

ACCESSIBILITY EVALUATION

Webpage Accessibility Evaluation

**Mayo Clinic Alix School of Medicine
M.D. Program Academic Enrichment Webpage**

Prepared by
Dustin Smith

Original Evaluation: February 7, 2024
Portfolio Edition: Revised August 2026

Portfolio Edition Note:

This edition preserves the original 2024 report while updating document structure, clarity, and presentation. A table of contents and Appendix B: 2026 Follow-Up Accessibility Review were added in August 2026 to improve navigation and document subsequent review findings.

Related Portfolio Deliverables

- [Feasibility of Accessibility Improvements: Mayo Clinic Alix School of Medicine M.D. Program Academic Enrichment Webpage](#)

Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Scope of Review.....	1
Reviewer.....	1
Review Process.....	1
Evaluation Summary.....	2
References.....	4
Appendix A: 2024 Evaluation Reports	5
Appendix B: 2026 Follow-Up Accessibility Review	6
Follow-Up Summary	6
Review Scope	6
Follow-Up Testing Methods.....	6
Finding 1: Unique ID Attribute / Status: Unresolved.....	6
Finding 1 Assessment	7
Finding 1 Recommendation	7
Finding 2: Footer Link Contrast / Status: Resolved & Improved	7
Finding 2 Assessment	8
Finding 2 Recommendation	8
Finding 3: Keyboard Navigation / Status: Resolved.....	8
Finding 3 Assessment	8
Finding 3 Recommendation	8
Recommended Next Actions.....	8

Executive Summary

This accessibility evaluation examines the Mayo Clinic Alix School of Medicine (MCASOM) M.D. Program Academic Enrichment webpage. The assessment evaluates the webpage against applicable Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 Level A and Level AA criteria intended to improve access to digital content for users with disabilities. Based on this evaluation, the webpage demonstrated strong overall accessibility but contained several issues requiring remediation before full WCAG 2.1 Level AA conformance could be claimed (W3C, n.d.). Detailed review results are available in the Results and Recommendations section below.

Evaluation Background

The Academic Enrichment webpage provides current and prospective MCASOM students with information about opportunities to customize their academic experience. These opportunities include dual degrees, global health, research, electives, certificates, and distinction-track programs. WCAG nonconformance can create barriers to digital content for users with auditory, cognitive, motor, and visual disabilities. Evaluating the accessibility of the Academic Enrichment webpage helps identify barriers that may affect equitable access to educational information and resources for current and prospective students.

Scope of Review

This accessibility evaluation combines automated testing and manual review to evaluate selected WCAG 2.1 Level A and Level AA accessibility criteria. Testing was conducted in American English on February 7, 2024. The webpage and its underlying implementation may have changed since the evaluation date.

- URL reviewed: <https://college.mayo.edu/academics/mayo-clinic-alix-school-of-medicine/md-program/curriculum/academic-enrichments/>

Reviewer

At the time of the February 2024 evaluation, Dustin Smith was a Technical Communication undergraduate student at Minnesota State University, Mankato. The evaluation was completed as part of coursework involving the technical assessment of website accessibility and was subsequently submitted to the MCASOM for review.

Review Process

This review combined automated accessibility testing with manual interaction testing. Google Lighthouse and the WAVE Web Accessibility Evaluation Tool were used for automated analysis. Non-Visual Desktop Access (NVDA) was used to evaluate screen-reader interaction, and manual keyboard testing was performed to evaluate navigation and focus behavior.

Results and Recommendations

The following sections summarize the results of each accessibility evaluation and test. Each testing method evaluates different aspects of accessibility, allowing both strengths and potential barriers to be identified. The evaluation found strong overall accessibility while identifying several issues requiring remediation. This report recommends periodic accessibility reviews, particularly after significant webpage or component updates, to identify regressions and monitor continued alignment with applicable WCAG requirements.

Evaluation Summary

Evaluation Method	Primary Result
Google Lighthouse	95/100; unique-ID issue identified
WAVE	Footer link-text contrast issue identified
NVDA	No screen-reader navigation barriers observed
Keyboard Testing	Focus-order and focus-visibility issues identified
Text Resizing	Resized to 200% without loss of functionality

Google Lighthouse was used to perform an automated accessibility audit of the webpage, including checks related to Accessible Rich Internet Applications (ARIA) attributes and keyboard-control semantics. The February 2024 audit produced an accessibility score of 95/100, indicating strong overall performance while still identifying an issue requiring remediation (Google Chrome, 2024). The audit identified a non-unique id attribute associated with the focusable “Back to top” element and recommended assigning a unique identifier. The February 2024 Lighthouse accessibility report is linked in Appendix A.

The WAVE Web Accessibility Evaluation Tool was used to identify visual and structural accessibility issues on the webpage. The evaluation identified insufficient contrast in the footer link text, which used approximately #616161 against a #000000 background. This combination produced a contrast ratio of approximately 3.39:1, below the WCAG 2.1 Level AA minimum requirement of 4.5:1 for normal-sized text (WebAIM, 2024). Increasing the luminance contrast between the footer link text and background is recommended to improve readability for users with low vision or reduced contrast sensitivity. The February 2024 WAVE evaluation is linked in Appendix A.

Manual testing with NVDA found the webpage usable with screen-reading technology during the tested navigation path. NVDA moved through the tested page sections without an observed navigation barrier. Images encountered during testing included descriptive information that could be communicated to users relying on a screen reader.

Manual keyboard navigation input testing identified several focus-order and focus-visibility issues. The webpage contains a functional “*Skip to main content*” link; however, it appeared as the second interactive element in the focus order. Interactive elements initially displayed a visible blue focus indicator against a white background. After focus reached the “*Curriculum*” section, the visible focus indicator disappeared even though subsequent elements remained keyboard accessible using Tab and Enter/Return. The review also identified an illogical focus sequence near the bottom of the page. Keyboard navigation progressed through Academics > MCASOM > M.D. Program > Curriculum; focus returned to the “Curriculum” navigation area near the top of the page.

Text resizing met the tested accessibility criterion. Text could be resized to 200% without observed loss of content or functionality. Interface components adjusted to the increased text size while remaining usable during testing. Images scaled without noticeable pixelation, and the surrounding layout adjusted without disrupting the tested page flow.

References

Google Chrome. (2024). *Lighthouse report*. Retrieved February 7, 2024, from [2024 Lighthouse Report Link](#)

NV Access. (n.d.). *Empowering lives through non-visual access to technology*. NV Access. Retrieved February 7, 2024, from <https://www.nvaccess.org/>

W3C. (n.d.). *How to Meet WCAG*. Retrieved February 7, 2024, from [W3C website link](#)

WebAIM. (2024). *WAVE Web Accessibility Evaluation Tools*. WebAIM. Retrieved February 7, 2024, from <https://wave.webaim.org/>

WCAG 2.1. *Understanding SC 1.4.4:Resize Text (Level AA)*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Understanding/resize-text.html>

Appendix A: 2024 Evaluation Reports

This appendix provides links to the automated evaluation reports used during the February 7, 2024, accessibility review of the MCASOM Academic Enrichment webpage.

- *WAVE Report. February 7, 2024:* <https://wave.webaim.org/report#/https://college.mayo.edu/academics/mayo-clinic-alix-school-of-medicine/md-program/curriculum/academic-enrichments/>
- *Google Lighthouse Audit, February 7, 2024:* [2024 Lighthouse audit link](#)

Appendix B: 2026 Follow-Up Accessibility Review

Follow-Up Summary

The August 2026 follow-up review found measurable accessibility improvements in two of the three areas evaluated in the original 2024 report, while one issue remains present in the current implementation.

Original Finding	Follow-Up Method	2026 Status
Unique ID Attribute	Chrome DevTools / DOM	Unresolved
Footer Link Contrast	WCAG Checker Chrome Extension	Resolved / Improved
Keyboard Navigation	Manual Keyboard Testing	Resolved

Review Scope

The August 2026 follow-up review examined the current status of three accessibility issues documented in the original evaluation:

- Unique identification of the “Back to top” control
- Footer link-text contrast
- Keyboard navigation, focus order, and focus visibility

Follow-Up Testing Methods

The review used a combination of automated, manual, and code-level testing methods:

- **Chrome Developer Tools:** Inspected the rendered Document Object Model (DOM) and verified the number of elements using specific HTML IDs.
- **WCAG Checker Chrome Extension:** Evaluated foreground and background color contrast.
- **Manual Keyboard Testing:** Evaluated keyboard navigation, focus order, focus visibility, and access to interactive controls.

Finding 1: Unique ID Attribute / Status: Unresolved

The current Academic Enrichment webpage contains two “Back to top” controls. One appears within the page footer, while a second fixed-position arrow control appears near the lower-right corner of the viewport. The current implementation was inspected in Chrome DevTools Console to verify that the IDs of these controls were unique.

The following DOM queries were used:

- `document.querySelectorAll('#page-top-link6656').length` Result: 2
- `document.querySelectorAll('#page-top').length` Result: 1

The query confirms that two elements currently use the same *page-top-link6656* ID. The destination anchor used by the controls was then inspected:

Finding 1 Assessment

The duplicate *page-top-link6656* values indicate that the unique-ID issue identified during the original 2024 accessibility evaluation remains present in the current DOM.

The current page contains an additional fixed-position “*Back to top*” control that was not part of the original evaluation. It is possible that the ID was previously assigned uniquely and was later reused when the additional component was introduced; however, the current DOM alone cannot establish when or why the duplicate ID was introduced. The follow-up therefore documents only the verifiable current condition: two separate controls share the same HTML ID.

Finding 1 Recommendation

Assign a separate unique ID to each “Back to top” control while retaining the single, uniquely identified page-top destination. Future component updates should include DOM validation to ensure reusable interface components do not introduce duplicate identifiers.

Finding 2: Footer Link Contrast / Status: Resolved & Improved

The 2024 evaluation identified insufficient contrast between footer link text and the black footer background. The original footer link colors were:

- **Foreground:** #616161
- **Background:** #000000
- **Contrast Ratio:** 3.39:1

This ratio did not meet the WCAG 2.1 AA minimum contrast requirement of 4.5:1 for normal-sized text. During the August 2026 follow-up review, the current footer link text and background were evaluated using the WCAG Checker Chrome extension.

The current colors were identified as approximately:

- **Foreground:** #A8A8A8
- **Background:** #000000
- **Contrast Ratio:** 8.83:1

The 8.83:1 Contrast Ratio exceeds the WCAG minimum requirements for normal text and provides substantially greater contrast than the implementation evaluated in 2024. The current footer links also include a visible underline, providing an additional non-color visual indicator that the text is interactive.

Finding 2 Assessment

The footer-link contrast issue identified in 2024 is resolved in the current implementation. The change from approximately 3.39:1 to 8.83:1 represents a substantial improvement in text visibility. The addition of visible underlining further improves link recognition by providing a visual cue beyond color alone.

Finding 2 Recommendation

Maintain the current high-contrast footer text and visible link treatment during future design updates. Future accessibility reviews should continue verifying both text contrast and non-color indicators for interactive text.

Finding 3: Keyboard Navigation / Status: Resolved

A manual keyboard-only accessibility review was conducted in August 2026 to determine whether the keyboard-navigation issue identified during the 2024 evaluation remained reproducible. The webpage was navigated without a mouse to evaluate access to interactive elements and keyboard focus behavior.

The follow-up review verified that:

- Interactive controls could be reached using keyboard navigation.
- Keyboard focus progressed through page elements in a logical sequence.
- Visible focus indicators were present during navigation.
- Tested interactive elements could be activated without a pointing device.
- No keyboard traps were encountered during the review.

Finding 3 Assessment

The keyboard-navigation issue identified during the original 2024 evaluation was not reproduced during the August 2026 manual review. Based on the tested current implementation, the issue appears to have been resolved or substantially improved since the original evaluation.

Finding 3 Recommendation

Continue performing manual keyboard-only testing after navigation, menu, footer, or interactive-component updates. Automated accessibility tools can identify many structural issues, but keyboard interaction should continue to be manually verified.

Recommended Next Actions

1. Assign unique IDs to each “Back to top” control.
2. Include DOM inspection or automated markup validation when testing reusable interface components.
3. Repeat targeted accessibility testing after major webpage redesigns or component updates.