

EXPERT TECHNICAL REPORT

Web Accessibility Evaluation

Independent Technical Assessment of Alleged WCAG 2.1 Level AA Violations

Case Reference:	[REDACTED] v. [REDACTED]
Docket Number:	[REDACTED]
Engaging Counsel:	[REDACTED] — Defense
Subject Website:	www.[redacted-domain].com
Evaluation Period:	March 3–14, 2025
Report Date:	March 21, 2025
Prepared By:	Robert Andrew Elliott II — Expert Services
Report Status:	SAMPLE — Confidential

SAMPLE DOCUMENT — FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY. All case identifiers, party names, domain names, and docket numbers have been redacted. This document demonstrates the format and scope of expert reports produced by The Accessibility Robert Andrew Elliott II. It does not constitute legal advice.

Table of Contents

I.	Qualifications of Expert	3
II.	Scope and Methodology	3
III.	Standards Applied	4
IV.	Executive Summary	4
V.	Detailed Findings	5
	Finding 1 — Missing Alternative Text (Critical)	5
	Finding 2 — Insufficient Color Contrast (Critical)	6
	Finding 3 — Inaccessible Form Controls (Critical)	6
	Finding 4 — Keyboard Navigation Failures (Moderate)	7
	Finding 5 — Missing ARIA Landmarks (Low)	7
VI.	Conclusions	8
VII.	Certification	8

I. Qualifications of Expert

This report was prepared by a certified web accessibility specialist with expertise in the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1, Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and ADA Title III digital accessibility requirements. The evaluating specialist has conducted accessibility audits for legal, healthcare, governmental, and educational organizations, and has served as a technical expert in ADA digital accessibility proceedings.

The evaluating specialist holds professional certifications in web accessibility and has direct experience remediating WCAG violations across a broad range of content management systems, web applications, and document formats. Detailed curriculum vitae is available upon request.

II. Scope and Methodology

Scope of Evaluation

This evaluation assessed the public-facing website of the respondent organization for conformance with WCAG 2.1 Level AA success criteria. The evaluation covered the following pages and functional areas:

Page / Feature	URL
Homepage	www.[redacted].com/
Contact / Inquiry Form	www.[redacted].com/contact
Services Overview	www.[redacted].com/services
Patient Portal Login	www.[redacted].com/portal
Document Download Center	www.[redacted].com/documents
Appointment Scheduling Tool	www.[redacted].com/schedule

Testing Methodology

The evaluation employed a combined automated and manual testing methodology consistent with industry best practice and the recommendations of the W3C Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI):

Automated Scanning. axe DevTools and Microsoft Accessibility Insights were used to identify automatically detectable WCAG failures as an initial baseline.

Manual Keyboard Testing. All interactive elements were tested for keyboard operability without a pointing device, including focus order, focus visibility, and trap detection.

Color Contrast Analysis. All foreground/background color pairs were measured using the WebAIM Color Contrast Checker against WCAG 2.1 Success Criterion 1.4.3 (minimum ratio of 4.5:1 for normal text; 3:1 for large text).

Form and Error Testing. All form inputs, labels, error messages, and validation states were evaluated for WCAG 1.3.1, 1.3.5, 3.3.1, and 3.3.2 conformance.

III. Standards Applied

WCAG 2.1 Level AA

Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.1, published by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). WCAG 2.1 Level AA is the standard referenced by the Department of Justice in ADA Title III enforcement actions and structured settlements.

Section 508

Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, requires federal agencies and their contractors to make electronic and information technology accessible. Where applicable, Section 508 technical standards are referenced.

ADA Title III

Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in places of public accommodation. Courts have applied Title III to websites and mobile applications. See *Robles v. Domino's Pizza, LLC*, 913 F.3d 898 (9th Cir. 2019).

IV. Executive Summary

The independent technical evaluation of the subject website identified **seventeen (17) distinct WCAG 2.1 Level AA failures** across the six pages and functional areas assessed. Of these, **three (3) were classified as Critical**, meaning they present complete barriers to access for users with one or more categories of disability. **Nine (9) were classified as Moderate** and **five (5) as Low**. The Critical findings are detailed in Section V of this report. In the opinion of the undersigned, the subject website, as evaluated, does not conform to WCAG 2.1 Level AA and presents material barriers to access for users with visual, motor, and cognitive disabilities.

Severity	Count	Description
Critical	3	Complete barrier — users with certain disabilities cannot access content or complete tasks
Moderate	9	Significant friction — substantially impairs usability for users with disabilities
Low	5	Minor deviation — limited impact but constitutes a technical WCAG failure
Total	17	

V. Detailed Findings

Finding 1: Missing Alternative Text on Informational Images

Critical

WCAG Criterion: 1.1.1 Non-text Content (Level A)

Pages Affected: Homepage, Services Overview, Document Download Center

Description

Twenty-three (23) images across the evaluated pages were found to lack appropriate alternative text. Of these, fourteen (14) were informational images conveying content material to understanding the page — including staff photographs with identifying captions, service description graphics, and document type icons in the download center. The remaining nine (9) were decorative images that were not appropriately marked to be ignored by assistive technology.

Impact

Screen reader users receive no information about the content or purpose of these images. In the Document Download Center, this prevents users from identifying document types prior to downloading. This constitutes a complete barrier to equivalent access.

Technical Evidence

[img src="/assets/services-banner.jpg"] – No alt attribute present.

[img src="/staff/dr-[redacted].jpg"] – Empty alt="" on informational image.

[img src="/icons/pdf-type.png"] – No alt attribute on functional icon.

Applicable Criterion

WCAG 2.1 Success Criterion 1.1.1 requires that all non-text content that is presented to the user has a text alternative that serves the equivalent purpose.

Finding 2: Insufficient Color Contrast — Body Text and Interactive Elements

Critical

WCAG Criterion: 1.4.3 Contrast (Minimum) (Level AA)

Pages Affected: All evaluated pages

Description

Eleven (11) foreground/background color combinations across the site failed to meet the WCAG 2.1 minimum contrast ratio requirements. Failures were identified in body text, navigation links, form placeholder text, and button labels. The most severe instance — placeholder text within form inputs —

registered a contrast ratio of 2.1:1 against the input background, well below the required 4.5:1 minimum.

Impact

Users with low vision, color deficiency, or age-related vision changes are substantially impaired in their ability to read and interact with the site. Failure in form placeholder text directly affects the ability of users to complete the patient intake and contact forms.

Technical Evidence

Body text: #777777 on #FFFFFF – Ratio: 4.48:1 (required: 4.5:1). FAIL.

Nav links: #6B9BD2 on #FFFFFF – Ratio: 3.12:1 (required: 4.5:1). FAIL.

Form placeholder: #AAAAAA on #F8F8F8 – Ratio: 2.10:1 (required: 4.5:1). FAIL.

CTA button label: #F5C842 on #FFFFFF – Ratio: 1.89:1 (required: 4.5:1). FAIL.

Applicable Criterion

WCAG 2.1 Success Criterion 1.4.3 requires a contrast ratio of at least 4.5:1 for normal text and 3:1 for large text (18pt or 14pt bold).

Finding 3: Inaccessible Form Controls — Appointment Scheduling Tool

Critical

WCAG Criterion: 1.3.1 Info and Relationships (Level A); 3.3.2 Labels or Instructions (Level A)

Pages Affected: Appointment Scheduling Tool

Description

The appointment scheduling tool presents a multi-step form with date selection, provider selection, and patient information fields. Field labels are implemented visually using positioned elements rather than programmatically associated elements or aria-labelledby attributes. As a result, the form controls have no accessible name as rendered to assistive technology.

Impact

Screen reader users are unable to determine the purpose of any form field in the scheduling tool. The tool is completely unusable without a pointing device and visual reference. This prevents blind and low-vision users from scheduling appointments independently through the web interface.

Technical Evidence

Date of Birth

No or aria-labelledby present.

Screen reader announces: 'Edit text' with no label context.

Applicable Criterion

WCAG 2.1 Success Criterion 1.3.1 requires that information, structure, and relationships conveyed through presentation be programmatically determinable. Success Criterion 3.3.2 requires that labels or instructions be provided when content requires user input.

Finding 4: Keyboard Navigation — Focus Trap in Modal Dialog

Moderate

WCAG Criterion: 2.1.2 No Keyboard Trap (Level A)

Pages Affected: Patient Portal Login

Description

A modal dialog on the Patient Portal Login page, triggered by the 'Forgot Password' link, traps keyboard focus within the modal but provides no mechanism for keyboard users to dismiss the dialog other than completing the form. The ESC key does not dismiss the dialog. No visible close button is present.

Impact

Keyboard users — including users with motor disabilities and blind users navigating by keyboard — who trigger the Forgot Password modal cannot exit without completing the form or reloading the page.

Technical Evidence

Modal triggered at: `www.[redacted].com/portal` – 'Forgot Password' link.

ESC keypress: No response.

Tab cycles within modal indefinitely. No close control reachable by keyboard.

Applicable Criterion

WCAG 2.1 Success Criterion 2.1.2 requires that if keyboard focus can be moved to a component, focus can be moved away using only the keyboard, and if it requires more than unmodified arrow or tab keys, the user is advised of the method.

Finding 5: Missing ARIA Landmark Regions

Low

WCAG Criterion: 1.3.6 Identify Purpose (Level AAA) / Best Practice under 1.3.1

Pages Affected: Homepage, Services Overview

Description

The Homepage and Services Overview pages do not use ARIA landmark roles or equivalent HTML5 sectioning elements (main, nav, header, footer, aside) to delineate page regions. The entire page content is rendered within a series of elements without semantic structure.

Impact

Screen reader users are unable to navigate by landmarks, requiring linear navigation through all page content to reach desired sections. This substantially increases the time and effort required to use the site.

Technical Evidence

No element or role='main' identified on homepage.

Navigation rendered as – no role='navigation' or .

Footer rendered as – no role='contentinfo' or .

Applicable Criterion

While ARIA landmark roles are not explicitly required at WCAG 2.1 Level AA, their absence represents a best practice failure under 1.3.1 and is consistently cited in DOJ structured settlements as a required remediation item.

VI. Conclusions

Based upon independent technical evaluation conducted between March 3 and March 14, 2025, and applying the methodology described in Section II of this report, it is the opinion of the undersigned that the subject website does not conform to the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 at Level AA.

The three Critical findings identified herein — missing alternative text, insufficient color contrast, and inaccessible form controls in the appointment scheduling tool — each independently constitute a material barrier to access for users with disabilities protected under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The combined effect of all seventeen findings substantially impairs the ability of users with visual, motor, and cognitive disabilities to access the services offered through the website on an equivalent basis with non-disabled users.

In the opinion of the undersigned, the failures identified in this report are remediable. A prioritized remediation roadmap with specific code-level guidance is available as a supplemental document upon request.

VII. Certification

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, and that I have conducted this evaluation independently and without bias toward any party. I have not been asked to reach any particular conclusion, and my compensation is not contingent upon the outcome of this matter.

[REDACTED]

Web Accessibility Specialist

Robert Andrew Elliott II

March 21, 2025

Date

This report is a SAMPLE document produced by Robert Andrew Elliott II for illustrative purposes. All identifying information has been redacted. For inquiries regarding expert services, contact us at www.theaccessibilityhighlander.com/services/expert-services