

Library-Press Collaborations: A Study Taken on Behalf of the University of Arizona

Charlotte Roh

Roh, C. (2014). Library-Press Collaborations: A Study Taken on Behalf of the University of Arizona. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication* 2(4):eP1102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1102>

© 2014 by the author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution License, which allows unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, providing the original author and source are credited.

JLSC is a quarterly journal sponsored and published by Pacific University Library | ISSN 2162-3309 | <http://jlsc-pub.org>

Library-Press Collaborations: A Study Taken on Behalf of the University of Arizona

Charlotte Roh

Scholarly Communications Resident Librarian, University of Massachusetts-Amherst

BACKGROUND The University of Arizona Press moved under the University of Arizona Library both physically and administratively a few years ago, echoing a trend amongst university presses: 20 AAUP members now are under the administration of university libraries. To understand the new evolving relationships in scholarly communication, 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). **LITERATURE REVIEW** There has been much written throughout the years on both the acrimonious and collaborative relationships between university presses and academic libraries. Much of the literature includes either editorials or case studies, with one or two major reviews of scholarly communications and the state of publishing. **DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT** 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. Then University of Arizona Library and Press staff were interviewed regarding their perceptions of their roles and each other's roles. **NEXT STEPS** This research report includes findings from the literature review and interviews as well as specific recommendations for the University of Arizona that will be implemented to improve and build relationships going forward.

Received: 05/28/2014 Accepted: 09/15/2014

Correspondence: Charlotte Roh, 154 Hicks Way, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA 1003-9275, charlotteroh@library.umass.edu



© 2014 Roh. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

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, “[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. 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, Neddill, & 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

<i>Press within the Library</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housed within library building Hardware, software, IT support HR support Development and advocacy
<i>Research and Events</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Author/speaker series Copyright and publishing panels Market and subject area research
<i>Digital Projects</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digitized backlist available both open access and POD Born digital monographs Online journals Conference proceedings Data sets Interactive book-like projects

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 naïve 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:

Academic Libraries and University Presses both...	
<i>Mission</i>	Believe in high quality academic research and output Make academic work available to the public Serve consumers and producers (scholars and researchers)
<i>Institution</i>	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
<i>Value</i>	Are positioned to offer unique expertise Are positioned to offer and act on big-picture thinking Are positioned to be leaders in scholarly communications

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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alice R. Pfeiffer, Syracuse University Press; Bryn Geffert, Amherst College Press; Charles Backus, Texas A&M Press; Charles Watkinson, Purdue University Press; Dan Lee, University of Arizona Libraries; Kathleen Keane, Johns Hopkins University Press; Kathryn Conrad, University of Arizona Press; Linda D. Cameron, University of Alberta Press; Lisa Bayer, University of Georgia Press; Mary Braun, Oregon State University; Michael Spooner, Utah State University; Mike Furlough, Pennsylvania State University Libraries; Patrick Alexander, Pennsylvania State University Press; Peter J. Potter, Cornell University Press; Rebecca Kennison, Columbia University Libraries; Rick Anderson, University of Utah Library; Ronald Chrisman, University of North Texas Press; Sandy Thatcher, Pennsylvania State University Press; Sarah M. Pritchard, Northwestern University Press; Will Underwood, Kent State University Press.

REFERENCES

AAUP Library Relations Committee. (2014). *Library-press collaborations survey report*. Retrieved from http://www.aaupnet.org/images/stories/data/librarypresscollaboration_report_corrected.pdf

Alexander, P., McCoy, J., Salisbury L., & Brown, R. (2011). Mixing oil and water: Recipes for press-library collaboration. *Charleston Conference*, November 2–5, 2011. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314937>

Anderson-Wilk, M. & Kunda, S. (2012). Publisher-library partnership for accessibility: A case study of scholarly publishing for public audiences. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 15(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0015.104>

Armstrong, M. (2011). We're all in this together: Supporting the dissemination of university research through library services. *Charleston Conference*, November 2-5, 2011. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314938>

Bonn, M., McCormick M., & Watkinson C. (2011, March 1). Models for Campus-Based Publishing. New York, NY: Columbia University Libraries/Information Services. Retrieved from <http://scholcomm.columbia.edu/2011/02/09/models-for-campus-based-publishing/>

Brown, L., Griffiths, R., & Rascoff, M. (2007). *University publishing in a digital age*. New York, NY: Ithaka. Retrieved from <http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/university-publishing-digital-age>

- Butler, D. (2013). The dark side of publishing: The explosion in open-access publishing has fuelled the rise of questionable operators. *Nature*, *495*, 433+. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/495433a>
- Choudhuray, S., Furlough M., & Ray, J. (2009). Digital curation and e-publishing: Libraries make the connection. *Charleston Conference*, November 4-7, 2009. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314782>
- Clement, R. W. (2011). Library and university press integration: A new vision for university publishing. *Journal of Library Administration*, *51*(5-6), 507-528. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2011.589330>
- Courant, P. N. (2010). What might be in store for universities' presses. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, *13*(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0013.206>
- Day, C. (1995). The need for library and university press collaboration. *Collection Management*, *19*(3-4), 107-115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J105v19n03_10
- Doyle, H., Rebecca K., & Gass, A.. (2004). Who pays for open access? *PLoS Biology*, *2*(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0020105>
- Eaton, N. L., MacEwan, B., & Potter, P. J. (2004). Learning to work together: The libraries and the university press at Penn State. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, *35*(4), 215-220. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/jsp.35.4.215>
- Greenstein, D. (2010). "Next-generation university publishing: A perspective from California. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, *13*(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0013.205>
- Housewright, R., Schonfeld, R. C., & Wulfson, K. (2013). *US faculty survey 2012*. Ithaka S+R. Retrieved from <http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/us-faculty-survey-2012>
- Kennison, R., Neni P., & Helen T. (2010). Dangerous citizens online: A case study of an author-press-library partnership. *Serials*, *23*(2), 145-149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1629/231456>
- Mullins, J. L., Murray-Rust, C., Ogburn, J. L., Crow, R., Ivins, O., Mower, A., . . . Watkinson, C. (2012). *Library publishing services: Strategies for success: Final research report (March 2012)*. Washington, DC: SPARC. Retrieved from http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/purduepress_ebooks/24/
- Smith, K. (2009). Lightning in a bottle: Libraries, technology and the changing system of scholarly communications. *Charleston Conference*, November 4-7, 2009. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314729>
- Watkinson, C., Murray-Rust, C., Nesdill, D., & Mower, A. (2011). Library publishing services: Strategies for success. *Charleston Conference*, November 2-5, 2011. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314935>
- Withey, L., Cohn, S., Faran, E., Jensen, M., Kiely, G., Underwood, W., . . . Keane, K. (2011). Sustaining scholarly publishing: New business models for university presses" *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, *42*(4), 397-441. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/jsp.42.4.397>

ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Bakker, C. (2013). Bringing history into the digital age: A case study of an online journal transition. *The Serials Librarian*, 64(1-4), 263-266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2013.760419>
- Björk, B. (2012). The hybrid model for open access publication of scholarly Aarticles: A failed experiment? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63(8) 1496-1504. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/asi.22709>
- Breaux, A, McCullough, M., Schultz, L., & Sugarman, T.S.. (2009). E-Duke books: What have we learned? *Charleston Conference*, November 4-7, 2009. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314764>
- Givler, P. (2002). University press publishing in the United States. In R. E. Abel & L. W. Newman (Eds.), *Scholarly publishing: Books, journals, publishers and libraries in the twentieth century* (). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Koh, A. (2013-2014) Digital challenges to academic publishing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/profhacker/tag/digital-challenges-to-academic-publishing>
- Lynch, C. (2010). Imagining a university press system to support scholarship in the digital age. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 13(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0013.207>
- Maughan Perry, A.; Borchert, C. A., Deliyannides, T. S., Kosavic, A., Kennison R., & Dyas-Correia, S. (2011). Libraries as journal publishers. *Serials Review*, 37(3), 196-204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2011.10765382>
- Watkinson, A., Anderson, K., Smith, D., Woodward, H., & Renear A. (2010). Who do we trust? The meaning of brand in scholarly publishing and academic librarianship. *Charleston Conference*, November 3-6, 2010. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284314806>
- Wittenberg, K. (2010). Reimagining the university press. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 13(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0013.203>
- Woutersen-Windhower, Saskia. (2013). The future of open access publishing in the Netherlands: Constant dripping wears away the stone. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 39(1), 105-107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2012.11.015>
- Xia, J. (2009). Library publishing as a new model of scholarly communication. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 40(4), 370-383. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/jsp.40.4.370>

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?