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Library publishing is not a new topic in the (digital) pages of JLSC. In volume 2 alone, there have been two articles (McIntyre et al., 2013; Weiner & Watkinson, 2014) and a review (Lally, 2013) focused on different aspects of the topic, and it’s also made appearances in pieces on related issues (for example, in Salo (2013)). This is, however, the first issue dedicated entirely to this rapidly growing area of practice. The issue, in its entirety, provides a current picture of the range of programs and diversity of approaches in library publishing. The three practice articles include an in-depth look at an innovative journal publishing project (Newton, Cunningham, & O’Connell), a report on an in-progress pilot project focused on publishing open textbooks (Sutton & Chadwell), and a review of library-press collaborations (Roh). The rest of the issue consists of selections from the first Library Publishing Forum, held in March of 2014 in Kansas City, MO. The Forum consisted of invited panels and interactive sessions, which were both thought-provoking and lively. The authors included here take a variety of approaches to representing their Forum sessions—from the practical to the provocative. We also include in this issue the posters from the Forum, which were first made available in May.

Library publishing is often portrayed as a mission-driven attempt to reform the scholarly communications system. Not surprisingly, its practitioners tend to push the envelope in their own scholarly practice. We had a submission that was written on a new, collaborative authoring platform,1 and another that provoked a lively exchange on Twitter and The

---

1 https://www.authorea.com/users/6729/articles/7032/_show_article
Lib Pub blog (see Vandegrift (2014) and Gilman (2014)). The authors challenged our expectations, and seemed determined to hold their own scholarly journals to the ideals they espouse in their publishing work. We found the experience educational and, frankly, a lot of fun.

This issue represents a small node in a larger network of scholarly examination of library publishing. It is our hope that it will complement recent efforts such as the Library Publishing Toolkit, the recently released SPEC Kit, Library Support for Faculty/Researcher Publishing (Bruxvoort & Fruin, 2014), and the forthcoming volume edited by Maria Bonn and Mike Furlough, Getting the Word Out: Academic Libraries as Scholarly Publishers (ACRL, 2014). It is also our hope that in the future, we will see more research and scholarship that continues to connect the practical and provocative.

We would like to thank the authors who submitted their work and the reviewers who contributed their time and energy to the creation of this special issue. We also extend our thanks and appreciation to Isaac Gilman and Sarah Lippincott, who were enormously helpful to the editorial process. Finally, we would like to thank the JLSC editors, Isaac Gilman and Marisa Ramírez, and the rest of the editorial board for the opportunity to contribute to JLSC and to the discourse on library publishing.

Stephanie Davis-Kahl and Melanie Schlosser
Guest Editors
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Counting the Cost: 
A Report on APC-Supported Open Access Publishing in a Research Library
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BACKGROUND  At one-hundred twenty-two articles published, the open access journal Tremor and Other Hyperkinetic Movements (Tremor) is growing its readership and expanding its influence among patients, clinicians, researchers, and the general public interested in issues of non-Parkinsonian tremor disorders. Among the characteristics that set the journal apart from similar publications, Tremor is published in partnership with the library-based publications program at Columbia University’s Center for Digital Research and Scholarship (CDRS). DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM  The production of Tremor in conjunction with its editor, a researching faculty member, clinician, and epidemiologist at the Columbia University Medical Center, has pioneered several new workflows at CDRS: article-charge processing, coordination of vendor services, integration into PubMed Central, administration of publication scholarships granted through a patient-advocacy organization, and open source platform development among them. Open access publishing ventures in libraries often strive for lean operations by attempting to capitalize on the scholarly impact available through the
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use of templated and turnkey publication systems. For CDRS, production on Tremor has provided opportunity to build operational capacity for more involved publication needs. The following report introduces a framework and account of the costs of producing such a publication as a guide to library and other non-traditional publishing operations interested in gauging the necessary investments. Following a review of the literature published to date on the costs of open access publishing and of the practice of journal publishing in academic libraries, the authors present a brief history of Tremor and a tabulation of the costs and expenditure of effort by library staff in production. NEXT STEPS Although producing Tremor has been more expensive than other partner publications in the center’s portfolio, the experiences have improved the library’s capacity for addressing more challenging projects, and developments for Tremor have already begun to be applied to other journals.

INTRODUCTION

Tremor and Other Hyperkinetic Movements (Tremor), a peer-reviewed, open-access medical journal publishing original research, case studies, and reviews on non-Parkinsonian tremor disorders, is produced at the Columbia University Libraries/Information Services (CUL/IS) through the publications partnership program developed at the Center for Digital Research and Scholarship (CDRS) (Maughan Perry, Borchert, Deliyannides, Kosavic, & Kennison, 2011). Among peer publications, Tremor is unique both for its affiliation with a library-based publishing program as well as for its business model: open access content (both libre and gratis) supported through article processing chargebacks to authors. Since its launch in 2011, Tremor has experienced escalation in growth, reputation, and supporting services through the partnership between CDRS, which handles journal production, and the journal’s editor-in-chief, who executes editorial oversight in connection with Tremor’s editorial board. At one-hundred twenty-two articles published, Tremor is a qualified success in the eyes of these partners. At the outset, the partners leaned heavily on their collective experiences to establish baselines for production workflow efficiency and APC price points. In the years since, much real-world data on the allocation of personnel and costs of production have become available. The experience has proved instructive and speaks to the increasing potential of scholarly publishing programs in research libraries, particularly at CDRS. An examination of the monetary expenditures and personnel investments made in realizing that potential answers implicit questions about the costs of those advancements.

LITERATURE REVIEW

There is a significant amount of literature written on open access (OA) journal publication, including work that focuses on OA models that employ article processing charges (APCs)
to finance publication. OA journals are most prominent in the science, technology, and medicine (STM) fields, where they are most commonly funded by APCs (Solomon & Björk, 2012). In 2010, Björk et al. found that within these particular fields, “The weighted average OA availability over all [STM] disciplines was 20.4%” (p. 6). Among life sciences journals, gold OA (immediate, free access to a publication) is more prevalent than green OA publishing (self-archiving a version of a manuscript). Solomon and Björk (2012) report that in 2011 there were a total of 1,825 journals in the cross-disciplinary OA journal index DOAJ charging APCs, better than 26% of journals indexed there. Of the journals studied, the largest number of them charged APCs in the $601-$800 range. Solomon and Björk also found that universities in general have a lower article processing charge ($461 USD on average) as opposed to commercial publishers. The range of APCs is vast; they “…vary quite dramatically…” from $800 for certain Hindawi publications, to $5,000 for Cell Reports (both OA) (Mangiafico & Smith, 2014, p. 225).

APCs are just one option in a broad landscape of publication funding models. Lack of transparency of publisher costs, however, has prevented a general consensus on the expense of producing a journal. As Van Noorden (2013) notes: for-profit journals are “…even less transparent about their costs than their open-access counterparts. Most declined to reveal prices or costs when interviewed for [Van Noorden’s] article” (p. 427). Nevertheless, attempts to understand and evaluate publishing costs have been made many times, mostly by utilizing rough estimates. In his analysis of costs incurred in creating and maintaining a peer-reviewed journal, Clarke (2007) created a framework to categorize and monetize necessary tasks—from receipt of a manuscript to publication (focused mainly on electronic tools and dissemination). Clarke’s cost model consists of Establishment costs, Operations costs (submissions-related, article-related, and generic costs), Infrastructure Maintenance, and Financial Aspects. Clarke also makes the distinction between fixed and variable costs: fixed costs are ongoing and “…are associated with the creation, existence and sustenance of an operation, and are independent of the volume of production,” whereas variable costs relate to volume (of submissions, of accepted papers, of published papers, etc). Using these components he estimated costs for set-up and maintenance of an online journal in various scenarios (not-for-profit publishers, for-profit publishers, among others). Using a per article APC of $730 Clarke estimated it would cost $22,000 per year to run an OA journal. Hovav and Gray (2001) reported on a case study which set out to analyze the fee and management structure of six ejournals. While none of the journals studied utilized APCs as a supplemental source of revenue, the range of cost to produce ejournals ranged from “minimal, voluntary” to “$25,000” per year (Hovav & Gray, 2001, p. 756). King (2007) estimated that “…the average fixed cost to publish an article would be $3,000 per article,” (p. 92) which would essentially just cover fixed costs and not take into account
variable costs, which he notes “…are affected by the size of an organization, inefficiencies, and R&D capabilities” (p. 90). Hedlund, Gustafsson, and Björk (2004) surveyed editors of open access scientific journals in an attempt to understand the cost structure based on either direct publishing costs or time estimates for task completion related to publication. Using a time-as-cost model, they came to the conclusion that about 163 hours are spent per year on tasks such as administration, IT-infrastructure, planning issues, and marketing to authors and readers. This figure reflects hours spent on an already established journal, where set-up and establishment efforts have already been completed. Further, Hedlund et al. surveyed editors who, in many cases, likely deal more closely with content-related duties and less with the administration and operation of the technological infrastructure and/or other publication management tasks. Included in publication management tasks is the oversight and coordination of post-acceptance manuscript preparation, whether this work is accomplished in-house or through a vendor. As Solomon and Björk (2012) found, a large portion of smaller-scale OA publishers make the decision to contract outside vendors for operations like copyediting and typesetting, most often because the capability to do so in-house is not available (Solomon & Björk 2012). This necessarily adds another direct cost associated with publication for those smaller or newer publishing ventures that do not have the staff or capability to perform copyediting and typesetting.

Library-based publishing operations often do not have the capability to take on the task of copyediting and typesetting for the reasons mentioned above. In many cases these operations support open access to research produced at the institution. In their article “Libraries as Journal Publishers,” (2011) Maughan Perry, Borchert, Deliyannides, Kosavics, and Kennison discuss the different roles that libraries can and do play in the creation and support of scholarly journals beyond publication: increasing discoverability of content; advising on author rights, author agreements, and licensing options such as Creative Commons; ISSN registration; DOI assignment; software services and support; formulation of outreach strategies; and training of editorial staff on publication platform. Many of these tasks taken on by library publishing operations to support OA publications are uniquely relevant to libraries (functioning as journal publishers) because, by definition, libraries are “mission driven, rather than market driven, [are] strong supporters of intellectual freedom, and [are] opponents of censorship and other restrictions on access to knowledge” (Mangiafico & Smith, 2014, p. 222). In 2008 Karla Hahn surveyed the member institutions of the Association of Research Libraries to gauge the level of involvement or interest in library-based publishing. Of the 80 libraries surveyed, 44% were actively involved in library publishing at the time of the survey, and 21% were in the planning phases of beginning such a program (Hahn, 2008). Mullins et al. (2012) also surveyed libraries to better understand the current landscape of libraries that publish academic journals. Of the 43 large research libraries surveyed, 55%
were either involved in, or interested and willing to become involved in, journal publication support, and “About three-quarters of the programs publish between one and six journals, the majority of which are only distributed electronically and are less than three-years old” (p. 6). York University’s library publishing operation is one such venture that exceeds these reported numbers; as of 2010 the York Digital Journals (YDJ) program was publishing 18 journals after about 4 years of existence. The YDJ project benefitted from native library infrastructure; the University landscape was crucial to the early success of the operation because it provided the journals program with “…multiple layers of support from library and university administration, as well as faculty members, librarian mentors, and library computing services” (Kosavic, 2010, p. 313). More recently, a survey conducted by the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC) project yielded 110 institutional responses and data on 565 published journals, most of which were faculty-driven. Similar to YDJ, 90% of libraries responding to the LPC survey rely (in part or totally) on “…their library’s operating budget to support publishing services” (Library Publishing Coalition, 2013, p. xi).

Also like the YDJ, many library-based (and commercial) publishing operations rely on freely available, open source software, such as Open Journal Systems (OJS), as a publishing platform (Figure 1). OJS is “…a robust, standards-based, publication-management system for scholarly journals, providing editorial workflow management, online article access, full-text searching, and interactive reading tools” (Devakos, 2007, p. 17).

Of the libraries surveyed for the research report “Library Publishing Services: Strategies for Success,” 57% used OJS for electronic publication (Mullins et al., 2012). These numbers are consistent with the findings of Hahn’s 2008 ARL report, which found that more than half (about 55%) of the surveyed libraries active in scholarly publishing utilized OJS (Hahn, 2008). The LPC’s directory reported that 45% of surveyed libraries utilized OJS; it was the most common platform among respondents (Library Publishing Coalition, 2013). While this software is open source and free to use and build upon, there are often “…some considerable recurrent costs […] involved in the development and operation of the publisher’s online access systems” (Houghton et al., 2009, p. 57). This tends to include multiple rounds of customizations and continual updates to the system, as recorded by Clarke (2007) who incorporates into the cost of publishing an electronic journal “…sustaining the technical infrastructure and the intellectual infrastructure on which the journal’s operation depends.” As Kosavic (2010) discovered with the YDJ project, the use of Open Journal Systems is often not just a straightforward install, requiring staff to perform necessary upkeep. After the initial set up, the faculty at York University “…began to ask for added functionality and to request customizations to the software, which resulted in the need for programming time” (p. 314).

In addition to customizing the OJS interface to meet publishing goals, libraries have made concerted efforts to utilize available technology to further support mission-related goals: acknowledging preservation as a function of scholarly publishing, and ensuring long term, permanent archival storage of and access to published content. These principles are oftentimes manifested in the form of institutional repositories (IRs). Many IRs run on DSpace, an open source software application that can be used to create an ‘out of the box’ install, a highly customized digital repository, or something in between. Hahn (2008) found DSpace to be the second-most utilized software program that libraries used to support their publishing services (behind OJS). These findings were echoed by Mullins et al. (2012) who also found DSpace to be second to OJS for library publishing purposes, at 36%. As Houghton et al. (2009) observed:

Enabling and supporting self-archiving through the operation of institutional repositories offers a number of potential benefits for universities and research institutions, not only through providing greater support to research, but also in providing a platform for hosting and showcasing the institutions research and maintaining a more complete record of it… (p. xxiv)

In addition to institutional repositories, which house a broad range of disciplines, subject-specific repositories exist to aggregate content into discipline specific pools of information for potential researchers. PubMed Central (PMC) fills this role for life sciences journals;
when studying OA scientific literature Björk et al. (2010) found PMC to be the most frequently encountered subject based repository, along with arXiv. Standards for inclusion in a repository vary. Within PMC, once a publication is accepted for inclusion there are certain requirements that must be met in order for each article to be properly ingested into the system, like the “…conversion of submitted material into highly structured and tagged ASCII text” (Fisher, 2008). Fisher (2008) cites this work to make content fit for inclusion in PMC as an added cost of publication that can be, and often is, accommodated through outsourcing copyediting and typesetting to a vendor that understands the nuances behind “[m]ore complex document tagging definitions (such as the US National Library of Medicine DTD).”

REPORT FRAMEWORK

The following sections of the report provide a framework for considering the costs of publishing Tremor at CDRS—first, through an examination of the categories of personnel assembled for the journal production and subsequently through a review of the journal production components and effort estimates of personnel in each component. The report reviews costs both (1) as a measure of staff time to conduct work in the components and (2) as a balance sheet of revenues against expenses, and these may be found under the Project Activity Report and Accounting Summary sections respectively. A number of compromises were sought to bring some uniformity to data analysis and presentation, and a brief description of and rationale for these appear here:

• Both the project components and the personnel categories presented in this report reduce complexity of the data to provide a useful framework for discussion. Every effort has been made to faithfully recount events and account for time spent, yet the overall picture has been reassembled and estimated from historical data sources (e.g., email, invoices, internal reports).

• Some of this reduction has led to the presentation of categories with blurry boundaries. As will be seen, individual staff members occupy roles in multiple personnel categories. In turn, similar production activities occur in multiple project components. Explanation is provided in the corresponding descriptions to improve clarity.

• All effort expenditures reported by CDRS staff are production (read: not editorial) allocations. Therefore, in addition to all data presented here are the investments of effort in editorial preparation by the Tremor editor-in-chief, the reviews editor, and the editorial board. Effort in conducting peer-review management and of editorial
time spent in dialogue with project constituents is thus excluded.

• Among the platform customizations, the development of an OJS plugin to manage communication and transfer of data between the OJS and an external vendor was especially resource-intensive, owing to a number of factors that include staff turnover and ramp-up of internal expertise in OJS development conventions. With the benefit of hindsight, CDRS staff would likely pursue a different path to achieve similar results, but the impact of these efforts on the totals nevertheless appear in the data reported.

• An earlier account of the costs in developing Tremor was reported at the 2013 PKP Scholarly Publishing conference in Mexico City (Newton & Morris, 2013). Whereas the numbers provided here differ, this present work provides a new framework for examining the costs and represents an even greater investent in arriving at an accurate report.

• The dip in number of work hours for library staff in 2012 results not only from a greater maturity and realized efficiency of the journal project but also from a temporary reduction in overall staff at CDRS, which required a reduction of time across all projects to meet prioritized deadlines.

• CDRS’ approach to open source software development and customization has advanced significantly since the project’s inception. Technical debt incurred from early decisions to modify core OJS application code would be averted, given the current preference for a modular development approach and plugin-based architecture.

**PROJECT ACTIVITY REPORT**

**Personnel Categories**

The history of the Tremor project can be reviewed as a series of overlapping project components, each attended to by one or more members of the library staff. The project components presented in this paper place these staff into broader personnel categories to consolidate the discussion of their work, and these categories are described in further detail in the following sections: Project Management; Production; Systems Administration; Finance; and Communications. Please see also Figure 2 (following page), which presents a comprehensive view of all of the staff described in this paper, with their corresponding personnel categories.
Project Management

Staff in the planning and project management category perform the following and similar duties: manage production schedules, establish editorial partner meetings and agendas, review and coordinate vendor deliverables [both to the journal site and to PubMed Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Categories (# Titles)</th>
<th>Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management (9)</strong></td>
<td>Director, CDRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Copyright Advisory Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usability Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Data Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production (12)</strong></td>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Web Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Application Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video Producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Repository Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDRS Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Sciences Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems Administration (1)</strong></td>
<td>Senior Systems Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance (3)</strong></td>
<td>Associate Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Assistant VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications (2)</strong></td>
<td>Communications Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** Staff with corresponding personnel categories. Represented are 22 titles and around 33 people total (accounting for turnover) over the course of the project. Some titles span multiple categories as seen above.
(PMC)], schedule staff time for maintenance and new development work, and report on all progress through to CDRS administration.

There have been a number of CDRS personnel devoted to planning and project management. Near the project’s outset, the director and the production manager were heavily involved in establishing the project’s priorities and deliverables. As the project matured, these duties were handled in turn by the senior project manager and then subsequently her deputy, the project coordinator. Other associated library staff who have participated in a consultative role in project planning meetings were considered for this category, and we therefore add also the director of the Copyright Advisory Office, who provided essential insights related to author agreements and content licensing. The head of usability (now a vacant position) also played an early key role in site assessment and information architecture development, here grouped among Project Management duties.

Production

Production across CDRS projects is largely a technical function with programming staff working on open-source and locally developed applications to achieve a range of desired outcomes elicited from project partners. From the outset, CDRS staff and the *Tremor* editor-in-chief wanted to put the journal on an open source publishing platform to ensure a measure of ongoing customization and flexibility. As is done on the majority of its other publishing projects, a CDRS Web developer was tasked by Project Management with the primary responsibility of setting up, developing, and maintaining the *Tremor* codebase. None of the center’s projects employ a strictly 1:1 relationship between staff and codebase, however. Instead, CDRS developers work in a collaborative environment, submitting and merging code into common repositories, and the efforts of the senior application developer at CDRS were eventually brought in to the project for the purposes of increased development throughput, maintenance backup, and general problem-solving efficiency.

Journal production, however, also includes a significant number of non-technical tasks related to the preparation, quality checking, and publication of original content (both text and multimedia on the journal Web site and elsewhere). Several staff involved in project management also assume production related duties—namely, the senior project manager and the project coordinator. Add to these the position of the production assistant (a versatile member of the staff who works across many of the center’s teams) and the digital repository assistant (who ensures *Tremor* content is properly represented in Columbia’s digital research repository, Academic Commons).¹

¹See bit.ly/TremorJournalInAC for all *Tremor* content in Columbia’s repository
Systems Administration

To set up new project Web sites, CDRS staff work with the library’s local IT unit to arrange access to servers, to establish development, testing, staging, and production Web environments, to secure access to cloud-based source code repositories, and to configure and compile various essential platform components. Systems Administration, therefore, includes the group of library staff managing these activities and ensuring the uptime of core infrastructure. CDRS and its staff have remained the application owners throughout the project life, however, and the maintenance of any code remains the responsibility of the Production personnel. The Senior Systems Administrator of the Library Information Technology Office, with the assistance of junior staff, comprise the Systems Administration category. Personnel from both Production and Project Management liaise with Systems Administration personnel directly.

Finance

The library’s finance office conducts essential business on behalf of the journal, namely the processing of APC payments, the payment of invoices received for production activities, and the management of *Tremor* accounts through the university-wide accounting system. Finance personnel include an Administrative Assistant and a Business Manager as well as the library administrator to whom they report.

Communications

The CDRS Communications Coordinator is another core member of the *Tremor* team, with duties that include preparation and distribution of messages to existing and potential readership. Development of mailing lists, assistance in writing periodic promotional copy, social media engagement, and readership analytics analyses reside among the responsibilities captured here. Communications may draw upon the availability of student assistance and full-time staff from Project Management in preparing communications material. Frequently, Communications works directly with the editorial leadership in parallel with Project Management.

Project Components & Effort Expenditure Review

The project component bar graph, presented in Figure 3 (following page), visually depicts yearly allocation of staff time according to the structure we use for the remainder of this discussion. For the purposes of discussion, the *Tremor* project has been divided into individual phases or components, here defined. Subsequently, we will use these components
to provide an approximate framework of work accomplished, apportioning both real costs and estimates of efforts from the corresponding personnel categories in the ensuing section on cost estimations. Figure 4 (following page) shows the relative percentages of effort across all components for the entire project period. Following the presentation of the project components and associated allocations of staff time, the authors provide two additional composite views of the data:

- Figure 5 (following page) plots average monthly hours apportioned across all staff and all components for each year since the project’s inception.

- Figure 6 (following pages) provides a summary of the aggregate data. A fuller view of the underlying data and calculations has been published and may be reviewed at http://dx.doi.org/10.7916/D8765D1K.

- The sequence of major project milestones has been coded by component and presented chronologically. The sequence is presented as a linked table here: http://dx.doi.org/10.7916/D8GM8603.
Figure 4. Percentage of total hours spent within each project component from September 2010 to June 2014.

Average monthly hours/year

Figure 5. The average time spent working on Tremor on a per-month basis each year.
Partner Interactions

Component Description. At CDRS, the success of library-led journal-publishing ventures correlates strongly with the commitment to engaged partnership between the CDRS and the editorial leadership. In support of this relationships-first model of partnership building, Project Management and CDRS leadership expend considerable effort throughout the project to meet regularly with and plan work around the needs observed and raised by Tremor’s editor and other constituents, such as authors and reviewers. Most directly, this has meant settling into and arranging a series of biweekly face-to-face meetings where agenda are prepared and discussed on the progress of all project-related issues. Partner interactions, however, continue beyond the face-to-face meetings, into regular phone calls and email correspondence in-between appointments as well. Such partner interactions inevitably generate new production tasks, and the work of scoping and executing these to the satisfaction of the editorial management and the center leadership are likewise captured here as Partner Interactions.

Project Specifics. The production partner meetings have remained regular throughout the life of the project (i.e., the aforementioned biweekly schedule of face-to-face appointments). Those in Project Management overwhelmingly handle these engagements, although such responsibilities have moved to increasingly junior staff with the supervisory oversight of more senior members. In later stages of the project, Communications has become more directly involved in partner interactions, primarily through the preparation of copy for press releases, the management of activity on the journal mailing list, and the communication of Web analytics insights during partner meetings.

Expense Overview. Figure 7 (following page) provides the annual breakdown in estimated Partner Interaction expenditures realized since the journal’s inception. During the heaviest...
work in journal setup in 2010-11, Partner Interactions peaked, largely in response to the number of issues around submission quality and quantity, platform capability, prepress vendor performance, and manuscript workflow across all parties. In the years since, Partner Interaction has reduced and stabilized as many previous unknowns and problem areas have been worked out.

Partner Interactions (Average Monthly Hours)

![Graph showing average monthly hours spent on partner interactions each year. An estimated 455 total hours have been spent on this component to date.]

**Figure 7.** Average monthly hours spent on partner interactions each year. An estimated 455 total hours have been spent on this component to date.

Platform Setup and Launch

**Component Description.** During the Platform Setup and Launch component of the project, principles conducted a short survey of eligible publishing software, selected OJS, and initialized the software in the CDRS development environment. Platform Setup and Launch includes design treatment, information architecture design, preloading of editorial and reviewer accounts, the testing of the native OJS components, and the development of the orienting text and navigational structure for the site.
**Project Specifics.** Very early in Platform Setup, Production and Project Management began customizing the publishing platform to respond to editorial feedback and bespoke project needs almost immediately. Cosmetic changes to the page templates based on individual preference were coupled with much deeper customizations to the editorial workflow management tools underneath. Although Production is well-versed in PHP and the Model-View-Controller design convention (both employed by OJS), experience in working with this particular platform was in short supply, and building a customized OJS-based journal was an R&D project in production. Further, it was determined early in the project that a new set of functions needed to be built out, permitting the Tremor staff to send and receive journal articles in numerous stages of preparation with a third-party prepress vendor directly through the application itself, and these development costs are also reflected in Platform Setup.

**Expense Overview.** Platform Setup costs, which represent in large portion the efforts of the Production in the early phases of the project, dwarf Partner Interactions by comparison. By not electing to launch Tremor on an out-of-the-box instantiation of OJS, the CDRS team realized considerable expense in building capacity to work with the platform and to conduct testing of journal production functions with various stakeholders. Full-time staff in Production were committed to Tremor work in its launch year, customizing core code and building custom plugins. Figure 8 (following page) represents the annual breakdown of estimated expenditures.

**Vendor Relations**

**Component Description.** Tremor is unique among many of the journal publication projects at CDRS as external vendors are contracted to provide several core services. A full-suite prepress services vendor handles copyediting services (tiered, depending on the complexity of the editing assignment) as well as PDF layout, HTML, EPUB, XML preparation, and more. Additional vendors have been engaged in discussions around reprint services. Captured in the Vendor Relations category are both the ongoing weekly interactions to deliver, receive, and approve vendor goods and services as well as vendor onboarding, setup, and evaluation expenditures of effort. Real expenditures in dollars toward vendor services, however, are represented elsewhere, in the summary accounting of all financial transactions.

**Project Specifics.** The Tremor team selected its prepress services vendor based on established track-record in work with large commercial publishers, ability to provide a range of services across editorial, layout, and XML preparation, and in its willingness to facilitate transmission of published content to PubMed Central (now PMC), an early goal identified as essential to the success of the journal. CDRS Production and Project Management staff
learned quickly, however, that contracting with an established vendor is little protection against escalating costs in ensuring quality deliverables and in reconciling expectations in organizational culture. Quality, timeliness, and accountability have all been areas of concern for *Tremor* journal management in perceiving the vendor’s work, and CDRS staff have had, to varying degrees, unanticipated additional expenditures of time and energy in conducting successful vendor relations to ensure positive journal partnership.

**Expense Overview.** In the earliest project phases, vendor relations expenses were compounded across at least two vectors: (1) The prepress vendor provided very few tools for communicating progress of the accepted journal manuscripts, from copyediting to author-response back to journal editorial. All accounting of vendor progress of manuscript processing was handled by Project Management, an early expense later assuaged by improved vendor communication tools. (2) More significantly, quality of vendor deliverables were frequently at issue. Copyediting and typesetting infelicities recognized at late stages in
publication preparation meant additional rounds of back-and-forth with vendor contacts for remediation. This added expense is accounted for in Vendor Relations. Add to this some early engagement of a separate print-on-demand vendor that never successfully on-boarded the *Tremor* project before folding as a company, and the early rationale for additional Vendor Relations expenses takes shape (Figure 9).

**Figure 9.** Average monthly hours spent on vendor relations each year. An estimated 124 total hours have been spent on this component to date.

### Publication Workflow

**Component Description.** Publication Workflow captures expenditures of time by CDRS staff in posting solicitations for journal submissions, ensuring the journal platform successfully accepts them, that editors and reviewers can work with submissions as expected on the platform, and that they may be published to the site as expected once final galleys are received and approved by editorial.
Project Specifics. Publication workflow tasks completed prior to the journal launch have been captured under Platform Setup and are thus excluded from Publication Workflow. Similarly, the calculation of time and effort here attempts to separate out time spent with PMC and the article preparation vendor, which are likewise accounted for in corresponding categories.

Expense Overview. Publication workflow expenses in 2013, at 17.04 average monthly hours of Production time, were the highest seen since launch and are the highest expected (Figure 10). By mid-2012, primary responsibilities for the publication workflow had been shifted to the CDRS Project Coordinator, a junior staff position, and overall hours committed to this work has been reduced although publication volume increased in the same stretch. Higher costs in 2012 may be attributed to extra work in training supervised staff, in continuing to establish and communicate a regular procedure, and in managing against platform problems that were resolved through subsequent development.

Figure 10. Average monthly hours spent on publication workflow each year. An estimated 461 total hours haven been spent on this component to date.
Additional Services

**Component Description.** There are a number of additional CDRS-provided services that distinguish *Tremor* from other journal publishing projects in the center. Examples include the work of Communications staff to develop and produce marketing material; APC and vendor invoice processing through the library’s finance office; archiving and preservation of journal content in the university’s digital research repository; and development of journal-specific data management policy. Where the affordances of the areas of activity within CDRS and the libraries broadly have provided opportunity for expansion of the journal’s operations, these activities have been captured under Additional Services.

**Project Specifics.** Midway through the reported project period, *Tremor*’s editor initiated conversation with the patient-advocacy group The Tremor Action Network (TAN). These discussions produced additional financial support for *Tremor* in the form of TAN-sponsored publication scholarships. Authors submitting to *Tremor* could always elect to have the APCs waived by responding to select questions about available sources of funding. Through the TAN scholarships, however, an additional source of publication support is made available. (See Figure 11 for an accounting of waivers and scholarships granted over the life of the journal.) Oversight of the waivers and the scholarship applications adds a level of administrative overhead for both CDRS and the libraries office, and these costs begin tracking in 2012.

![Waivers and Scholarships per Fiscal Year](image)

*Figure 11.* Waivers and scholarships awarded in *Tremor* by fiscal year date of publication.
Expense Overview. Costs under Additional Services are borne largely by three groups: the finance office as it processes APC invoices and manages Tremor’s accounts; Communications, as it facilitates outreach through custom mailings and other forms of journal promotion; and through the junior staff in Production, preparing internal reports, archiving journal content, onboarding new services such as DOI assignment and more. With some minor variation, these costs are relatively steady across years and comprise approximately 7.6% of the overall estimated journal costs. Tremor’s role within CDRS as an ambassador for the program suggests these costs will remain steady over time, and perhaps higher in comparison with future journals as efficiencies are realized through experience (Figure 12).

Additional Services (Average Monthly Hours)

Figure 12. Average monthly hours spent on additional services each year. An estimated 332 total hours have been spent on this component to date.

PubMed Central

Component Description. Indexing in PubMed (pubmed.gov) has always been an editorial (and therefore partnership) priority for Tremor. To become visible in PubMed, a difficult
charge for an upstart journal, the Tremor team elected instead to pursue publisher status in PubMed Central (PMC), the open access archive for publicly funded medical research publications (pubmedcentral.gov). Many of Tremor’s authors are NIH award recipients, and their corresponding journal publications were supplied to PMC out of compliance necessity. CDRS partnered with a librarian from the Columbia University Medical Center to handle the earlier one-off deposits of individual articles in PMC, which subsequently became discoverable in PubMed. Behind the scenes, however, CDRS production and journal editorial worked extensively to meet PMC publisher-status qualifications for comprehensive coverage of journal content.

**Project Specifics.** Application to PMC is two-fold, with both scientific quality and technical components. As of May 2011, eligibility to apply for publisher status required continuous publication of a minimum of 30 articles. Nearly all of the early work in PMC preparation, therefore, was handled outside of CDRS (and therefore not represented in this calculation) in the solicitation, review, and publication of the initial corpus, a task made challenging by the lack of visibility of the journal in the first place.

From the production side, groundwork was laid to ensure a swift and successful scientific quality evaluation. Extensive documentation (on the makeup of the editorial board, on the rigor of the review process, on the ethics standards pursued by the journal and its editor) was published to the journal Web site. In preparation for the technical evaluation (ostensibly a review of the NLM DTD-compliant XML article galleys for validity and conformance to idiosyncratic PMC requirements), Production worked with a prepress vendor familiar with PMC to publish XML content alongside HTML and PDF expression of the articles.

**Expense Overview.** PMC costs, captured as a separate project component, also peak in 2012, at the height of the activity around technical assessment for journal inclusion (Figure 13, following page). There were a number of minor areas of review and concern expressed by PMC about the quality of Tremor XML, which precipitated several rounds of discussion with the XML-preparation. Since successful promotion to PMC publisher status in 2012, these costs have been significantly reduced, and all journal content is now visible in both PMC and PubMed, meeting the initial requirement (Figure 14, following page). Subsequent expenses have included minor adjustments to the formatted files for the inclusion of DOIs, for the publication of errata and article responses, and for outbound linking from PubMed back to the journal site. Presence in PMC remains an ongoing priority for the journal, and it is presumed these costs will never drop to zero.
Figure 13. Average monthly hours spent on PubMed Central activities each year. An estimated 74 total hours have been spent on this component to date.

Figure 14. A Tremor article in PMC (visible here: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3889335/).
ACCOUNTING SUMMARY

Revenues

Over and above expenditures of library staff time in production and management, *Tremor* incurs direct costs in the form of prepress vendor invoices and more, against which journal revenues may be applied by Finance. To arrive at the direct costs assessment for producing *Tremor*, we examine incoming revenue (in the form of APCs and scholarship support) against expenses incurred (vendor fees and ancillary expenditures).

APCs and Waivers

The APCs charged back to authors for the five article types that may be published in *Tremor* break down as seen in Table 1, and the aggregated totals for each article type over the history of the journal have been compiled in Figure 15 (following page).

APC levels were set in early planning meetings to provide revenue for vendor services incurred, namely copyediting and article preparation in a variety of formats (PDF, HTML, NLM XML, and EPUB). It is presumed that many authors submitting full-length papers will be presenting the results of funded projects and that the APCs may be met out of the research award. Other reports and reviews, presumed also to be shorter pieces and thereby less expensive to process, are set at commensurately lower APC levels. It was expected in planning that the schedule of APCs would cover production costs in the aggregate, even when authors of eligible articles cannot meet the requisite fee and apply instead to have the fee waived.

Scholarship Support

Shortly after *Tremor* moved into full production, the editor approached the patient advocacy group Tremor Action Network (TAN) and arranged for additional journal sponsorship in the form of annual publication scholarships to be provided to authors of tremor-focused scholarship. Authors who cannot otherwise meet the APC may thus apply to the TAN scholarship, and production expenses may be paid from these monies when a successful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-length article</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case reports</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief reports</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters (select)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Corresponding APCs in the journal for various article types.
application is made. Finance exercises management over the TAN fund, which has received two annual contributions of $5,000 to support journal publication.

**Cash Expenses**

The majority of production expenses as cash outlays are realized through the use of an external vendor that conducts copyediting of manuscripts as well as final article preparation in the aforementioned formats. Midway into the project, a second, more thorough tier of copyediting service was negotiated with the vendor to handle language-editing of papers written by non-native English speakers. Other expenditures throughout the project have included the following:

- email marketing management
- custom domain name registration and renewal
• purchase of original artwork for the journal site theme
• print marketing

These non-manuscript-preparation expenses have been summarized in Figure 16, divided between recurring and one-time costs.

**Figure 16.** Detail of one-time and recurring costs.

**Financials Review**

Total APCs invoiced for the 122 unique articles accepted for publication into *Tremor* total $31,300 (Figure 17). Expected vendor costs to process all articles to date total $21,147.15, of which $10,719.30 has been allocated to articles receiving no APC revenue. The anticipated APC revenue to date, minus vendor processing charges, leaves a positive $10,152.85 to be applied against additional and future journal costs. Aggregated APC revenues
against expenses per fiscal year are provided in Figure 18. Notably, the print-on-demand service, while live and linked from the journal site, has not yet generated any revenue at all.

Expectations for waiver requests ran as high as 50%, although in practice, the number of requests has only run 11.38% of submissions, and all waiver requests have been granted. ‘Lost’ revenue to waived APCs total $5,300, and processing costs for articles with fee waivers totals $1,656.90 (Figure 19). It had originally been hoped that over time that lost revenues would decrease as the TAN publication scholarship backfilled the deficit. Since submission of this article, *Tremor*’s arrangement with TAN has ended, and scholarship subvention of APC is no longer available. The general approach of seeking external partners to provide publication support to authors, however, remains a key component of the future of the CDRS journals publication program.

![APCs vs Costs per Fiscal Year](image)

**Figure 18.** APC revenues versus costs per fiscal year according to date of publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waived Article Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waived fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor costs due to waivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver requests (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 19.** Total waived APCs for *Tremor* to date as a percentage of all accepted articles.
DISCUSSION

It is often presumed that publishing in libraries can be an inexpensive, efficient means of reaching local scholars with alternative pathways to promote research and scholarship, especially openly. Large library publishing operations demonstrate the capability of such programs to scale up and meet demand. (The work of publishing programs at the California Digital Library, University of Michigan Libraries, and University of Pittsburgh Libraries supply ample testament.) The experience of producing *Tremor* at CDRS provides a view from another angle, where investment into a single productive partnership with a member of the campus faculty is prioritized. Even so, several unexpected challenges presented themselves as detailed in the report. Dependencies on external groups (e.g., vendors, indexers, even allied intra-library offices) can be difficult to manage to the satisfaction of all partners, especially in the fledgling stages of a new publication where expediency is essential. Even when the work in question is managed directly by the libraries using library staff, project requirements can dictate a difficult path, and the extent of that difficulty may become manifest only after sunk costs inhibit course correction, such as occurred here in platform development.

From the outset, the goal of the partnership has been to produce a journal that becomes entwined in and essential to a particular scholarly community. Recent dialogue between editorial and authorial perspectives playing out on *Tremor*’s pages suggests that goal is in sight. Other milestones and signifiers of quality and community embeddedness have lit the way for the partnership to make selective investments and advance the project; having moved on from persistent identifier assignment; PMC publisher status; and search engine indexing, the team shifts its gaze to the challenges in impact analysis, content recruitment, journal data policy, and platform performance review. The potential in the project, however, is driven in the first place by the presence of a particularly motivated and engaged editorial partner, and enabled in the second place by a risk-tolerant production environment, where research and development can proceed apace, throttled primarily by the demands of the other scholar-focused digital projects across the center.

Throughout its journals publication program, CDRS seeks efficiencies and scale. For the majority of the center’s 20+ publication partners, modest platform investments can be realized quickly across titles by design. At some level, this makes *Tremor* an outlier, perhaps due to the idiosyncratic needs of its disciplinary orientation. From another vantage point, however, it is expected that *Tremor* is emblematic of the first-of-a-kind philosophy that drives all investment and innovation in the center. Work on the journal has pioneered processes for

---

custom Google Scholar indexing, for identifier service interfaces, for scholarship fund setup and maintenance that are already being applied to other journal partnerships. Revenue surpluses, such as those reported here, speak to the viability of the funding approach taken and invite conversations around adjustment or reduction of APCs and novel application of the scholarship funds to further drive growth of the journal and engagement of the scholarly community to which it supplies venue.
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INTRODUCTION
This article describes a joint open textbook publishing initiative begun in 2013 between Oregon State University (OSU) Libraries and Press and the Open Educational Resources and Emerging Technologies unit of Oregon State University’s Extended Campus. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM
This initiative combines the Open Access values and project management resources of OSU Libraries, the book production (peer review, editing, design, marketing) expertise of OSU Press, and the technological development skills of the Open Educational Resources and Emerging Technologies unit. Authored by OSU faculty and focused across some of the University’s signature areas, the initiative seeks to establish a sustainable model for research libraries and university presses to collaborate with each other and other partners to publish open textbooks that will benefit students on both economic and educational levels. The article analyzes how open textbooks fit within the emerging library publishing movement, examines the implementation of the OSU open textbook publishing initiative, and conveys some lessons learned for other libraries to consider as they entertain the possibility of similar collaborations. NEXT STEPS
A description of next steps includes tracking course adoptions of the textbooks as well as establishing sustainable digital publishing platforms and business models.

NOTE: Some material included herein was drawn from Faye A. Chadwell’s presentation as part of the panel, “Organizational Alignment for Library Publishing Services,” at the 2014 Library Publishing Forum held in Kansas City, Missouri.
INTRODUCTION

Since time immemorial, academic libraries have grappled with textbook issues. Nearly any university librarian or college library director can offer stories of recurring appeals from students for the library to buy textbooks that can be checked out or put on reserve. These requests are clearly based on economic motivations as students resist paying hundreds of dollars apiece for textbooks they view as unlikely to have usefulness after the course ends. The ability of libraries to meet student needs in this area through the purchase of textbooks is limited. While some libraries make a concerted effort to collect textbooks, most appear unable to undertake this task on a comprehensive level, given the frequency of textbook revisions, the scope of textbook usage on any campus and limited collection budgets that are already committed to other vital resources (Pollitz, Christie, & Middleton, 2009; Raschke & Shanks, 2011).

Some academic libraries, however, are pursuing new strategies that revolve around open textbooks. These textbooks are part of the larger Open Educational Resources (OER) movement. OERs are teaching and learning materials that are released online under open licenses that allow for the reuse, revision, remixing, and redistribution of their content. As the OER movement has gained momentum, open textbooks are being produced by a variety of entities across disciplines. This trend is coalescing with the appearance of librarian positions and services that focus on the discovery and adoption of OERs, as well as the emergence of the library publishing field, in which academic libraries are assuming the role of publisher for the intellectual output of their institutions. While library publishing programs are becoming more commonplace, the creation of open textbooks through these models is just beginning to take shape. Within this landscape, there are important opportunities for libraries to become involved in the publication of open textbooks through their own publishing structures, or in collaboration with university presses and other campus partners, to provide both financial and educational benefits to students.

In 2013, Oregon State University Libraries and Press (OSULP) developed an open textbook publishing initiative in partnership with the Open Educational Resources and Emerging Technologies unit within Oregon State University’s Extended Campus (Ecampus). Ecampus manages OSU’s online degree program, and is part of the OSU Division of Outreach and Engagement. OSU Libraries and OSU Press are part of the same organization, but operate somewhat independently. While each has its own publishing activities, the open textbook initiative brings the two together in an innovative way that leverages their shared expertise. This article will discuss this collaboration and the broader context of open textbooks in relation to the affordability of higher education and the library publishing movement. It will
also examine future directions to consider as more libraries engage in the creation of open textbooks at their universities. In broad terms, the article will illustrate how involvement with open textbooks aligns with the shared mission of academic libraries to remove barriers to the free flow of information in support of teaching and learning.

**OPEN TEXTBOOKS AND THE AFFORDABILITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

The affordability of higher education is one of the most critical, and talked about, issues in academia today. As state and federal support for colleges and universities, as well as student financial aid, have declined sharply over the past ten years, institutions have accordingly increased tuition and fees. Over the past decade, textbook prices have increased by 82 percent, or three times the rate of inflation (United States Government Accountability Office, 2013, p. 6). The average student now spends $1,200 per year on textbooks and supplies in the United States (College Board, 2013, p. 11). As a result, students are avoiding buying textbooks, even with the awareness that their grades and learning may be compromised. A 2013 survey of over 2,000 students found that 65 percent had decided against buying a textbook because it was too expensive; 94 percent of those students were concerned that doing so would hurt their grade (Senack, 2014, p. 4). While used textbooks and rentals offer lower-priced alternatives, textbook-related costs make up an increasing percentage of higher education expenses with far-reaching negative consequences for many students.

In reviewing the various components that constitute the cost of attending college (tuition, room and board, etc.), textbooks make up the one category that can be directly influenced by faculty on both the supply and demand sides of the equation. Faculty members (or academic departments) choose the textbooks for their courses, and many textbooks are written by professors. This offers a tremendous opportunity for libraries to act as catalysts working with faculty on the creation and adoption of open textbooks that not only benefit students on an economic level, but also have the potential to enhance learning through multimedia elements and other interactive features.

While governmental support for higher education is generally on a downward trend, there are counter examples of increasing financial support for the development of open textbooks. In recent years, the state governments of Florida, California, and Washington, as well as the provincial government of British Columbia, have funded open textbook publishing programs for higher education. (For more details on these programs, see http://studentpirgs.org/open-textbooks/about in the “Writing and Publishing Open Textbooks” section.) The U.S. federal government is also poised to enter this sphere as the “Affordable College Textbook Act” (S.7014/H.R.3538) works its way through Congress. If passed, this
bill would create a large-scale, competitive grant program to fund the creation of OERs by educational institutions. As these developments unfold, academic libraries should proactively determine where they fit into the OER and open textbook paradigms to identify potential partners and funders.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

Library publishing of open textbooks is in its infancy, and literature on the topic is limited. Most publications on library engagement with open textbooks and OERs focus on efforts by librarians to facilitate their discovery and adoption by faculty members, rather than their production by libraries. For example, an international survey of 57 libraries on their roles in OER initiatives revealed, “The main areas of library involvement are: description and classification, management, preservation, dissemination, and promotion of OER” (Bueno-de-la-Fuente, Robertson, & Boon, 2012, p. 7). This report goes on to discuss the dissemination function. This role typically involves hosting OERs in libraries’ institutional repositories, although these libraries are often not playing an active role in the creation of the OERs themselves. A 2014 Ithaka S+R report on the open textbook market echoes this perspective:

Some college and university libraries see a role for themselves here, at very least in directing students and faculty to relevant content. In some cases, they have been able to play a role in gaining attention for the issue on their campuses, and to incentivize faculty to consider alternatives to expensive textbooks. Still, despite recent development of scholarly communications services at many libraries, most do not yet have expertise in textbook development, or an effective means to develop and distribute a textbook that will be used beyond its author's campus. (Maron, 2014, p. 9)

Similar observations are made in Karen Okamoto’s article on academic libraries as advocates for open textbooks and OERs. She outlines the following types of library engagement with open textbooks and OERs: advocacy, promotion, and discovery; evaluation, collection, preservation, and access; curation and facilitation; and funding (Okamoto, 2013, p. 271). Okamoto references a few instances of direct library support for the creation of open textbooks at Temple University, North Carolina State University, and the State University of New York (SUNY).

The nature of the support provided by these libraries varies. At Temple, the library offers funds for the faculty development of alternatives to traditional textbooks that may or may not be full-blown open textbooks (http://sites.temple.edu/alttextbook/about-the-event/).
At North Carolina State, the library collaborates with the Physics department to host open textbooks developed independently by the department’s faculty (Raschke & Shanks, 2011). Conversely, the Open SUNY Textbooks project seems to be the most fully developed library-based initiative that formally publishes open textbooks (http://opensuny.org/omp/index.php/SUNYOpenTextbooks/index).

Open SUNY Textbooks was established in 2012 by SUNY libraries with support from SUNY Innovative Instruction Technology Grants. This initiative seeks to publish 15 open textbooks by SUNY faculty authors with the libraries providing publishing services and infrastructure. As of June 2014, five titles have been published. The initiative at Oregon State University resembles the SUNY project in seeking to publish open textbooks by its institution’s faculty. These two projects illustrate how open textbook production is an emerging component of the library publishing movement, although the Oregon State initiative does include a university press partner housed within the library organization. As Okamoto observes, “Library involvement in the funding, curation, and creation of OER materials in the United States may be part of a new and growing trend of what some are calling ‘library publishing’” (Okamoto, 2013, p. 274).

Over the past ten years, there is a clear trend within academic libraries to launch publishing programs. This phenomenon is reflected in the 2013 establishment of the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC) with 51 member libraries. The LPC’s Library Publishing Directory 2014 describes a broad range of publishing and dissemination activities at 115 academic libraries (Lippincott, 2013). These endeavors include publishing monographs and Open Access journals, as well as hosting resources such as technical reports, conference proceedings, and electronic theses and dissertations via institutional repositories. The Directory indicates that 11 libraries were participating in textbook publishing as of 2013, but there is no further information to indicate what percentage of these textbooks are open. Another volume on library publishing, the Library Publishing Toolkit, offers case studies of various publishing initiatives at libraries, yet textbooks are only mentioned four times in its 381 pages, including one reference to an open textbook published by Utah State University Libraries (Brown, 2013, p. 278). Taken together, the existing literature suggests that open textbooks are currently the focus of a small portion of library publishing activity but represent a potential growth area as more libraries simultaneously undertake publishing services and engage with the OER movement.

The emergence of library publishing has generally coincided with a period of increasing mergers and collaborations between academic libraries and university presses. Both of these trends are creating an environment in which library involvement in the publication of open
textbooks would seem to be a natural outcome. There are also possibilities for libraries to partner with presses outside of their organizational structures that are already engaged with open textbook publishing. One example of such a university press is the University Press of Florida and its Orange Grove Texts Plus. A scenario in which libraries and presses unite with faculty to take ownership of the creation and dissemination of textbooks in ways that are economically beneficial to students requires some shared risk-taking by all partners.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

The open textbook publishing collaboration at Oregon State University is based on a vision that is neatly captured in the Ithaka S+R report:

What if...collaboration among university presses, university libraries, campus-based instructional design groups, and faculty could produce the best of class textbooks? The presses have needed expertise in developing collections, editing manuscripts, and managing distribution channels; libraries have a strong position on campus to support faculty and students and could identify useful materials, whether created on campus or elsewhere. To be sure that any new materials developed would be useful to the wider community, perhaps editorial boards comprised of experts across multiple institutions could be empanelled, by discipline and by topic. (Maron, 2014, p. 10)

OSULP determined that open textbooks were a natural fit with the Libraries’ longstanding commitment to Open Access and its growing involvement in library publishing, as well as the Press’ interest in strengthening its impact on teaching and learning at OSU. The organization also recognized great benefit could be found in leveraging pre-existing connections with OSU Ecampus. OSULP views open textbooks as a mechanism through which all three partners can contribute to OSU’s land grant mission by making education more economically accessible.

Background on Partners

Like many campuses across the United States, Oregon State University has experienced years of student complaints about high textbook costs. As Oregon’s land grant university, the cost of textbooks is at odds with OSU’s mission to make higher education more accessible to the citizens of the state. OSU has attempted various actions to ameliorate this situation. This includes a project between the Provost’s Office and the campus bookstore to increase discounts for students. These attempts also involved the Libraries’ investigation on the use of funds to purchase more textbooks to place on reserve (Pollitz, Christie, & Middleton, 2009).
These earlier attempts to address rising textbook costs collectively set the stage for this initiative as the collaborators shared a common interest in tackling this problem by enabling the creation of open textbooks by OSU faculty. OSULP is the second largest research library in Oregon and the state’s only university press, which joined with the libraries in 2007. OSU Press is one of 20 presses that report to a university library in some capacity among more than 130 members of the Association of American University Presses. This organizational configuration gives OSULP a distinct advantage when considering publishing initiatives because strong publishing services exist in both sides of the house. Also, the major goals of the OSULP 2012-2017 strategic plan motivate us to investigate partnerships and embed the organization’s expertise in endeavors that contribute to students’ academic success and highlight the University’s signature areas of research.

The publishing services of the Libraries and of the Press are focused on producing and disseminating authoritative and peer-reviewed scholarship, especially scholarship produced at OSU. The Press’ publishing niche is Oregon and the Pacific Northwest with a strong focus on natural resources and the landscape as well as environmental, cultural, social, literary, and historical aspects of the region. Library publishing services complement rather than duplicate Press publishing operations, though collaboration between the two is steadily increasing. Library publishing services include the hosting of peer reviewed and non-peer reviewed journals and all publications by OSU Extension Services. Related dissemination services include OSU theses and dissertations, as well as conference proceedings, technical reports, and other materials in the ScholarsArchive@OSU institutional repository.

OSULP’s partner in the open textbook publishing initiative, the Open Educational Resources and Emerging Technologies unit, is part of Ecampus, which is regularly ranked among America’s best providers of online education. The OER unit, which was created in 2013 using both existing and new positions to more fully support OER development to improve learning outcomes, was an ideal partner. Its staff has the technical expertise to develop the multimedia content that is essential to the textbooks, and as part of the University’s very successful online education system, the OER unit was able to provide the financial incentives that were offered to authors as a core part of the initiative.

The project draws well on the strengths of the respective organizations—the programming savvy of the OER unit, the multi-partner project management skills and Open Access principles of the Libraries, and the expertise with peer reviewing, editing, design, and marketing of books within the Press. Members of the initiative’s planning group include the director of the OER unit, the Associate University Librarian for Research and Scholarly Communication, the University Librarian and Press Director, and the Associate Director of the Press.
The Open Textbook Publishing Initiative

After a series of meetings to conceptualize the initiative, the planning group issued a request for proposals (RFP) to OSU faculty in June 2013 (http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/oregon-state-university-open-textbook-request-proposal). This campus-wide call sought proposals to develop open textbooks geared toward specific fields of study and related courses that were articulated by the authors. Proposals that applied to multiple, high-enrollment undergraduate courses in natural resources, geosciences, forestry, marine biology, agricultural sciences, and environmental sciences were preferred. These subject areas are among the University’s signature areas and also align well with the Press’ publishing niche. If other library/press publishing partnerships pursued this approach, there would likely be less duplication of subject coverage in future open textbooks.

All proposed textbooks had to be original content or a compilation of openly licensed materials. Authors were asked to describe how their proposed textbooks would make use of extensive, original multimedia and interactive content. The proposal also stipulated that final acceptance of the proposal was dependent on approval of the OSU Press Editorial Board just like every book project the Press undertakes. Successful authors could expect to be compensated up to $15,000 to produce their manuscript. These funds are not an outright cash payment, but rather a budget transfer that the author can use for research support, professional travel, or similar purposes.

To gain insights about how this type of publishing might work, the planning group developed a prototype concurrently with the RFP. The group selected an existing OSU Press title, Living With Earthquakes in the Pacific Northwest: A Survivor's Guide, originally published by OSU Press in 1998 and used widely in college courses throughout the Northwest. During the summer of 2013, the OER unit worked with the author, Professor Bob Yeats, to create an updated open, electronic version of the book that includes video clips of earthquakes where still photos once resided and replaces many graphs and illustrations with animated features. The creation of this prototype provided several benefits to the project:

• experience creating interactive content from an existing text;
• experience creating different formats of an electronic textbook (i.e., html, ePub);
• evidence for participating authors that this partnership could yield a valuable resource to transcend the physical print format.

Several versions of Living With Earthquakes in the Pacific Northwest (ePub, html, and PDF) are available at: http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/oer/earthquake/. (The PDF version can
be accessed via a web browser, but use of Adobe is recommended to fully engage with its multi-media content.)

The RFP resulted in multiple inquiries, and ultimately nine proposals were received. The four proposals that were selected span a variety of academic disciplines, covering animal nutrition, biochemistry, biocomputing, and ecological management. The successful proposals met the criteria of being adoptable in high-enrollment undergraduate courses or relating to distinctive subject areas for the University. The biocomputing and ecological management proposals also have strong cross-disciplinary potential for course adoptions. The publication of the books is scheduled for 2015 and early 2016, and they will be official OSU Press titles. The books will be available in four formats (HTML, PDF, iBook, and ePub) to increase the chances of course adoption within and outside OSU. There will be a print-on-demand edition likely to be distributed via a service such as LightningSource™. All books included in the project will have a similar design intended to brand the texts as part of the OSU initiative. The textbooks will be issued with a CC BY-NC license to allow others to build upon their content non-commercially, while providing appropriate attribution to the OSU authors.

After accepting the four proposals, the planning group met with the authors to discuss a tentative timeline, workflow, and distribution of funds. For all authors, the project team outlined the following benefits to participating in the project:

- Final acceptance of projects is dependent on approval of the OSU Press Editorial Board, a board composed of scholars from OSU and other Oregon institutions of higher education who guide the publication of all manuscripts proposed for publication with OSU Press. This editorial support and the peer reviewing process led by University Press staff will lead to an authoritative peer-reviewed work published with a respected university press imprint.

- The Press and Ecampus have marketing personnel to promote the textbooks broadly, increasing visibility for the author and the potential for adoption. This can include a presence at discipline-specific conferences and direct marketing to departments and programs as potential adopters of the textbooks. The respective marketing departments have connections to the University’s marketing division that can also heighten visibility. The Libraries will also develop strategies to facilitate adoption of the textbooks through placement in various OER repositories.

- The technological prowess of OER staff will take a lead role in developing the interactivity of multimedia content in consultation with the authors, thus theoretically enhancing learning for the reader.
Lessons Learned

Though this initiative remains a work in process, several lessons are apparent that can benefit others who might pursue similar partnerships.

Organizational cultures. Successful collaboration is dependent on recognizing and respecting the differences in organizational cultures among partners. When OSU Press came into the Libraries in 2007, its staff had been on the defensive while the campus figured out its future. Such a mindset does not always lend itself to risk-taking. When the Press became part of the Libraries, an organization with a history and organizational culture of innovation, their comfort level had to be increased in order for the Press to feel safe stepping out to do new things. The open textbook publishing initiative reflects a new level of organizational integration at OSULP. As the project moves forward, Library personnel and OER staff will also have to learn about the structure and process of creating a well-designed, peer-reviewed monograph from the Press.

Duplication of effort. Each partner brings respective strengths and weaknesses to the table with an overarching need to avoid duplication of effort. OSULP has a strong emerging technologies unit of its own but the Ecampus OER unit has more substantial experience with the creation of learning modules and multimedia components, thus making the OER unit a better choice for developing the interactive content.

Organizational capacity. It is important to consider a unit’s capacity for new projects and to check on this regularly. When the initiative was first conceived in 2013, the OSU Press was fully staffed. However, a retirement in late 2013 resulted in two back-to-back openings, a tremendous challenge for a staff with 4 FTE. As a result, the Press may consider more outsourcing of editorial and design work in the open textbook project while a new managing editor assumes oversight for book projects already in the queue. Outsourcing costs would be part of the OSUL in-kind contribution to the project.

Workflow management. Collaboration often takes longer than working solo. One central challenge is managing the workflow of two units who will make different but related contributions to the textbook. Since the primary versions of the open textbooks are online and interactive, authors are working with the OER unit on those elements while simultaneously writing the text. This arrangement inherently impacts how quickly the final manuscript will be completed with all of its multimedia features. The Press is used to

Print on demand copies may yield some author royalties.
receiving an initial proposal, then the completed manuscript, to send out for review and eventual Editorial Board approval. Some of the authors in the initiative will have completed their texts before the multimedia components are all in place, requiring the Press to decide if the text-only manuscript should be reviewed first, with an expedited repeat of the process once all of the multimedia is added, or should the review process be delayed until text and multimedia are all finalized. Great flexibility and communication is required to manage the timing of the respective processes. Looking ahead, the project team will have to decide the best way to get both the interactive content and the text reviewed efficiently in one step rather than two.

**Targeted audience.** In producing an open textbook, it's important not to forget the true audience and determine how to effectively reach it. While students will be the end users, ultimately it is the faculty who must adopt the textbook for it to have the desired impact. The textbook project is aimed at OSU classes first and foremost, but also seeks for the books to be adopted at other universities, which will require effective marketing and discoverability strategies.

**Authors’ expectations.** Researching, writing, and publishing a textbook requires author attention to be sustained over a longer period than researching and writing a journal article. Though the project team attempted to be clear about its expectations of authors and learn of their expectations of the project partners, it was still necessary to manage authors’ expectations of what will be done for them versus what they will have to do for themselves. Authors who already have highly developed manuscripts in hand still need to work closely with the OER unit to create interactive content rather than expecting the OER unit to do this without author input. Unrealistic expectations about financial reward instead of intangible personal and professional rewards for contributing open and validated scholarly content to the higher education community also have to be managed in some cases.

**NEXT STEPS**

Managing the publication of even four open textbooks is a challenge. Before the initial set of proposals was reviewed, inquiries were already received about when the next RFP would be issued. As the project team works through the initial pilot phase, it is already planning next steps that will likely include another call for proposals. This will likely continue to focus on the university’s signature areas, but to maximize adoption at OSU the focus may shift to approaching departments instead of individual faculty members. Next steps will focus on:

**Sustainable and seamless publishing platforms.** In December 2013, OSULP hired a new Gray Family Chair for Innovative Library Services. This is a unique endowed position
among research libraries. For the next three to four years, one of the Chair’s principal foci will be experimenting with publishing platforms to identify sustainable and seamless options for creating content. The platforms should cover the entire cycle from proposal through reviewing and editing to production and dissemination. Toward that end, open textbooks offer an opportunity to explore platforms that include workflows for peer reviewing, editing, and design, as well as the creation of interactive content.

As stated earlier, interest in publishing affordable or open textbooks is growing across higher education in the United States. The cost of textbooks is also an established concern for organizations like the Association for Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU). APLU lists textbook prices as one of the issues that has direct impact on its initiative to make higher education affordable. In its 2008 discussion paper, “University Tuition, Consumer Choice and College Affordability: Strategies for Addressing a Higher Education Affordability Challenge,” the APLU proposed a framework for exploring ways to keep higher education affordable for a larger percentage of the population. One strategy within this framework focuses on cost-effective ways of delivering course content to keep tuition costs down (McPherson & Schulenberger, 2008). Though not spelled out in the paper’s discussion, a central component of this APLU initiative should be collaborations among member schools or other higher education institutions to build inter-institutional course-delivery platforms that embed the means to create and disseminate high-quality, peer-reviewed OER material or open textbooks to be shared across institutions. Such systems could enable APLU institutions to assume greater control of curricular content in open distribution models. This approach could also leverage the developing expertise in library publishing and existing strengths among university presses and other campus entities like OSU’s OER unit. Academic libraries are well-positioned to take the lead in initiating conversations about such models on their campuses and across institutions.

**Viable business models.** As stated earlier, the project’s pilot phase was made possible from entrepreneurial funds provided by Ecampus. These funds originate from student tuition and fees for online programs offered by Ecampus. This money only pays for incentives for participating authors and does not cover the in-kind staff expenses from the OER unit or OSULP, especially from the Press. At present the work of the pilot project has to be assumed alongside other priorities.

As the university offers more courses, programs, and degrees online, it may be possible to partially or fully support the production of open textbooks on an ongoing basis through Ecampus redirecting student fees to the project, or implementing a nominal OER fee in place of textbooks costs. It is not clear what economic contributions the print-on-demand versions of the OSU textbooks might make. There will be a need to capture information
about the costs and time investments for producing a single textbook to better ascertain the number of titles such a publishing program can support on an ongoing basis. The creation of shared systems with other institutions could conceivably keep costs down.

Overall it remains imperative to link the value of the open textbook initiative to the educational objectives of OSU and the state of Oregon. Effectively demonstrating value could open the door for centralized funding from the university or state government to cover in-kind costs or program personnel. As of spring 2014, the Oregon legislature had only slightly explored centralized support for open textbook production. A 2012 report on textbook affordability was issued as a result of Oregon House Bill 4058. This report, which details recommendations and offers analysis of existing federal and state laws and projects related to textbooks, did not overtly recommend grants to centrally fund the production of OA textbooks (http://www.oregon.gov/gov/docs/OEIB/HECC6.pdf). However, as OSU’s initiative and other projects within the state, like Portland State University Library’s “PDX Open: Reducing Student Textbook Costs” or Lane Community College’s OER Faculty Fellowship program, gain momentum, Oregon institutions will be positioned to collectively demonstrate their value and advocate for a centrally funded program like those established by Oregon’s neighbors to the south and north (California and Washington).

**Tracking adoption.** One obvious way to demonstrate value is through tracking adoption of the textbooks within OSU as well as at other institutions. This process seems relatively straightforward at one’s home institution. The author will typically be the adopter and will be familiar with any courses taught by their colleagues that employ the textbook. Tracking adoption elsewhere is a more challenging proposition. Download statistics provide only limited data that would require significant follow-up to confirm actual adoption in a course. One alternative would involve monitoring comments from adopters via repositories such as the University of Minnesota’s Open Textbook library (http://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks). The payoffs of successfully tracking adoption, however, are immense. This information could enable analysis of how many students have benefited and how much money was saved in comparison to the cost of textbooks typically used in those courses.

**CONCLUSION**

As the importance of open textbooks continues to grow in higher education, there are tremendous opportunities for academic libraries to become catalysts for positive change through engaging faculty on these issues. Academic librarians can be at the forefront of universities seeking to establish programs that facilitate the creation and adoption of open textbooks. The concept of libraries becoming publishers of open textbooks dovetails nicely with the emerging field of library publishing and its emphasis on Open Access. Just as a
commitment to the free exchange of information undergirds many libraries’ involvement in Open Access journal publishing, the same principle should inform consideration of their entry into open textbook development. Open textbook publishing reinforces the compelling argument that academia needs to assume greater ownership of the distribution of the content it creates. Instead of giving that content away to external publishers so it can be sold back to students at often egregious prices, higher education could invest in systems that take advantage of library and press expertise surrounding the creation and dissemination of information in various formats.

While academic libraries can bring essential resources and expertise to the table, they should proactively look for collaborators in open textbook endeavors, especially university presses. The increasing mergers and connections among academic libraries and university presses offer fertile ground for open textbook publishing partnerships to take root. The Ithaka S+R report observes:

> With state, federal and private funding invested in determining how to remedy an uneven marketplace and deliver high quality materials to students at reasonable cost, there may well be roles here for new players: the university presses who have close ties to authors, mission-based goals tied to scholarship and education, and basic business skills lacking in many of the early OER experiments; and for the academic libraries who are strong campus advocates for the teachers and especially the students whose plight they witness first-hand. (Maron, 2014, p. 12)

Those libraries that enjoy existing organizational relationships with university presses clearly have an advantage in launching such collaborations, but libraries at schools without presses should consider collaborating with presses or library publishing programs at other institutions.

Multi-university coordination will ultimately be a key to maximizing the scope and impact of libraries on open textbook publishing. This is true not only for finding appropriate partners, but also for ensuring the textbooks complement rather than duplicate each other. There is a natural tendency to focus on one’s own campus in these kinds of initiatives, but experience shows that as in the broader field of library publishing, there is great benefit to be gained from approaching this work as institutional contributions to a greater cause with global impact. At Oregon State University Libraries and Press, open textbook publishing is viewed as an appropriate and strategic application of resources in support of the institutional mission and higher education in general. This partnership offers a model for other libraries to consider as they determine their own levels of engagement with open textbooks as part of their contribution to teaching and learning.
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BACKGROUND

The University of Arizona Libraries is one of the top academic research libraries in the world and is known for its innovation under the leadership of Carla Stoffle, who was the Dean of Libraries for 22 years and spearheaded early adoption of function-structured library departments. It is currently an active member of the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC) and hosts several journals and many other publications in its digital repository.

The University of Arizona (UA) Press was founded in 1959 through the Department of Anthropology and has retained its reputation in the field and a strong regional focus, though it publishes authors from around the world. It produces about 55 books a year with a staff of 13 people. The UA Press wins awards every year and prides itself on a high quality of scholarship and publishing. A few years ago, it was precipitously moved by university administration into the University of Arizona Libraries, both physically and administratively.

This situation is not unique to Arizona. The UA Press and Libraries are part of a recent trend in scholarly communications: As of 2013 there were 20 members of the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) that reported through their university libraries and 58 institutions participating in the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC).

The relationship between the UA Press and the UA Libraries previous to the move was amicable but distant. The Special Collections Department in the Libraries and the UA Press collaborated on events with success, as both are focused on Southwestern subjects and have good partnerships with local agencies both in Tucson and in the wider region. However, the relationship between the Libraries and the Press was not clearly defined both before and after the move. There was a lack of clarity of roles and communication between the two organizations, which remained functionally independent. This led to uncertainty and anxiety, particularly on the Press side, which was not unfounded considering the unusually high number of university press closings over the last decade. There were friendly conversations about possible projects through the Library’s Scholarly Publishing and Data Management team, but there was some trepidation in planning for the future since Dean Carla Stoffle was due to retire.

In order to better understand the trend of new evolving relationships, a review of university press and library collaborations was undertaken by the University of Arizona Press and the University of Arizona Library through the Association of Research Libraries Career Enhancement Program (ARL CEP). The goal was to gain better understanding of past and present collaborative relationship in order to inform the future relationship and collaborations between the UA Press and Libraries.
METHODOLOGY

During the course of nine weeks, the ARL CEP Fellow reviewed existing literature, interviewed staff at the University of Arizona Press and Library, and conducted 27 informal interviews with library deans, press directors, and scholarly communications leaders.

The interview questions were developed by exploring common themes in academic literature regarding library-press collaborations in the past and took the bulk of their inspiration from the Ithaka report “University Publishing in a Digital Age” (Brown, Griffiths, & Rascoff, 2007). The questions also relied heavily upon the input and interests of Kathryn Conrad, the Director of the UA Press; Jeremy Frumkin, the Assistant Dean for Technology Strategy, and Dan Lee, the Director of the Office of Copyright Management & Scholarly Communication.

The interviews addressed the partnership history, structure, motivations, goals and needs, administrative support and budget decisions, key stakeholders, and thoughts on the future of their relationships as well as scholarly communications. Not all questions applied to all the respondents, as each library had a different relationship with each press. The questions asked at the University of Arizona did include similar elements but were different for the obvious reason that there was not yet ongoing collaboration between the Press and the Libraries. Rather than examining programs, the interviews were an attempt to determine current perceptions of the library and the press and ask the staff to consider current challenges and future steps. Both sets of questions are available in Appendix A.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In 1995, Colin Day, then Director of the University of Michigan Press, advocated for change in his article “The Need for Library and University Press Collaboration.” His essay asked readers to look beyond budgetary issues and see the interdependence of libraries and presses as part of a system. He asked for a higher level solution, writing that, “[i]t is hard not to wonder if things are organized sensibly when two entities owned by the same institution – the university - are each pursuing policies that make life more difficult for the other.”

Unfortunately, the environmental factors that have made lives difficult for libraries and presses have only intensified in the past two decades. The change factors and ensuing tensions behind these new structures and roles are well documented. High journal prices for electronic formats, consequent low sales for print monographs, a poor economy, advances in technology, and the evolving habits of scholars have all led to slashed budgets for both libraries and presses. The word “crisis” has been used so often that it has lost its meaning,
and there is resentment and defensiveness amongst publishers and libraries, particularly when there is lack of dialogue between specific parties.

In his article, “Library and University Press Integration: A New Vision for University Publishing,” Richard Clement (2011) of Utah State University detailed the strategies that presses have employed in order to adjust to shrinking monograph sales, and concluded that it is not enough, that presses are still in jeopardy because they stand at the margin rather than the core. He advocated for library and press partnerships, stating bluntly that,

University libraries, unlike most presses, stand at the core of essential programs and at the center of the university's mission. While library budgets have been cut, and librarians periodically contemplate potential marginalization, there is very little risk of libraries being eliminated. From a press perspective, libraries look to be good partners that can protect them politically and financially and help move them to the center. From the library’s perspective, a press offers an obvious expertise in editing and publishing, and, in particular, the production of a peer-reviewed product with an established reputation, an imprimatur. But most significantly, a press brings new pathways for interaction with faculty and engagement with the creation of scholarly content. (p. 12)

This concern for closer engagement with the faculty and alignment with the “center” of an institution (i.e., an institution’s strengths and priorities) is perhaps the most common theme amongst advocates for library and press partnerships (Brown, Griffiths, & Rascoff, 2007). It speaks to the distance publishers have traveled from their original founding purpose of publishing the scholarly output of their universities, although there are many presses that have retained their regional strengths. Collaborative projects with libraries have therefore allowed presses an opportunity to better maintain the balance between supporting local efforts and being seen as vanity publishers that are biased towards their institutions. Purdue University Press (Watkinson, Murray-Rust, Nesdill, & Mower, 2011), Penn State University Press (Eaton, MacEwan, & Potter, 2004), the University California Press (Greenstein, 2010), Georgetown University Press (Alexander, McCoy, Salisbury, & Brown, 2011), and the University of Michigan (Courant, 2010) are just a few examples of press and library efforts that address this alignment need by either creating new works that are of value to their institutions or making available previously published works to the greater public.

Programmatic collaboration has always been a part of library partnerships with other entities on campus, including publishers. However, the same environmental factors that have put pressure on university presses have also put pressure on libraries. The development of institutional repositories, digital archives and curation (Choudhury, Furlough, & Ray,
2009), and now faculty journal hosting and data management services has led to a shift in focus, from traditional collection development and access to library distribution and a more active role in the research process (Armstrong, 2011) as the scholarly landscape itself changes (Smith, 2009). New forms of dissemination and scholarship itself have brought libraries, presses, scholars, and administrators to rethinking the future of scholarly communication (Brown, Griffiths, & Rascoff, 2007). As libraries experiment with new forms of scholarly material and output (Mullins et al., 2012), the university press is an obvious resource for publishing expertise as well as legitimacy (Butler, 2013). This is particularly relevant as institutions look toward open education resources (Withey et al., 2011) and open access publishing as part of their mission (Anderson-Wilk & Kunda, 2012).

**INTERVIEWS WITH SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION LEADERS: REASONS FOR COLLABORATION**

The interviews conducted over the course of nine weeks for the most part reflected the published literature. Of the 27 scholarly communications leaders interviewed, 13 were library professionals and 14 were publishing professionals. Though many of the presses reported administratively through their libraries, this did not preclude or require active collaboration. On the other side, there were several presses that did not report through their libraries but had a working cooperative relationship.

Many of the people interviewed mentioned the need for alignment with the core strengths of the parent institution as a reason for working together. The scholarly mission of making academic work available to the public is seen as a common goal of both the library and the press, as both helped scholars as producers and consumers of content by both sides. According to one library dean, press and library collaborations “bring two very important players in the scholarly communication ecology together both physically and organizationally.” Another publisher commented:

> I certainly see every reason to be open to the interaction. I would recommend understanding and respect of… the particular parts of the mission. The recognition that ultimately we’re in the same business and that in the process there are mutual gains to be had.

This sense of belonging to a common scholarly ecosystem was a common theme for many press directors and several library deans, who expressed as a priority the audience beyond the academic community of their institution. The status of many universities as land grant institutions, and subsequently their directive to serve the public at large, is taken seriously by libraries and presses. This is most clearly shown by the many institutions that participate in
open access publishing related to regional issues and history: Northwestern University Press, Penn State University Press, and Purdue University Press are just a few of the publishers that cited their land grant status as a reason for making their work available online for the public. Some of these digital offerings resulted in print sales, but that was generally not the main goal for a digitized backlist or online journal. Most publishers saw the digitization of their backlist as a way to keep important scholarly works alive, the proof of which is evidenced by the number of downloads. This makes authors happy, commented one publisher who went on to describe the surprising number of local and international downloads that have gained new audience for works that would otherwise have disappeared.

### Common Collaborations Between Academic Presses and Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press within the Library</th>
<th>Housed within library building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardware, software, IT support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development and advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research and Events</th>
<th>Author/speaker series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright and publishing panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market and subject area research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Projects</th>
<th>Digitized backlist available both open access and POD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Born digital monographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conference proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive book-like projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another reason for cooperative digital publishing is to have the means to experiment with emerging forms of scholarly publishing. As previously mentioned, many presses have cut costs to the point where they simply do not have the staff and funding to experiment beyond their traditional roles without the support of the library. One publisher explained that their collaboration has been a positive one because “there are things that may or may not be critical in the future, presses have to think about what they spend and hope they get it back someday” and the library is a partner that can experiment and serve as a digital lab.
Many libraries provide support in both staff time and technology infrastructure in order to digitize, produce, and host projects in which they already have interest. One publisher noted that their “Press has a focused mission, and are a little more conservative…. [There’s] a little anxiety about the future, and we haven’t had resources. Now as a part of the library, we are in a position to take more risk.” Admittedly, quite a few libraries have engaged in publishing projects independent of their university presses, usually through repository-based journals. Often library publishing efforts are less formal (gray literature, conference proceedings, data sets, and the like) and done independently rather than under a joint imprint or active sponsorship of a press. However, both university presses and academic libraries expressed the desire to engage with scholarship as it evolves, to experiment and create new working sustainable models of publication and access. One interviewee noted that her organization was “imagining a day when [we] can make content more digitally readable” beyond text and pictures to a more interactive experience. In fact, this sort of exploration was seen by many as a necessary action in order to be active players in the scholarly communications landscape.

Digital offerings are not the only partnerships, and in fact, one publisher commented on concerns regarding the digital divide and how this move toward online-only access would impact the public. For presses that are structured administratively through their libraries, digital project-based partnerships are an extension of the office overhead and IT support that is funded through the library budget. Several presses have benefited from a library-based new reporting structure because their human resources and IT functions are now handled by the library. In one instance, a publisher recounted how the change in reporting structure resulted in an upgrade of their offices (located in a historic house) to the current century with new wiring, plumbing, and technology. The library dean in this case pushed for the funds from the university administration and hosted the press staff in the library during construction. Other examples include development and fundraising: One library created an endowed internship for the press, and another library has partnered with the press and an academic department on campus to apply for a grant together. According to one interviewee, guarantee (or strong consideration) of publication can be a determining factor for grant acceptance, particularly for international grants.

For those presses now under library administration, the subsequent sharing of resources such as IT and HR services have made both the library and press more efficient and opened possibilities for experimentation. However, these benefits also speak to the lack of support and advocacy for the university press within its parent institution. The creative editorial and marketing expertise of the press staff possess valuable skill sets, yet these assets are not fully understood. Most presses are minimally supported by their parent institutions but are for the most part financially self-sustaining, operating at maximum scholarly benefit for minimum
dollar cost. Unfortunately, this academic output in relation to fiscal conservatism is not always recognized by institutions. In one case, a university made moves to do away with their press even though the press published strongly in regional materials and demonstrated solid profit throughout recession times. This lack of understanding of the value of the university press is perhaps due to the fact that historically the press has existed outside the bureaucratic structure of the university, as the press is not an academic department. One publisher explained that the move had been a positive one because “what the Press really needed was financial support and strong visible advocate on campus, and both [the current] and previous director have been vocal in supporting the Press.” In fact, many presses reported that one of the benefits of moving under the library reporting structure has been a seat at the table. Some of the interviewees reported that under the library, presses are considered as part of the library strategic plan and therefore included in conversations with the university. Press directors are included in upper level meetings and serve as members of the library board, and press staff serve on library committees.

Of course, a formal reporting structure is not absolutely necessary for collaborative involvement, nor does it preclude a positive relationship. Several presses that did not report through their libraries cited library advocacy on behalf of the press as one of the most important and helpful results of a positive relationship. However, one library dean said with administrative oversight of a press commented, “libraries and presses are coming together but there’s still some tension there. I think librarians are still naive when it comes to what it takes to publish and presses are narrow in their definition.” Like the University of Arizona, there were a few people who indicated that even though their press reported through the library, they had minimal interaction with the library. One common theme was that there are still major differences that are unlikely to be overcome, since they are rooted in the different business models and therefore practices and philosophies.

**INTERVIEWS WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA**

At the University of Arizona (UA), librarians and press staff were interviewed on the nature of publishing and the relationship between the library and the press. The question, “What does publishing mean to you?” produced some measured responses from the larger scholarly communications community (many felt it was a loaded question). In contrast, the response at Arizona on both the library and press sides were surprisingly similar. Both librarians and press staff agreed that scholarly publishing was peer reviewed and went through a process of editing, developing, and marketing that added value and authenticity. Librarians did have a broader view of what could be considered publishing and felt that open access was important, but were also very aware that costs were involved and wanted to know more about the business models that enabled the UA Press to be profitable.
The UA Press and UA Library demonstrated little knowledge about each other despite being housed in the same building. It was recognized by librarians that the UA Press publishes in tandem with the strengths of the university, and therefore acts as a leader in the region and its related fields (such as border studies, anthropology, and planetary sciences), but the perception from the Library is that the Press is small in scope and size. The UA Library is recognized for its service to the campus and community and its strong national reputation as an ARL library, but the Press has little intimacy with the actual responsibilities and projects taking place. This lack of understanding has led to a lack of trust and collaboration despite the desire to experiment and do more in scholarly communications. While this could be attributed to the general hostile climate between libraries and presses, only Kathryn Conrad, the Press Director, was aware of this hostility, and the librarians were quick to say they respected the Press. The lack of trust instead seemed rooted in the fact that the Press was not consulted in their move to the Library, and there had been no discussion as to how that move impacted them. The status of the Press within the Library was not clear. This uncertainty coupled with a busy publishing schedule meant that conversations on the relationship between the Library and the Press had only taken place recently.

One of the things that emerged from interviews with the Library and Press staff was the lack of infrastructure and staff on both sides. The Press staff felt that they would like to innovate and do more, but simply did not have the time, as they were already so busy in their regular duties, having lost several full-time staff in the past. The Library had also made cuts in staff that were not replaced, and do not have the time and technology knowledge in-house to move forward beyond current institutional repository and basic journal hosting services. In fact, only recently, in the fall of 2014, did the University of Arizona Libraries advertise for positions that had long been needed. Generally, the three big needs identified by Library staff were time, technology capability, and outreach to faculty.

**ASSESSMENT OF FINDINGS**

The importance of relationship-building cannot be overstated. The influence of personalities and a positive relationship between the library and press was the most commonly cited reason and recommendation for a successful collaboration. More than one publisher commented that they had a very good relationship with their library for now, but that could change in the future; an element of caution that pervaded all interviews due to past animosities. Though the library and the press may share mission goals of high quality academic research and output, there are large cultural and structural differences between the two that need to be bridged. For example, while there is often administrative and resource sharing between libraries and presses, for the most part the budgets remain separate. This is because, in the words of Patrick Alexander at Penn State University Press, libraries are given a bucket of
money to spend, while presses are given a bucket with a little bit of money and told to fill the rest. This long-established difference in business models was the most cited reason for cultural differences between libraries and presses.

These economic and idealistic cultural differences have perhaps expressed themselves most loudly around the issues of pricing and open access. In fact, the question of open access met with the most variation in response. One press director called open access a tool amongst others, and Patrick Alexander bluntly stated, “Open access is not a business model. It’s a philosophy. The reason open access works in the sciences is the sciences have money and the humanities don’t.” In contrast, Bryn Geffert of Amherst College maintains that open access publishing is the solution for how to connect needed material to readers that traditional models of publishing cannot reach.

Despite these opposing views, there is not a simple library versus press divide, as it is clear from both case examples and conversations that press directors are not opposed to open access. One press director noted that working with academic librarians was actually easier than working with other partners because “libraries understand that digital costs something,” and several directors expressed that they would like to have their publications available online either through open or hybrid access. The issue is again a cultural one, as presses are concerned about filling the metaphorical bucket with money, particularly since for many sales is a marker of value. However, there are other ways of measuring value, such as downloads and citations. The concerns for both publishers and librarians are more practical than philosophical, namely 1) how open access would be funded 2) how quality would be maintained. This issue of sustainability was one that came up often, and while the published literature on press-collaboration features many successful projects, conversations revealed that some of these successes are one-time projects and some lack the funding and infrastructure for sustainable expansion.

In the words of Kathryn Conrad of the University of Arizona Press, “Open access is almost a red herring. The goal is to provide as much scholarship at the highest quality possible in sustainable way…We have to be open to new models and new business models, but we have to stand up for what we believe standards should be.” This emphasis on standards for publication was most present when people were asked the question, “What does publishing mean to you?” The response was inevitably a measured one, with the words “continuum” or “spectrum” used to describe everything from blog posts to traditional peer reviewed monographs. There was often a distinction made between traditional scholarly publishing and more casual forms of what many called “dissemination,” whether to establish traditional publishing as “real” publishing or make the argument that in this era all forms of public dissemination could be called publishing. This semantic debate is likely to be continue
as new forms of scholarly communication advance their efforts to establish standards of quality control.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA**

While academic presses and libraries have a fundamental difference in business model, taken all together it was clear from the interviews that there were quite a few similarities in mission, their positions within the institution, and value, as shown by the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Believe in high quality academic research and output</td>
<td>Come out of and serve academic institutions</td>
<td>Are positioned to offer unique expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make academic work available to the public</td>
<td>Are feeling pressure from institutions to prove their value</td>
<td>Are positioned to offer and act on big-picture thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve consumers and producers (scholars and researchers)</td>
<td>Day-to-day operations not clearly understood by institution</td>
<td>Are positioned to be leaders in scholarly communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several areas in which the UA Library and Press can work together for mutual benefit. The first is to share expertise with each other. The Press would like to know more about metadata and discoverability, and the Library would like to know more about business models. This is knowledge that can be shared with each other through workshops or meetings.

The second is to use their shared expertise in order to market their value to the campus. For example, the Press can connect faculty to librarians as valuable resources. The Press and Library together can investigate campus interest in different forms of publishing in order to take initiative and establish themselves as expert resources. Programmatic partnerships, like a publishing panel for graduate students or author speakers during Open Access Week, are also ways in which the Library and Press can provide value, work together, and market themselves.

Thirdly, the Press and Library can advocate for more infrastructure in staff and technology. At the time of this project, the UA Library was going through a time of change, as they had
recently hired a new dean. While tumultuous, such change is an excellent time to determine areas of mutual need and request those resources that can be shared. For example, due to the strong regional focus of the Press, digitizing the backlist for the Library’s institutional repository and possible print-on-demand sales would provide value to the community both on campus and throughout Arizona.

Lastly, the Press and Library need to build relationships and determine their identity in relation to each other. Since the Press has an identity that is grounded in campus strengths and high quality, the Library should be careful not to dilute that brand. Instead, the brand can be leveraged in order to initiate new opportunities such as grant-based or collections-based publishing projects. The positive attitude of librarians toward the Press indicates that the Press should see the Library as a resource, an advocate, and an opportunity to be more involved in the life of the campus.

CONCLUSIONS

In February 2014, the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) released a joint study on the very topic of library and press collaborations. Many of the conclusions echoed those of this study: more presses were under library administration, most remained functionally separate, libraries are publishing more but differently. The report revealed some tension regarding the quality of library-published efforts. One press director commented that, “Libraries are well-suited to create and preserve free, online materials. They are rarely suited to engage in commerce, or in editing, design, and printing” (AAUP Library Relations Committee, 2014, p. 20). However, for the most part the tone was conciliatory, as more institutions move towards partnerships.

One of the largest motivating factors for collaboration that is missing from both the published literature and from the interviews conducted through this study is scholar habits. Monograph publication is often necessary to the tenure track process, but this does not address attitudes toward publication from the author side. According to Ithaka’s 2012 Faculty Survey, “less than one in five respondents across disciplines strongly agreed that their ability to share work directly with peers has made scholarly publishers less important, with almost half of respondents strongly disagreeing; this brings into question the rhetoric of decline in publishing” (Housewright, Schonfeld, & Wulfson, 2013). It is clear that the peer review and editorial process is still highly valued by scholars. Publishers should be more vocal about their role in this process, both as providers and as advisors to their libraries, particularly if there is partnership for an online imprint or journal. Also of note is that published conference proceedings rank above scholarly monographs in how scholarly
research is shared, indicating that it should be a target area of growth for publishing institutions.

Another important finding, though not a new one, is that scholars publish most frequently in the scholarly communication formats that they themselves read. While influence varies by subject area, the internet era has been democratizing for the dissemination of information in that anyone now has the power to read and make public their thoughts without going through a library or a publisher. Many young scholars now operate in different modes of information-gathering and discussion. Rebecca Kennison of Columbia noted that the scholarly communication process “used to be a tricycle: creator, library, publisher.” This has changed because technology allows for the creator to publish and disseminate on their own, since, a “unicycle is totally fine at the end of the day. Not very stable but simple… The creator of the work is really the important one. Lots of people really like bicycles. If we can really sort out how we can be that other wheel and what creator wants.” This shift has already made itself felt in sometimes awkward ways,¹ and both publisher and libraries need to think about what this means for their roles in the shifting landscape.

A more casual means of scholarship that lives outside the traditional ecosystem is valuable, but also brings up the question again of standards, a topic that should be explored further by the scholarly community. For example, the MLA has standards for how to cite a tweet – does this mean that publishers and librarians should have standards on the veracity said tweet? Does this include peer review? High quality open access journals have shown that traditional peer review standards of verification and authenticity are not limited to traditional means of publishing, just as there are poor quality subscription journals that prove the same.

Business models aside, it seems that libraries and presses share similar values when it comes to integrity in scholarship and similar hurdles when it comes to unconventional means of scholarship. Their shared challenges and values, along with the mission of supporting scholarship in their institutions and at large, are a common ground on which libraries and presses can build relationships and plan for the new future of scholarly communication. Strategic planning and partnerships are key in establishing and marketing value in an increasingly loud and crowded information marketplace. In fact, recently at the first LPC meeting, the tone toward presses was decidedly friendly from the libraries, and many of the speakers talked collaboration rather than crisis. Judging from published examples and

¹ For example, a peer reviewed article was published on the basis of a blog post by Mark Goodacre, a professor at Duke University: http://ntweblog.blogspot.com/2013/04/peer-reviewed-article-responding-to.html
interviews, the shape of these partnerships will be different depending on each context, but relationship-building and resource-sharing has incredible value as the landscape of scholarship itself is changing.
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APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Press-Library Interview Questions

Introduction
• What does the word “publishing” mean to you?
• What is the history of your collaboration?
• What advice would you offer an institution that is looking into a press/library collaboration?

Why
• What were the reasons behind your collaboration with the press? Goals? Needs?
• How does a press-library collaboration provide for the needs of the larger institution’s mission?
• How did you determine the priorities of the collaboration? (needs assessment?)

Who
• Who were the leaders in this collaboration? Why?
• Who were and are the stakeholders in the collaboration? How has that evolved?
• What was the level of support from the university administration? What were their perceptions and needs?

How/What
• Why did your collaboration take the structure that it did?
• What differences did you see between the press and the library in terms of perspectives and culture?
• How did you address branding and quality consistency?
• How are resources allocated? Budget? Staffing? Technology? Where did you have to sacrifice and make decisions?
• How did you address metadata and discoverability?
• What was/is the timeline?
• How do you assess and track value? Impact?
• How do you market your services to the institution? Elsewhere?

Evaluate
• Going into the collaboration, what were some of the preconceptions that you found to be true? Not true? How have these perceptions changed?
• What do you consider to be a successful outcome? A failed outcome or process? What did you learn?
• What were some challenges/obstacles in collaborating?
• Where do you see this particular collaboration moving in the future?
• What are your thoughts on the future of how content is created, marketed, and accessed? (monographs, multimedia)

Closing
• Are there any other questions we did not ask that we should have?
• Whom else should we consult for this study?
• Do you have any questions for us?

UA Interview Questions

Introduction
• What does the word “publishing” mean to you?
• What/who are your current priorities, both in the short term and long term?
• What are your thoughts on the future of how content is created, marketed, and accessed? (monographs, multimedia)

Needs Assessment
• Who is the audience for the library/press? Who are the key stakeholders?
• What are your perceptions of the University Library?
  • What are the challenges/needs of the Library?
  • What are the strengths of the Library?
• What are your perceptions of the University Press?
  • What are the challenges/needs of the Press?
  • What are the strengths of the Press?
• What differences are there in culture?
• How would a press-library collaboration provide for
  • The needs of the Press?
  • The needs of the Library?
  • The needs of the larger institution?

Structure
• How do you see the Library and Press fitting in with each other currently? In the future?
• What would be the priorities of collaboration?
• Who should be involved?
• How would you address branding and quality consistency?
• How would resources be allocated? Budget? Staffing? Technology?
• What is an ideal timeline?
• How would you assess and track value? Impact?
• How would you market the collaboration to the institution? Elsewhere?

Closing
• What is your work wishlist?
• Are there any other questions we did not ask that we should have?
• Whom else should we consult for this study?
• Do you have any questions for us?
Good morning. I’m looking back in this talk to a talk that I gave in 2005 at a meeting of the Society for Scholarly Publishing in Boston. As I was sitting and thinking before I got up here, I’d say my interest and involvement in the subject of library publishing and the many things it can mean began another 10 years before that, around 1995.

At that point, I was the director for the Institute of Advanced Technology and Humanities. I had started there in 1993 when they hired me by mistake. I was working with the Rossetti Archive and negotiating with Eve Trager and some other people at the University of Michigan Press to make the Rossetti Archive one of the University of Michigan Press’s first electronic publications. That was a long negotiation, and it did not result in a publication. The experience was tutelary, to say the least.

I maintained an interest from that time forward in trying to figure out the proper relationships and collaborations for librarians, scholars, and publishers, especially around new forms of digital scholarship. I’ll be talking about some of those topics today, nearly twenty years later. Hopefully, a little bit of wisdom will have accrued in the interval.
Some of the things we have to negotiate in this territory have to do with professional identity and how we think of ourselves in our professions. The last time I talked about this, I invented not only one, but two, new professions: “liblisher” and “pubrarian.” Interestingly, “liblisher” hasn’t caught on. Nobody wants to be one of those, so “pubrarians” it is.

The question of professional identity has intersected for me, just recently, in the classroom as well. I have taught and will teach a course at Brandeis in the English Department on twentieth century American bestsellers. In this course we are reading *Babbitt*, which I recommend if you haven’t read it lately. Many of us haven’t read it since high school, though it’s actually a very good book. One of the things that *Babbitt* talks about is the rise of the professional class in America. It’s very interesting on that subject, and I’ll come back to that in just a moment.

In my December 2005 talk on “pubrarians” and “liblishers,” I made a number of points, but at that time I was principally noting the overlap in the activities of academic publishers and research libraries. At the end of the talk I called for the intentional development of cross-trained professionals who would have education and experience in both professions: librarianship and publishing.

Library publishing, according to the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC) website, is:

[B]ased on core library values and builds on the traditional skills of librarians. It is distinguished from other publishing fields by a preference for open-access dissemination, and a willingness to embrace informal and experimental forms of scholarly communication and to challenge the status quo.

That’s not just a mission statement. That’s also a statement of professional values and aspirations.

As I was looking at that, and looking at some of the reading that I was discussing with my class at Brandeis yesterday, I was struck by this passage in an article we were reading from a Modern Language Association (MLA) publication. This is an article about *Babbitt*, *Mainstreet*, *Arrowsmith*, *Dodsworth*, a set of novels in which Sinclair Lewis explores the rise of the professional managerial class. The author of the article, Michael Augspurger, who wrote this as part of his dissertation and had it published by Cornell University Press (Auspurger, 2001), had some very interesting things to say about this. The true professional ideal, he said, encouraged doctors, lawyers, engineers, scientists, ministers, and professors to approach their jobs as “callings” that demanded disinterested objectivity, devotion to public service, professional autonomy, and a rejection of material ambition. That’s an interesting set of values to take as defining characteristics of the professional ideal.
Elsewhere in this article, Augspurger talks about a split in the professional class and a bifurcation into what he calls “adversarial professions” and professionals who accommodate themselves to bureaucracy and capitalism. I think one of the challenges we have in the library publishing world is that split. We have two groups of professionals in the room. One of them is perforce accustomed to interacting with market places, to dealing with money, and to selling things. The other does not have that as part of their job description and feels vaguely queasy about those roles. I think that divide is one of the humps that we have to get over in order to work together effectively. We have to recognize that really, if you are in academic publishing, you have a fair claim to have rejected material ambition. I mean, really.

Having accepted that, I think other intersections between the professions of librarian and publisher become easier to see, for example, that publishers, like librarians, consider their work in the service of the public. Not only are they not doing it to get rich, they are doing it because they think it is a good thing to do. In fact, if somebody hadn’t, against all odds, published that dissertation as a book, I wouldn’t have found that very interesting article that really illuminated a whole book and in some ways is becoming a centerpiece for the class that I’m teaching. I think we have more of these professional values in common than we generally allow.

Flash forward, from December 2005 or January 1995, pick your starting point, to February 2014 and to an *Against the Grain* article: “University Presses Facing Enormous Tectonic Shifts in Publishing” (Herther, 2014). This has also been a theme for the last twenty years or so of my life in the academy: there is a crisis in the humanities, there is a crisis in scholarly publishing, there is a crisis in the university. The only strange thing about this crisis is that it doesn’t go away. It never concludes. Usually, there is some point at which the crisis is over. This crisis seems to have become our mode of being.

In the article, Nancy Herther (University of Minnesota Libraries) provides a nice round-up of up-to-the-moment activities and perspectives. It quotes Sarah Lippincott and others involved with the Library Publishing Coalition, and others like Doug Armato and Sandy Thatcher from the university press world. There are good voices, some very interesting perspectives. It’s a nice compilation of markers of the current moment.

One of the things that we learn in Herther’s piece is that there are now more university presses who are reporting through their libraries, or as part of their libraries, and that 60 libraries now belong to the Library Publishing Coalition. Brandeis belongs to both of those categories. Brandeis, is a Contributing Member of the Library Publishing Coalition, and as of last spring, the Brandeis University Press, which had reported through the president’s office, is now reporting through the library.
The story of how the press came to report through the library is instructive. I got a call from one of my more senior managers in the president’s office who said, “This press, do we need it?” I said, “Give it to me and you won’t have to worry about it. I’ll take care of it.” The Brandeis University Press is, in my view, an incredibly important part of the Brandeis brand out in the world. It defines us in some scholarly circles, and it is also part of the critical research infrastructure for the humanities and for the social sciences at Brandeis.

Brandeis is unusual, among university presses, in the way that it is grounded in the campus. It is integrated; series editors come from institutes on campus in many cases. It’s more connected to campus life and activity than university presses sometimes are. I take that as a good sign and it is one of the reasons that I wanted to adopt the press.

I think one of the challenges that university presses have is that their activity is essentially altruistic from the point of view of the university and the funders. It is easy to see why you would give a library money and not expect them to give you money back. You give the library money because they procure collections and resources, which are used by your local constituency. It’s not at all clear in the same way that university presses provide a local good, and therefore the logic of subsidy is a lot more difficult. One of the things I hope for with the Library Publishing Coalition is that we can change that calculus as more presses and more libraries start to work together. I hope that there will be seen to be local goods—not just forms of vanity publishing—that accrue to the campus as a result of having a press.

I am hopeful, but we haven’t quite figured it out. Libraries, having been subsidized to produce a local good, don’t want to charge people for information. That seems like double dipping somehow. University presses, who honestly believe in the value of the content they are producing, don’t want to think that people might pay for the format in which that content is delivered. And that’s not just university press publishers; I think that is true of publishers everywhere. It’s a little bit of an insult to think that if somebody could get the intellectual content of a thing for free, that they would pony up nine dollars for an ebook format just because they like reading on their Kindle. But, in fact, that is how people behave. And nobody in this picture is fully funded for innovation, much less for altruism. We need to grapple with those issues.

There is a saying often attributed to Einstein (though it probably originates with William Bruce Cameron’s 1963 book Informal Sociology), “Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted.”

With respect to the Library Publishing Coalition, it began by focusing on the libraries and even in cases where there were presses reporting through those libraries, taking those
presses off the table in the initial headcount. When I asked about this, the reason given for excluding them is reasonable, I think: to enable direct comparison across library programs, including those who do not work with a university press. And because the press often operates independently in terms of acquisitions, production, *et cetera*, from other library publishing activities, even if it is housed within the library.

All true. It is very reasonable to want to compare apples to apples, especially in the early stages of defining a new kind of activity and disseminating best practices. Still, I am happy to see many publishers here and happy that subsequent conversations with people at the Library Publishing Coalition have made it clear that library publishing can also be an activity see to include those university presses that report up through libraries. This is from Sarah Lippincott in Nancy Herther’s *Against the Grain* article:

> Monograph publishing has been a fruitful area of collaboration between libraries and university presses. In one collaborative model, the press contributes editorial expertise and distribution mechanisms for print media, while the library provides sophisticated technology for digital versions of the monograph or supplemental material.

I think it is telling that in much of what the Library Publishing Coalition says about publishers, publishers are defined in some ways as an earlier version of themselves. Publishers do print, they are not interested in open access, and they do distribution mechanisms and things like that.

I think there is a lot that library publishers can gain from working with university press publishers. It’s critical to recognize that university press publishers are no longer just about print—far from it. University press publishers are also no longer opposed in some categorical way to Open Access. Like the rest of us, I think, they are trying to figure out how to make this work.

I think there is good value in sharing experience with other people who are starting to do something that you are starting to do. But I think ultimately as a community that involves both libraries and university presses, at some point we will want to step back far enough to measure and value the *activity* regardless of the *actors*.

In my 2005 talk, I noted a few things about the parties here. There are some things that publishers do that librarians have not traditionally done. Now, there are people in this room who come from relatively venerable library publishing operations and would be able to produce examples of some of these activities, but by and large, these are things that have characterized the profession of publishing and the activity of publishing.
Libraries have a separate set of things that they do that haven’t overlapped much with things that university presses do. Some of these activities have changed quite a bit in the last ten to fifteen years. We don’t select in the same way that we used to in libraries, for example. We don’t do as much original cataloging. But these are still activities that are deeply embedded in the professional identity of librarians.

So, if we did work together, deliberately, what could we do?

One thing we could do is to educate and train “pubrarians,” cross-trained professionals in publishing and libraries. The Library Publishing Coalition is involved in an effort that is focused at the University of Illinois to work with that iSchool to develop such a program. I would be very interested in seeing that. In my 2005 talk, I listed a whole bunch of courses then in the curriculum that would be directly applicable to the activity of publishing. I’m not going to bore you with that list, but it would be longer now than it was before. We have a lot of faculty, especially in the online LEEP program at Illinois, who come from some different parts of the world of (especially) electronic publishing. A lot of those pieces are in place and it’s great to see an effort afoot to actually pull them together under the heading of a certificate or a degree.

We also have some problems that we may be able to address together as librarians and publishers. Some of these are problems I identified in 2005, but that are still relevant today. When we go back to 2005, it gets brown and old looking. There is no business model for preservation by publishers. This is a long story, actually. Publishers have been melting down plates forever. It’s just not their business to keep them around after they have outlived their usefulness for production.

There is no mission in libraries to work with authors. Some libraries have worked with faculty who are editing journals, or doing other things, but we aren’t used to working with authors as producers in the way that publishers do.

Publishers aren’t particularly trained in the organization and collection of information. Within certain boundaries and activities they do this, but it’s a particular view of the activity. And librarians aren’t trained in marketing, graphic design, or business. Again, in certain domains, they do things that look like that, but it’s not a core part of their business.

There are “pubrarians” out there. By and large in 2005, and probably to a lesser extent but still today, you will find the majority of them in commercial publishers. University

---

1 http://www.lis.illinois.edu/future-students/leep
presses are in this game only if they are collaborating with their libraries, partly because this is a question of infrastructure and who has capitalized to have it. The particular kind of infrastructure involved here is more likely to be found either in commercial publishing or in libraries than in university presses.

Commercial publishers are capitalized for new ventures. They spend money to develop products in advance of the market. And that’s good, if you are a commercial publisher. It’s not so good if you are a university press and you are trying to compete at some level with people who are capitalized in some way and can do new things.

When I was at Illinois we had a conversation that didn’t really develop the way that I had hoped it would. Some people in this room were probably part of that conversation. It involved, at each of several campuses, the director of the university press, the dean of the iSchool, the director of the library, and the provost. The purpose of these conversations was to figure out if across a number of major state universities, all CIC universities, we could agree to capitalize the development of new research services around data communities that we could identify.

One of the interesting things that emerged in that conversation was that all of the parties at each of the universities had basically only local constituencies, except for the presses. The presses were the only people in the room who worked with communities of scholars across universities where their communities were defined by discipline or area of interest. You could think of it as list building, but it’s also community building.

Everybody else was focused on the campus constituency. These conversations eventually broke down, in part I think, because the presses and the libraries couldn’t quite figure out how they were going to work together. I still think the notion of developing advanced research services for data communities in an academic setting is a very legitimate, interesting target for a group like this and is doable if we can figure out our respective roles.

In the last part of this talk, I’m going to give you a few different examples of opportunities to get at some of this. These are all things that I’m involved with in one way or another so I make no pretense of disinterest, but they are also things that I know reasonably well as a result of being involved.

The first thing I will talk about is the HathiTrust Research Center. This offers the opportunity to develop and serve data communities without a lot of redundant infrastructure. There is so much data being pooled in the HathiTrust, not just from the Google Books projects, or things that libraries themselves have digitized, but from multiple sources, as you’ll hear when I talk about Knowledge Unlatched.
In some real way it represents the contents of an ideal research university library. There are three billion pages on all subjects and in many languages, about half in English. There is a ton of opportunity, and the fact that the basic infrastructure exists removes a huge barrier to innovation for this community. With the infrastructure in place, we now only need to figure out how to build services on top of that infrastructure.

The University of Illinois has just started a grant from Mellon: a sort of re-granting operation to work with specific projects that are interested in developing a clearer understanding of a corpus in the context of these huge collections. If you are working with three billion pages, you aren’t working with three billion pages. No one can work with three billion pages. You are working with some subset of that very large collection. So how do you cut through the mass of stuff to get the subset that interests you? How do you manipulate that subset of data once you have it, how do you share results? How do you share your data, just the selected set, with other people? What happens as that dataset goes through its life cycle, and what are its parts? Are they different in different disciplines? Are they different in different languages? How do we understand this fundamental building block of scholarly work in the presence of big data?

So I see the HathiTrust Research Center as a laboratory for exploring new research needs and opportunities. I see it as a place where we will partner in some ways with academically oriented commercial publishers like Gale and ProQuest. I think the incentive for them is that people already come to them on a regular basis asking for datasets. They want to be helpful, and they want to know what people are doing with these datasets, because they are interested in understanding the behavior of clients.

They generally try to provide these datasets, but they do so with no guarantee that they will ever hear back about what happened, no guarantee that the agreement to destroy the data when the research is done will be upheld and a fair amount of staff time spent manually assembling the datasets that are required. I can see a business case for a commercial publisher to put its data in the HathiTrust and to ask the research center to be in charge of providing researchers with those datasets.

Part of this discussion is the issue of rights management. We are very excited in the HathiTrust Research Center to be working through the final stages of a security review at Illinois and at Indiana with oversight from Michigan. That is a necessary step on the way to our being able to provide people with computational access to the copyrighted material that is in the HathiTrust. That is the 75 percent of material that you can’t get at under any circumstance right now. Managing those rights, like building the infrastructure, is a huge undertaking that could swamp any of our efforts to build services on top of that.
The HathiTrust’s matrix of rights gives a sense of the enormity of this endeavor. Across the top of this matrix is the type of work, whether it is searchable as bibliographic information and full text, whether it is viewable, whether you can download a full PDF, whether it’s available to the data API, whether it can be printed on demand, whether it can be made available to people with print disabilities, and whether it has preservation uses.

Down the left hand column are types of work. For example, one type is public domain worldwide. That’s the least problematic stuff. It’s about 10 percent of the total. Continuing down this column, we have public domain in the U.S.; non-U.S. works published between 1872 and 1923; works that rights holders have opened access to HathiTrust; where rights are known and the right holder has made the work open access; works that are in copyright or of undetermined status (including the difficult category of orphan works).

And then, where are these conditions obtained? Is public domain worldwide searchable? Yes, worldwide. Is it viewable? Yes, worldwide. Are works that are public domain in the U.S. and non-U.S. works published between 1872 and 1923 searchable? Yes, worldwide. Viewable? When accessed from the United States. All of these conditions have different switches depending on who is looking at them and what they are looking at. There is an infrastructure for dealing with this, and there is a way of identifying materials as belonging to these categories. That in itself is a huge boon—a move towards being able to do work without ending up in court, or let’s just say, without ending up in court very often.

This is infrastructure that you don’t want to have to build. This is high performance computing hooked up to data stores that are provided to the research center from the HathiTrust and various processes, authentication, passing algorithms back and forth across fire walls, et cetera. It’s great stuff not to have to do.

Why would we do those things? Here are some of the actual interesting questions that we get, things that people want to do with this data. I see lots of opportunities here for us, collectively. Can we identify all the works that deal with Francis Bacon? What musical scores are in the corpus? What works contain music notation? Which works have back-of-book indexes that I might analyze? How would I gather works by sixteenth century women? By nineteenth century men? Which works are fiction? Which are nonfiction? Which are essays? Poetry? How would I gather works similar to those that I currently have in hand? Can I define different kinds of similarity?

We didn’t make up those questions. Those are real questions that real researchers have, and you can see an implied research program behind those questions. All of these questions are, in principle, answerable. They are all questions that you can’t answer right now with existing
metadata. Even though, like in the MARC record, there is a place to identify genre, we don’t currently do that when we catalog things. The gender of the author, likewise.

There are interesting computational ways to deal with some of these problems. There are all kinds of things to be learned by trying to answer questions like this. I think a combination of publishers, who work with authors, and libraries, who support scholarly research, is a good group to be working with some of these questions.

My second example is the University Press of New England. One of my reasons for accepting the invitation to come here and talk to you is that I really see a strong opportunity here for library publishers. I understand that the focus in library publishing is and should be on Open Access. That implies electronic distribution for free.

However, given that we know that people will pay for format, why not offer people the chance to pay for what they can also get for free and see what they do? Why not work with a group like the University Press of New England who has a large program of publishing services and affiliates, and say, “These titles seem like they might work ... you take them and make them into ebooks, get them up on Amazon, iTunes, all the distribution channels that you already work with, and let’s see what happens. And while you are at it, if someone wants print, make it available so they can print on demand. We think it will be too expensive, but, you know, let’s see what happens.”

I think there is enough interest in format to potentially make certain kinds of open access sustainable in economic terms, if we don’t deliberately cut off that market. This is what the University Press of New England is focusing on at the moment in terms of list building. They have both general interest and academic lists, and they have an interest in books for course adoption. Some of the topics here might chime with some things that you are considering doing in your own library publishing operations. If so, there might be some advantage to having those titles available to be found where people are finding other titles on those subjects.

But these are really what the UPNE focuses on in their work with publishing affiliates. The topics are at the discretion of the affiliate and cover a very large range. The UPNE provides a range of services such as manuscript editing and book design; project management; domestic and Asian print brokering; ebook production conversion; and national and international distribution to major channels including Kindle, Nook, iBooks, and library ebook aggregators; financial management and business operations; metadata management; book marketing and publicity; book sales; order entry; customer service; warehouse and fulfillment including print-on-demand coordination.
As a library, those are a lot of things that I don't want to learn how to do, and I would be very happy not to have to do them. But I wouldn't mind print-on-demand in Asia or international ebook distribution. That would be great. Ebooks are kind of the heart of the matter, at the moment. This is Doug Armato from the Against the Grain article: “The ebook transition has been a major hurdle, but it is well underway.”

The biggest challenge in the academic library market is that it hasn’t transitioned to electronic fast enough, and presses are still running parallel print and digital systems for library products, which is costly. From the library side, the advent of ebooks has been overwhelming and confusing. Brandeis is part of an ebook pilot project in the Boston Library Consortium where we negotiated prices with several publishers. No two publishers price their ebooks the same, incidentally. It’s enough to make you pine for Amazon.

Pricing is all over the map. Publishers will offer you terms like, “four people can view it, and then the fifth person that looks at it, you’ve bought the book.” But another publisher will have different terms. It’s the overhead, and just figuring out what you are buying in some of these ebook deals is kind of staggering.

I don’t think it’s that libraries aren’t interested in ebooks. They are interested in what their patrons want, and increasingly, people want ebooks. Also, libraries are and have always been interested in technological innovation. So they aren’t averse to this. But it hasn’t been easy to figure out how to work with it. At the same time, I think Doug Armato is absolutely right that running parallel systems is expensive and if you don’t have a system that seamlessly produces multiple outputs with a single input, it ups your cost of doing business.

My third and final example is Knowledge Unlatched. Again, many people in the room participate in Knowledge Unlatched and are aware of it. I’ve been looking at things like this since I got to Brandeis. I’ve spent some time speaking to the Unglue.it people. Unglue.it is a kind of Kickstarter model for making titles open access. It’s great, but it doesn’t work with library budgeting. It’s great if you are an individual, but libraries couldn’t plan a budget around Unglue.it to save their lives.

Knowledge Unlatched, on the other hand, has really taken that problem and solved it in a very clever way. It represents an interesting collaboration between libraries and publishers. There is a group of libraries that selects titles offered up by publishers, and that selection is licensed as a bundle and sold to participating libraries. Once the publisher has earned back the title fee, which the publisher gets to set, then the book becomes open access with a Creative Commons license.
In this way libraries could see their subscription budget as buying books out of bondage, and that’s attractive. And you can budget it. The open access infrastructure for distribution is OAPEN in Europe and the HathiTrust.

Knowledge Unlatched addresses a number of problems that publishers face. With more titles and fewer sales, there is more risk per title for publishers. If you contribute a book to Knowledge Unlatched as a publisher, you have basically zero risk. In fact, on average you are likely to have better results with that book than with your other titles because you have a guaranteed source of income for it, and there are typically no guarantees in publishing.

Secondly, monograph sales are being squeezed out of library budgets by journals. Libraries need to figure out how to increase open access to monograph materials. What we’ve been doing so far is providing funding for authors to pay page charges, which is okay in the sciences, but it does nothing for you in the humanities and social sciences. It’s just not a model that works there. Some title fee examples from Knowledge Unlatched: if you have a $10,000 title fee, and there are 250 libraries participating, the cost per library for the title is 40 dollars. Forty dollars is not an unreasonable price to pay for a monograph.

If you have 750 at that 10,000 title fee, it is 13 bucks. That’s a deal. I think these title fees are realistic, from looking at the Brandeis University press. They are in the realm of reality. To think that, with a few hundred libraries participating, this could be sustainable year in and year out, and every year would provide more open access monographs in the humanities and the social sciences, is really encouraging. I applaud Knowledge Unlatched for having cut this particular Gordian knot.

Next, I’ll offer some thoughts on opportunities for the Library Publishing Coalition.

One is engaging the digital humanities. Going back to trying to publish the Rossetti Archive with the University of Michigan Press, we still really haven’t figured out how to publish born-digital humanities scholarship, and it’s still out there. Before I left, I helped the university press at Virginia start Rotunda, which is a pretty successful experiment in this kind of publishing, but there are not a lot of them, and there is plenty of room to do more in that area.

A second is supporting data communities, which I mentioned before. I think that is a very real possibility right now, and one that we should jump on. Other people certainly will.

The third is the publication and curation of gray literature. A lot of important scholarship and communication goes on in the form of conference proceedings. I’m involved with
the Alliance of Digital Humanities Organizations, which puts a great deal of care into its conference proceedings every year, and it is a publishing operation that they do, year in and year out, because they want to preserve that record.

The fourth way is publishing faculty-edited journals that experiment with new business models and promote sustainable Open Access. Those are all things that I think are on the table that we could be doing together.

And, because I came out of an English PhD program in the early 1980s, I have to end with deconstructing some binary oppositions for you.

Libraries versus publishers: that one is breaking down, isn’t it?

Open access versus commercial: one of the things that I learned early on about the University Press of New England that interested me in knowing more about them was that they had done a simultaneous open access and on-demand ebook publication in classics, of all fields, and that it had been a success.

The opposition of print versus electronic: problematic. Everything is electronic to begin with, some things are electronic at the end, some things are print in the middle. I don’t think we should be slicing our world according to those oppositions.

Experimental versus traditional: traditional is becoming increasingly experimental. But I think it’s in the nature of professional values and professional behavior to embrace both of those things. We know why our traditions are what they are; why we value some of the things that we do, not because they are traditional, maybe in spite of the fact that they are traditional, but we value them because we understand that they are important. We shouldn’t put them aside because they have that label.

Research versus publication: much more of a continuum now than it used to be. I think maybe it was always more of a continuum than it seemed, but a lot of that continuum was hidden from view—people writing letters to each other. The kind of communication and development of ideas that takes place now, on the way to publication, is much more public. It is done on blogs. It’s done in various online forums. The moment of publication: that is an interesting problem. When did you publish that idea? When it came up in a blog entry? When you published it in an ebook?

Last but not least: this is one that I think will be one of the more difficult ones to tackle, but the opposition between vanity publishing and scholarship, where vanity publishing is
defined as publishing at home and scholarship is defined as publishing abroad. That one we have to get around, and I don’t know how we do that other than by addressing it head on. If you are at a university that has a library publishing operation or a university press operation, publishing with your local publishers should not be a stigma. It should assume the same level of peer review that characterizes whatever else goes through those channels, and we need to get past this in order to, for one thing, bring a little more of the logic of local goods and the subsidies for local goods to bear on our publishing operations.

So, that’s it. I’ll see you all again in 10 years.
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Library publishing is a growing area of interest for academic libraries as journal editors are increasingly seeking the services offered by libraries to start new journals, revive older journals, or cross over from commercial publishers. The purpose of this paper is to reflect upon how library publishers can align with journal editors’ expectations. Six categories are discussed, and recommendations are proposed relating to: (a) variation in editor expectations; (b) preservation, access, and discoverability; (c) tools and services; (d) training and education; (e) resource sharing; and (f) library publisher-editor relationships.

Library publishing, while not new, is a growing area of concern for academic libraries. The nascent Library Publishing Coalition defines it as “the set of activities led by college and university libraries to support the creation, dissemination, and curation of scholarly, creative, and/or educational works” (LPC, 2013). In 2010, three-fourths of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member libraries surveyed reported either offering or exploring library publishing services (Mullins et al., 2012). The rise of these kinds of services is well documented; there is motivation and interest among libraries towards advancing and maturing their publishing services. This might be exemplified by the broad interest in the Library Publishing Coalition project—an initiative to develop a new professional association for libraries engaged in publishing scholarly materials—and its recent inaugural forum.
Faculty have long been key constituents of the academic library—in their teaching and research capacities, as partners and as customers. Library publishing services add faculty as journal editors to that list of roles. While librarians have a history of theory and practice relating to liaison service to faculty (Hahn, 2009), librarians’ background in service to editors is generally not well developed, barring instances where libraries and university publishers are organized under the same institutional bodies (e.g., Purdue University or the University of Michigan). Librarians are situated, as a larger body, at the lower end of a learning curve. As library publishing services develop, we will need to become more familiar with the needs and expectations of faculty-as-journal editors.

One of the suggestions that rose from Tyler Walters’s (2012) exploration of future library publishing scenarios was that faculty editors will be moved to adopt library publishing services not by attraction to the services per se, but by dissatisfaction with some aspect of service from their traditional commercial or professional scholarly publishers. That is, most editors will come to library publishing with pre-existing expectations formed in the commercial publishing world, but no longer being met there. Aligning library publishing services with those expectations, therefore, seems critical to the success or failure of the enterprise. This article follows a session at the 2014 Library Publishing Forum co-facilitated by the authors, and reflects upon the questions: How do library publishers identify and align their goals and services with editor expectations? What do editors expect, and how do those expectations impact the planning and implementation of library publishing services?

**KEY CATEGORIES FOR ALIGNING WITH EDITOR EXPECTATIONS**

Three main factors can be said to apply to this problem of alignment: (a) journal editors’ expectations of library publishing services, (b) the services library publishers are currently providing, and (c) opportunities for library publishers to align those services with editor expectations. As authors with very different roles in regards to publishing and journal editing, we propose to discuss issues of alignment with editor expectations in six key categories related to the above factors. These categories are: (a) variation in expectations; (b) preservation, access, and discoverability; (c) tools and services; (d) training and education; (e) resource sharing; and (f) library publisher-editor relationship.

**Variation in Expectations**

The only constant that can be asserted about journal editors’ expectations of library publishing services is that they are variable. Some editors may not know what they want or how to ask for it; others may be experienced and confident in the process of managing a journal. Editor expectations of service may be high or low and can fluctuate given a range of factors. Three of these factors that appear to have particular influence on editor expectations
are the developmental stage of the journal, the discipline or scope of the journal, and the experience of the editor.

As a journal progresses through developmental stages, from startup to established, editor expectations of publisher services will change. Editors of new journals may be primarily concerned with graphic design, cost, and establishing a peer review network and editorial workflow. As the journal matures, those concerns will be less immediate, and editors will begin to look at more fine-grained services, like analytics, indexing and abstracting, impact factor, and positioning in the broader landscape of the discipline. This process may also work in reverse, as when an inexperienced editor takes over a journal from a more experienced editor, and the developmental stage of the journal slows or regresses. Quality of a journal can also be seen as a developmental stage that impacts editor expectations. A lower quality journal may lack in effective management, workflow, or infrastructure, and editors’ expectations regarding those processes will be respectively high. As a journal grows and increases in quality, the developmental stage of the journal will change, and editors will expect different and more sophisticated services from library publishers. These expectations may come in waves, and different journals may be at different stages of development.

Editor expectations may also vary given the scholarly communication culture of the journal’s discipline. A discipline’s norms can drive expectations for how its journals should be distributed. For instance, the STEM community’s willingness to publish in open access venues follows both its research funding structure (largely grant-funded, reducing cost barriers to article processing charges) and pace (fast, broad distribution advances its disciplines and benefits its researchers). In contrast, humanities scholars may be more reluctant to consider open access as grant funding is scarce and research outputs tend towards monographs, which require different economic environments than do research articles. Given a discipline’s culture, should a journal in that discipline be produced in print, online, or both? Should a journal require a copyright transfer agreement or operate under Creative Commons licenses? Should a journal provide open or toll access? The answers to these questions are often strongly influenced by disciplinary culture, but given the right tools and education, editors and editorial boards can be advocates of library publishers even in a hostile disciplinary climate. Unfortunately, it is the experience of the authors of this paper that editors often lack this knowledge, and may be fearful to adopt a library publisher because they simply do not understand their value proposition in comparison with traditional publishers in the field.

Editor experience is a strong driver of expectations (in addition to impacting the developmental stage of the journal). A new editor starting a journal from scratch will have different expectations of a publisher than a new editor taking over for an existing journal, and both will differ from an experienced editor. The editorial history of the journal can
also impact editor expectations: A journal migrating from a commercial scholarly publisher to a library publisher will bring along with it assumptions that may misalign with actual library publishing service. Editors will have widely varying expectations, depending on prior experience (or lack thereof) with library and/or commercial publishers.

These are not the only drivers of variability in editor expectations. The longevity of the journal, how long the journal has been under a library publisher, quality of the journal, whether the journal was in print prior to transitioning to a library publisher, and why the journal is being transitioned to a library publisher—all have an impact on editor expectations of library publishers. Editors, too, may simply have unrealistic preconceptions about the affordances of digital publishing platforms, assuming for instance that ‘digital’ means ‘malleable’ and that work can be easily changed after publication. The variability of editor expectations can be mitigated by clear communication from both sides about available services, prior editorial experience, journal history, and initial expectations. This may require an active process as both sides may have unarticulated assumptions that preclude clear communication. This approach ties variability in expectation closely to the sixth key category, library publisher-editor relationship, and will be expanded in that section.

**Tools and Services**

Alignment with editor expectations pre-assumes that library publishers are able to provide tools and services that editors expect. Editors need a breadth of services; library publishers often offer something closer to hosting or distribution. Editor expectations for tools and services may include indexing and abstract services, marketing, permissions and licensing, records management, infrastructure, succession planning, and technical expertise. Unfortunately, most library publishers cannot offer all of these, and this inability to offer a broad range of tools and services causes misalignment between editors’ expectations and library publishers.

For example, marketing is a common service that editors expect, seeking to grow the prestige and profile of their journals. However, library publishers may not be able or willing to provide marketing services. The literature is replete with discussions of librarians’ aversion to marketing (Garoufallou, Siatri, Zaferiou, & Balampanidou, 2013). While forward thinking libraries have embraced marketing as a basic customer service activity for decades (Koontz, Gupta, & Webber, 2006), resistance remains. Librarians who avoid marketing may stigmatize it as a commercial activity not in line with the ethics of librarianship and so take a passive stance towards implementing marketing activities or underfund it as an area of focus.

There are, however, opportunities for library publishers to establish tools or services to help their editors/journals succeed. Library publishers that operate more like hosting services
are uniquely positioned, at little or no cost to the editors, to revive journals that have lost their infrastructure. With expertise in knowledge management, organization, and archival practice, library publishers could with minimal effort establish records management services to aid in succession planning for journals. Tracking author agreements, operational records, journal policies and history, editorial boards, etc. on behalf of faculty editors could prove invaluable to journals that see regular turnover in editorial management. Library publishing systems often include sophisticated metric reporting, which is attractive to editors and authors alike. Libraries may also provide the perfect infrastructure for student-run journals needing a platform but not extensive copyediting or typesetting service.

**Preservation, Access, and Discoverability**

Preservation may not be on editors’ radar, but it is a key concern for librarians regarding the materials they are producing and disseminating. Preservation is a core competency for librarians dealing with digital and special collections (Phillips, Bailey, Goethals, & Owens, 2013; RBMS, 2008). This may be a unique and attractive feature of library publishing services in general. Libraries’ long ethic of preservation activities for their collections translates to a special focus on maintaining an accessible archive of published material, which may come to be more important to editors as a journal matures.

Even more than preservation, access (i.e., practices to make resources available and useable) and discoverability (i.e., practices relating to the description, findability, and disbursement of resources) are central to library practice. Library publishers, often leveraging institutional repository and other related software, can provide enhanced accessibility to a client through best practices in metadata creation and exposure, distribution through multiple channels (redundancy), visibility of materials to search engines, etc. Editors may not expect preservation, access, and discoverability services from their publishers; or, they may equate discoverability only with traditional journal indexing services and ignore the broader service the library can provide. This suggests that library publishers positively manage editors’ expectations, helping editors understand why library competencies are of benefit to their journals’ health.

**Education and Training**

Library publishers have an opportunity, undergirded by librarians’ long experience with instruction and outreach, to provide education and training for new editors. Library publishing services can be particularly attractive to startup journals with limited resources, in part because library publishing services generally leverage distribution models that remove some of the costs from the publishing equation. Where these startups represent faculty just venturing into editorial work, libraries can help faculty ascend the learning
curve toward successful journal management and publication. Providing journal editors with programming, workshops, and materials—on best practices of journal management, training of peer reviewers and editorial boards, editorial workflows—can be instrumental in successfully increasing the quality of library-published journals, boosting editors’ confidence, and aligning with editors’ expectations. There is opportunity here for the Library Publishing Coalition to develop central programming that members can appropriate to educate their respective journal editors.

**Resource Sharing**

Education and training shares its ethos with a fifth category, resource sharing. Library publishers have been functioning in silos, developing their own tools and education materials in accordance to the communities they service and the services they provide. Some may be more willing than others to share these resources. As with education and training, there is opportunity for the Library Publishing Coalition to play a role here: The Coalition could serve as resource clearinghouse for useful materials, as recommended by Mullins et al. (2012). The library publishing community could both contribute to and benefit from such a central knowledge repository and share these resources in turn with their editors. These resources could include: (a) best practices and strategies for editors, editorial boards, and peer reviewers; (b) templates for memorandums of understanding or succession plans; (c) informational tip sheets of lessons learned; (d) potential marketing and indexing strategies; and (e) more. Libraries, with their general bias towards open access publishing models and their historically close working relationship with faculty, are uniquely positioned to contribute the kinds of resources that could help change the tenure and promotion reward structures prevalent in higher education. The Library Publishing Coalition could even serve as a bid broker for problem-solving across its constituency. Because library publishing programs vary—in size, resource, maturity, and focus—a clearinghouse promises to reduce duplication of materials and effort and to disseminate valuable lessons learned by individual institutions in a range of publishing contexts.

**Library Publisher-Editor Relationship**

Finally, and potentially most important to the question of alignment with editor expectations, library publishers and editors must establish strong working relationships. For new projects it is critical to have an in-depth series of discussions in advance of a working partnership, perhaps facilitated by an intake form or other instrument. Here, expectations about what services library publishers will and will not provide an editor can be communicated, and misalignments can be identified and worked out. Libraries, too, have the opportunity here to clarify what will be expected of journal editors. This can be especially important in library publishing, where traditional functions like copyediting
may not be provided, and editors may have to spend more effort on quality control for the materials they shepherd to publication. A Memorandum of Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding between the library publisher and the journal/editor can document and cement these pre-partnership understandings. Taking these steps helps both editors and library publishers avoid frustration, opens the way for future innovation not hampered by unspoken or misaligned expectations, and ultimately leads to a more productive and fruitful working relationship between both parties.

SUMMARY

It is apparent that there are both opportunities and misalignments in bringing library publishing services and faculty editors’ expectations together. As budgets constrict and the models of scholarly communication change, faculty increasingly find themselves looking for publishing services outside of traditional channels, and library publishers are situated to meet some of that demand. At the same time, library publishers as a class offer a range of services that differ from those of traditional scholarly publishers, and editors’ expectations will need to be managed in order to make clear what libraries will and will not provide. Libraries, and the Library Publishing Coalition in particular, could take the lead in educating faculty editors about the workflows of journal publishing that were customarily handled by commercial publishers in the past. Library publishers may bring their professional concerns and ethics to the table—including expertise in preservation, access and discovery and a willingness to pursue open access and non-profit scholarly communications economies—and these may be of benefit to editors. And the Library Publishing Coalition is particularly well suited to serve as a resource clearinghouse for editors and library publishers alike, directing both to third parties who can manage services that neither can provide.
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One of the main reasons library-based publishing operations have been formed is in response to dissatisfaction with traditional publishers, which are frequently vilified for obtaining nearly exclusive rights to scholars’ work and producing expensive products, thereby hindering authors’ use of their own work and impeding broad and affordable access by readers. In response, library-based publishers have aimed to publish more cost-effectively and provide fairer terms to authors than traditional publishers, especially by allowing authors to retain copyright, granting to the publisher only those rights necessary for publication. This grant of rights or license sometimes happens using a click-through agreement when submitting a manuscript through software like Open Journal Systems (OJS) and sometimes happens by signing a contract. This license is often non-exclusive, meaning the author can grant similar rights to another party besides the library-based publisher.

The University of Michigan Library’s publishing operation obtains agreements in writing. As the publishing operation grew from a few staff members (the Scholarly Publishing...
Office) to a multi-department staff (MPublishing) and later an operation fully integrated with the University of Michigan Press (Michigan Publishing), the approach to rights management with authors and editors has evolved along with the organization’s thinking about these questions. Taking as an example an open-access journal with a single editor, this article discusses the various configurations of rights agreements used by the U-M Library throughout the evolution of the publishing operation, the advantages of the various models, and the reasons for moving from one to another.

**FIRST GENERATION: MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING**

When the Scholarly Publishing Office was first created, journals, bibliographies, and other material were accepted for online publication as opportunities arose. Many had already been published in print, and some of the journals continued to publish in print even after partnering with the library. Each project had unique features, and no standard publication types had yet emerged. What was especially unclear was the division of labor between the library and the publishing partner—in the case of a journal, the editor.

To clarify this relationship, a memorandum of understanding was drawn up. It included a description of what files the editor would provide to the library, and what the library would do in return. It was usually written as a letter from the head of the Scholarly Publishing Office to the editor but not signed by either party. SPO staff did not have these reviewed by staff of the university’s general counsel, seeing them, incorrectly, as nonbinding agreements.

The library accommodated such journals’ production workflow and file formats where possible in digitizing back issues and publishing new issues online. Since these journals already used agreements with their authors, the library’s publishing operation only sought a single agreement with the journal editor, not with each author. The standard author agreement was perhaps reviewed to verify that it included rights to publish online, but the responsibility for collecting these agreements lay with the editor. Furthermore, the single agreement with the editor was always non-exclusive: editors were free to make their content available through other channels, both during and after any relationship with the library. Given this arrangement, it didn’t make sense for the library to enter into an agreement with each author just for the version published online by the library.

**SECOND GENERATION: AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE LIBRARY AND THE EDITOR**

As standard publication types emerged, the library’s publishing operation (which by then was rebranded as MPublishing) needed boilerplate agreements that included the best clauses from past agreements to ensure the rights of authors, the journal editor, and the library. Furthermore, library staff wanted to ensure that important clauses not previously included
in agreements—notably, an explicit granting of publishing rights by the journal to the library—were included as well.

The practice of the library entering into only an agreement with the journal editor continued. The journal editor warranted that he or she had the right to authorize the library to publish the articles in the journal—that is, that the editor had secured author agreements from all contributors. Since the library increasingly took on journals that had not previously been published in print or electronically, it became increasingly important to offer guidance to the editor on author agreements. The library provided two variants of a model agreement for use by the editor: one in which the author retained the copyright but granted to the editor a non-exclusive license to publish and to grant others (such as the library) the right to publish, and another in which the author transferred the copyright in the article to the journal. The latter was originally devised out of concern that, if the author kept the copyright, the library would exacerbate the orphan works problem by making it harder for readers to track down authors in order to republish the work; however, publishing staff eventually decided that the former agreement was indeed sufficient to cover future uses.

In addition to a warranty that the editor had secured the right to publish all content, the single agreement also included a clause, standard in publishing contracts, that guaranteed that the journal contained no defamatory or libelous material. Furthermore, the editor indemnified the library for any breach of the agreement, meaning the editor would be completely liable for any content published by the library as part of the journal that could lead to a lawsuit. This was a problem for journals bringing back issues for migration to the library’s site, for which author agreements could not always be secured. It also left the editor personally liable for actions undertaken in the course of editing the journal. The library recommended that agreements be signed not by the editor personally but by a representative of an organization sponsoring the journal (if one existed). Alternatively, editors were encouraged to incorporate as an S corporation or an LLC and sign as this corporate entity.

Past agreements were gradually revisited to move to the new standard agreements. While Creative Commons had emerged as the preferred method for sharing open-access content, the focus for the publishing operation had always been simply on making content available to read online, without insistence on attaching a CC license. While the first-generation arrangements predated Creative Commons as an organization, once use of CC licenses became common, they were incorporated into the model agreements and single agreement with the journal editor. Originally the Attribution license (CC BY) was used for journals, though as one editor after another balked at such permissive licensing, the default was changed to the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs license (CC BY-NC-ND). However, as major players in open-access publishing such as Elementa, PeerJ, Wiley Open
Access, and OASPA began using CC BY (in accordance with the definition of open access from the Budapest Open Access Initiative), the default was changed back to CC BY, with an understanding that this might lead to a productive discussion with the editor and, if necessary, a modification of the terms of the agreement.

**THIRD GENERATION: AGREEMENTS WITH EDITORS AND DIRECTLY WITH AUTHORS**

As the library’s publishing operation was fully integrated with that of the University of Michigan Press (with the combined operation rebranded as Michigan Publishing), it made sense to reconcile the different rights agreements in use. The press, as a publisher of monographs, had always made agreements directly with authors. In the case of an anthology, the press would make an agreement with the editor of the anthology, with a brief contributor agreement signed by each author. All of these agreements were kept on file at the press.

The press anthology model will be used as the basis for the third generation of agreements for journals. A single agreement will be signed by the editor and a representative of the University covering the journal as a whole, but the library will also require a signed agreement from every author of a journal article granting a license to publish to the university. This agreement could be consulted in case of a dispute, instead of having to rely on the editor’s word that the necessary rights had been secured as in previous generations of agreements. More important for the editor, he or she—or the journal’s sponsoring organization—would not be liable in case of such a dispute.

However, the story of the evolution of the U-M Library’s publishing operation isn’t just one of increasing formality and conformance to the model used by the press. The integration of publishing operations and creation of Michigan Publishing also led to an examination of the author agreement used for University of Michigan Press titles. In a new standard author agreement for press titles that debuted in 2013, authors are allowed to keep copyright while granting publishing rights to the press, allowed to deposit the work in an institutional repository after three years, and offered the opportunity to license their work with a Creative Commons license, either immediately or after three years. If they choose the immediate option for a CC license, they receive an advance on royalties. Why do this? Michigan Publishing is committed to taking a leadership role in the expansion of the open-access philosophy to monograph publishing but understands that one of the impediments to author adoption of open access is the risk of losing royalty revenue. The incentive program is designed to nullify this particular concern. While Michigan Publishing believes that, in many cases, open access to monographs will stimulate sales, the advance against royalties serves as a kind of “insurance policy” to authors who would be interested in going OA but don’t feel enough data yet exist to persuade them that doing so won’t undercut their sales.
As someone who has been involved in the writing and rewriting of these publishing agreements, it’s tempting to think that the library has finally settled on the optimal language in these agreements, but I know better since I have so often found language in need of improvement when looking at any agreement with fresh eyes. Michigan Publishing’s contracts will surely continue to evolve in tandem with author expectations and publishing practice. As the library’s associate university librarian for publishing wrote in the announcement of the new standard author agreement for press titles, “We will continue to work to align our publishing practices with the needs of the scholarly community, increasing the accessibility and viability of the scholarly record while removing obstacles from use and reuse of publications by our authors and other scholars” (Kahn, 2013).
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Library Publishing is Special: Selection and Eligibility in Library Publishing

Paul Royster
Coordinator of Scholarly Communication, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries

Traditional publishing is based on ownership, commerce, paid exchanges, and scholarship as a commodity, while library activities are based on a service model of sharing resources and free exchange. I believe library publishing should be based on those values and should not duplicate or emulate traditional publishing. University presses have mixed views of library publishing, and libraries should not adopt those attitudes. Library publishers are not gatekeepers; their mission is dissemination. Libraries need to publish because traditional publishing suffers from high rejection rates, required surrender of intellectual property, long production schedules, high cost of products, and limited dissemination. Nebraska’s Zea Books is a response to these needs. Miscellaneous advice for library publishers is offered and selection and eligibility criteria are outlined. A suggestion is made for a cooperative ebook distribution network.

I want to thank the audience for coming out today and the organizers of the Library Publishing Forum for inviting me to participate. Our question for this session is “Should library publishing follow the same model of acquisitions as more traditional publishers?” If at the end of ten minutes you do not know my opinion on this question, I will have failed miserably.

Traditional publishing is based on ownership, commerce, paid exchanges, and scholarship as a commodity. The “reaction equation” is as follows: knowledge and ideas are transformed
into books and journals, and these are transformed into dollars, eurodollars, rubles, shekels, bitcoin, or pieces of eight. Money is the measure, universal solvent, and end-product of the traditional publisher’s chain reaction.

The traditional model is based on the publisher’s ownership of the content for all time, in all places, in all forms, throughout the universe, and on all planes of existence, e.g.:

[...] all copyright in and to the Contribution, and all rights therein, including but not limited to the right to publish, republish, transmit, sell, distribute and otherwise use the Contribution in whole or in part in electronic and print editions of the Journal and in derivative works throughout the world, in all languages and in all media of expression now known or later developed [...] (Wiley-Blackwell, 2014, emphasis added)

This assertion of ownership is not altogether unlike the “Toddler’s Rules of Possession”:

1. If I like it, it’s mine.
2. If it’s in my hand, it’s mine.
3. If I can take it from you, it’s mine.
4. If I had it a little while ago, it’s mine.
5. If it’s mine, it must NEVER appear to be yours in anyway.
6. If I’m doing or building something, all the pieces are mine.
7. If it looks just like mine, it is mine.
8. If I saw it first, it’s mine.
9. If you are playing with something and you put it down, it automatically becomes mine.
10. If it’s broken, it’s yours.

Bear in mind that the content so adamantly claimed by the traditional publisher was surrendered to them—usually at no cost and often with additional payments or page charges—by the submitting author(s). The ownership so acquired will now be aggressively asserted and defended, often at the expense of the author, whose extended use or dissemination may be proscribed almost indefinitely.

Libraries, on the other hand, are based on a service model of sharing resources and free exchange. Books and materials are loaned and borrowed without charge; the point is not their possession, but their use. As John Lennon wrote: “Imagine all the people, sharing all the world.”
We (the libraries) should not adopt the values of the system that has been exploiting us—library publishing should not duplicate or emulate traditional publishing.

Figure 1. Libraries should not adopt the values of the system that has been exploiting them. (“The Seal Hunt” by Percival Skelton. From Joseph Hatton and M. Harvey, Newfoundland, the Oldest British Colony [London: Chapman and Hall, 1883], p. 304.)

Earlier this winter the American Association of University Presses published the results of a survey of press managers regarding their collaborations with university libraries in publishing efforts (AAUP, 2014). While some comments were supportive of library involvement in publishing, others clearly were not:

“… no perceivable quality control, no revenues”

“Libraries are not generally equipped to publish in a market-driven economy.”

“Libraries … are rarely suited to engage in … editing, design, and printing.”

“If a library wants to publish, [it] should do so through the press.”

“… most libraries have done very little research on how exactly scholars and students are using materials.”

“[In] our library’s digital publishing group there is simply no knowledge of publishing. It’s one thing to create content or even package it. That doesn’t mean you’re publishing.”
“The danger is that the library might want to take us over, since they are very aware that some presses are now reporting to libraries!”

The press comments display an uncomfortable degree of condescension, disdain, and outright antagonism toward library publishing efforts. Note that absence of revenues is seen as a fault, and that the libraries are said to fail the tautology test—by publishing but not “publishing.” Why would libraries want to adopt or emulate these attitudes towards themselves? [Aside: Advice to libraries—Do not take over the press! It is a white elephant whose issues you don’t need to take on.]

But what could be the reasons behind this antipathy? What did the libraries do that was so terrible or offensive? Well, 1) they took in survivors from the university presses that went under, offering a place of shelter and refuge; and 2) they kept scholarly presses afloat for 30 years by buying monographs that nobody wanted to read or check out. The crisis among university presses can partly be traced to library acquisition budget cuts that have reduced guaranteed sales of esoteric monographs from the thousands to a few hundred. Circulation figures indicate that very many of those volumes never left the library shelves.

Do publishers have special insight into the future of publishing? Arguably not, since the major business strategy seems to be acquiring the competitors in order to secure a tighter stranglehold on the market. My belief is that the future is wide open; nobody has the answers, least of all the traditional publishers.

Library publishers are not gatekeepers; their mission is dissemination. But should libraries become publishers? Why, or why not? My view is they should, because of the present state of publishers publishing, which is characterized by

1. high rejection rates (of which many publishers are surprisingly proud)
2. surrender of intellectual property
3. long production schedules
4. high cost of products
5. limited dissemination

At Nebraska, we started our library publishing imprint (Zea Books) because we encountered projects that 1) needed to be published, and 2) were being left out by the “regular” publishing system.

For example, our Dictionary of Invertebrate Zoology, by Mary Ann Maggenti, Armand R. Maggenti, and Scott Lyell Gardner, had been peer-reviewed and accepted by the University
of California Press, but on the eve of its final manuscript submission the contract was canceled by the press, which had suffered financial reverses and decided to get out of zoology publishing. A second press declined the work, due to its having a competing project, and the reviewer for a third press offered to recommend it only if he were made a co-author, an offer that was declined with emphasis. I saw the manuscript while touring the Parasitology Lab (it was about 24” high), heard the history, and persuaded Scott Gardner to let us publish it digitally, and later in hard copy print-on-demand format. It can be seen at http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/onlinedictinvertzoology/2/

Figure 2. Dictionary of Invertebrate Zoology, by Mary Ann Maggenti, Armand R. Maggenti, and Scott Lyell Gardner. Book cover courtesy Zea Books; reproductions permitted.

Another example is Hopi Nation: Essays on Indigenous Art, Culture, History, and Law, edited by Edna Glenn, John R. Wunder, Willard Hughes Rollings, and C. L. Martin; http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/zeabook/11/. It contains essays and artwork from a 1981 symposium at Texas Tech University. Co-editor John Wunder had proposed the book to practically every university press west of the Mississippi, but without funding to subsidize its 75 color illustrations, no press was willing to take the project. Digital production made it possible for us to do the work as both an ebook and a print-on-demand hardcover.

Our mission, as we see it, is to provide a publishing outlet for scholarly work that does not fit other available publication models, either because it is too long, too short, too esoteric, too expensive, too complicated, or just too strange. I sometimes refer to us as “the press of lost causes.”

Our authors are scholars who are either affiliated with the University of Nebraska-Lincoln or working in research areas of significant interest at UNL. (You might ask what area is not of significant interest at Nebraska? One answer would be “University of Texas football.”) Zea Books selection policy does not require formal peer review; it does, however, seek an opinion from a knowledgeable expert, from on campus if possible. Areas in which we publish include: Ornithology, Parasitology, Holocaust studies, Music history, Early American texts, Art history, and Women's studies.
Figure 4. Ornithology from Zea Books: (top) A Nebraska Bird-Finding Guide by Paul Johnsgard; A Prairie’s Not Scary by Paul Johnsgard; The Birds of Nebraska, Revised Edition 2013 by Paul Johnsgard; (middle) Wings over the Great Plains: Bird Migrations in the Central Flyway by Paul A. Johnsgard; Birds and Birding in Wyoming’s Bighorn Mountains Region by Jacqueline L. Canterbury, Paul A. Johnsgard, and Helen F. Downing; Rocky Mountain Birds: Birds and Birding in the Central and Northern Rockies by Paul Johnsgard; (bottom) Birds of the Central Platte River Valley and Adjacent Counties by Mary B. Brown and Paul Johnsgard; Wetland Birds of the Central Plains: South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas by Paul Johnsgard; A Two-Hundred Year History of Ornithology, Avian Biology, Bird Watching, and Birding in Kansas (1810–2010) by Thomas G. Shane. Book covers courtesy Zea Books; reproductions permitted.
Figure 5. Parasitology from Zea Books: *The Fish Doctor* by Glenn Hoffman; *Reported Incidences of Parasitic Infections in Marine Mammals from 1892 to 1978* by John R. Felix; *Estudios científicos en el estado de Hidalgo y zonas aledañas, Volumen II*, ed. Griselda Pulido-Flores and Scott Monks. Book covers courtesy Zea Books; reproductions permitted.

Figure 6. Holocaust studies from Zea Books: *Great Misery/La grande misère* by Maisie Renault, trans. Jeanne Armstrong; *We Survived … At Last I Speak* by Leon Malmed. Book covers courtesy Zea Books; reproductions permitted.


Figure 10. Women's studies from Zea Books: *Remarkable Russian Women in Pictures, Prose and Poetry* by Marcelline Hutton. Book cover courtesy Zea Books; reproductions permitted.
My advice to library publishers would include the following.

Maintain your autonomy; as a publisher you are responsible for defending the freedom of the press. Control your costs; nothing attracts supervision as fast as funding. Start small and build up; it is much easier to grow than to scale down.

Know your author; you will not have the protective layers of interference that traditional publishers can rely on. This, however, can be a good thing, as the closer direct and personal relationships can be especially rewarding.

Look for projects that are “shovel-ready”; beware of “Winnie-the-Pooh”-type works that get stuck half-way in and half-way out.

My criteria for eligibility would be 1) it should be scholarly, or of interest to scholars, 2) it should be ready to publish, or nearly so, and 3) it should not be suitable for the university press, since we wish to respect their domain and not seem to be eating their lunch. My criteria for selection would be: everything that meets the eligibility requirements.

Finally, I would like to say a word about what I feel is needed most to make library publishing more widely effective: a comprehensive shared delivery network whereby your library publications automatically go into our catalog (and ours into yours) upon publication. Most users find our books through Google, but for those who do use the library catalogue, it would be good to have them find these resources.

My time is up. Thank you.

[Author’s note: While we did ask to hold questions until the end of the session, I did quickly answer one about our POD supplier, which is Lulu.com. The session went full time, so there was no opportunity for further questions or discussion. I did have the opportunity for a conversation with a university press director who was greatly incensed by my presentation. However, another press director told me it was the best program of the whole meeting—so I guess it averages out.]
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“Free to All”: Library Publishing and the Challenge of Open Access

Micah Vandegrift
Scholarly Communication Librarian, Florida State University

Josh Bolick
Scholarly Communication Assistant, Florida State University

There is a significant and important responsibility as libraries move into the role of publishing to retain our heritage of “access for all.” Connecting and collaborating with colleagues in the publishing industry is essential, but should come with the understanding that the library as an organization is access-prone. This article discusses the complexities of navigating that relationship, and calls for libraries and publishers to embrace and respect the position from which we begin. Finally, the article forecasts several possible characteristics of what “publishing” might look like if libraries press the principle of access in this growing area.

INTRODUCTION

The distinguished legacy of libraries is connecting people with resources, at no charge: “Free to All.” As libraries increasingly assume the role of publisher, we must honor that legacy, acting as “library publishers” rather than “publishing libraries.” The core library value of access supports the great opportunity to share knowledge and push innovation, thus driving our entry into publishing. This evolution is complementary to established publishing structures. We argue herein that as libraries invest more in this space, we must uphold our values and principles of access and discoverability.

This evolution is not an indictment of traditional publishers and university presses, who will remain important in the emergent 21st century publishing environment. Publishing
is evolving with various representative groups expressing their own motivations. The gap between libraries and certain types of publishers has lessened in recent years. University presses, for example, are working more closely with libraries, in some cases reporting to their university library system (Howard, 2013). Society and association publishers, also deeply committed to the dissemination of scholarly knowledge, echo the values of these non-profit organizations. We draw the distinction between these three groups – university presses, libraries, and society or association publishers – and commercial publishing companies, to illustrate the complexity of the system into which library publishing is entering.

Libraries must walk the line between the heritage of access and the practical considerations of the commercial enterprise of publishing. Our goal herein is to illuminate this position, and encourage “libraries as publishers” to be deliberate and forthright in these decisions.

**DISCUSSION: OPEN ACCESS BEYOND THE REPOSITORY**

Session Prompt: Directory of Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association (OASPA), faculty resolutions and federal grant requirements: how can libraries comply with them? Should we? When such policies are in conflict with what our authors and editors want, how do we juggle our responsibilities? In this session, we will examine the ramifications for library publishing of the varied landscape of open access requirements.

The underlying precept of this session, as dictated in the prompt, was that the library’s role in publishing is reactive. Challenging that idea, this presentation offered the idea that as the library becomes involved in publishing, we have the opportunity to rewrite the rules of “open access publishing” to align with our principles. The Library Publishing Coalition (n.d.) has adopted a definition of library publishing as having a “preference for open access dissemination… [and] challenging the status quo.” This presentation began by asking why shouldn’t we define library publishing as “advocating for open access and changing the status quo.”

The current conversation (Mullins et al., 2012) about library publishing seems to focus on process, practicalities and production, especially in light of protecting and connecting with our university press colleagues. However, what has not been directly addressed are the principles that libraries hold to, and how those create a role that we carry with us into all
new ventures. The direct question with which we must wrestle is whether or not open access is a core principle of a library publishing program.

Columbia University Libraries Center for Digital Research and Scholarship (CDRS), a leader in this growing area, addressed this issue effectively by being forthright about their promotion of open access, while allowing the editorial board of their published journals to make the final decision. Rebecca Kennison (2011) wrote, “CDRS encourages the journals it hosts (and other journals on campus) to adopt an open access business and licensing model… Even so, CDRS is neutral in terms of the business models and licensing agreements for the journals it hosts” (p. 203). CDRS colleagues Mark Newton, Eva Cunningham and Julie Morris (2013) echo this in the Library Publishing Toolkit. They write, “In practice, CDRS’ approach to publishing support is business model-neutral, however, and OA is not a requirement for partnership” (p. 110).

Beyond the choice of business model, however, it is stated often around the scholarly communication world that “open access is not a business model.” Kevin Smith (2012), Duke University’s Scholarly Communications Officer, in a blog post titled Three Things Open Access is Not says,

Open access is not just one thing… and it is not just a business model. Open access is also a statement about the values of scholarship; an attempt to introduce more transparency into the process of research and to encourage greater participation in its creation, financing, and evaluation.

When discussing libraries’ shifting role in publishing, thinking about open access solely in terms of business models and policies is too narrow; our heritage of “access for all” must be accounted for as well.

One opportunity for libraries in the evolution of publishing is how we talk and write about it. For example, there is a fine line between “library publishing services” and “library as publisher;” the former a pivot to meet changing needs of users, the latter a deliberate recasting of the role of the library, stressing the primary function as an access agent. Challenging the premise that publishing happens “out there” and that libraries need to respond to it, Karla Hahn (2008), in Research Library Publishing Services: New Options for
University Publishing writes, “In the near future it should be possible for research libraries to collectively define the core publishing services, particularly for journals, in a 21st century network-based publishing and dissemination system” (p. 29). Alignment with open access policies, then, need not be a compliance issue for libraries, but a corrective opportunity. Libraries can build publishing programs, services, and organizational models to realign the norms, to include and promote openness.

Mike Furlough (2010), former Associate Dean for Research and Scholarly Communications at Penn State University, framed early library publishing efforts writing, “Much of the early emphasis on library publishing services drew energy from advocacy efforts that sought to counterbalance the control of research by commercial scholarly publishers. But the success of these services will depend not on advocacy, but on identifying significant needs and promising trends in research and scholarship and creating services to meet them” (p. 1). Furlough underscores the ever-apparent fact that open access in libraries was a reactive movement since the beginning, forced to that end by the “serials crisis.” Recently, libraries moved upstream in the production and dissemination of research, identifying needs, forecasting trends, and creating programs to address them, substantially changing the conversation.

Responding to Furlough, the establishment of the Library Publishing Coalition seems to have defined the needs and trends, and the service models are outlined in recent publications like the Library Publishing Toolkit and Library Publishing Directory (LPC, 2014). To that end, we’ve returned to the place of advocacy, but from a better vantage point, one where the scope of our influence is not a serials crisis, but as a partner, arbiter, and service provider in the production of scholarship. Approaching library publishing with the understanding that we can shape the future of this field should free librarians to be progressive, innovative, and experimental.

Rather than addressing the panel’s defined parameters, this presentation proposed a different set of questions: How will publishing be structured in five to ten years, and what role does open access play there? As libraries simultaneously grow into the areas of publishing and open access, how can or should we shape each in practice? In what ways can we be more proactive than reactive? The “library as publisher” should address these questions through the formation and establishment of on-the-ground services, guided by advocacy organizations like SPARC and/or the Library Publishing Coalition.

It is likely that the next decade will see the further development of library publishing activities, alongside the continued work of university presses, scholarly societies, as well as traditional, for-profit publishing companies. Each of these players brings perspective and
can remain relevant by promoting our strengths and honoring our values. In many cases, particularly between libraries and our counterparts at university presses and societies, the opportunities for mutual support and collaboration are ripe. If libraries, university presses, and academic societies can get on the same page, we are well suited to being able to define and realize our values as opposed to the market/profit first imperative nature of traditional publishing. Open access fits into this future by providing a more equitable avenue for the publication and spread of great ideas that might struggle in traditional marketplaces. Already we see examples of this proposed in KN Consulting’s *Scalable and Sustainable Approach to Open Access Publishing and Archiving for Humanities and Social Sciences* (Kennison & Norberg, 2014) and more recently the Association of American Universities and Association of Research Libraries’ (2014) *Prospectus for an Institutionally Funded First-book Subvention.*  

---

1 It should be noted that Rebecca Kennison, of Columbia University Libraries, is a founding partner in KN Consulting, a 501(c)(3) organization.
As members of the academy, we have the tools in place: creators, reviewers, editors, technologists. We are the creators, curators, and consumers of our knowledge. Research already indicates a tipping point (European Commission, 2013) in the amount of scholarly literature being made open access, and other studies suggest that the overwhelming majority of that literature will be openly accessible by 2020. The shift to a more open academic publishing industry could come to fruition only if we are proactive in making it so. Otherwise we leave the conversation to be dictated to us by other parties, usually to the betterment of their bottom line and the depletion of our budgets.

We can start by loudly and unabashedly supporting the principle of open access. Our goal as library publisher should be to produce high-quality scholarship which can be accessed by anyone, “free to all.” Doing so will help us identify our natural partners within our institutions. Increasingly, we are more deeply collaborating with academics; libraries set up, host and promote their journals; we collaborate and produce open educational resources that other publishers might overlook; and we explore new innovative models of dissemination. Library publishers are in the best position to recognize and develop a publishing environment that is flexible to the needs of scholars. Our proactivity is being responsive to our partners, rather than reactive to the publishing industry, and responsible to the promotion of our values.

Publishing in its current state is rightly defined by the publishers, be they small academic societies and associations, university presses, or commercial publishing companies. Because open access involves the dissemination of scholarly products, it has been subsumed into what we refer to as “publishing.” To that end, groups like the Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association (OASPA) include members such as Cambridge University Press, Oxford University Press, SAGE, and a voting member, the Copyright Clearance Center. These four organizations support open access in name, but are also working to maintain their financial stake in the system, as clearly outlined in their lawsuit against faculty at Georgia State University. Additionally, open access archiving, the deposit of scholarly works in repositories,
is entirely dependent on the publishers imposing their constrictions, such as which arbitrary version of the work is allowed to be deposited when. If libraries are truly investing in publishing, and are carrying certain values, ethics and principles into this space, flexing our collective muscle to define where open access occurs in the research process and under what terms becomes ever more necessary. One clear example of this would be the Library Publishing Coalition becoming a member of OASPA and representing the community there.

IN APPLICATION:

We envision the following: applying open access as a core publishing principle, Libraries will rewrite how we understand shared knowledge in the academy and beyond. This departure may include some of the following characteristics:

1) Allegiances shift: By nature of business model, publishers have self interest in the production of quality work. Libraries, however, due to the heritage of “access,” have a public interest. Publishing then will evolve to focus on the consumers’ needs rather than the producers investments; perhaps a user-centered publishing evolution will occur.

2) Organizational categories dissolve: The distinctions between organizations are already changing as university presses and libraries fold together. The more apparent divisions in the near future will be the motivation behind the action, for example the for-profit venture vs. the non-profit initiative.

3) Policy influence: Open access/publishing won’t be dependent on the publisher lobby directing public policy or tangential organizations structuring open access to fit their programs. The default will be reset, and determined, by library publishers as producers, disseminators, and consumers of academic works. We will have a more decisive role in shaping policies as they benefit the broadening scope of what we do.

4) Community growth: The best possible outcome of libraries investing in publishing is creating deeper effective connections among publishers and harnessing strengths of both organizations to push academic work into society in new and meaningful ways. The crossover and shared mission of libraries and publishers, especially university presses, will increase the impact of both.
“Library as Publisher as Open Access Advocate” then becomes a question of alliance rather than compliance. It is not advantageous to approach this shift in terms of aligning with, or conforming to, or complying with open access politics (and policies). Rather let’s mold, create and shape publishing to include, embrace, and uphold open access, especially when it is a product of the shared labor of libraries. Open access in publishing is an agility, a freedom, not a requirement or restriction. The consummate Library Publisher is a change-agent, loud and clear, affirming and announcing its agenda as access-prone.
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So, why am I here today? I know we’re all suffering from a food coma. We’re all tired. We’re thinking about our flights, maybe about a tight connection, maybe even about jumping an earlier flight. Well, unless you’re a chairman’s preferred platinum two million miler, you’re not getting on an earlier flight today. So hang tight.

And, really, so much has been said in the past two days. It’s a little intimidating to stand here and think about whether there’s anything new or even interesting that I can add to the fantastic series of conversations that have occurred over the past two days.

So what can I do? I can share a little bit about the results of what’s come to be called my Listening Tour, during which I’ve visited 40 university presses, with more to come. I can talk a bit about the Listening Tour and some of the things that it’s done for me and for the university press community. I can talk about the one thing that scares me the most about our future. There are lots of things that scare me a little bit, but there’s one thing that scares me a lot. And then, given the venue, given the group, and given the fantastic energy, I want to spend some time talking about some of the things that I think we can do together.

What exactly is a Listening Tour? First, it’s a phrase that I borrowed from my friend Elliott Shore at the ARL. Elliott is newish in his role, he has about a three month jump on me in his tenure and when he came on board he had the great idea to plan a series of visits with
ARL’s members. It seemed like such a great idea that I said, “You know what? I’m going to do the same thing, too.” And since stealing the idea wasn’t enough for me, I also stole the name. They had dubbed Elliott’s visits The Listening Tour. So I said “Well, okay if it’s good enough for ARL, it’s good enough for AAUP!”

I have in fact visited 40 member presses from across the continent. I’ve hit every time zone. I’m actually going to fly over the water next month and try to expand the visit to some of our non-continental members. Frankly, the tour was originally designed to accelerate my own learning curve as a new director in the AAUP. In my deep, deep background I have some association management experience and in my more recent background, I’ve worked for what some folks consider to be a university press. But I really needed to test the things that I thought I knew about association management and the things that I thought I knew about our community. So I hit the road.

The Listening Tour has, however, evolved. It’s now actually turned into a longer-term opportunity for the association to assess members’ needs. In fact, the AAUP board met Monday and Tuesday of this week, and some of the things that arose on the Listening Tour have informed the strategic planning process that we undertook during the last two days.

I should pause to disclaim the things that I’m going to say next. My observations are my observations. While I will speak for a group of folks, as you’ll hear in a moment, in this case that’s a challenging thing to do.

What have I been hearing? I’ve been hearing that university presses are crazy-diverse. I’ve been hearing that university presses are in crisis. I’ve been hearing that university presses are misaligned. And I’ve observed clearly that university presses are changing. So I’ll talk about all four of those things, starting with the diversity in university presses.

University presses elude generalization. They vary tremendously, and some of this will be familiar, but I think some of the implications of it may be a little subtler. They vary tremendously by size. They vary by whether they are affiliated with a public or private institution. Being a university press at a land-grant institution has its own separate set of responsibilities. Being a university press for a system press Florida, like UNC, like the SUNY Press, like the University of California Press, also has a special set of responsibilities that come with it, that the non-system presses within the organization don’t necessarily face.

Funding and finances of course are key drivers of the diversity within the university press community. Many of us get subventions from our host institutions. Some of us have substantial endowments to rely on. Some of us have robust fundraising program. Some of
us, believe it or not (and not just the big ones), some of us actually are expected to give back to our parent institutions in crazy ways. There’s one particular university press I have in mind here, which falls into our smallest membership category, which gets a subvention of about $150,000, but because it’s at a faith-based institution it’s also expected to tithe back ten percent of its top line. That’s a challenge. That’s a serious challenge for that tiny press.

I think another way that we’re diverse is in our publishing mix. We all publish books. Some of us publish journals. A few of us even publish textbooks. We all hope that our monographs get adopted as supplementary course readings, of course, but a few of us actually do have textbook publishing programs. And the mix varies depending on discipline. Most of our members are largely humanities and social sciences publishers, but if you’re a university press doing STEM publishing, the world feels a little bit different again.

So what are the lessons here? Well for me there are two lessons. The first one I think is—and this is very particular to my own prior experience—when I first came into the role I thought that the biggest thing that made Oxford University Press (OUP) different from other university presses is its size, right? Wouldn’t you think that? But you know what? While size matters, it turns out that the biggest difference is that OUP is four thousand miles away from its institution. And when you are on campus and you’re part of an ecosystem, life is very different in lots of good and sometimes challenging ways.

So the second point about this is that generalizations for a group of 135 folks—two-thirds of whom have the same two words in their name (“university press”)—are harder than you’d think. There’s always going to be somebody standing in the back of the room who can raise their hand and say “Well, you know what? It’s actually not that way at my press.” So there you go. That’s the first challenge: university presses are diverse.

What’s next? University presses are in crisis. University presses have been in crisis, off and on, for 50 or 60 years now. The sources change with each crisis, but we do sort of stumble from crisis to crisis. So who are the culprits this time? I think the culprits are technology and the corporatization of the academy. And I’ll circle back to each one.

Technology is a substantial challenge for university presses in three ways. First of all technology requires scale. You know Random House bought Penguin. In a million years, Yale University Press is not going to acquire a Harvard University Press. So without that kind of combination, how do university presses get scale?

The second reason that technology is a particular challenge for university presses is it’s hitting our workflow simultaneously in three ways. It’s hitting all of our back office systems,
it’s hitting our production systems, and it’s also hitting the way we deliver the finished product in the form of simultaneous print and e-books.

So it has hit every department of the organization simultaneously in core ways. And then the most important thing—and I’ll touch on this more later—is that technology is also about to have a very profound impact on our scholars’ workflows. For reasons that I’ll talk about in a couple of minutes, that’s something that university presses actually haven’t even started to wrap their brains around.

I need to round out the discussion of the corporatization of the academy. I almost glossed over this because for this audience we’re very close to a “duh” moment right here. You’ve been living with the impact of corporatization and the invasion of the MBAs probably longer than university presses have. We’ve managed to fly under the radar until three, four, five years ago. So we’re only still starting to make our peace with it, and it’s difficult because we don’t know how to respond to the questions that are being asked—and that’s frankly because some of them are a little offensive, right?

There was an article in the Economist last fall where I was quoted as saying “No one asks the chemistry department to make a profit.” And you know there’re two things I regret about that quote. It was a good quote, but first of all I wish that I had said political science instead of chemistry because in fact, occasionally a chemistry department gets a patent. And truthfully, the really even cleverer rejoinder to that quote is “yet,” right?

So we all know which way the wind is blowing and we all have to be thinking about filthy lucre in ways that perhaps we’re not comfortable with.

A new, lower order, but still important, crisis that we’re facing now relates to peer review and tenure. And peer review is a funny topic for university presses because we’ve always assumed that peer review is a sacred cow. It’s the one thing that we all agree on. Peer review is literally how university presses define themselves. Full membership in AAUP requires a peer review program that meets certain criteria, for example. But simultaneously, it’s also how the rest of the ecosystem defines us. We thought that the fact that we did peer review was the one non-delegable bit of university press publishing. So the à la mode attacks on our peer review function baffle me at a molecular level. I’ve seen the software tools; they’re awesome, they’re great. But they’re work flow management solutions. They’re not a replacement for editorial judgment. Someday. Not yet.

The other challenge with technology displacing discretion and judgment in peer review is that crowdsourcing anything always kind of scares me. The loudest, loneliest voices tend
to dominate any conversation. But the interesting thing about crowdsourced reviews is perhaps best understood through an anecdote. I heard somebody tell a story the other day in which someone who had died fifty years ago came back today and said “How would you explain the one most significant difference between life today and life when I passed away?” And the response was, “I have a device in my pocket that gives me instant access to the entire accumulated wisdom of mankind. And I use it to watch cat videos and fight with strangers.” And I’d like to think that the bar would be a little bit higher than that for crowdsourced peer reviews. And while I think, too, that tools like SSRN are hugely beneficial for helping to develop a scholarly argument, I’m concerned that we’re not at a point yet where technology is able to help us make the ultimate evaluation, not to help decide if a particular piece of scholarship fits in a continuum of scholarly communications (what we used to call a “list” in university press publishing). I don’t doubt that we’ll get there, but I don’t see it happening in the short term. So I think the whole enterprise of poking at peer review is a little premature.

The other aspect of this particular crisis is tenure. And university presses have, I think, a very schizophrenic relationship to the tenure process in the humanities and social sciences. On one hand, we do understand our role in the process, and the financial benefit that inures to us from it. On the other hand, no university press actually perceives its fundamental purpose as being a cog in the tenure machine. So we have these two tensions and while we’re wrestling with that, technology is forcing the academy to ask really appropriate questions about what scholarship should qualify for promotion and tenure decisions. In a digital age, we’re still thinking entirely about promotion and tenure in print terms and that’s wrong. So we generally agree that these questions need to be asked, but we’re also mindful about the implications of the answers for our print runs.

So if we’ve been in crisis before, what’s different this time? I think two things are different. One is scope and two is velocity. I think that the changes that are occurring now, because of technology, are occurring more rapidly and on a much larger scale than we’re going to have time by ourselves to react to and to recalibrate for. And again I’ll share a little bit more about this when I come to my greatest concern.

So what have we said so far? We’re diverse. We’re in crisis. Next, we’re also structurally misaligned within the academy and I think that plays out in three important ways.

First of all we’re misclassified on virtually every campus in the country as an auxiliary unit. I have member press directors who share reporting responsibility with parking garage managers. I live in New York, I don’t have a car, but I hear parking garages are pretty important. So my purpose here is not to denigrate the role of universities’ parking garage
managers, but I don’t think it’s an appropriate alignment for university presses and parking garage managers to be thought of in the same way. Similarly, and partly as a result of that, we’re required to traffic in commerce in ways that are alien to virtually every other part of the scholarly communications ecosystem. Occasionally that gets us into real trouble. Occasionally it’s a source of strength and new information and frankly resilience.

The second way in which university presses are structurally misaligned is, by design, we publish predominantly from outside our own institutions, and that makes us outward facing in a way that all of our peers across our campuses aren’t, and it creates some different ways of thinking about the world and some different tensions when dealing with colleagues who are focused on their own campuses.

Then the third way in which we are structurally misaligned is that there are perhaps 3200 colleges and universities, but only 135 university presses. We are serving a disproportionate number of institutions that don’t have their own university presses and it creates some interesting challenges for the universities that do have presses. We talk about this traditionally in terms of a “free rider” problem. And the notion there is if you are university “x” and only 15 percent of your own scholars are being published by your university’s press, and the other 85 percent are coming from universities that don’t have any presses, those other universities that those 85 percent represent aren’t contributing financially to the system. It’s a free ride.

The free rider problem exacerbates some of the new business models that we’ve tried to experiment with, like a press that has decided—and we do have them—a press that has decided to go immediately and entirely to fully open access publishing. But it also creates some new opportunities. One of the many cool things about Knowledge Unlatched, which I think we talked a little bit about yesterday, is that it tackles the free rider problem head on. Just another piece of the puzzle in the three ways in which we’re structurally misaligned.

So we’re misaligned, we’re in crisis, we’re diverse. What’s left?

We’re also changing, and this is really exciting and I think I’m about to share some information that may be a little surprising.

We’re experimenting with open access in ways that I think many people in this room will be surprised and pleased to hear about. We’ve heard about a couple of efforts over the past two days—Florida’s Orange Grove Press for textbooks, UVa’s Rotunda—and just bear with me for about ninety seconds and I’ll share a little bit more.
So we’re trying, but we know—we know particularly because we’ve had to live with commerce for 50, 75 and in some presses’ cases 125 years—we know that Open Access actually has to be sustainable. Because it turns out that information doesn’t really want to be free.

Wait! What did I just say? The real story behind that quote I think is hugely interesting. According to Wikipedia (so we know it’s true!), that iconic phrase is attributed to Stewart Brand. If you don’t know who Stewart is, he is, according to Wikipedia, a bit of a post-nuclear renaissance man who among other things edited the *Whole Earth Catalog*. In its fullest form, it appears that Brand first uttered the quote when he was speaking with Steve Wozniak at the very first hacker conference in Marin in 1984. And here’s what he allegedly said. “On the one hand information wants to be expensive because it’s so valuable.” I love this. “The right information in the right place, just changes your life. On the other hand information wants to be free because the cost of getting it out is getting lower and lower all the time.” So you have these two fighting against each other. Precise attribution is a little tough because it was after all a hacker conference. But Brand is in fact documented as having made substantially similar comments in numerous other places. And what’s interesting to me about this quote—besides the near permanent convolution of it—is its full implication for how we get to Open Access. If you’re a Hegelian (or Kantian, if you want to be a purist), and if you believe that progress unfolds through dialectics, free and expensive absolutely have to exist in tension with each other in order to get to where we want to be. In other words you don’t have synthesis until you have thesis and antithesis.

If you’re not sure how you feel about Hegelian dialectics, that’s okay. The logic still obtains; in all likelihood, we won’t achieve Open Access—and I will say that as mission-based publishers, the notion of the broadest possible dissemination of our scholarship resonates absolutely—until free and expensive fully understand each other and find ways to support each other’s goals.

So we’re trying to figure out how to make open access sustainable. What else is changing at university presses?

You’ve heard a little bit over the past couple of days about some of the ways that we’re experimenting with technology. Most of us have or are very close to simultaneously releasing our front list both in print and electronic. Many of us have converted or are converting our back lists to electronic and in fact many of you have been helping us do that. We’re also experimenting with new formats, like digital shorts and aggregation platforms like Project MUSE and University Press Scholarship Online. We’re experimenting with digital content. Remember that, because there’s more to the technology story than just digital content.
So university presses are changing. What about AAUP? Is AAUP changing? Let me just share a few really interesting statistics with you.

Our current board of directors has 13 members. Three of them report to libraries. A fourth is the director of a fully open access press, and that fourth by the way is our incoming president. There’s more of that kind of change afoot. I can’t talk about it yet, but I think that when you hear about the next generation of board appointments, you’ll see that the trend is continuing. Some of this is a generational shift. Currently there are 11 of the 135 university presses with open directorships. In addition to that, over the past two years 18 other presses have appointed new directors. That’s 29 out of 135 presses with new leadership—and sometimes these appointments take a while—so we’ll say over a three year period. I also can say from my 40 visits that the next tier of press management is young, energetic, open to new thinking, and utterly motivated by the mission. So all of that is really, really exciting.

Before I leave the generational shift, I should talk about another aspect of it, because it’s important to put it in context. I have here on my notes, “Be candid, but remember that the tape is running.”

So the generational shift, it does herald a philosophical shift as well. But there are a couple of important things to remember about that. First of all, because of our diversity, university presses won’t all shift at the same time and frankly, we won’t all shift in the same way. And before we dis the old philosophy, we do really have to understand where it came from and honor the service that it’s provided to the academy in prior decades.

And finally let’s remember one other really important thing: those three misalignments that I highlighted (the structural misalignment, the external focus, and the free-rider problem), they’re not retiring. They’re still going to be with us and they are going to create challenges and stresses for the new generation of press directors, including some of the “bold and reckless” individuals you’ve met here over the past two days.

So that’s the past and the present. What about the future?

I’d like to share an experience from my on early days in publishing because I think it has a direct application for what I see in store for university presses (and by extension for library publishers) somewhere down the road. I have to confess, based on some of the conversations that I’ve heard over the past two days, I’m kind of inclined to the opinion that I might be about to preach to the choir a little bit. So you can tell me afterwards.
My career in legal publishing spanned those heady days in the 90s when we migrated our product line from print to electronic; first, believe it or not, through proprietary dial-in lines and then (as soon as Al Gore invented it!) via the Internet. There are two significant features from this experience that I think are relevant here. I’m going to speak in the language of commerce, but I bet we can translate it.

First, the same publisher still “owned” the author, the content, the customers, and its central role in the process when the migration from print to electronic was complete. It’s caused no shortage of sleepless nights for me contemplating the possibility that the centrality of all university presses may not be a given once the technology disruption and its consequences achieve critical mass in the scholarly neck of the publishing woods. That is, I’m not sure that we’re going to have the same central role when the print to electronic migration is completed.

But wait, there’s more.

Second, the truly revolutionary thing about our migration was what followed it. Most customers found the initial journey painful—very painful. After it was done, and the dust settled, we’d moved their cheese and they’d adjusted. They got comfortable doing research online and they discovered that they liked these things called computers and it turned out that these things could do a whole bunch of other things. So they begin to push us to go further, to make our content do more for them—as did our authors.

For example, in the print world, legal publishers would provide binders for estate planners with sample forms and clauses. Initially we just migrated those binders of sample forms and clauses to electronic. And then we thought we’d get really smart and give people an MS Word file, a manipulable form of the sample clauses and documents. But then the cutting-edge practitioners that are really smart said “No, no, no. Don’t do that. Really make it all hum for me. Build me document assembly software. Walk me through a wizard. Walk me through a Q & A that lets me select from sample forms and clauses and produce a draft that I can review and edit and present to my client.” Pretty cool, huh? We did it. By the time I left Wolters Kluwer, we thought of ourselves as solutions providers. We barely even thought of ourselves as publishers anymore.

So what’s the lesson here for university presses? Instead of focusing just on how technology is changing publishing from print to electronic, because we’re actually getting okay with that, we really need to begin thinking about how technology is changing scholarship and what those changes mean for the workflow of our authors (our customers, the scholars), and therefore for us. And we’re only just starting to think about that. And thinking about it is really scary for the reasons of scale that I pointed out earlier.
So that brings me to a final set of thoughts about the future. What are some of the things that we can do together? I’ve thought about this in three buckets.

We’ve heard a bunch of speakers over the past two days talk about all the things that libraries are good at, and all of the things that university presses are good at, and if you happened to visit AAUP’s poster last night you might’ve also noticed that the really smart people in those presses and in those libraries who thought about it agree that our future endeavors should complement those respective strengths.

In the current environment, there’s nothing to be gained and frankly a great deal to be lost, from reinventing the wheel. So I’ll approach this from a university press perspective: what we’re good at and where we struggle. Clearly, editorial expertise is the sine qua non of university press publishing. It is our USP, our unique selling proposition, and how we do it sets us apart even within the world of publishing.

Acquisitions editors, good ones anyway, do two critical things: they curate and they connect. An experienced editor with a strong list knows where the interesting scholarship is developing in a given field. These folks have a passion for their work that borders on the clinical, and they go about it from a singular vantage point. That makes an acquisitions editor a great resource for a library publishing project. She can help you connect with other scholars, sometimes in far flung quarters of academia, who may be working on the same interesting questions that your project is addressing.

The second critical thing that university presses do is they bring that great scholarship to a community of consumers. They market it. So there’s an infrastructure in place that library publishing programs can and should take advantage of. Let’s find opportunities to align library publishing programs with kindred marketing programs—bearing in mind that fit is really important here—and expose the scholarship to the broadest possible audience.

The other obvious thing that university presses do is that whole bundle of back-of-house activities that those who’ve never worked in publishing assume magically happens with the press of a button. I’m talking about production and fulfillment, and while they’re the nuts and bolts of how we do our jobs, there is, for better or for worse, what is likely an irreversible trend towards consortial activity in these areas. So maybe the departure point here for us is to think about experiments in achieving scale that include both university presses and library publishers.

This brings me the most important thing that university presses struggle with and I’ve alluded to it several times: scale and technology. If you think back to my “life lessons” about
how legal publishers migrated from P (print) to E (electronic) to S (solutions), university presses are on the path from P to E, but I don’t know that we have the scale to go from E to S on our own. But libraries might, and together we could.

On my Listening Tour, I’ve consistently seen two things on campuses where the university press has been aligned with the library. First, the press often moves to nicer, more centrally located digs. But the main thing that I’ve noticed is that presses generally find themselves having access to a much broader and much deeper array of technology resources. So if we’re all serious about publishing and supporting the digital humanities, we need to build on that together. And we need to bring another piece to the table, too: the CTOs (chief technology officers) on all of our campuses.

So job one is avoiding duplication, leveraging strengths, and building collaborations. What else can we do together?

How about Cyril Oberlander’s call for professional development. Let’s create opportunities for library publishing professionals to undertake residencies and internships at university presses. Now this will be no small task. It requires an allocation of resources and the establishment of an infrastructure, neither of which currently exists, but I think it’s essential if the enterprise that’s brought us all together today is to succeed. And we want it to succeed. In fact, we want it to lead to even more university presses and even more library publishing programs.

When our president assumed office last June, he articulated a goal of 100 new university presses in ten years. I’ll confess I was a little surprised, but why not? I noted earlier that there are 135 university presses doing the lifting for 3200 universities; why not try to improve that ratio? Now not all of you will choose to take your library publishing programs in that very specific—and I’ll emphasize rigorous—direction, but for those of you who conclude it makes sense to do so I say, “Hell yes!”

Moving on to the last set of observations that I want to share. There was an effort on the part of university presses in the fall of 2012 to create more awareness of who we are and what we do through a very focused (and expensive) public relations campaign. We hired an outstanding and high-priced public relations expert in the city who introduced us to a whole bunch of the right editors at the right general interest publications: the Times, the Atlantic, the New York Review of Books, the Wall Street Journal. As it turned out, the experiment was of limited utility. It was a learning experience. If you want to get an article placed in a general circulation periodical, you’ve got to feed them raw meat, and university
presses are a lot of things, but we don’t generate a lot of raw meat. So it was tough to capture a lot of mind-share from these folks.

But one of the most interesting tidbits to come out of the entire experience was an offhand remark by the relevant editor at the *Wall Street Journal*, who referred to university presses as the “last interesting cultural institution in America.” And I love that. I thought about it a lot because I wondered, “can that possibly be true?” And I thought about the things that are interesting and important to me, and two of the things that I like to do in my free time are theater and opera.

And, I have to ask: when was the last time that something successful on Broadway was not based on the film of the same name? So theater may not be the last interesting cultural institution in America. I know there’s great stuff going on at the Guthrie and at the Goodman and at the Red Hat in Los Angeles, but it’s exceptional. That’s not the norm for theater.

Turning to the even more fabulously, outrageously, expensive world of opera: my partner and I lived in Chicago for a decade and when we left, we pined for the Lyric and we used to fly back out when we could to get our fix. I mean we live in New York; we have an opera company. But the Lyric did such wonderful stuff and they did it so well. Unfortunately, the work there has gotten so “safe” recently that we haven’t been back in four years.

The interesting opera company in Manhattan, the City Opera, cratered. The Met. You know The Met is not going anywhere, but I think the single most interesting thing they’ve done is their HD broadcasts. Their successful new productions are actually co-productions—something that comes over from Covent Garden or the ENO. So in the areas that I know, I can point to exceptions, like Gotham Chamber Opera or the Chicago Opera Theater, which does hugely interesting site-specific stuff, but as a group, opera performances are not culturally exceptional. What they’re doing is not, as a group, culturally interesting.

If I shift a little bit and I think about university presses, I’ve been to 40 of them now and I’ve seen all 135 of their catalogs. I cannot think of a single one that’s not doing stuff that’s culturally interesting. So it turns out that we’re all exceptions and no rules and that dude from the *Wall Street Journal* might be right. We just may be the last interesting cultural institution in America.

I’m going to close actually on a very personal note. I pursued the opportunity to become AAUP’s new Executive Director because, as you can tell, I believe so passionately in what it is that university presses do. We curate the scholarly argument across the humanities
and the social sciences, we present the academy’s best and brightest to a public acutely in need of critical thought, and we document with authority the natural and cultural history of people and places. And we do these things, things that no commercial publisher would dare, against all odds and with joy in our hearts. These are things worth doing, things worth cherishing, and things worth fighting for.

When I introduced myself to the AAUP annual meeting last June, I told them all this, and I offered as a benediction a text that to me is sacred. And because I’m in awe of the energy that has pulsed through these halls for the past two days, I’m going to offer it again to all of you here today.

I’m reminded of Prior’s valedictory to Belize in part two of Tony Kushner’s “Angels in America.”

This disease will be the end of many of us, but not nearly all and the dead will be commemorated and we’ll struggle on with the living and we are not going away. We won’t die secret deaths anymore. The world only spins forward. We will be citizens. The time has come. Bye now. You’re fabulous creatures, each and every one. And I bless you: More life.

Prior concludes, and so shall I, with the invocation he first received as the angel came crashing through his bedroom ceiling in the climax of Part One, “The great work begins.”
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COLLABORATIVE ORGANIZATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURES TO SUPPORT OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

Marianne A. Buehler, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

With the advancement of open access (OA) journal publishing opportunities in partnership with presses and faculty, libraries in alignment with intersecting academic values are fulfilling a need by supporting sustainable models of scholarly communication that incorporate disseminating faculty scholarship in collaboration with library and/or press staff and editors to “start up” an OA journal or transform an existing print journal to OA. Library staff that embrace faculty or student publishing partnerships are structuring and utilizing their scholarly communication skill sets by positioning the availability of open access publications to disseminate quality research results. University presses are also forging alliances with libraries to strategically align their business models as an economically viable solution and compelling competitor in publishing journals. The peer-reviewed OA journal model actuates library publishing activities with the goals of making research globally visible, the ability to build upon others’ work, and uphold the scholarly communication practices of researchers and publishers that might include stakeholder ways in: supporting the faculty research cycle; hosting software and tools’ training; metadata creation; database indexing; Creative Commons licensing; reducing libraries’ purchasing costs; engaging altmetrics; and economic viability. My infographic poster will visually depict various stakeholder alignments in publishing OA journals.
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LIBRARY-LED PUBLISHING DATA & BENCHMARKS: JOURNAL DATA COLLECTED FROM THE DIGITAL COMMONS PLATFORM

Casey Busher, bepress
Irene Kamotsky, bepress
Ann Taylor, bepress

The Digital Commons community launched 156 journals in 2013, putting the total number of journals published across all Digital Commons repositories at almost 700, including law reviews. These numbers speak to the success of library-led publishing efforts, and there is much more to discover by exploring the journals’ publishing history and performance data in more detail.

This poster presents detailed data from across all journals hosted on Digital Commons. We show how publishing rates and readership vary within the community and how these trends can be used to derive target activity levels for new journals. We also look at publishing across various disciplines to see which of those disciplines are well represented and which may be underrepresented. Measuring the success of publishing efforts can be key in proving viability to stakeholders. Using data that reflects the publishing experiences of over 180 institutions, we’re able to suggest benchmarks of publishing activity and readership that will help publishers set goals and prove effectiveness.

Supplemental Content
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THE LEVER INITIATIVE: REIMAGINING THE SCHOLARLY MONOGRAPH

Mark Christel, College of Wooster

In early 2013 the Oberlin Group, a consortium of selective liberal arts colleges, met to discuss the challenges and opportunities facing book publishing in the 21st century. While much attention had been given to open access efforts in journal publishing, and substantial advances had been made in making that literature more accessible, relatively little had been done in opening up monographs. The group established a task force and commissioned a research project to explore alternative approaches to monograph publishing with a focus on producing good academic literature that people want to read, made freely available to all; and to do so efficiently, sustainably, and making full use of technology and new media. This initiative is called the Lever Initiative (http://leverinitiative.wordpress.com/), after Archimedes' claim that given a lever and a firm place to ground it, he could move the earth.

The individual liberal arts colleges in the Oberlin Group have been inspired by the contributions made to open scholarship and conceptions of academic publishing in projects such as OAPEN and the partnership between the libraries and press at The University of Pittsburgh. The Lever Initiative is a project to determine whether there is a role that these smaller colleges could collectively play in advancing open access publishing of scholarly monographs and short-form books.

This poster will present information about the Lever Initiative, our objectives for beginning this study, a brief overview of our research methodologies, and highlights from our research. We have gathered data through interviews and discussions with library administrators and college presidents, provosts and deans. The group published a white paper on open access book publishing models, available at http://leverinitiative.files.wordpress.com/2013/12/oa-monograph-report_dec13_v1.pdf. At the end of 2013, the group completed an extensive survey of faculty at liberal arts colleges that garnered over 600 responses and we are now ready to present some of our preliminary findings. This poster will provide fuel for further discussion as to how the library community can work together to increase the quality, utility, accessibility and impact of scholarly monographs.
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E-JOURNAL PUBLISHING BY THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SYSTEM, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Lauren B. Collister, University of Pittsburgh - Main Campus
Timothy S. Deliyannides, University of Pittsburgh - Main Campus

The University Library System, University of Pittsburgh, offers its e-journal publishing program and Scholarly Exchange® hosting service as part of the library’s goal to articulate and exemplify new models of scholarly communication and support the principle of Open Access to research on a global scale. The e-journal publishing program was started in 2007 to align with the ULS’s mission to support researchers in the production and sharing of high-quality scholarly publications. The ULS is the publisher of 35 scholarly peer-reviewed journals, 32 of which are Open Access; the journal portfolio includes journals edited at the University of Pittsburgh as well as by publishing partners across the world. The Scholarly Exchange® hosting service was acquired by the ULS in 2012, and serves the needs of underserved scholarly communities in low-resource settings by providing a low-barrier entry point to scholarly publishing. 45 journals are hosted on the Scholarly Exchange® platform from scholars and societies around the world.

In the past seven years, the e-journal publishing program has blossomed into a comprehensive publishing service with international partnerships to both develop software and technology and create new journals in diverse academic areas. These partnerships have helped the ULS enrich the publishing program’s offerings, for example by developing an altmetrics plugin for Open Journal Systems in partnership with Plum Analytics and the Public Knowledge Project. Membership in the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association has also benefitted the ULS by giving insight into international policies and procedures that have helped shape our program.

This poster presents the details of the programs for both ULS-published journals and Scholarly Exchange® journals. It includes a list of the services provided in the base packages, value-added services that publishing partners may request, and the sustainable cost-recovery plan to support these programs in times of ever-shrinking budgets. Of particular interest to some readers is the cost recovery information, detailing the pricing structure for e-journal offerings which was created to offset the costs of the growing demand for journal publishing services. The poster also demonstrates the ways that the ULS’s e-journal publishing program aligns with the goals of the University Library System and the needs of its stakeholders and peers. By sharing this program information, the ULS hopes to provide a model that will inspire other libraries who are embarking on publishing endeavors.
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COLLABORATIVE AND INNOVATIVE PUBLISHING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND SUSTAINABILITY SCIENCE

Barbara DeFelice, Dartmouth College

The Dartmouth College Library (DCL) is supporting the dissemination of sustainability science, studies, and practice through collaborative publishing projects with partners on and off campus. *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene* is the result of collaboration among the not-for-profit publishing services provider BioOne and leading academic institutions to create a new interdisciplinary, open access publishing program. This poster outlines the key components of the project, illustrates the collaboration involved in the technical and editorial work, and highlights the role of the Dartmouth College Library in furthering our publishing program by responding to the needs of our stakeholders in the sustainability community.

Highlights of this project include:

- A complex collaboration that offers a new model of campus based publishing
- A project design that recognizes the roles of key stakeholders
- The challenges and benefits of building on the open source Ambra publishing platform
- Implementation of the JATS XML
- Configuration of the Aries Editorial and ProduXion Management systems
- Development of staff dedicated to the project
- Support of Dartmouth’s long standing concerns with sustainability

The Dartmouth College Library is a technology partner in the distributed editorial, peer review, web site, and publishing platform work that supports this enterprise. The DCL is engaging in this endeavor in order to support the development of new publishing models that better meet scholarly and societal needs for access to information, and to support scholarship in sustainability. The inaugural domains were developed through an iterative process, starting with subject areas not well covered by high quality open access journals, and refined through working with faculty and librarians at the partner institutions.

The editorial and production management process is facilitated by a full time Production Manager working closely with the editors in chief, editorial board members, and project team members. The editorial team is well supported in this collaboration, which has resulted in a positive experience for authors, reviewers and editors alike. By using the Aries Editorial and ProduXion Management software, they are offered a smooth and professional experience, customized to the special nature of *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene*. 
The publishing platform is built on the open source Ambra software suite, with HTML5 to support responsive design by the company ripe, and a WordPress site for policies and outreach materials that are integrated into the Elementa home page. A full time Programmer builds and adapts the Ambra platform, and the Project Director and the Director of Communications provide content for the WordPress site. Media files are hosted locally, and data files are deposited with Dryad.

The project uses JATS XML, and experts continue to update the XML specifications document as conditions change. The version of record is the XML, but readers can also interact with content in HTML, PDF, EPUB3, Mobipocket, and JSON.

As an innovative publishing program, *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene* provides the infrastructure on which to build a collaborative interdisciplinary scholarly publication to help meet sustainability challenges by integrating systems thinking, actionable research, and multiple forms of expression. This model can be extended to other projects. The outcomes for the DCL publishing program include the potential to use the publishing and editorial infrastructure for other journals, deep learning about the requirements for an effective editorial board, best practices and policies in the evolving world of library based publishing, and a proven ability to meet needs of stakeholders in our scholarly community.
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**COMPLEMENTARY SKILLS, RESOURCES, AND MISSIONS: BEST PRACTICES IN DEVELOPING LIBRARY-PRESS COLLABORATIONS**

**Donna Dixon**, State University of New York Press
**Brenna McLaughlin**, Association of American University Presses

In 2012, the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) surveyed library directors, deans, university librarians, and university press directors with the objective of mapping similarities and differences in operational and financial structures as well as practical differences. 42 library leaders and 41 university press directors responded to a set of 32 questions that could be answered by either audience. In 2013, follow-up interviews were
conducted with 22% of the respondents, focusing on the “why” of library publishing services, and requesting detail on certain aspects of library-press relationships.

The following broad conclusions and recommendations for successful collaboration between presses and libraries were issued by the Library Relations Committee of AAUP along with the survey results, analysis, and excerpts from interviews, in January 2014.

**Library publishing services are on the rise.** 65% of respondents said library-publishing programs are an increasingly important service. 77% of library respondents and 34% of press respondents to this question agreed that publishing should be part of the library’s mission. A library director said: “Motivation and campus context are everything. The infrastructure of new technologies can be leveraged to serve publishing needs.”

**Collaboration rather than duplication is recommended.** 69% of respondents believed that library-publishing initiatives should complement press publishing programs, rather than reinventing or duplicating a service for formal peer-reviewed literature. One dean of libraries stated: “We would rather work together with the press but not duplicate services.” A press director added, “I think there needs to be a better understanding of what each brings to the table.”

**Recognize and discuss mission overlap.** 95% of respondents saw the need for presses and libraries to engage with each other about issues facing scholarly publishing beyond the usual topics of open access, fair use, and copyright. Common interests—such as how to best serve scholars—would be fruitful topics of discussion.

**Understand the scope of publishing activity on campus.** Respondents indicated some knowledge of on-campus publishing operations, but a large percentage of respondents had no sense of number or scale. Presses and libraries should recognize where these operations present opportunities for each.

**Look beyond the financial figures.** Many libraries provide in-kind support to presses. In 11% of cases the library provided cash support to a press, but more than 53% of libraries provided other kinds of service ranging from digitization, metadata, and preservation services to office support and rent-free space.

The issue of cost recovery in publishing activities is an area of divergence between presses and libraries. One press director said, “Libraries receive a pot of money and must spend that pot of money carefully and wisely. Presses receive a pot and are told to fill it with money... and spend it carefully and wisely.” Another director commented, “Presses are perceived as
businesses and libraries as services. I wish we could work collectively to change this thinking.” Summary survey data is available from http://www.aaupnet.org/resources/for-members/data-collection-and-analysis/library-press-collaboration-survey.
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THE POSEIDON PROJECT: THE OCEAN SCIENCE LIBRARY FIGHTING AGAINST POSEIDON’S TRIDENT, OPENING THE FUTURE WITH KNOWLEDGE ON THE OCEAN

Jong-Yup Han, Korea Institute of Ocean Science and Technology

Special libraries have a unique place in the field of academic research. In addition to providing traditional information services, they are required to produce and distribute creative information content through various channels. To meet these requirements, the Ocean Science Library (OSL) developed the POSEIDON Project, named after the Greek god of the sea. The project focuses on “enhancing the capacity of a special library through academic publication.” It is composed of the following activities.

First, OSL publishes the international oceanographic journal, Ocean Science Journal (OSJ). The journal is in direct response to dramatic changes in scholarly communication due to rapidly developing internet services and information technology in twenty-first century. These changes enabled libraries to independently produce and even distribute scholarly publications, which dramatically reduced cost and time to deliver quality information to the audience. OSL recognized this paradigm shift in the academic communication and worked together with South Korea’s ocean-related organizations such as the Korea Institute of Ocean Science and Technology (KIOST) and the Korean Society of Oceanography (KSO) to publish the OSJ since 2006.

Subject librarians of OSL actively participated in the preparation of OSJ from deciding its basic editorial format to the review process for submitted papers. Also, OSL entered into
a strategic partnership with the Springer to make OSJ as one of the top oceanographic academic journals in Northeast Asia.

Second, OSL has been developing and distributing educational content related to ocean science. The project to create an ocean education textbook was entrusted to the OSL by the Ministry of Land, Transport, and Maritime Affairs, and marks the beginning of OSL’s endeavor in knowledge content development. OSL’s subject librarians analyzed and customized ocean literacy programs and educational materials in advanced maritime nations such as the United States, Japan, the United Kingdom, and Australia to create the best ocean literacy curriculum.

Through these processes, the Dreaming Ocean book series was published. This series was Korea’s first ocean education book series, which contained ocean science contents to remind the importance of the ocean. OSL was in charge of the whole project. The Dreaming Ocean book series targets youths and aims to publish more than 100 books, which will introduce R&D accomplishments in the field of ocean science. As of March 2014, OSL has published 25 books within the series.

Lastly, OSL also operates the “Science Mécénat Program”, which utilizes various books published by OSL to promote ocean literacy. The term “Mécénat” was derived from Gaius Clinius Maecenas, a Roman politician, who fully supported culture artists. In present day, Mécénat has been redefined as a non-profit cultural and social outreach activity. OSL adopted this term and applied it to science-related activities. Currently, the Science Mécénat Program includes a book donation campaign, a lecture series and an ocean science classroom program.

OSL has been facilitating close cooperation between subject librarians and scientists to strengthen a public outreach framework in the field of ocean literacy. OSL believes that our work can serve as a role-model for publishing services by sharing successful cases from OSL with other countries’ libraries.
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ESTABLISHING AN ACADEMIC LIBRARY PUBLISHING PROGRAM

Ruth Ann Jones, Michigan State University

Since the installation of an Espresso Book Machine in late 2011, the MSU Libraries have explored on-demand publishing in addition to a robust business printing books for MSU and community customers.

Our experiments include informal collaborations with the MSU Press, publishing opportunities for students, rare cookbook reprints, and the Comic Art Preservation Project, an effort to make lesser-known classic comics more widely available to libraries, collectors, and fans.

Particular successes:

- Libraries in six states have purchased *Michigan Imprints, 1851-1876*, which fills the gap between *Preliminary Checklist of Michigan Imprints, 1796-1850* and *American Book Publishing Record Cumulative, 1876-1949*.

- *Tim Tyler’s Luck, 1937-1939* reprints an early American adventure strip from proof sheets in our Comic Art collection, and was reviewed on comicsbulletin.com.

- The *MSU Student Comic Art Anthology* was the first in a series to highlight student creativity. Forthcoming in August: *MSU Students Speak Out on Civil Rights*.

Our titles are sold primarily through Amazon.com. Full list: http://lib.msu.edu/publications.
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VISION SMASHING INTO REALITY: IMPLEMENTING CORE SERVICE MODELS

Dan Lee, University of Arizona Libraries
Kimberly Chapman, University of Arizona Libraries

The University of Arizona Libraries offer publication services using multiple platforms. These include a Campus Repository Service on a hosted DSpace platform and a Journals
Service using a local Open Journals Systems (OJS) instance. As both services were planned, core service models were developed and formally acknowledged emphasizing user self-sufficiency following appropriate training from library staff along with library provided software support. Under the model, users are responsible for editorial control, implementing best practices, uploading content, and ensuring the live presentation represented the user's intended product. Such a service model was developed with user input, and scaled to the resources available from the UA Libraries. Then reality set in! We will describe how our model has been flexible enough to accommodate user needs and expectations that have differed from what was anticipated, in addition to the ramifications on our behind-the-scenes costs and staffing of the services.
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A PORTRAIT OF THE LIBRARIAN AS AN EMERGING PUBLISHER: A PROACTIVE APPROACH

Rachel Leket-Mor, Arizona State University

Library publishing is one of the promising directions for research libraries in the twenty-first century. Although this exciting terrain cannot be explored without librarians to lead the way, the role of the publishing librarian has not been seriously considered in the growing research literature about library publishing services. The general assumption, so it seems, is that librarians understand publishing through and through due to their traditional role as the ultimate clients of published goods while interacting closely with publishers, or as authors of works related to the Library and Information Studies field. However, in both these cases, librarians do not gain direct experience in the process of preparing a text for publication, but either in the very end of the publishing process in the former or its very beginning in the latter case.

Based on my personal experience as a certified copyeditor transformed librarian, and as a librarian acting as editor-in-chief of a peer-reviewed LIS journal, I find this underlying assumption implausible. Similar sentiments were reported in a number of recent studies cited in the poster. Mullins et al. (2012, 15), for example, stated that “library publishing programs—many of which offer skeletal production systems and minimal editorial support—have discovered that authors and editors continue to demand publishing services that the library had assumed to be irrelevant in an era of digital dissemination.”
As outlined in the poster, I propose that the Library Publishing Coalition, in collaboration with other organizations and publishing librarians, adopts an action plan to train librarians for their new roles in digital publishing. The plan is based on developing three goals: standards for library publishing across all institutions, with focus on services acceptable in scholarly publishing; competency standards for publishing librarians; and internship programs. Each of these goals is tied to specific objectives, so libraries can genuinely offer scholarly professional publishing services to their constituencies.
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**LIBRARY PUBLISHING AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY**

Yuan Li, Syracuse University  
Suzanne E. Guedo, Syracuse University  
Suzanne Preate, Syracuse University  
Sarah H. Theimer, Syracuse University

Syracuse University Libraries (SUL) engages in a wide range of publishing activities, including ETDs, journals, monographs, conference proceedings, and grey literature (e.g., working papers and technical reports). Particularly, in last two years, the Libraries have had increasing journal publishing request from the campus. Journal publishing services is quickly becoming an expected library service. This poster focuses on journal publishing at SUL, emphasizing the workflow and examples.

In the workflow section, we share our step-by-step approach to determining the specific needs of each publishing project. We then elaborate on each step by detailing tasks appropriate to each publication. We hope this approach will help readers understand our practice in detail, especially for those institutions just launching publishing initiatives. Next, we provide a list of questions we use to determine the needs, priorities, and expectations of the group or faculty editor wishing to launch a publication. The information gathered through this questionnaire directly impacts the services we will offer. Thirdly, we list tiered services available, including both free and fee-based services. A unique collaboration between SUL and Syracuse University Press enables us to provide comprehensive publishing services—as
demonstrated in this list—ranging from metadata modeling and creation, ISSN application to copyediting and marketing.

Finally, the poster profiles examples of journals mounted in both Digital Commons and Open Journal System (OJS) platforms. We highlight in particular an OJS journal, Public: A Journal of Imaging America, published by Syracuse Unbound, a joint imprint of SU Libraries and SU Press. OJS was the right choice for Public because of the journal's sophisticated design requirements and interface customization needs, including data extraction, manipulation, and visualization. We also include a link to a book chapter in the Library Publishing Toolkit that describes this collaborative project in greater detail. For further information about SUL publishing services or the collaboration between the Press and Libraries, contact Pam McLaughlin at pwmclaugh@syr.edu.
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**CREATING AFFORDABLE DIGITAL TEXTBOOKS THROUGH COLLABORATION: A CASE STUDY FROM PURDUE**

Jennifer E. Lynch, Purdue University
Brady Kalb, Skyepack

One area in which library publishing initiatives have a great opportunity to align their activities with university goals is in the area of affordable texts for students. Not every library has the resources to reinvent the wheel and create a new digital platform for texts but searching widely for other campus partners can sometimes produce surprisingly good results. This poster focuses on a pilot project in which the Purdue University Libraries Publishing Division (PUP/SPS) works with a startup company called Skyepack, part of the University’s business incubator program, to create low-cost, platform-neutral digital textbooks. The program creates opportunities to marry text and multimedia into a cohesive and easy-to-use product. A working application of the Skyepack technology has been created, and the program is set for rapid expansion in the next year.

**Poster:** http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309/lpf.1011
PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT: COLLABORATIONS & COMMUNITY BUILDING

Karen Meijer-Kline, Public Knowledge Project, Simon Fraser University

Library publishing services play a critical role in scholarly communication and in providing the emerging services that faculty, students, and others increasingly require. They will have a large role to play in how libraries will stay relevant in the changing world of academia. It is crucial that we keep publishing tools freely available to everyone, so libraries can continue to be able to provide top quality publication services.

The Public Knowledge Project is a not-for-profit research and development team at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, Canada, developing 100% open source software publishing platforms since 1998. PKP is a joint effort between partners from different parts of the world, and this poster showcases how the collaboration and interaction with our partners and user community shapes our efforts towards common goals.

Open source software allows for groups of individuals to come together to create their ideal platform and share it with others; pooling knowledge and resources; sharing ideas and skills. It is inherently flexible. Establishing clear channels of communication between users, developers, and other stakeholders is of vital importance for the ongoing success of open source projects. Since the PKP applications can be downloaded and used without registration; users come from a wide range of contexts and are globally distributed; and have a variety of needs, establishing these channels can sometimes be challenging.

The poster illustrates how PKP currently uses different venues to guide software development (e.g. ‘sprints’, subject committees) and for soliciting feedback (e.g. forums). PKP’s committees consist of our sponsors and partners, from the library community and engaged in (library) publishing. They are able to ensure their voice is heard, coming together to discuss development priorities that are in alignment with broad stakeholder goals; potential projects and plugins; and new initiatives. As a result, at any time we have half a dozen experimental or research-oriented side projects around subjects like Altmetrics and XML, thereby ensuring that our open source software continues to facilitate a wide range of publishing practices.

The poster also introduces some of the new initiatives being investigated to further build the community of users around our publishing platforms and to ensure all our users’ needs are met. These new initiatives focus on the creation of a broad, interactive user community with lively engagement and a sense of ownership over the software. Options under consideration are the creation of software user groups, focus groups around particular issues, and the
ability for the wider community to vote on development ideas and features. PKP is also looking into the creation of a community ‘square’ or ‘hub’ where people can see what other users are doing, fostering the ability to collaborate on projects; to post a call or proposal; or look for partnerships on a particular subject matter or a particular journal type.
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**TRUE BENEFITS OF PEER REVIEW**

**Thomas Neidenmark, Stockholm University**  
**Karl Edqvist, Stockholm University**  
**Martin Wincent, Stockholm University**

Swedish libraries have established a national publishing collaboration thanks to excellent university collaboration. One outcome of the higher education collaboration is that most universities in Sweden are connected to the same digital publication repository for research publications. Now innovative quality control of Open Access monographs is on our shared national agenda. The opportunities to connect appropriate researchers for reviewing manuscripts are promising.

As a continuation of the final report of the project, *A National Consortium for Open Academic Books in Sweden*, and the ongoing European collaboration Going for Gold, Stockholm University Press (SUP), is now focusing on an efficient exchange of reviewers. Together Swedish universities are now addressing the quality control question. One of the biggest challenges we see is the recognition of merit for those involved. The poster presents how Stockholm University Press editorial boards are creating a badging system to attract high quality reviewers with the True Benefits of Peer Review. The poster visualizes (for funders) each and everyone’s contribution to knowledge production and thus to scholarly communication as a whole. The system is being implemented today in collaboration with Ubiquity Press in the United Kingdom. When asked, younger reviewers tend to show stronger interest in the model than their more experienced colleagues. The feedback in general is characterized by positive curiosity by both new and senior faculty, which we intend to nurture and cultivate.

Important issues on a national level in Sweden and perhaps also at American libraries include what is the value of reviewing scholarship, what will a badge visualize for an article reviewer versus a monograph reviewer, and how do citations and web metrics affect the
badge credits? These issues are currently the biggest challenges and bring up the need for and importance of international quality and format standards.

Possibilities with the peer review model and standards for recognition will be addressed and discussed in a series of forums and networks on a national level in May 2014. Incentives to succeeding with the peer review model mainly come from the belief that transparency increases the quality of reviews. Those reviewers who contribute to higher quality in all parts of scholarly communication should be recognized by a sustainable and widely embraced rewarding system.

We hope to gain American perspectives on this peer review model and at the same time strengthen the collaboration between American and European university libraries.
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**DIGITAL PUBLISHING SERVICES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS LIBRARIES**

**Marianne A. Reed,** University of Kansas  
**Brian Rosenblum,** University of Kansas

Digital Publishing Services at the University of Kansas Libraries provides support to the KU community for the design, management and distribution of online publications, including journals, conference proceedings, monographs, and other scholarly content. We help scholars explore new and emerging publishing models in our changing scholarly communication environment, and help monitor and address campus concerns and questions about electronic journal publishing.

Since 2007, when *Biodiversity Informatics* made its debut, Digital Publishing Services has supported the KU community in the online publication of scholarly journals through Journals@KU. While almost all articles in Journals@KU are fully open access, a few editors choose to offer the newer content only to subscribers, with a rolling open access window of three to five years after publication. All of the journals hosted by KU Libraries are easily discovered by Google and other web crawlers; as a result, in 2013, articles in these journals were downloaded over 1 million times.

KU Libraries provides journal editors with the technical infrastructure to publish their journals on either of two platforms: KU ScholarWorks (DSpace), KU’s institutional
repository, which makes journals visible to an international audience and assures their long term preservation and Open Journal Systems (OJS), which makes journals very visible and assures their preservation, but also supports the entire editorial management workflow, including article submission, multiple rounds of peer-review, and indexing. Journal editors can select the platform that suits the needs of their editorial process with full confidence that either platform will ensure their journal’s maximum visibility.
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A LIBRARY PUBLISHER AND A STATE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION WORKING TOGETHER—PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES: RESEARCH & PRACTICE

Thomas L. Reinsfelder, Pennsylvania State University - Mont Alto
John H. Barnett, University of Pittsburgh - Main Campus

As libraries expand traditional services and become more involved with the publishing of scholarly content such as open access journals, library publishers will want to form strong partnerships with journal editors. Similarly, creators and editors of open access journals need to identify a publisher who will work to help bring their vision to reality and offer ongoing support as the journal grows.

In 2012, the University Library System at the University of Pittsburgh issued a call for new titles to be produced through its e-journal publishing program. At the same time, the members of the Pennsylvania Library Association’s College & Research Division were discussing the possibilities for creating a new, online, peer-reviewed, open access journal. Consequently, the two organizations connected to more effectively highlight and share librarians’ scholarly and professional work through a new publication.
Pennsylvania Libraries: Research & Practice (PaLRaP.org) was first published in the Spring of 2013 and currently produces two issues each year. While the members of the Pennsylvania Library Association provide editors, peer-reviewers, authors, and readers, the University Library System at the University of Pittsburgh provides publishing expertise and technical support including hosting and maintenance of the Open Journal Systems (OJS) platform, graphic design for the website and article templates, DOI registration, and registration with indexing services (e.g., EBSCO).

It has been almost two years since this partnership began, and representatives from both organizations continue to implement new features and make improvements to the journal’s functionality, look, and content. Originally envisioned as a journal focused on the work of Pennsylvania’s academic librarians, PaLRaP has evolved to become more inclusive of the larger professional community and has attracted articles written by public and school librarians. The journal now includes other types of content, such as feature articles and news items, and aims to help new authors produce high-quality articles for publication. The editorial team has developed its own style guide for authors and editors and has conducted training for new copy editors. Along with the assistance of the library publisher, the editorial team is pursuing new opportunities, including rolling issues, more sophisticated statistics and usage measures (e.g., article-level metrics provided by Plum Analytics), the ability to accept payments and donations, and opportunities for print on demand.

During the poster presentation at the Library Publishing Forum in March 2014, the editors discussed PaLRaP from inception to future plans and shared thoughts on how library publishers and editors can work together to incubate and improve scholarship and professional development.
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LIBRARY-PRESS COLLABORATIONS

Charlotte Roh, University of Massachusetts - Amherst

In order to better understand evolving relationships between university presses and libraries, a review of press and library collaborations was undertaken by the University of Arizona Press and the University of Arizona Library through the Association of Research Libraries Career Enhancement (ARL CEP) Program. The research included a literature review; 27 informal interviews with library deans, press directors, and scholarly communications leaders, and interviews with key librarians and staff and the University of Arizona Libraries.
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THE BEST OF BOTH WORLDS: CREATING A CONTINUUM OF PUBLISHING SERVICES FOR PURDUE UNIVERSITY

David Scherer, Purdue University - Main Campus
Katherine Purple, Purdue University - Main Campus

In recent years the scholarly communications environment within higher education institutions has changed so dramatically that stakeholders have become unsure who to turn to for research dissemination support. Whether student publications, books written by faculty, or technical reports, it was unclear to members of the campus community who might offer the best options and solutions. At many academic institutions around the globe, faculty, staff, and students have looked separately to a range of campus specialists, including marketing and I/T departments, as well as libraries and university presses, for guidance and support for disseminating scholarship. The Purdue University Libraries and Purdue Press realized the need to combine their joint publishing and service-oriented undertakings for the campus community into a more cohesive effort. Beginning in 2009, the Press became more strategically aligned with the Libraries so that in 2012, a new Libraries Publishing Division was formed that now offers a center of excellence for campus-based publishing initiatives. This poster will introduce and describe the efforts and solutions of the Purdue Libraries Publishing Division, highlighting the continuum of services, activities, and products now offered to the campus community, as well as discussing the future of library publishing at the University.

Poster: http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309/lpf.1016