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The EAR Ebook Committee is providing this preliminary report to the EAR in advance of the February 12, 2018 deadline. The report explains how the Committee solicited and evaluated proposals from vendors, ranks the proposals received, and recommends that COLD allocate $91,000 in extra funding received this fiscal year to partially fund a system-wide ebook package and lower its cost for individual campuses.

**Review of 2016-17 CSU Survey**

The Ebook Committee reviewed the results of the 23-campus survey conducted by the 2016-17 Ebook Committee. This year’s Committee concluded that the 2016-17 survey provided enough useful information to forego an additional survey.

The Committee reviewed 2016-17 campus responses to survey question 2: “Which vendors would you like considered for centralized ebook acquisitions?”

The Committee reviewed the most popular vendors and decided to seek ebook proposals from six vendors: Ebsco, Gale, JSTOR, Oxford, ProQuest (Ebook Central), and Springer.

**Soliciting Proposals**

The Subcommittee asked each vendor to address the following criteria when submitting their proposals:

* **Acquisitions model**: DDA, EBA, etc.
* **Title List:** What titles will be provided, are they front or backlist, is the list customizable, etc.?
* **# Simultaneous Users:** Unlimited or not
* **Multiplier/cost formula:** How does vendor factor the system-wide cost?
* **DRM:** What are print, copy, ILL limitations (what if any DRM restrictions will materials have?)
* **ADA accessibility**
* **IP authentication**
* **Platform features:** citing, bookshelves, highlighting, etc.
* **Admin features:** COUNTER options (type of analytics, analytics dashboard, MARC record availability)
* **Duplication:** How to avoid duplication of both physical and ebook copies in CSU collections
* **Currently participating consortia**
* **Growth in program:** what are long-term prospects for proposal;will new titles be added?

**Evaluation of Proposals**

After careful consideration of all submitted proposals, the Committee ranks them in the following order:

1. JSTOR

We consider this the best proposal. Content is strongly interdisciplinary and from well-known publishers. The content is DRM-free at the chapter level. The offer is scalable and can be adopted without full CSU participation. In addition, JSTOR has good experience with EBA across consortia. Pricing is fair (from $321,154 to 403,532 depending on participation) with 25% going to access fees and 75% to the final purchase of materials. The cost multiplier will 22 X cost of title minus 65% initial discount. 41% of titles are 2010 or newer.

1. ProQuest

The Committee also considers this to be a strong proposal. Since the initial proposal ProQuest has promised to make the content is DRM-free at the chapter, which was a high priority for campuses and essentially the same DRM access provided by JSTOR. This is an all-in proposal with an initial investment of $250,000, $50,000 of which will pay access fees and $200,000 towards title purchase. The multiplier model for per title cost is 3X3SU (3 multiplied by three simultaneous user cost). Content is limited to University Presses, which is a positive but also restricts the offer to a limited set of publishers. 37% of titles are 2010 or newer. Of the 24,000 titles offered, 9,800 titles are unique to the package (some titles may be owned through campus DDA).

1. Gale

The GVRL package has potential if campuses find the list of materials attractive. Per-volume cost across all campuses would be reasonable. Although we would not likely retain access to a lot of content, Gale is including “gratis” numerous titles already owned by multiple campuses.

The Committee is in favor of considering this offer again in the next fiscal year, including system-wide access to the ASCD "Teacher Preparation and Development" Collection. The proposal requires a commitment of $90,000 towards the purchase of titles, which are discounted 60% system-wide.

1. Springer

Springer content is DRM-free. There is a variety of content, more so than in Elsevier’s recent offer, but the offer is largely similar to Elsevier’s in most respects. Springer is the content publisher, which limits scope, to some extent. It also limits content to a single publisher. The Committee considers the cost to be very high and the multi-year commitment is not attractive and should only be undertaken if a single year is successful. This offer ranks below ProQuest’s mostly due to cost. First year cost is $806,240; second year: $842,521; third year: $880,435. In each year, an access fee is applied and the remaining funds go to evidence-based acquisition. First year fee: $65,726; second year: $68,684; third year: $71,775.

1. Ebsco

The Committee considers the Ebsco offer to be thin on content, lacking substance, and less than a full proposal. It is more like a proposal to make a proposal. They provided few details, except to point out (perhaps rightly) that it would be easier to facilitate an EBA program through GOBI. While that may be true, we also have the supposed power of ALMA analytics to help us along the way.

The Committee considers it worthwhile to continue discussions about how GOBI might work with the offer we recommend.

1. Oxford

Oxford declined to submit a proposal.

**Summary**

The Committee has reviewed and evaluated five vendor proposals and was able to rank them based upon their relative merits. The most attractive proposal, from JSTOR, would greatly expand ebook access across the CSU at a fair price; it integrates well with the existing platform, and provides content from a variety of publishers that is DRM-free. The Committee also considers the ProQuest package to be an attractive alternative to JSTOR. If central funding can be used to bring down the cost to individual campuses, both package are likely to be attractive options for many.