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college or university was required to sign a Memorandum of Understanding confirming that there were no contractual conflicts, such as an exclusivity clause, with the textbook provider on campus.

Once the agreements were signed, faculty were recruited at each institution. Criteria used to select faculty and courses for participation varied from campus to campus, but at a minimum, faculty who were selected had to adopt a textbook from a publisher included in the pilot. Additional criteria for inclusion in the pilots included: faculty interest and comfort in experimenting with new technology; number of students and discipline of the course; and e-textbook availability. To ensure return on investment, each institution worked to ensure the highest level of participation based on the designated tier while applying the institutional specific selection criteria.

**The Work of the Pilots: Commercial E-textbook Publishers and CourseLoad**

Once faculty were recruited, content had to be secured and enabled in the learning management system (LMS). Frustratingly, not all textbooks from each publisher’s catalog were available to be used in the pilots. Some e-textbooks were withheld for financial reasons: publishers, concerned about lost revenue, removed many popular and heavily-used e-textbooks from their catalogs during the pilot. The electronic versions of other textbooks were simply not available at all, and the conversion process from print to online could take weeks from point of notification to delivery. Plus, if the electronic version of a textbook wasn’t requested from the publisher in the first pilot, that textbook was often ineligible for inclusion in the second and third pilots. Finally, some textbooks were not available at all, for reasons unknown.

Activation of the content began with communicating the information on textbook adoption, course data, and student counts to Courseload and to the publisher(s). Institutions installed the Courseload building block in their learning management system and then Courseload linked the e-textbook to the appropriate course using the course code. Once the content was in place, unique user aids and documentation were created for students and faculty by the participating colleges and universities. Staff developed Web pages, provided in-person or virtual training for the faculty, and engaged IT for possible support issues.

While the pilot was in progress, work on assessment began. Pilot participants could engage in any or all three of the following assessments which were developed by the participants with the guidance and organizational expertise of Internet2:

1) baseline study that gathered basic elements such as demographics and course information using two different instruments, one for students and another for faculty;

2) pilot implementation survey; and

3) teaching and learning survey.

**All Dressed Up and No Where to Go**

All three e-textbook pilots required considerable investments in time, energy, and money. Even with the support of Internet2 and EDUCAUSE, there are unresolved issues following the pilots. At the end of the fall 2012 pilot, the cost of e-textbooks emerged as the most important issue. **USF** and other pilot participants have yet to arrive at a business plan beyond the “100% sell-through” model in which all students pay a fee upon enrollment in a course in order to access the e-textbook. Many colleges and universities are reluctant or unable to discharge student choice, and publishers need that guarantee of revenue to begin discussions on reduced pricing. Another barrier is the implementation of such fees, especially because they are often viewed as an additional financial burden on students. The process for obtaining approval for such fees is arduous and lengthy. Finally, in some states or institutions, such fees cannot even be considered.

Scalability is another issue. Supporting a relatively small number of courses during a pilot for one semester was a huge, complicated undertaking; scaling up to a production-level environment will require significant investments, ones that will eat away at the costs savings passed on to students.

At **USF**, faculty who participated in the three pilots remain enthusiastic about the use of e-textbooks and the pilots. They expressed their primary motivation for participation as an opportunity to save students money and experiment with e-textbook technology. However, without the ability to advance a student e-textbook fee and the publishers’ reluctance to negotiate without the guarantee of full student participation, we are all dressed up and have nowhere to go.