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Introduction
In the past, publishers sold books and libraries bought them. They were separate entities with separate roles within a university institution. These lines have blurred in the past two decades: As of 2013 there are 20 members of the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) that report through their university libraries and 58 institutions participating in the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC).

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.

Fortunately, time and necessity have led to more positive dialogue in recent years. The collaborative work done by some libraries and presses have borne fruit in places like Johns Hopkins University and Project Muse, Purdue University’s open access journals, and Columbia University’s Center for Digital Research and Scholarship (CDRS) and interactive book project with Fordham University Press. There are many presses that do not report through their library, yet collaborate in order to experiment in new scholarly modes of communication. These collaborations take place on a broad spectrum – from programmatic co-sponsored events to dual imprint electronic publications.

Methodology
In order to better understand these 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). 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 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 evaluated
current perceptions of the library and the press, and asked 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, “[it] 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. In his article, "Library and University Press Integration: A New Vision for University Publishing," Richard Clement 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.

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, and 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, 2011), Penn State University Press (Eaton, MacEwan, Potter, 2004), the University California Press (Greenstein,
2010), Georgetown University Press (Alexander et al, 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, and Ray, 2009), and now faculty journal hosting and data management services have 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, and Rascoff, 2007). As libraries experiment with new forms of scholarly material and output (Mullins et al, 2013), 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 and Kunda, 2012).

**Interviews with Scholarly Communication Leaders**

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 relationships.

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. However, many press directors and several library deans also 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 who collaborate on
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.

Another reason for cooperative digital publishing is simply 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. The library provides support in both staff time and technology infrastructure in order to digitize, produce, and host projects in which they already have interest. Quite a few libraries have also engaged in publishing projects independent of their university presses, but these efforts are often less formal (gray literature, conference proceedings, data sets, and the like), or done under press advisement rather than under a joint imprint or active sponsorship. Both publishers and libraries expressed the desire to engage with scholarship as it evolves, and would like to do more to experiment and create new working sustainable models of publication and access.

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. The library dean in this case pushed for the funds from the university administration and hosted the press staff 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.
Administrative shifts and 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, and 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. 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 this kind of involvement, nor does it preclude a positive relationship. There were a few people who indicated that even though their press reported through the library, they had minimal interaction with the library, and one library ceased its relationship with the press when the press acquired a new director with different priorities. Also, 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.

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. There is an element of caution 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
An initial 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 accesses 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 continue as new forms of scholarly communication advance their efforts to establish standards of quality control.

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. Thoughts from both sides were surprisingly similar. Both librarians and press agreed that true scholarly publishing was peer reviewed and went through a process of editing, developing, and marketing. 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 is recognized 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 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 national strong reputation, but not much was known about the actual responsibilities and projects taking place at the Library. This lack of understanding has led to a lack of trust and collaboration despite the desire to experiment and do more in scholarly communications. This may be due in part to the fact that the Press was not consulted in their move to the Library, and their status within the Library is not clear. This uncertainty coupled with a busy publishing schedule has meant that conversations on the relationship between the Library and the Press have only taken place recently.

One of the things that emerged from interviews with the Library and Press staff is 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. The three big needs identified by Library staff were time, technology capability, and outreach to faculty.
Recommendations for the University of Arizona

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. The UA Library is going through a time of change, as they have recently hired a new dean. This 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

One of the largest motivating factors for collaboration that is missing from both the published literature and the interviews 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, and 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 from the survey, 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, and this shift has already made itself felt in sometimes awkward ways. This more casual means of scholarship 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. However, regardless of pricing structure, 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. Judging from published examples and interviews, the shape of these partnerships will be different depending on each context, and may change in this uncertain climate. This uncertain climate is even more reason to build relationships. Products and outcomes may change, but relationships endure, and it is certainly better to have allies in times of crisis than enemies.

---

1 For example, recently 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
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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?
Appendix B

Library-Press Collaborations Presentation, July 20, 2013

See following
Library and Press Collaborations

University of Arizona
Charlotte Roh
July 19, 2013
9 weeks at the University of Arizona

- **80+** Articles, reports, conference proceedings, presentations, and editorials
- **27** Interviews with university presses and libraries that work together
- **11** Interviews at the University of Arizona
- 1 really dark tan
Library and Press Collaborations
Some History

The crisis story has been well established.

High Prices for Libraries
- Technology changes and electronic journal packages put pressure on library budgets

Low Sales for Presses
- Less money for print monographs
- Not enough money for digital conversion

Changes in Roles
- 20 university presses now report through the library
- 50 institutions participate in the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC)

And, of course, there’s the economy.
Unproductive Dialogue

Publisher’s hate you. You should hate them back.

February 21, 2012 - 8:55am — Blake

Publishers hate you. You should hate them back.
So library-types, let’s get our story straight. Publishers have contempt for the authors they need to write works, and the readers they need to read works. Publishers are scared that the internet is going to disintermediate their asses into the dustbin of history, and the best response that many of them have come up with is to express their fear through hatred. For all the things that we might need to improve in libraries or apologize for, this isn’t one of them.

“But we don’t hate them, we love them!”
- Abby Mogollon, University of Arizona Press
Lawsuits and Lack of Communication

From Library Journal

**Librarian Sued By Publisher for Saying Mean Things**

*February 11, 2013 by Annoyed Librarian 19 COMMENTS*

There's a librarian in the Great White North (or at least McMaster University in Ontario) under legal siege by the Edwin Mellen Press for writing a blog post criticizing EMP. A "faithful reader" sent these links about the story and wondered what my take on them would be. My first take was a double take. Suing a librarian for criticizing your press? Doesn't that seem excessive?

The best summary of the story at this point is probably this [Inside Higher Education](https://www.insidehighered.com) article, following up on the blog posts.

The librarian in question wrote a blog post in 2010 critical of everything EMP. Now EMP wants $3 million from him and McMaster for defamation.

From Publisher’s Weekly

**Libraries: Good Value, Lousy Marketing**

Brian Kenney | Jan 23, 2013

The singular most important finding in the latest Pew study, *Library Services in the Digital Age*, is that libraries—in the opinion of most Americans—aren't just about books. 80% of U.S. residents say that lending books is a "very important" service, but they rate the help they get from reference librarians as equally important. And nearly the same number, 77%, reported that free access to technology and the Internet is also very important. This triumvirate—books, help, and technology—runs through the entire report.

Could the library brand—historically bound to book borrowing—be undergoing a transformation? In the last major study of users, OCLC's *Perception of Libraries, 2010*, patrons were asked to associate the first thing that came to mind when they thought of libraries. And for 75% of the respondents, the answer was books. While Pew didn't play the same association game, it seems that Pew's users have a more nuanced take on the library's role.
Not everyone feels this way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>“It 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.”</td>
<td>Day, &quot;The Need for Library and University Press Collaboration&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>“First and foremost, we agree that university libraries and university presses have a shared stake in the future of scholarly communication.”</td>
<td>Eaton, MacEwan, and Potter, “Learning to Work Together: The Libraries and the University Press at Penn State”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>“What is at risk is a diverse marketplace that offers publishing opportunities for a wide range of content at reasonable cost.”</td>
<td>Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff, <em>University Publishing in a Digital Age</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>“In most cases, university libraries provide hosting services to the presses at no charge to the presses; in some cases, the libraries have also digitized the books. Without this level of institutional support, these programs would not be possible.”</td>
<td>Withey et al, “Sustaining Scholarly Publishing: New Business Models for University Presses”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Libraries & University Presses

Mission
• Believe in high quality academic research and output
• Make academic work available to the public
• Serve consumers and producers

Institution
• Come out of and serve academic institutions
• Are feeling pressure from institutions to prove their value
• Day-to-day operations not clearly understood by institution

Value
• Are positioned to offer unique expertise
• Are positioned to offer and act on big-picture thinking
• Are positioned to be leaders in scholarly communication
Library-Press Collaborations

- Cornell University Press and Library co-publish Signale, a series of books on modern German studies
- Fordham University Press makes backlist titles by Fordham faculty available, and plans to expand the program to non-Fordham authors.
- Indiana University Press has made about 400 titles available to the University community through the IU Library
- Johns Hopkins University Libraries and the Press founded Project Muse
- Kent State University Press is housed in the Library and sponsors a speaker series together
- New York University Press, in collaboration with the NYU Libraries, launched a collection of 125 backlist titles in fall 2010, with more titles to be added each year.
- Northwestern University Press offers titles selected from the university libraries’ special collections
- Oregon State University Press is administratively and physical part of the Library, which has funded an internship
- Stanford University’s HighWire Press hosts journals, books, reference works, and gray literature.
- Syracuse University Press reports through the Library and is launching 2 open access online journals together.
- Texas A&M University Press offers open access to all titles published to date in analytical psychology online.
- The MIT Press eBooks Library, a partnership between IEEE and the MIT Press, offers online access to more than 450 titles in computer science and engineering technologies
- University of California Press makes about 2000 titles online available through the California Digital Library (CDL)
- University of Georgia Press offers fifty backlist titles in Georgia history
- University of Michigan, operates under the UM Library’s MPublishing, which is the primary academic publishing division of the University.
- University of Pittsburgh Press has most of its backlist (more than 500 titles) available through its Prologue Books program, hosted by the university’s library.
- University of South Carolina Press’s AccessAble Books program
- University of Wisconsin Press and Library collaborated on open access titles. They have also worked with the University Legal Counsel staff on presentations about copyright issues
- Utah State University Press report to the Library but is now a department of the University of Colorado Press
Productive Projects

Dangerous Citizens is a multimedia online book partnership between the author, Neni Panourgia, Fordham University Press and the Columbia Center for Digital Research and Scholarship.

Purdue University Press publishes three open access journals through their library.

Some Common Goals

Money is not the object!

Goals are to
- Provide value to the institution
- Experiment and innovate in scholarly communication
- Remain players in the scholarly communication landscape
- Meet demands of faculty and students as both authors and readers
- Create opportunities to partner with community and funders
- In case of land grant institutions, to better serve the community
What does publishing mean to you?
More Collaboration Commonalities

Press within the Library

- Housed within library building
- Hardware, software, IT support
- HR support
- Development and advocacy

Research and Events

- Author/speaker series
- Copyright and publishing panels
- Market and subject area research

Digital Projects

- Digitized backlist available both open access and POD
- Born digital monographs
- Online journals
- Conference proceedings
- Data sets
- Interactive book-like projects
Outliers and Exceptions

**Structural Exceptions**
- Not all of the presses interviewed reported through their libraries.
- There are presses that report through the library but do not collaborate.
- In one case, the same person held the title of the library dean and the press director.
- One press is completely under the library.

**Open Access and Copyright**
- One library changed their stance on copyright due to discussions with the press.
- One library decided not to move forward with a campus open access policy out of respect to their press.

**Failure to Communicate**
- One press officially reported through the library but lacked a positive relationship.
- One library publisher no longer works with the press but would like to eventually.

**Institutional Pressures**
- One press made a profit but still came under heavy pressure from the institution to fold into the library.
- One press reported that the best thing that had come out of their relationship with the library was the advocacy done by the library on their behalf.
Relationships are Key
What does this mean for the University of Arizona?
Some Quick Facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Arizona Press</th>
<th>University of Arizona Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Founded in 1959 through the Department of Anthropology</td>
<td>• Founded in 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nearly 60 books/year</td>
<td>• Collections reflect regional interests and University’s strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15 active book series</td>
<td>• Staff has won awards for innovations in technology, instruction, and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Title reflect the strengths and interests of the institution and Arizona</td>
<td>• Services include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 20% authors affiliated with UA</td>
<td>▫ Technology and study space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 35–40% authors affiliated with one of Arizona universities</td>
<td>▫ Instruction (education) online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authors and publications are respected and win awards in their fields</td>
<td>▫ Electronic delivery of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▫ Institutional repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▫ Data curation and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▫ Journal hosting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Libraries & University Presses

Mission
- Believe in high quality academic research and output
- Make academic work available to the public
- Serve consumers and producers

Institution
- Come out of and serve academic institutions
- Are feeling pressure from institutions to prove their value
- Day-to-day operations not clearly understood by institution

Value
- Are positioned to offer unique expertise
- Are positioned to offer and act on big-picture thinking
- Are positioned to be leaders in scholarly communication
On the Same Page

• What is publishing?
  ▫ The UA Library and UA Press seem to agree on the value of traditional scholarly publishing.

• Connections are important.
  ▫ The UA Library would like to see more connections made with faculty and the community.
  ▫ The UA Press has strong connections with the faculty and community.

• Technology is important.
  ▫ The UA Library and UA Press agree that more staff, particularly technology-savvy staff, are needed to operate and innovate effectively.

• Business models are important.
Philosophy vs. Business Model

“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.”

- Patrick Alexander, Director of Penn State University Press
## Practical Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Needs</th>
<th>Press Resources</th>
<th>Solutions/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outreach to faculty and grad students | • Strong connection with faculty  
• Publishing expertise       | • Connect faculty to librarians  
• Publishing panel          |
| Outreach to community         | Strong connection with community              | Programmatic partnerships                    |
|                               |                                              | - Speaker series                            |
|                               |                                              | - Arizona/local events                      |
| Outreach to funders           | Publishing and marketing expertise            | Nonprofit and for profit publishing partnerships |
| Partner with UA institutions and conferences | Publishing and marketing expertise       | Publication of grey literature such as conference proceedings and datasets |
| UA-relevant subject knowledge | Editorial expertise                          | Resource for library staff, shared knowledge |
## Practical Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press Needs</th>
<th>Library Resources</th>
<th>Solutions/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book discoverability</td>
<td>Metadata and cataloging expertise</td>
<td>• Conversation about how the Press assigns metadata and how to better improve visibility in the Library catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitization of backlist</td>
<td>• Process in place for book digitization</td>
<td>• Online text discoverability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional repository</td>
<td>• Possible POD sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and staff</td>
<td>Funding for FTE</td>
<td>• Online public access for local/relevant materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development &amp; advocacy</td>
<td>• Development officers</td>
<td>• Tech-savvy staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty status</td>
<td>• R&amp;D help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Representation and support from administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practical Steps: Starting Now

Get to know each other.
- Have lunch in the staff lounge (not your desk).
- Why does everyone have individual coffee makers?

Consider opportunities and impacts.
- Explore publishing from Special Collections
- Explore incorporation of Press into current faculty outreach efforts.

Brag and ask!
- Ask how the Press could be useful.
- Ask how the Library could be useful.
Summary and Recommendations

- Consider the landscape.
- Consider each other’s strengths.
- Invest in staff and infrastructure to move more quickly.
Questions for the Future

• Does the University of Arizona want more forms of publishing?

• Is Arizona looking to online education initiatives?

• Are the Library and the Press currently equipped to act on institutional needs?

• How will things be funded and sustained?

• What will measure success and communicate value?
Thank you!
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