HC Web Labs

Heather Cooper — Web Design & Development

WEBSITE AUDIT & ASSESSMENT REPORT

A structured look at what's working, what isn't, and what it would take to fix it.

Report Details

Site / Business Name: _____

Site URL: _____

Audit Date: _____

Platform / CMS Identified: _____

Hosting Provider (if known): _____

Prepared by: Heather Cooper, HC Web Labs · webmaster@heather-cooper.com · (865) 356-3769

Purpose & Scope of This Audit

This audit reviews the site's current code quality, responsiveness, accessibility, performance, security, and content fundamentals against HC Web Labs' standard technical practices. Findings below are used to define the scope, priority, and investment for any resulting Statement of Work (SOW) — consistent with the audit-first approach described in the MSA and SOW for Redesign & Existing-Environment Work engagements. This audit does not modify the site; it only documents its current state.

1. Code Quality & Structure (Semantic HTML5)

- Uses semantic elements (header, nav, main, section, footer) rather than generic divs throughout.
- Proper heading hierarchy — a single H1 per page, with logical H2–H6 nesting.
- Clean, valid markup — no broken tags or deprecated elements.
- Reasonable file and asset organization.

Findings:

Severity:

☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Critical

2. Responsive Design & Scaling Typography (Mobile-First CSS3)

- Layout adapts cleanly across standard breakpoints (mobile, tablet, desktop).
- Typography scales fluidly rather than overflowing or becoming illegible.
- No horizontal scroll or overlapping elements on small screens.

- Touch targets are appropriately sized on mobile.

Findings:

Severity:
☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Critical

3. Interactivity & Functionality (JavaScript ES6+)

- Navigation, menus, and interactive components function correctly.
- Forms validate and submit properly.
- No console errors on page load or interaction.
- Graceful behavior when JavaScript is slow to load or disabled.

Findings:

Severity:
☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Critical

4. Backend & Platform Notes (PHP / CMS / Hosting)

- CMS, platform, or page builder identified, and version if known.
- Hosting environment identified (provider, PHP version if applicable).
- Plugin, theme, or extension inventory — especially anything outdated.
- Database or dynamic content considerations.

Findings:

Severity:
☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Critical

5. Accessibility (WCAG 2.2 AA)

This is a spot-check, not a full conformance review. For a complete criterion-by-criterion evaluation, see the accompanying Accessibility Conformance Report.

- Images have meaningful alt text.
- Color contrast meets minimum ratios.
- Site is fully navigable by keyboard alone.
- Form fields have properly associated labels.

Findings:

Severity:

☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Critical

6. Performance & Speed Optimization

- Page load time spot-checked (e.g., via PageSpeed Insights or similar).
- Image sizes and formats are optimized for the web.
- No unnecessary render-blocking scripts or stylesheets.
- Caching and compression in place where applicable.

Findings:

Severity:

☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Critical

7. Cross-Browser & OS Compatibility

- Tested in current versions of Chrome, Firefox, Safari, and Edge.
- Tested on desktop, tablet, and mobile devices.
- Fallback behavior noted for older or unsupported browsers where relevant.

Findings:

Severity:

☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Critical

8. Security Basics

- HTTPS/SSL is active and properly configured.
- No exposed sensitive files, directories, or credentials.
- Plugins and CMS core are up to date.
- Basic spam or bot protection is present on public forms.

Findings:

Severity:

☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Critical

9. SEO & Content Fundamentals

- Page titles and meta descriptions are present and unique per page.
- Heading structure supports content hierarchy (dual-purpose with accessibility).
- Images have descriptive alt text.
- XML sitemap and robots.txt are present.

Findings:

Severity:

☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Critical

10. Overall Findings & Priority Recommendations

List findings in priority order — this becomes the basis for scoping the SOW.

High priority:

Medium priority:

Low priority / nice-to-have:

---

11. Recommended Next Step

Based on these findings, the recommended engagement type is:

☐ Redesign & Existing-Environment Work ☐ Debugging & Optimization

☐ Ongoing Care (Webmaster) ☐ No action needed at this time

Estimated Scope / Investment Range: _____

Final scope, timeline, and pricing are defined in the accompanying Statement of Work (SOW), consistent with the Engagement Factors described in the MSA (Scope of Work, Starting Point, and Client Participation).

Prepared By

By: _____ Name: Heather Cooper

Title: Owner, HC Web Labs Date: _____