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Pack Supply Chain and Production

• Complex supply chain involving many people
  – Faculty and Faculty Directors
  – Curriculum Assistants
  – Course Materials Program

• Print and electronic course materials production is an intertwined process
Copyright Clearance Process

• CMP reviews content to determine what may need clearance

• Permission can come in other forms
  – Licensing via CHM, Library
  – Creative Commons resources
  – Arrangements involving use from required textbooks
Recent Permissions Negotiations

Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins and Elsevier Global underwent comprehensive reorganization of their Rights & Permission offices

Nearly all required textbooks for Block I and II are published by one of these two companies.
Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins

• New LWW-proposed pricing structure equated to approximately $0.88 per figure for print and electronic use

• Renegotiated down to $0.27 per figure for print and electronic use
  – Includes standing arrangement allowing for gratis use of material original to required textbooks, along with previous edition
Elsevier Global

- Royalty rates have been raised from $22.50 flat fee per figure to $24
- Initially invoiced for material from required textbooks, previous agreement of gratis print and electronic use has been maintained
Others of Note

• Scientific American royalties renegotiated
• BMJ Group (BMJ, J of Med. Ethics, 40+ more) raised print royalties
• JAMA
e-Packs in PDF Format

• PDFs are highly-versatile format
  – Can be outputted from wide range of applications
• Can be used on many devices
• Free and fee-based note-taking software available
• Zooming in on high-definition images
Making e-Packs Searchable

• CHM survey results showed 92% value searching capability
• Optical Character Recognition (OCR)
• Converts text in image format into renderable text
• New sector for CMP, challenges exist
Access using ANGEL

• Learning Object Repositories (LORs)
  – Easy way to deliver content
  – Simple to adhere to licensing terms
  – Tracking usage data
  – Generally available one week prior to print pack distribution
Learning Object Repositories (LORs)
Access using ANGEL and beyond

- Transitioning to Desire 2 Learn will occur by 2015
- Both ANGEL and D2L have LOR functionality, virtually identical
- D2L will be more accessible than ANGEL
Student Survey Feedback

“Which of these electronic course pack options have been helpful in your course? Check all that apply.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Enlarging</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inserting notes</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If only the electronic course pack (at cost for only electronic) were available to you, would you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print the entire course pack yourself</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print selected portions of the course pack</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order a printed copy of the course pack for an additional charge</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use only the electronic course pack</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Survey Feedback

- 82% rated the impact of e-Packs on learning being 7-10 out of 10; 33% rated 10

However...
“Overall, do you think e-Pack or paper packs provide a better learning experience? (choose one)”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-Pack significantly better</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Pack slightly better</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference (e-Pack and paper pack the same)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper pack slightly better</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper pack significantly better</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format Used</th>
<th>2013 Results</th>
<th>2012 Results</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic only</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic more than 50% of the time</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper and electronic equally</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper more than 50% of the time</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper only</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Survey Feedback

“Electronic course packs require all students in the course to be assessed a material charge to cover copyright and processing. Do you support continuing this payment model?”

90% YES
“I really loved the electronic course packs. The only problem I had with them was when the instructors had fill in the blanks in their material. Therefore, when I would search, or look back at the electronic course packs, some of the information would not be there. If the electronic course pack would be in a form that had all the material (all the fill in the blanks filled in) that would be REALLY helpful.”
Challenges with e-Pack Files

- Usage with devices require additional formatting
- Size of files cause slowdowns and crashes
- Potential challenge in that ~45% of students reported that they are not considering purchasing new electronic devices soon
Anticipated Changes

• Releasing versions of e-Pack as one file, and broken down by unit/session/etc.
• Releasing as early as possible
• Recommendations for digital content creation
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