***Report with result of the studies***

In our opinion, the ULPGC webpage is a well-crafted and accessible website that empowers its users and lets them navigate seamlessly. We have also found that the webpage is efficiently organized and lets its experienced users navigate efficiently. Its layouts are consistent and easy to read. The page offers appropriate feedback when interacting with clickable links and the menus are all accessible from anywhere on the website. The webpage is also very easy to navigate even when using only keyboard. However, there is an animated element on the main page and not all the images have alt text.

The CUM webpage however, is in terms of usability an inconsistent mess. There are menus only accessible from the main page (in addition to the header drop down menu), inconsistent page layouts, heavy memory load and poor feedback. Images also lack alt text, and when visiting the page’s English version there’s a lot of unavailable UI elements.

In conclusion, both pages still have accessibility features that they should implement, but ULPGCs greater consistency leads to an effortless navigation that the UCM doesn’t allow