

Consortium Complications: Scholars Portal's Service Assessment Framework and the Evaluation of the Accessible Content ePortal

Sabina Pagotto and Ravit H. David, Scholars Portal, Ontario Council of University Libraries

Abstract

Description

Purpose & Goals

Assessing a service provided by a library consortium adds an extra layer of complication to any assessment project. Scholars Portal, the service arm of the Ontario Council of University Libraries, developed a framework to guide assessment projects for its services. This paper describes the first implementation of this framework. It was used to identify strengths, opportunities, and next steps for the alternate text format service, the Accessible Content ePortal (ACE). The decision to choose ACE as the first candidate for the assessment framework resulted from recent changes to the service and evolving accessibility legislation and standards.

Design & Methodology

The assessment framework builds on a previous Library Assessment Conference presentation from Scholars Portal, "Evaluating from Arm's Length: Assessing Services Provided by a Library Consortium" (Pagotto, Barrett, and Pereyaslavskaya, 2016) which recommends taking a comprehensive view of consortial services, including stakeholder and community perspectives, and using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Following this previous study, three methodologies were selected for the present assessment of the ACE service: a comparative analysis of similar services, a quality assurance review, and a survey of staff stakeholders.

Findings

This assessment project has enabled us to articulate the value of the ACE service for our member institutions, understand its place in the Canadian and International alternate format service landscape, and identify specific steps that would improve the quality of the service and reduce barriers to its usage. As the first project created within the Scholars Portal service assessment framework, it has also been an important vehicle to test that framework and its methodologies.

Action & Impact

Recommendations about enhancements that can be developed for the ACE service are currently being reviewed by the consortial governance bodies. Specific, actionable recommendations about the most effective ways to implement or manage the service locally have also been distributed to the local ACE coordinators at each consortial member library. Internally, Scholars Portal is working

to revise the service assessment framework based on what we have learned from this first project. The framework, along with the findings of this assessment, will be shared publicly with our community.

Practical Implications & Value

Services provided at the consortial level are complex, involving various stakeholders and different institutional priorities across member libraries. The ACE service assessment project responds to both shared and individual library requirements to provide accessibility services to users, faculty and staff. By looking at both local and consortial needs, this project helps to validate the new service assessment framework. For Scholars Portal, introducing the service assessment framework represents a step forward in our plan to periodically assess our services comprehensively, transparently, and appropriately.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the members of the ACE Assessment Working Group:

- Lynne Serviss, McMaster University (co-chair)
- Mark Weiler, Wilfrid Laurier University (co-chair)
- Hujma Chowdhury, University of Toronto
- Joanne Oud, Wilfrid Laurier University
- Allison Ridgway, Trent University
- Sheyfali Saujani, University of Toronto

Introduction

At the 2016 Library Assessment Conference, one of the authors of this paper co-presented the paper “Evaluating from Arm’s Length: Assessing Services Provided by a Library Consortium”. Re-reading the conclusion of this paper eight years later, it all still rings very true:

Assessing the services provided by a library consortium is just as necessary as assessing services provided by individual institutions. However, the additional factors of an extra perspective (the library as client), the distance from end-users, and differences between the needs and priorities of different libraries can all contribute to making such assessment difficult. The solutions to these difficulties and ultimately the best practices for assessment can vary greatly between services.ⁱ

The question we still struggle to answer is: how do you assess the services provided by a library consortium? Individual institutions may assess the value they receive from these collaborative services or programs, but consortial initiatives to evaluate service offerings are rarely documented in the literature. When assessments at the consortium level do occur, they are generally about demonstrating value or connecting outcomes to strategic priorities. These types of assessment typically look at cost savings and efficiencies, such as ROI (return on investment) calculations, balanced scorecards, or the usage of consortially licensed resources.ⁱⁱ More recent assessments have taken a big-picture view of value and impact.ⁱⁱⁱ

While these approaches are highly beneficial to assessing and learning about the relationship between consortium and member institutions, they tell us little about a consortial service as a

service. The overarching question is still, as Armstrong & Teper put it, “What have you done for me lately?” rather than “How well is this service performing?”^{iv} Considering the sheer number of stakeholders to consider, any assessments of consortially or collaboratively provided library services for the purposes of service improvement or evidence-based decision-making tend to be one-off, labour-intensive projects.^v

To address the layers of complication inherent in consortial service delivery, Scholars Portal, the service arm of the Ontario Council of University Libraries, developed a framework to guide assessment projects for its services. This paper describes the first implementation of this framework.

The Scholars Portal Service Assessment Framework is intended to provide a procedure to quickly create working groups to do one-time assessment projects of Scholars Portal services, as the need arises. To understand how an assessment of this kind would work in practice, Scholars Portal ran a pilot assessment project for the alternate text format service, the Accessible Content ePortal (ACE).

This assessment project has enabled us to articulate the value of the ACE service, understand its place in the Canadian and International alternate format service landscape, and identify specific steps that would improve the quality of the service and reduce barriers to its usage. As the first project created within the Scholars Portal service assessment framework, assessing ACE has been an important vehicle to test that framework and its methodologies and an important step forward in our plan to periodically assess our services comprehensively, transparently, and appropriately.

Context: Consortia are Complicated

The Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL) is a regional academic library consortium serving public universities in Ontario, Canada. At the time of this project, the consortium had 21 member institutions, which are distributed geographically across the province and vary considerably by size, research intensity, focus, and governance structure.

Despite the differences between these institutions, they have a shared commitment to inter-library collaboration. OCUL is a member-driven organization, with governance resting in the hands of the Council (also called the OCUL Directors), made up of the library director of each member institution. Committees and subcommittees made up of library representatives support each of OCUL’s program areas.

Scholars Portal is the shared technological infrastructure arm of OCUL. Based at the University of Toronto, OCUL’s largest member, Scholars Portal provides shared digital services and infrastructure for OCUL members. Scholars Portal offers 13 distinct services, including locally hosted platforms for consortially licensed electronic resources, a collaborative virtual reference chat service, a digital preservation service, library publishing services, and more. As part of OCUL, Scholars Portal is ultimately accountable to and under the governance of OCUL membership, in the form of the Council itself and the Director-level Scholars Portal Operations & Development Committee (SPOD). Some services have an additional committee, community, or working group involved in the decision-making for that service.

What does this complex environment mean for service assessment? The potential pool of users is huge, with the student population of OCUL hitting over half a million. Even the services that we offer that are library-facing, rather than end-user facing, such as our digital preservation service, have hundreds of potential users with different needs and priorities. Barriers such as variation in technology and privacy legislation limit the types of data we can collect about these many users. The lines of accountability and reporting are also complex and vary from one service to another.

Developing the Framework

Assessment at Scholars Portal has historically been fairly ad-hoc. Pilot projects and other experimental initiatives generally have a built-in assessment phase, but ongoing services have only haphazardly done much assessment. An initiative (previously discussed) towards assessment planning led mostly to a more regular and standardized way of reporting out usage statistics for our services to member libraries—a valuable goal but only a narrow sliver of assessment.

With an increasing emphasis on assessment, the OCUL Directors and SPOD indicated that they wanted to see more mechanisms for assessment at Scholars Portal. To help support assessment, we developed the Scholars Portal Service Assessment Framework. This framework is intended to be used for one-off assessment projects to answer specific questions. The framework was developed with the following principles:

- **Consistency:** A structure that provides for consistency in terms of governance, lines of reporting, and deliverables.
- **Flexibility:** The ability to take different factors into account, or to use different methods for different services and different types of assessment.
- **Transparency:** As a member-driven organization, the assessment project and its result must be transparent not just to OCUL Directors, but also to the individual librarians and library staff at our member libraries who work with these services.
- **Community involvement:** To make sure that the assessment takes into account the full view of the service, the assessment needs to involve people at member libraries who work with the service and library leaders who are involved with the service, not just Scholars Portal staff and library directors.

The framework includes specific instructions about:

- How an assessment project can be initiated
- The role of SPOD in approving the project and providing direction
- How the assessment working group should be formed, including which community/stakeholder groups must be represented
- The level of community engagement required for recommendations
- What kind of information should be included in the final assessment report

The first draft of the framework was prepared in 2022 and was refined in multiple stages by the services leads at Scholars Portal and by the SPOD committee. In order to fully evaluate how well the framework would work, the decision was made to use the service assessment to assess one of our services, and assess the framework at the same time.

The Accessible Content ePortal

The service selected as the first to be assessed using the framework is the Accessible Content ePortal (ACE), a digitization and repository service for accessible books. A service of Scholars Portal, ACE is available to members of OCUL as well as members of the consortium of Ontario college libraries, the Ontario Colleges Library Service (OCLS).

First piloted in 2012, ACE was envisioned as a time- and cost-effective way to fulfill obligations under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA), which requires libraries at post-secondary institutions to provide alternate format version of print texts in their collections to users with print disabilities upon request. ACE provides a digitization service to convert print library books into accessible formats, and a repository to share these digitized titles across institutions.

Digitization Service

Requests for digitization are submitted by staff at participating institutions, known as local ACE coordinators. The ACE team at Scholars Portal works with those institutions to source a copy for digitization, usually from the University of Toronto Libraries, where Scholars Portal is based, or shipped to Scholars Portal from the requester's library. The book is then scanned by our digitization partner, Internet Archive Canada, run through an Optical Character Recognition (OCR) program, converted into several file formats, and added to the repository. ACE coordinators can also request that books in the [Internet Archive accessibility collection](#)^{vi} be added to ACE at no cost, as long as that title is owned by at least one participating library. Neither Internet Archive nor Scholars Portal perform any additional remediation beyond basic quality checks of the scan and metadata.

Since 2020, a new community submission program has allowed ACE coordinators to upload books they have digitized in their institutions. Notably, local institutions' digitized books do not go through the same quality control workflow as ACE requests. This often results in substantial variations in scanning and metadata quality. About one third of new titles added to the repository come from either the Internet Archive collection or community submissions.

Repository

The ACE repository uses the existing infrastructure for Scholars Portal's local ebook platform, though it has a separate database. Users at OCUL libraries have access to all titles on the platform, whether their library owns a print copy or not, unless the library has chosen to opt out.

The ACE repository allows end users to independently search for and download items. Eligible users receive a secure access token from their local ACE coordinators. Scholars Portal staff can track activity by the user's token and institution, but receive no other information about the user. The token system ensures near-total anonymity and medical privacy. ACE does not determine the eligibility of users to receive a token. Each institution is responsible for determining the eligibility of its users.

As of fall 2024, the repository includes around 25,000 titles.

Assessing ACE

In 2023, the SPOD committee approved a project charter for the initial assessment project to be conducted under the Service Assessment Framework: an assessment of the ACE service. Accessible formats, adaptive technologies, and accessibility legislation have all seen significant changes over the last decade; SPOD and Scholars Portal staff agreed that an assessment would help the team to make evidence-based decisions about the future of the service.

The specific areas of the assessment included:

- Understanding which sources OCUL member libraries use to fulfill alternate format requests (including ACE) and the pros and cons of these services
- Reviewing the quality of the scans that have been submitted for the community submission program
- Identifying potential barriers to the usage of ACE by eligible end-users at OCUL member libraries
- Articulating the strengths of ACE as a service as well as opportunities for future development and growth using a SOAR (Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations, Results) analysis

While ACE is also available to college (OCLS) libraries, as an OCUL committee SPOD decided to focus the assessment on OCUL libraries' use of the service.

A working group was struck in July 2023, composed of the ACE and assessment leads at Scholars Portal (authors of this paper), local ACE coordinators, representatives from the SPOD committee and OCUL's community of practice for accessibility, and an ACE end user.

The working group selected three methodologies to answer the questions posed by the project charter: a survey of local ACE coordinators, a quality assessment of community submissions, and a comparative analysis of different alternate format platforms.

Originally, we had hoped to survey ACE end users as well, but the research office at one member's institution felt that research ethics board (REB) approval would be necessary in order to survey students. Due to time constraints, we did not think this would be feasible. Instead, we incorporated more questions about user experience into the survey of local coordinators, and used public testimonials from end users in the comparative platform analysis. Having a longtime ACE user as part of the working group was also a significant benefit. For reasons of privacy, we do not collect any data about ACE users centrally.

Survey of local ACE coordinators

The working group surveyed local ACE coordinators to determine their use and perceptions of different alternate format services, local workflows used to meet requests for alternate format materials, and perceived barriers to the use of ACE at their institution. This survey was distributed to the ACE coordinator mailing list, with targeted reminders to institutions who had not submitted a response halfway through the survey period, and received responses from over 80% of participating universities.

Quality assessment of community submissions

To assess the quality of different service providers, three books, each submitted by five community partners and three produced by the Internet Archive, were selected.

Ten pages were randomly selected from each book and five additional pages were chosen for specific, potentially problematic features (such as tables and images).

For each book, we evaluated:

- Metadata completeness and accuracy:
- Scan quality: conversion of the printed page into a digital image
- OCR quality: conversion of images of printed text into machine-encoded text
- Remediation: correcting and adding tags to the text

Comparative analysis of alternate format platforms

We performed a comparative analysis of online alternative format services to better understand the landscape in which ACE operates. Ten alternate format platforms were examined to see how they responded to user needs: three in Canada, two in Europe and five US/international platforms.

To understand end user needs, we reviewed testimonials from students with print disabilities talking about their experiences.^{vii} Based on the content of these testimonials, we developed eleven categories that focused on the end-user as the primary recipient of these services.

Platforms were evaluated on the following categories:

- Eligible Users: Who can access the alternate formats on the platform?
- Collections: Who decides which items are in the alternative format collection?
- Formats: The format options provided to the end user
- Services: Remediation and delivery services
- Search interface: This category is about how the user finds items
- Delivery experience: This category recognizes delivery of material to users
- Platform support: How the platform is a source of resources for end-users and stakeholders
- Stakeholder relationships: How a platform builds and maintains relationships with stakeholders in accessible reading experiences
- Service differentiation: How a platform recognizes needs vary across end-user types (e.g., students, faculty, researchers)
- Privacy
- Other unanticipated items

Findings of the Assessment

Findings from the Survey of ACE Coordinators

ACE is a well-used and valuable service. Specific benefits include the ability to request specific titles, including niche materials and out-of-print materials that can be difficult to source from places like Bookshare. The cost and labour savings of a centralized repository were also valuable

compared to digitizing locally. Several respondents emphasized the generally good scan quality (especially compared to services that digitize primarily for preservation rather than accessibility, like HathiTrust).

The survey also uncovered areas for improvement. Some barriers to the use of ACE highlighted by the survey include a lack of communication or awareness about ACE on campus, meaning that potentially eligible users are frequently unaware of the service's existence; little capacity locally for anything more than the most basic remediation work; long turnaround times for some materials; and the difficulty of the token system, which can be cumbersome to administer and confusing for users.

Findings from the Community Submission Quality Assessment

Community submissions are not consistently of the same quality.

Metadata quality can vary. For example, upon metadata investigation of the 5696 community submissions, 3654 were missing publication dates and 1911 were missing copyright data.

There is some scan quality inconsistency within local community providers. Scan quality issues included underlining, highlighting, blurrier text, curved lines, two pages scanned per page, and black margins. These impact OCR accuracy.

Optical Character Recognition (OCR) for the selected community-submitted examples was of overall high quality, with some exceptions for content type. All documents contained selectable text.

A major finding is the absence of remediation of the books. While remediation is not currently part of the ACE service and we would not expect titles digitized through ACE to be remediated, we also found that none of the community submissions had seen remediation such as tagging.

Findings from the comparative analysis

ACE provides key benefits that many other platforms do not. ACE users can independently search and access thousands of digitized books and ebooks. Independence and autonomy are particularly important values for researchers with disabilities. ACE is the only user-facing alternate text platform dedicated to the academic environment. The services and collections ACE provides can be tailored to academic and specifically to research needs.

ACE has built a functional community of alt text practitioners at partner libraries and fostered relationships with international partners. Local coordinators from member libraries are actively involved in driving policy and new feature development.

However, the comparison also highlighted some features that ACE is missing:

- Format options: ACE only includes basic text formats (PDF, plain text, EPUBs for some books) with no audio options
- Quality assurance: ACE does not provide remediation or advanced quality assurance (such as QA of OCR)
- Discovery experience: Users must search ACE. ACE content is not included in the library catalogue or discovery interface.

- Public awareness and strategic relationships
- Support for readers: ACE does not provide direct support for readers, instead referring them to contact their local ACE coordinator.

Simultaneous Projects: OCUL’s AI Task Force

While the assessment working group was evaluating the ACE service, OCUL initiated a separate process to establish a Director-level task force focused on identifying artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) projects that could enhance OCUL and Scholars Portal services. In 2023 the task force started work to explore how the consortium can pilot with AI and machine learning technology and in spring 2024 it published its final report to OCUL Directors. The report provided an informed, strategic perspective on machine learning applications and their relevance as OCUL initiatives.

The strategy outlined in the report includes the following five objectives:

- Identify AI/ML Use Cases: Explore operational projects that can benefit library users, staff, or both.
- Implement Collaborative Initiatives: Develop these projects as consortial efforts to maximize impact.
- Support Bilingual Accessibility: Ensure that tools and services are available to support both English and French-speaking Ontario learners and researchers.
- Build Capacity: Enhance libraries’ knowledge and technical skills regarding AI/ML.
- Enable Transformational Change: Further the mission of libraries through innovative applications of AI/ML.^{viii}

An outcome of this report was OCUL’s new AI and Machine Learning Program, a two-year program consisting of five projects identified in the AI/ML report.^{ix} Independently to the work of the assessment, the Task Force identified the ACE service as one that could benefit from AI technologies. This aligns well with the top recommendation from the ACE assessment report and came at the perfect timing to investigate how to implement AI tools and technologies when investing, for example, in remediation – as strongly recommended in the assessment report. Furthermore, centralizing expertise in processes like transcriptions, tagging or enhancing and standardizing metadata for accessible text enables OCUL libraries to experiment with evolving AI/ML tools without substantial time or infrastructure investments.

Following up on the Assessment

Next Steps for ACE

The working group prepared a report highlighting our findings and responding to the questions in the original project charter from SPOD. The report concluded with a series of 24 recommendations in four categories:

1. Invest in remediation and add more file formats

2. Leverage distributed workflows and existing networks to improve sharing of accessible content
3. Prioritize communication and add support for staff and end users
4. Foster partnerships and develop advocacy strategies

A draft of the report was shared with local ACE coordinators and with OCUL's community of practice on accessibility for comment in April 2024 and a final version was submitted to the SPOD committee in May 2024.

In addition to the assessment report, which was intended to be a brief document for the benefit of library and consortium leadership, we prepared a lengthy resource document. This resource document is intended to be used as reference material when reading the report, not as a standalone document. It includes a much more fulsome and detailed discussion of the methodology and findings of the assessment, as well as providing an introduction and definitions to specific concepts in the alternate format space.

After reviewing the report, the SPOD committee decided to add a covering letter before the report was shared with the full Council (directors of all member libraries). This letter served to categorize and prioritize the 24 recommendations so that the OCUL Directors could more easily vote on them.

OCUL Directors approved the report and recommendations in May 2024 and the report was officially published to all OCUL members in July. The AI/ML Task Force report was published at the same time. Since then, the ACE team at Scholars Portal, local ACE coordinators, the AI/ML Operations Team, and the SPOD committee have been discussing the recommendations to determine the best approach to implementation. We have set up a space on our consortium-wide wiki that includes all of the information and documents related to the assessment, including a chart tracking which Scholars Portal or OCUL committee or team will take responsibility for each recommendation. With a large number of recommendations and competing priorities, uptake has unfortunately been slower than anticipated in implementing the recommendations, but we are making progress.

Next Steps for the Assessment Framework

After the ACE assessment report was approved by the OCUL Directors, Scholars Portal staff evaluated how well the process had gone.

What worked well?

- **Working group membership:** The group was made up of representatives of different stakeholder communities or groups within OCUL, each of whom brought a different perspective about the service and how it fits into their own suite of services within their library. This approach gave us a much fuller picture of the service itself and the priorities of stakeholders.
- **SPOD mandate:** SPOD shared specific instructions including deliverables they wanted to see and questions they had about the service. This helped to guide the assessment and ensure that findings would be relevant for evidence-based decision-making.

- **Governance:** Having a defined process for the final report (review by the community, approval by SPOD) helped establish lines of accountability and priority while ensuring that the community found the assessment results valid.

What did we add, adjust or clarify during the project?

- **Project charter:** While the framework indicates that SPOD should give the working group a mandate for the assessment, it does not indicate how this should be done or what framing documents should guide the group. We decided that SPOD should approve a project charter that would act as both a mandate and terms of reference. The document clearly laid out goals, scope, deliverables, and anticipated timeline.
- **Resource document and cover letter:** To keep the report brief and to-the-point, we kept some of the technical details of the methodology, findings, and background to a resource document. Upon receipt of the report, SPOD wrote a covering letter for the OCUL Directors including their interpretation of the recommendations and priorities. This approach helped to translate and clarify the findings and recommendations for an OCUL Director audience.

What should we do differently in the future?

- **Scope:** The scope and objectives were very ambitious, resulting in a longer-than-expected timeframe and many recommendations. Future projects should be more focused.
- **Responsibility for recommendations:** While the framework allows for recommendations to other groups within OCUL, responsibility for the assessment belongs to SPOD. This can leave recommendations for groups other than SP in governance “no man’s land”. In the future, any recommendations that aren’t for SP should be detailed separately.
- **Considerations around end users:** Standards for whether ethics review boards need to approve surveys for service improvement (rather than research and publication) vary across OCUL member institutions. In this instance, we were not able to survey end users because the group determined that ethics approval would be necessary for this type of survey, and our timeline did not allow for a full ethics review. This should be considered carefully for any assessment project that may benefit from an end-user perspective.

The framework has been revised based on these findings. A second assessment project using the framework was approved in fall 2024 and kicked off in January 2025. This project has a much more specific question and involves a service that is very different from ACE in terms of technology, community, workflows, and governance, so it will be a true test of the flexibility and adaptability of the framework.

Conclusion

Accomplishing short-term projects in a consortium, especially one with a governance structure as complex as OCUL, is always an achievement. The ACE service assessment was a success on two levels.

As an assessment project, we were able to articulate ACE’s strengths as a service and better communicate its value, while identifying specific areas where the service could improve to better meet its goals in the evolving alternate format landscape.

As a test of the service assessment framework, this project validated many of the components of the framework, including governance, community feedback, and structures and guidelines to provide coherence while enabling flexibility. Testing the framework also brought to light specific aspects to clarify or change going into future assessments, such as making the scope and governance more specific.

Overall, this project demonstrated that frameworks can be used to ensure holistic, flexible, and community-involved assessment for consortially provided services. We now have the start of an assessment program for our services that goes beyond providing usage statistics and impact statements. This is increasingly important as so many services are now provided at the consortial level. Assessing consortial or collaborative services is important, and with proper planning and structure, the complexities involved do not need to be a barrier. The service assessment framework allows us to share language across services and is flexible enough to meet the needs of each service, using comparable processes and with a unified set of outcomes.

Notes

ⁱ Sabina Pagotto, Kathryn Barrett, and Katya Pereyaslavskaya, “Evaluating from Arm’s Length: Assessing Services Provided by a Library Consortium,” in *Proceedings of the 2016 Library Assessment Conference: Building Effective, Sustainable, Practical Assessment*, October 31–November 2, Arlington, Virginia, ed. Sue Baughman, Steve Hiller, Katie Monroe, and Angela Pappalardo (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2016), 555, <https://www.libraryassessment.org/wp-content/uploads/bm~doc/88-pagotto-2016.pdf>.

ⁱⁱ Examples include George Machovec, “Calculating the Return on Investment (ROI) for Library Consortia,” *Journal of Library Administration* 55, no. 5 (July 2015): 414–24, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2015.1047282>; Katherine Perry and James Self, “The ICOLC Balanced Scorecard Pilot: The Value of Collaborative Parallel Play,” in *Proceedings of the 2012 Library Assessment Conference: Building Effective, Sustainable, Practical Assessment*, October 29–31, Charlottesville, Virginia, ed. Steve Hiller, Martha Kyrrillidou, Angela Pappalardo, Jim Self, and Amy Yeager (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2012), 355–361, <https://www.libraryassessment.org/bm~doc/proceedings-lac-2012.pdf>.

ⁱⁱⁱ See, for example, Paula Kaufman, “Let’s Get Cozy: Evolving Collaborations in the 21st Century,” *Journal of Library Administration* 52, no. 1 (January 2012): 53–69, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.629962>; Kimberly L. Armstrong and Thomas H. Teper, “Library Consortia and the CIC: Leveraging Scale for Collaborative Success,” *Serials Review* 43, no. 1 (March 2017): 28–33, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2017.1284493>; Faye A. Chadwell, “Assessing the Value of Academic Library Consortia,” *Journal of Library Administration* 51, no. 7–8 (October 2011): 645–61, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.601268>.

^{iv} Armstrong & Teper, “Library Consortia and the CIC”, 32.

^v While the authors suspect that the vast majority of such initiatives do not make it into the academic literature on assessment, examples of scholarly work include Jocelyn Godolphin, “Defining Consortial Value: The CRKN External Review as a Test Case,” in *Proceedings of the 2014 Library Assessment Conference: Building Effective, Sustainable, Practical Assessment*, August 4–6, Seattle, Washington, ed. Sarah Durso, Steve Hiller, Martha Kyrrillidou, and Angela Pappalardo (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2012), 283–291, <https://www.libraryassessment.org/wp-content/uploads/bm~doc/proceedings-lac-2014.pdf>; Paul Gabriele Weston and Giuseppina Vullo, “United we stand: quantitative and qualitative

methods to assess cooperation: The URBS libraries network: a case study", *Library Management* 35, no. 6/7 (August 2015): 508-520. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-02-2014-0020>.

^{vi} "Books for People with Print Disabilities," Internet Archive, accessed December 12, 2024, <https://archive.org/details/printdisabled>.

^{vii} Sources of testimonials include York University Libraries, "Student Panel - Accessibility Symposium 2019," YouTube video, 1:03:52, March 2019, <https://youtu.be/KhBqThi9oqA> ; NNELS Canada, "2022 Accessible Publishing Summit | User Perspective Panel Discussion," YouTube video, February 2022, <https://www.youtube.com/live/GTanHtsOKjc>.

^{viii} OCUL Task Force on Machine Learning/AI, *OCUL Artificial intelligence/Machine Learning report and Strategy*, May 2024, https://ocul.on.ca/sites/default/files/20240625_OCUL-TFMLAI_FinalReport_Strategy_WEB.pdf.

^{ix} "AI and Machine Learning Program," Ontario Council of University Libraries, accessed January 20, 2025, <https://ocul.on.ca/aiml-program>.