| **Gender and Diversity Smart Questions related to Sustainability** |  |
| Is it sustainable for single trips? |  |
| Is it sustainable for chained or multiple trips? |  |
| Are some groups more attracted to sustainable solutions than others? Does the solution cater for these differences? |  |
| Will the transport solution continue to be sustainable when users’ needs change? |  |
| Does it provide speedy trips with no emissions? |  |
| Will it encourage users to leave their cars behind? |  |
| Wil it replace bus travel? |  |

### Step 3: Sustainability for Social groups and Providers

**Is this a ‘sustainable choice’ for these groups? Consider needs and intersections where relevant – some could be left blank**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** |  | **Score percentage** | **‘Sustainability’ considerations** |
| Work commuters |  |  |  |
| Leisure / off peak travellers |  |  |  |
| Women in general |  |  |  |
| Women or others making multiple / chained trips |  |  |  |
| Adults travelling with dependent children or carers |  |  |  |
| Low income groups, people on welfare |  |  |  |
| Young people and students |  |  |  |
| School-children travelling independently |  |  |  |
| Older people |  |  |  |
| People with disabilities, physical or cognitive |  |  |  |
| People travelling from or to remote locations |  |  |  |
| Minority ethnic groups |  |  |  |
| People feeling vulnerable in public spaces |  |  |  |
| Transport Providers |  |  |  |
| **Conclusions (Total % / n of applicable groups)** |  |  |  |

### Step 4: Sustainability: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Sustainable for who? Is it sustainable for most citizens?** |  |
| **Not Sustainable for who? How is it not sustainable?** |  |
| **Percentage Score** |  |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key

## **Indicator 5: Inclusive: Which stakeholders/users are served by the product? What aspects promote the inclusive approach? What barriers will this help to overcome?**

Inclusion is seen as a universal human right. The aim of inclusion is to embrace all people irrespective of race, gender, disability, medical or other need. It is about giving equal access and opportunities and getting rid of discrimination and intolerance (removal of barriers). It affects all aspects of public life.

**Inclusive design:** Inclusive design is about making places that everyone can use. The way places are designed affects our ability to move, see, hear and communicate effectively.

Inclusive design aims to remove the barriers that create undue effort and separation. It enables everyone to participate equally, confidently and independently in everyday activities and to access a product or service equally – however they encounter it.

Inclusive design is aimed at considering and combatting discrimination against certain groups of people and the intersections between them. It should particularly consider groups who may be vulnerable because of perceived differences, such as ethnicity or different gender or ability.

We do not ask for goals to be defined here, these will be evident from the earlier sections. We simply offer questions to assess inclusive design for products. This section also includes explicit questions to assess how the product caters for the widest range of ability, by making the abilities more explicit. This is not an exhaustive list but covers the types of ability normally considered in an ‘accessibility checklist’. Considering this list may prompt designers to think about inclusivity issues they might otherwise have overlooked.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TInnGO Questions related to Inclusivity** | **Percentage** | **Answers** |
|  |  |  |
| Does it offer effective, affordable, attractive and sustainable transport for all social groups? |  |  |
| Does the solution provide security for vulnerable groups? |  |  |
| Does the solution apply to various social groups with regard to economy, disability, age? |  |  |
| What anti-discrimination efforts might be applied to this product/solution? Please make recommendations. |  |  |
| **Physical and cognitive Accessibility questions:** |  |  |
| Will anyone be **excluded** because of issues with: |  |  |
| Vision impairment |  |  |
| Hearing impairment |  |  |
| Cognitive impairment |  |  |
| Strength, dexterity or reach |  |  |
| Mobility: Walking, stair climbing, standing or balance |  |  |
| Are provisions made for users with mobility aids .e.g. Wheelchair users, crutches and walking sticks? |  |  |
| Overall Inclusivity Percentage = Total / n (mean) |  |  |

### Step 4: Inclusivity: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Who is included in this solution?** |  |
| **Who is NOT included in this solution?** |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Percentage Score** |  |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key

Part C: Overall Assessment

This is intended to summarize how the product fits with its own defined goals and how far it meets ‘Gender and diversity smart’ criteria. The Evaluator should complete a rating based on the ratings per each indicator already completed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Does the design meet its own goals?** | **Percent** | **Smiley** | **Notes** |
| *e.g. The product meets the design brief needs of: appealing to young people and active, reasonably fit commuters who may choose to integrate use of an e-scooter into their daily commute from a train or bus hub.* |  | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |  |
| *e.g. the e-scooter could be an alternative to bringing a car into the city* |  | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |  |
| **Does the design meet the Gender & Diversity Smart goals - EAASI?** |  |  |  |
| 1 - Effective  Is the product effective? |  | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |  |
| 2 - Attractive  Is the product attractive to a wide range of users? |  | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |  |
| 3 - Affordable  Is the product affordable to a wide range of users? |  | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |  |
| 4 - Sustainable  Is the product sustainable / does it encourage sustainable behaviour? |  | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |  |
| 5 - Inclusive  Is the product inclusive from the point of view of gender and diversity? From the point of view of Accessibility? |  | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key

**What next?**

#### We hope this has given you some insight into how the product scores on the TInnGO ‘Gender and diversity smart’ indicators.

#### Perhaps the product met the design brief or your organisation requirements well but scored lower on the indicators? Having this knowledge can indicate where the gaps are and show aspects that could be improved or redesigned to be more inclusive and more gender and diversity smart.

#### **Designers:** you might want to revisit your design brief and discuss with your clients – is the brief wide enough? Does anything need to change?

#### **Evaluating a range of products?** You can use this knowledge to make choices or better predict take-up of a solution – does anything need to change to make it more EAASI?

#### The TInnGO team would like to hear your feedback about our tool.

#### Contact: Andree.woodcock@coventry.ac.uk