MODERATOR: It now gives me great pleasure to welcome Karen McCall. There goes a plane overhead. The joys of working from home. Karen's presentation is titled Digital Accessibility and Global Inclusive Education Standard. Karen McCall, M.Ed., is the owner of Karlen Communications and has been involved in digital accessibility since the late 1990s. That's pretty much since the beginning, I'd say. Karen's roots are in web accessibility. However, once Adobe added the capability of tagging PDF to make them accessible, her focus shifted to digital document design for accessibility and inclusion. Karen has written several books on accessible document design and currently teaches accessible document design in Mohawk College’s graduate certificate program in accessible media production. Her book on creating and working with accessible PDF, Word and PowerPoint documents was first published in 2005 and the fourth edition of her book on creating and working with accessible PDF, published in 2017. Since 2009, when the Ontario government began the commenting phase for the legislation on accessible education, Karen has been an active advocate for a global inclusive education standard. The standard would focus on including people with disabilities, rather than accommodating for them as the default position. I am delighted to welcome, all the way from Ontario, Karen McCall.

KAREN MCCALL: Thank you. I'm really honoured to be at this conference and have looked at some of the upcoming sessions and have checked some off to attend, even though it is midnight near Ontario, Canada. Let's talk about digital accessibility. I have started framing the global inclusive education standard around the sustainable development goals from the UN. The first five goals are to eradicate poverty, eradicate hunger, global health, inclusive education, and specifically, goal 4.5 mentions inclusive education, and gender equality. All of these first five sustainable development goals are directly related to creating a global inclusive education standard. In 2015, the UN, actually the World Bank, had estimated that every year of education added 10 per cent potential to someone's income. So, not having access to education or being accommodated for, which can sometimes delay education, it impacts your income which impacts poverty and hunger and health and your access to education and employment, but it also involves gender equality in terms of having women and girls with disabilities having access to education. And we have been talking about this as we went along, but COVID-19 has exacerbated the issue of accessible or inclusive education. My background is in digital accessibility, but also in education. Access to the internet and learning management systems -- these are problems that affect everyone. Access to broadband and I notice that my internet slowed down considerably once we had to isolate and self-quarantine because everyone was at home using their internet and things slowed down. Access to affordable broadband, when here in Ontario we were under lockdown and schools were contacting students in general, and asking them about their internet capabilities and their data plans. Most of the students would respond that they had a cell phone, so they had access to school, without considering that most data plans here in Ontario have a limit of two to five gigabytes of information a month, which may not be enough to support online learning if that's your only method of learning as well as all of your other social media activities. There are some misconceptions about data plans and affordability especially amongst students themselves. There is access to broadband. Those are kind of generic to all students, but again not being able to afford broadband or data plans impacts those of us with disabilities in a far more urgent way. There is also access to technology. Many of the students had access to things like screen readers and refreshable braille displays or tools like Intelli keys or speech recognition on their computers at school. But once they were immediately forced into online learning, they did not have that equipment at home. So trying to get a computer system at home as well as the technology that the students would need created a significant barrier. And I know that the school district that -- the board of education that I fall under -- because I have friends who are teachers, they were sending print information out to students who had visual disabilities or learning disabilities, because those students didn't have access to a computer or to the internet. Without the tool to make that print document accessible, it was basically just sending the paper that they couldn't use. So access to technology for those of us with disabilities especially if they are faced with complete online learning, does create a significant barrier. It's one that educational institutions really hadn't thought of. One of the things in contributing to a book a couple of years ago for students with disabilities in tertiary education -- I came across the term "unintentional barriers", and unintentional barriers was a way to couch the unwillingness of faculty to create accessible content. It was a way to approach them and say, well, we know you are creating unintentional barriers. We would just like to help you. And I wasn't comfortable with that term then because I have been an advocate for digital accessibility as well as inclusive education. And I'm still not comfortable with it. I was at a meet-up a couple of weeks ago, and I found a really good description of the intentional barriers we have created as a society, as a community, as software developers and vendors, in that Claudia Louise Vera was explaining that for things like fountains and streams -- in this slide I have an image on the left that is a stream with an old bridge across it. For things like that, the barriers were already there. And we built ways around those barriers. For the rivers, it was bridges. For mountains, we either put a tunnel through them or we created roads that went around them. But computers, the digital world is something that we created with intentional barriers. We didn't take into consideration people with disabilities, even though many of the things that started out digitally, like email, were designed for people with disabilities. We lost our way in terms of thinking of an inclusive digital ecosystem and inclusive content. So we have created these barriers. And they aren't -- they aren't accidental. They're not unintentional. So, we knew that we were creating barriers and we ignored the fact that we were. In 1997 and 98, while I was earning my masters degree here at the University of Toronto, there was an article I found about those of us with disabilities, especially those who are blind or visually disabled, and how as computers shifted from DOS to Windows 3.1, we couldn't use computers and this was reinforced by one of my instructors who refused me access to a computer programming course because, in his opinion, blind people shouldn't be using computers and they couldn't be using computers simply because they couldn't see what was on the screen. At that time, I was teaching computers to people who were blind and I was using a screen reader and screen magnification myself. So I found a disconnect between the research that was available and the articles and research that was built upon that one paper, saying that those of us with disabilities couldn't access digital content and that seemed to be the basis for things moving forward. So, I really was not happy with that and began advocating for inclusive education in a very small way. Since WCAG 1.0, we heard we had to settle for inaccessible content. One of the really amazing things about WCAG 1.0 -- I used to do training on plain English because no-one could figure out what they had to do. And people would say, well, we have WCAG 1.0, that means everything is accessible. Then when they applied the techniques for WCAG 1.0, they discovered even if you have really bad design it's not going to be accessible. And the magic button, the magic solution that they thought was going to be this set of guidelines really did not make things more accessible, it just revealed how much digital content wasn't accessible. As of at least 2005, we have known how to create accessible web content, and we have known how to create accessible digital content. We -- and I use this in terms of the global community -- have refused to teach teachers how to create accessible content. We have not made it an important thing that everyone needs to do, whether you are a student or whether you are a teacher. Then came the pandemic. So all of this time we have been getting people to adopt digital accessibility in an ad hoc basis by cajoling them and coddling them. Then the pandemic came and overnight, everyone shifted to online learning and the amount of inaccessible content was revealed. There is a lot of it out there. We, who are advocates, started screaming and shouting and pleading and begging and we developed plans. We showed people models. Here in Ontario, we have the -- Ontario College of Accessible Design. They were perfectly positioned to start going out and training teachers in primary, secondary and tertiary education to create accessible content. We told people that we have a four to five-month leeway before the pandemic will come back. We need to use that time to make as much content accessible because we are going to possibly be facing a lockdown for an extended period of time. We can't waste that time. We were basically ignored. There was a lot of publicity within the community, but it never reached government, it never reached school boards. So here we are in Ontario faced with even more schools going back to complete online learning because we do have an increase of COVID here in Canada. And nothing has been done to increase the digital accessibility, the accessibility of the content for the students. The other thing that we hear a lot of is the best format for you is… This is kind of tied up in the whole digital accessibility conversation because the first thing someone will say is what is the best format for you? There are people within the PDF, the EPub and HTML, possibly other formats if there are any, who will say theirs is the best format for me, for you, anyone with a disability. This is similar to the old medical model of, "We know best. We know what you need. You don't have to do a thing except accept what we say." And we are in the human rights model of disability where we do have the right to education. We have the right to access digital content. The best format for us is an accessible format. It's that simple. Whatever format you publish in, you have to make it accessible. We have to start teaching people that this is simply how you create a document. You decide on a format and make sure that it is as accessible as it can be. And if possible, you influence the standards so that the standards are based on what human beings need to be able to access that content, rather than what the machines need to create that content. The current battle is access versus accessibility. It comes down to what is the bare minimum I can do in order to please you, to satisfy you, to get to you stop complaining? The things we have heard is we can't tell document authors what to do. And I would beg to differ with that. We can't force document authors to make accessible digital content and this is my personal favourite, every document author has the right to create inaccessible content. If we move that to other things in our life and say that every car manufacturer has the right to create a car that will fall apart, or every housing contractor has the right to build a housing survey built on dust or sand or water, that will fall apart, that we don't have to adhere to building codes, we don't have to wear seatbelts -- everyone does have the right to make something inaccessible, but there are consequences for that. And we need to enforce the consequences. This was an argument that we found back with WCAG 1.0, when we started teaching people how to create accessible web content. One of the big arguments was that every web developer has the right to create inaccessible content. We got over that back in the late 1990s. It has appeared again. It started about three years ago on the -- one of the ISO committees that I was on, the one for PDF documents. It's the reason I left the committee. Because the shift moved from accessibility in terms of how humans would consume or have access to that content versus what the machines needed to simply convert the content. And going back to you should be satisfied with whatever we give you. The argument fails in several areas. The first is that at its very core, computers are 1s and 0s. We created the computers. We tell them what to do. We tell them how to set things up so that we have access to them. We can have the computers, the machines do as much of the prompting and the behind the scenes things that we need them to do. The second -- when someone looks at the visual representation of a page, they can figure out, based on what it looks like, what the structure of the document is and they get more information than those of us who are dependent on adaptive technology. I have some examples here. These are two documents. There is one on the left and one on the right. One of them is accessible and one of them is not. They look exactly the same. I will tell you that one is accessible and one is not. They have headings. They have paragraphs. If I move down a bit, there are lists and tables. So, visually, looking at both of these documents side by side, you can visually decode that there are changes in topics, that you have an ability to navigate these. But one of these documents is not accessible. It happens to be the one on the left. So if I took out all of the direct formatting from the document on the left, this is what I would have. And it would mean that no-one would be able to clearly navigate this document because everything would be a paragraph. And for that document on the left, that is what screen readers and text to speech tools see - are just plain paragraphs. There is no way to navigate in the same way that you see visually. Taking Microsoft Word as just an example, most word processors should be able to do this. There is a navigation pane you can open. You can see in this case there is nothing to navigate. This is the document that was direct formatted, which means I selected the text, I made it bigger, bolder. So, visually, someone has access to the navigational structure. But those of us with disabilities who are using adaptive technology do not have access to the same information that someone who can actually see the document and visually decode the document has. So this means people who are blind or visually disabled, people with learning, cognitive or other print disabilities. That whole segment of the population would not have access to those visual representations of headings. If I look at the accessible document, then I look in the navigation pane and I see the navigational structures. And they are sequential. I know there is a high-level topic change and it has some subtopics underneath it. The whole argument about access is good enough for you versus full accessibility -- this really creates a huge barrier for those of us with disabilities, if this is going to be the approach that is adopted moving forward. I really like the Plain Language Federation description of plain language and I recently have been appointed to the Accessible Canada Act Plain Language Standards Committee. That is how I came across this. The definition for plain language is, “A communication is in plain language if its wording, structure and design are so clear that the intended reader can easily find what they need, understand what they find, and use that information.” So, if I were to replace communication with an accessible digital ecosystem or accessible digital document, is accessible if its wording, structure, design are so clear that the intended reader can easily find what they need using headings for navigation. Understand what they find, so making sure that the document is very well structured. And use that information. At the end of this presentation, I do have a sample of the impact that something that I cannot use the information means in terms of access versus accessibility. So, I originally just looked at creating a global inclusive education standard, but I realised that we also need to start thinking of a standard for Word processed or desktop published documents. The reason that we need to do that is because currently we have best practices of the last 20 to 25 years. We have the old document -- the document presentation -- but before that, publishing has some really good ideas, go figure -- on how to structure documents. But we need to bring that into the computer age. And one of the best books that I have found -- it's a small book -- but it's called the PC is not a typewriter and it's still in print. Because people want to know what the standard is -- if you tell someone to put headings in a document, what standard? You say, well, we don't have any standard, what we have is best practices. Well, if it's best practices I can do whatever I want because it's not a standard and why should I do it? We need to take all of the things we have been doing for the last 20 years, combine them with the publishing standards -- not to be confused with the style guides. The APA and the Chicago Style are style guides. I'm talking about the actual publishing standards and the structures of documents, which we can separate from the style guides. Combine that with what we know about proportional fonts and spacing on a computer screen and create a standard on Word processed and desktop published documents. From there we can move to creating a standard on presentation, followed by a standard on spreadsheet kind of documents.

MODERATOR: 15 minutes to go, Karen.

KAREN: Thank you. So, the problem in not establishing this is we can't enforce a lot of the digital accessibility that we want. That organisations can pick and choose what they're going to do with documents and what they're going to accept. I'm just going to -- because I have 10 minutes, I'm just going to skip over some of this. So we move to the idea of a global inclusive education standard. What that means is accommodation for versus inclusion of. So if we liken that to access to versus accessibility of, we can do a comparison. Accommodation for seems to be the norm. If you're a student with a disability, then you are automatically going to be accommodated for. You're not going to be included in the classroom. You're not going to be included in the academic institution. But we will make special accommodations for you. In a digital environment, and with digital documents, a lot of the accommodation can be eliminated. So that any type of accommodation is -- it's not the norm. It's not the go to. It doesn't necessarily need to be done for all students with disabilities. For example, I have a disability. If content were simply created to be accessible, I wouldn't need any accommodation. But because it isn't, then if I were a student, I need accommodation. In fact, as an instructor, I still need accommodation. Because contracts are signed through an inaccessible document signing process. When I asked for an accessible version, they said, well, you know, just agree to it by email. That means I can't read my contract. I don't know how much I'm going to be paid. I don't know what my hours are. I don't know what the conditions of the contract is. It's all well and good to say, you know, you trust us, wink wink, nod. I have the right to read the contract and fill out my time sheets which should also be accessible. If the digital things that I encounter in my job or as a student were accessible, I wouldn't need these types of accommodation. Although just signing something by email without reading it is not really an accommodation. So, we also need to look at mainstreaming versus integration. I will leave you to -- I do have a hand out with all of these slides. I will leave that for you to read. We do need to recognise that mainstreaming was a failed experiment. And for those of us with disabilities, trying to link mainstreaming with inclusive education really is counterproductive. For both students and teachers, as soon as students touch a keyboard, they need to start creating things to be accessible. Teachers need to teach them how to create things to be accessible, which means teacher also have to learn it. This means in every aspect of what is created. Whether it is written assignments or multimedia, architectural -- what else is there? Open spaces. Any aspect of what students are going to create when they graduate, they must start at the very beginning and be taught by teachers who understand accessible content, how to create accessible content. If we don’t, we will continue graduating people who can't compete in a global economy where a lot of countries have legislation around accessibility. We also need teachers with disabilities for role models for students, for role models with students with disabilities, but also to show students without disabilities that we are equal and we can exist or do exist in professions. I did have the role model challenge earlier this year, because I couldn't find any stock photos in the creative commons that showed those of us with disabilities in professional environments. The one that I did, it was like bring your pet to work day. That's the picture I have on this slide. There is a woman at a desk in an office, but in the foreground is her service dog. The service dog should be in the background. The whole point of this picture is not to show that she brought a pet to work, but that she is a professional person who happens to have a service animal. So, can we do this in 10 years? We only have 10 years. And one of the goals for the sustainable development goals 4.5 is inclusive education. We are still having conferences and summits and everyone is bringing ideas, but no-one is cohesively putting those ideas into a standard, a baseline where we can say this is -- if you say you have inclusive education, this is what it means. It doesn't mean accommodating for students, it means doing your best to include them in every aspect of their education, and that includes bringing iPads into the cafeteria to order. It means everything that is digital and I'm approaching this from digital, but there are a lot of other aspects. There is Sign Language. There is captioning. There is the built environment. There are the open spaces. We have to start thinking of inclusive education in a broader sense. We also have to look at a timeframe. If we don't start creating this type of standard now, it's going to be 2070 and we will still be talking about all of the different pieces of inclusive education. We're going to be talking all on different pages and we still won't have anything done. Those of us with disabilities are going to be left behind. The one thing that COVID has taught us is that if we don't move to make education more inclusive and especially digital accessibility as part of that, there is a whole generation, if not two, of those of us with disabilities who will simply be left behind. We need to create this baseline so that anyone who says -- as I said, anyone who says they are an academic institution with inclusive education, that we know what they're talking about. And this slide has some examples of some of the ad hoc things that have been talked about at other conferences, but nothing is being done to bring everything together. Everyone is talking about and showcasing their own projects, but the projects aren't looked at in terms of a bigger picture, in terms of what does this mean for the students. In fact, Microsoft and Google are creating environments within their own operating system, but they are closed systems. Even with websites and browsers, you know, this website only works with Chrome, or this one only work was Edge. It has to work with everything. And nothing without us. Those of us with disabilities, those of us who are teachers, those of us who are students, we need a seat at the table. We have the experience. We have the knowledge. We have the years of being both in a lot of cases. We need to be at the table to talk about a global inclusive education standard. Because it's going to affect us and it's going to affect generations of people with disabilities that come after us. So, instead of resources, I want to give you an example of what I mean. I think this kind of sums up -- I think this kind of sums up the whole access versus accessibility, and accommodated for versus inclusion of. This is the Salamanca Statement, which was published in, I think, 1994. It just celebrated 25 years. So it created a framework for inclusive education. This was an inaccessible document. Even though they were celebrating this last year or the year before, they did not take the time to update it. So, I leave you with the question, in terms of access versus accessibility, and accommodation versus inclusion, which I think this symbolically represents, is this something that you would put up with if this were the access to your education? - The Salamanca Statement and framework for action, on special needs education. Adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs education, access and quality. Salamanca, Spain, 7-10, June 1994. Table, column 1, row 1, educational, the United Nations ministry of, educational, scientific and education and science, cultural organisation, Spain. Table end. This publication may be freely quoted and reproduced. Printed in UNESCO 1994. ED-94/WS/18. Preface. More than 300 participants representing 92 governments and 25 international organisations met in Salamanca, Spain, from 7 to 10 June 1994 to further the objective of Education for All by considering the fundamental policy shifts required to promote the approach of inclusive education, … to serve all children, particularly those with special education needs. Organised by the Government of Spain in co-operation with UNESCO, the Conference brought together senior education officials, administrators, policy-makers and specialists, as well as representatives of the United Nations and the Specialised Agencies, other international governmental organisations and donor agencies.

KAREN: I have access to this document, but not quite access to all of the content. If I go back to the plain language, I can't use this information. Even reading this one paragraph, I will bet most of you have a headache. I know I did when I first tried to read this. This is the difference between access and accessibility. It is the difference between accommodation of and inclusion in. With that, if you have any questions I would be happy to answer them.

MODERATOR: Do we have any questions for Karen? We can use the Q&A box down below . I will read out the first comment that's come from James Newton. “Hi, Karen. Great as always. In addition to teachers creating accessible content, textbooks for courses in creating documents et cetera teach terrible non-accessible document design practices so the advocacy needs to extend to those creating these books for courses.” Karen, I think you picked up on that in terms of us actually requiring students to learn how to create accessible documents. So that when they become the professionals of the future, that they actually have an understanding of what they're creating and what they're doing. Do you have any other comments for James on that, Karen?

KAREN: Yes, textbooks are notoriously inaccessible. I spoke at the In Design Plus accessibility conference last week and a lot of the textbooks are created using In Design. The fact we had 350 participants who were anxious, very anxious to learn about accessible design so they could implement it in the publications they are working on I thought was a good head start. And, yes, I advocate -- the reason I advocate for both teacher training and student training is to kind of attack or approach this issue from both sides. You start in primary education, but you also get the tertiary educators to learn how to create accessible content and all of their students must then create accessible content. You can build the accessibility into assignments in a seamless manner by simply saying your assignment has to have sequential headings. Here is how you do it. Your assignment has to have accessible tables. Here is how you do it. And just making that part of the criteria for what a product is when you do the research.

MODERATOR: Thanks, Karen. A question from Mark: With the celebration of 25 years of the Salamanca Statement and no updated documentation, is there any word that there is potential for an update?

KAREN: I don't know. I honestly don't know. I know there was a big summit that celebrated this. It was held in San Francisco last year. People talked about inclusive education. They didn't maybe realise that their initial framework was inaccessible. But it certainly would have been a good time to either publish an update or a refresh looking back on the 25 years and where we are now in perspective of the sustainable development goals moving forward. But I didn't hear anything like that coming out of that conference. It was mostly again a bunch of ad hoc conversations about what inclusive education could be.

MODERATOR: It sounds like we have not come all that far in lots of ways. The voice of your screen reader reminded me of Sam, which was the speech software in my Commodore ’64 in 1983.

KAREN: It is the old eloquence synthesiser. I use it rather than the natural phoneme synthesisers because it has the best pronunciation dictionary if you are doing writing and editing.

MODERATOR: So that's a really nice example of not using what is prescribed, but what actually works best for you.

KAREN: Yes. I am a firm believer in tool for task rather than tool for disability. I take full advantage of that. I'm kind of a technology geek. I want to see the new things that are out there and see how I can use them to help me access information. So I'm -- I tell people I'm on the bleeding edge of technology because I'm way over the horizon. I see something and it's like I want it accessible now.

MODERATOR: The bleeding edge of technology. Thanks for that analogy.

KAREN: The new technology is not always accessible. There are cuts and scrapes along the way when looking at trying to use it.

MODERATOR: Yes, absolutely. We're trying to roll out new tech at the moment and there are challenges with it, but we're working through case by case. It's not easy. A couple of other comments, Karen. This is from Leslie: It's not really a question. I'm totally gob smacked at the extent of this problem. I simply did not realise this until your session, Karen. Thanks, Leslie. I think a few of us are in that boat. Jay Thompson: Thank you, Karen, thought provoking and practical. I'm an educator in South Australia. We're currently looking for a definition on what inclusion means. Do you have any thoughts?

KAREN: No, for me the standard that I envisioned, it not only deals with people with disabilities, but any other group that may be left behind or -- I hate the phrase -- marginalised. There are so many of us that, as groups, are not really included in a lot of the educational processes. Here in Canada, it may be the Aboriginal people. It may be newcomers to Canada. People where English is their second language or French is their -- French is not their first language. So, there are many people for whom we need a global inclusive education standard. I see it as something encompassing more than those of us with disabilities.

MODERATOR: Thanks, Karen. We talk about, in Australia, the broad equity categories which cover most of the areas that you spoke of. But it's often used as a way of just -- in fact further marginalising the members of those communities. It's important to remember that this conversation can't be used to marginalise people further. Karen, we have a question from Marin: Are there any successful discrimination complaints that might start to make a difference in Canada (not that the onus should be on the disadvantaged).

KAREN: Most of the legal action has been in the United States. They seem to be quite a litigious lot. In Canada, we're known for being polite, which is sometimes to our detriment. There was a huge legal challenge here in Canada about 10 or 12 years ago, it had to do with the federal government websites not being accessible for people with disabilities who wanted to apply for jobs. It has taken a long time, but as a result we have the Accessible Canada Act now. We're starting to set standards for different things like built environment, plain language, communication. What is another one? I think, open spaces. Information communication technology. We started out with three standards that we're working on and then we will add the other standards as we go. Information communication is not one of the initial standards. Yet I think it affects everything. It affects open spaces in terms of signage and trail marking. It affects built environment in terms of having the elevators talk and the braille on, just signage throughout the building. So, even plain language, plain language needs to be accessible. One of the examples that I do have on the website where I have more of the types of documents that you listened to is a UN easy read document that makes absolutely no sense. Because it is not an accessible document. So, we need some kind of standard for this type of, as I said, word processed or desktop published documents, and information communication standards affect everyone, because it's in every part of our lives.

MODERATOR: Karen, ATEND, the Australian Tertiary Education Network on Disability recently put in a submission to the federal government reviewing the disability standards for education. The national disability strategy. And one of our points was that the government needs to consider coming up with a set of disability standards for publication. Much in line with what you're talking about, because it seems that the publishing industry is quite determined not to make content accessible to everyone. And not to make the adjustments that would seem reasonable and necessary for inclusion and access to information for all. I like the idea of an international standard even better than a local one. Thank you for raising that.

KAREN: One -- I can't put the entire fault on the publishers. Because here in North America, what happens is that individual colleges and universities contact the publisher. They have textbook A. They need an accessible version. But the accessible version is very much dependent on student preference. The student wants it in PDF. The student want it is in e pub. The student wants it in Word and it goes on and on. You end up with textbook A being created in like 100 different flavours of accessibility instead of one accessible document that can then be given to the students. One of the things I used to talk about was accessibility as opposed to user preference. I mean, I would prefer if things came in Word because I can move around it faster. But as long as I have an accessible version of a document, it's an accessible version, I shouldn't have to create anything differently accessible. The publishers, at one point, were just saying tell us what format you want. Out of that came the advocates for PDF is the best format, e pub is the best format. The publishers were being inundated with these student preference requests plus the advocates for the various formats, saying you have to produce it in this, it's the best for people with disabilities. So the publishers were confused. So there needs to be a consolidated effort to say if you’re going to publish something in e pub, it needs to be accessible. If you’re going to publish something in PDF, it needs to be accessible. And since most publishers are using tools like In design and Qurk to create their publications, especially textbooks, you can easily create an accessible document in In design and export it as accessible e pub or accessible PDF. There you go.

MODERATOR: There we are. Karen, we need to wrap up now, unfortunately. But I would be delighted to continue this conversation for the rest of the night. We have to move on to our next activity. On behalf of ATEND and the participants here today, I would like to thank you for taking the time out of your evening to join us from Ontario. And for bringing your wisdom and sharing your knowledge with us. I think we will have all found this a very thought provoking and informative session. And it's certainly given me some things to go back to my team and discuss with them about how we can do things better. In particular, the very simple notion of accessible is what works best for me. And not what I think -- not what we, as in the university, think it is should be, but what actually works best for the student or the academic who needs the content. Karen, thank you so much for your time this afternoon. Or this evening. We look forward to hearing more from you in the future.