I first decided to look at The Daily Beast website. I've never actually been to the website before, but from first glance without using the WAVE tool, it seemed like a lot for one webpage. Using the WAVE tool, there were 20 errors, most of them having to do with missing alternative text for pictures, as well as low contrast areas on the webpage that are harder to see for people who have visual impairments. The structure seemed to be decent. There were h2 headings for the names of the articles featured on the page, and there were unordered lists used for the navigation and menus of the website. It did contain a lot of Asides, which I'm not sure what that meant in terms of the structure of the website, but the website structure with "no style" on seemed to be organised. Navigating the website using just keyboard shortcuts was hard. There were so many categories and menu things that you had to click through in before you were able to get to any of the news articles, so that was very annoying, and probably not the best for someone who must navigate websites using keyboard shortcuts. AChecker had a few navigation errors it displayed, mostly because there were no texts in the anchors on the page.

Then I went to check CU's website. The WAVE tool said that there was only one error on the homepage, which is that a spacer was missing alternative text. There were a few contract errors as well, but nothing close to the number of errors on The Daily Beast. The structure of the website seemed good as well. There were separate "Search" sections and "Navigation" sections. The main content seemed to be sorted as well. The only issue that AChecker had with the website was that the italic element was used in several areas, as opposed to the strong element that would bold text. It seemed like the only issues with CU's website had to do with contrast and distinguishability for people with visual impairments.

For a website of my choosing, I decided to go CU's housing website, because I work in the housing office and I often direct people to go to our website for more information, like dates and processes. It was relatively easy to navigate using only the keyboard shortcuts. It did take a while to get to the actual content of the page since I had to tab through all the menu links. I will say that the lines that highlight which link is currently selected are very hard to see. I have a lot of trouble seeing already, so I sometimes could not tell which link was being highlighted. Also, when using WAVE just on the home page, there were 25 different errors happening. There were mostly issues with empty headings that were in the housing option tiles. There were also 2 contrast errors, one of them being the small text underneath "Housing & Dining". The structure of the website was good, though. AChecker had many errors mostly having to do with adaptability, distinguishability, and navigability.