

1-1-2014

The University Press: Trends, Initiatives, and Collaborations Over the Past Several Years

Clayton Hayes

Wayne State University, as6348@wayne.edu

Robert P. Holley

Wayne State University, aa3805@wayne.edu

Recommended Citation

Clayton Hayes , Robert P. Holley , (2014) "The university press: trends, initiatives and collaborations over the past several years", *Collection Building*, Vol. 33 Iss: 3, pp.73 - 80 doi: [10.1108/CB-03-2014-0016](https://doi.org/10.1108/CB-03-2014-0016)

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/libsp/107>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Wayne State University Libraries at DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Scholarly Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

The university press: Trends, initiatives, and collaborations

over the past several years

Clayton Hayes and Robert P. Holley

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to examine recent trends that have affected University Presses. The increased reliance on digital resources and fiscal constraints within higher education has forced University Presses to re-evaluate their position with the scholarly communication system. Responses include an increased focus on partnerships, new forms of publication, changing business models, and better meeting customers' needs.

Design/Methodology/Approach – The authors have reviewed publications on University Presses from the last five years and added their viewpoints on current and future trends.

Findings – University Presses must adapt to resource scarcity and current trends in scholarly communication to remain viable.

Practical Implications – Both University Presses and academic libraries may gain insights on how to meet the needs of researchers and scholars within a changing environment.

Originality/Value – This paper summarizes and evaluates a broad spectrum of research on University Presses.

Keywords: University Presses, Academic libraries, Scholarly communication, Open access, Patron driven acquisitions, Cooperation

Paper type: Viewpoint

Introduction

University Presses (UPs) have long been key stakeholders in the scholarly communication process by providing one of the primary means for academic faculty to publish in order to satisfy their institutions' requirements for promotion and tenure. The rise of the Internet and the increased dependence on digital information resources have caused widespread upheaval in the structure of scholarly publishing and have forced UPs (among other players) to reevaluate their position in a changing information landscape. In this paper, we will discuss the ways in which UPs have chosen to react to these changes with primary focus on the past five years. This will include the highlighting of key developments by UPs, the adoption or reaction to developments in the wider world of scholarly publishing, and the formation of partnerships with other stakeholders in the scholarly publishing process.

The history of University Presses in the United States is a long one. Clement (2011) gives a fairly comprehensive overview of that history, which is briefly outlined below. UPs developed in the latter part of the 19th century, in part due to the changes that were taking place in universities at that time. Their focus was shifting towards the production of research, and an in-house press was seen as essential to the dissemination of the university's scholarship. The first UP was likely that of Cornell University, founded in 1869. Though it later closed in 1884, a steady growth of similar presses at other institutions quickly followed. This growth continued until the early 1970s. Currently about a third of all research universities support a UP.

Though the original focus of the UP was the dissemination of scholarship produced by its host institution, especially scholarly monographs, presses began publishing more widely in order to avoid any conflict of interest on their part in the scholarly publishing process. This was especially important because of the role scholarly publishing had come to play in the promotion

and tenure of university faculty. By shifting towards the publication of scholarship independent of institution, UPs began to move from an essential role in their host institution to a more nebulous role in the wider world of scholarly publishing. UPs often became isolated from their host institutions both physically and academically; these factors have led, in the past, to occasional marginalization and, more recently, widespread economic turmoil. This turmoil has led many to question the sustainability of UPs, a question that has become all the more urgent after events such as the selling of the Iowa State University Press to Blackwell Publishing in the early 2000s, the closure of the Eastern Washington University Press in 2010, and the acquisition of the Utah State University Press by the University Press of Colorado in 2012. Needless to say, a great deal of discussion is taking place within the UP community to address this issue. Those solutions, though varied, generally fall into two categories:

1. Adoption or implementation of initiatives or developments related to scholarly publishing
2. Partnerships with other stakeholders in the scholarly publishing process

These categories will serve as a broad outline for the following discussion.

Products of UPs have traditionally fallen into three categories: monographs, journals, and reference or research databases. Lynch (2010) notes that this is still largely the case. Recent developments in technology, however, have led many scholars to investigate options outside these restrictive categories. Exploration of alternative forms of publishing may be a way for UPs to innovate and ensure their survival. Similarly, the presses must be aware of trends in both scholarly publishing and the publishing industry as a whole and identify the opportunities and challenges that come along with these trends. UP partnerships have increased in recent years as well, in many cases as a direct reaction to shrinking budgets and a need to share costs among several entities. Most often, these partnerships occur among several UPs or between a single UP

and the library system at its host institution. A discussion of these issues including some select examples follows.

Section 1: Trends and Initiatives

The sustainability of UPs in the rapidly-changing world of scholarly publishing is, as noted above, an area of much discussion. Many believe that a significant adjustment to the UPs' business model is needed in order for them to survive. Mudditt, as quoted in Bartlett (2012), describes the current scholarly publishing environment as one of "intense transition, challenge, and opportunity" and notes that the markets served by UPs are rapidly evolving due to technological factors. By establishing a new mission for the UP related specifically to this changing landscape and by developing a strategy based upon this mission, Mudditt feels that the UP can become more sustainable by becoming more efficient and economic. A key factor in all this change is embracing the digital future and understanding that it will become necessary for UPs to publish and disseminate information that is more complex than in the past. Dougherty (2010) provides a checklist for reimagining the UP into a more sustainable form and highlights areas such as a better understanding of the needs of its authors, rethinking the editorial process in order to support the scholarly reputation and economic well-being of the press, incorporating digital publishing workflows into every step of the production process, and maintaining a dialogue with both host institutions and other stakeholders in scholarly publishing. Presses have also, perhaps because they see their role in both the scholarly publishing process and in their host institution as a central one, failed to emphasize the marketing of their services. By focusing these marketing efforts at host institutions and at research universities, as described in Esosito (2010) and in Salisbury (2012a), UPs may gain back some of the ground lost due to marginalization and

may provide users with a more complete understanding of their place in the scholarly publishing process.

Open Access (OA), which has developed into an important part of the scholarly publishing sustainability discussion, is not something which can be ignored by stakeholders in the scholarly publishing process. The ideology underlying OA, that scholarly materials should be widely available and that cost should not be a barrier to access of these materials, is almost universally supported by UP directors and administrators. This is unsurprising as the mission of UPs has traditionally been to provide widespread access to quality scholarly materials that do not make sense for traditional publishers (Thatcher, 2010). According to Greenstein (2010), the integration of OA into publishing provides benefits to UPs in three compelling ways:

1. Providing academic institutions with leverage that may help to reduce the costs of academic monographs, textbooks, and journals,
2. Advancing the public service aspect of the university's mission, and
3. Providing the publisher with a connection to innovative forms of scholarly communication and their ensuing business opportunities.

Greenstein goes on to note that "...going open in academic publishing, in a well thought-out manner, makes increasingly good business sense" (2010). There are concerns, however, as to the costs involved in providing access to these materials and the effects of OA on the future of UPs. Though Thatcher expresses support for the mission of OA in scholarly publishing, he notes that UPs will have to choose, based on their financial situation, the extent to which they support OA. An exacerbating factor, as described by Thatcher, is the fact that universities in the U.S. have been reluctant to provide enough financial support to make widespread OA an option for a UP. Many UPs are also concerned with the potential OA has to disrupt their revenue streams. In the

print era, the free availability of a book in libraries did not detract from the book's sales in a significant way. For digital materials, there is a fear that providing free, online access to an e-book will cause significant competition to the purchase of the book in any form (Bartlett, 2012). Pritchard, speaking specifically on the relationship between smaller UPs and OA, expresses similar fears. Smaller UPs often rely heavily on the revenue from selling backlist titles, and it is unclear how this revenue could be recouped were the press to provide free access to that backlist. Pritchard does note, however, that a possible solution to this problem lies in providing OA to digital materials while selling print versions and that she would prefer to adopt this model before attempting to move a UP to one that is fully OA (Poynder, 2010). This reluctance to adopt a fully OA approach is common among presses, according to the Association for American University Presses [AAUP] (2013a), which reports that only 35% of member UPs support online full-text OA.

As was noted above, the interest of researchers in new forms of scholarly publishing has led many UPs to investigate alternatives to the traditional scholarly publishing model. Though the monograph will continue to be an effective vehicle for certain types of scholarly research and is not likely to be abandoned in the near future, the proliferation of digital resources means that scholars no longer need to be restrained to what, essentially, are print books hosted in an online environment (Lynch, 2010). Wittenberg (2010) suggests that alternative methods of publishing scholarship will play a key role in the future of scholarly communication and that UPs must be poised to support scholars interested in pursuing new possibilities. She suggests that UPs take a cue from technology companies and other businesses that must deal with rapidly-changing technological environments by investing in a research and development group that can develop new ideas and testable models that offer innovative solutions to issues in scholarly

communication. Lynch (2010) and Crewe (as quoted in Bartlett, 2012) provide some insight as to what these new UP products may look like. Links between arguments and the evidence underlying them can be made much more fluid and robust as can the incorporation of multimedia materials such as audio or video. With essentially no extra cost for longer works, the editorial and review process to trim manuscripts in the print world to ensure a lower price for longer works on less-accessible subjects may be reduced.

Conversely, a short, digital-only monograph can be developed as a bridge between the book and the journal article; this would provide the social sciences and humanities, traditionally monograph-focused subject areas, with a more timely method of commenting on current events (Bartlett, 2012). Several UPs, such as Princeton, Stanford, and North Carolina have already begun producing these “digital shorts,” which frequently consist of shortened or “digest” versions of popular titles (Colestock, 2012a). UPs may also take a cue from experiments in the field of journal publication by including pre-print archives, post-publication commentary, and author revisions (Bartlett, 2012). Though implementations of the latter example have been explored under the broader term Open Peer-Review by some involved in scholarly communication (Palmer, 2013), UPs as yet have not adopted them.

Several UPs have focused on specific initiatives in order to improve or expand the services that they offer. One of the most ambitious was the Minnesota Archive Editions, introduced in 2008. As reported by Howard (2008), through a partnership with Amazon, Google, and a local company (BookMobile), the University of Minnesota Press sought to provide access to nearly its entire backlist of published books. After being digitized by Amazon, these titles are full-text browsable through the Google Books service, with print-on-demand (POD) services being provided by both Amazon and BookMobile. According to Benjamin (2009a), a key factor

in the feasibility of this undertaking was an already-extant database of the University of Minnesota Press backlist and the documentation of rights held by the press for each title. Though third-party POD services have been used by UPs since at least 1998 (Thatcher, 2009), the project undertaken by the University of Minnesota Press is somewhat unique in that it involved a mass digitization of backlisted titles as opposed to the more gradual digitization used by UPs previously. This model has become a popular one according to the AAUP (2013), with 89 percent of member presses implementing some form of backlist POD or short-run digital printing program (SRDP).

SRDP, another recent development resulting from developments in digital publishing, allows UPs to publish with less economic risk. Using digital printing methods, both large and small print runs may be produced quickly and at almost the same cost per item. Thus UPs can avoid the pitfalls resulting from overestimation of a monograph's sales potential. As described by Thatcher, many UPs see POD and SRDP as providing greater financial stability (2009). POD can keep monographs in print indefinitely, while SRDP allows publishers to test out new titles and methodologies with a relatively small up-front cost. Thatcher goes so far as to say that both POD and SRDP “[have] hugely helped university presses to improve their cash flow and keep their inventory at a much lower level than hitherto feasible...” (2009).

Some UPs have also explored the integration of optimized access and applications, commonly called “apps”, for mobile computing platforms such as the iPad, iPhone, or other smartphones. Britton (2011) in particular points to apps as presenting scholarly publishers with an opportunity to develop resources in a more flexible way than PDFs allow. In 2011, the Oxford University Press (OUP) launched mobile-optimized access to all its journals, later supplemented with a service allowing authorized users to access OUP journals with mobile devices from

anywhere for six months at a time (Free, 2012). Apps for books are also a somewhat popular service, according to the AAUP (2013), with 16 percent of member presses involved in their development. According to Colestock (2011a), these book-based apps are often developed with new methods of supporting or accessing information in mind. The University of Hawaii Press has, for example, released a set of flashcards in app form to supplement a series of its Korean-language texts. The University of Chicago Press was able to take this a step farther by developing a text on gems and gemstones based on the collection at the nearby Field Museum and supplementing that text with an app that provides users with high-resolution images with zoom capabilities and three-dimensional interaction.

A major barrier to the development of these apps by UPs is, unsurprisingly, cost. Few, if any, UPs have the necessary staff to develop apps in-house, which means they must contract a third-party developer if they wish to begin producing apps. It should not be surprising that the first of the above initiatives was developed by Oxford University Press, one of the most profitable UPs in the world (Chan, 2012) and the last by the University of Chicago Press, one of the largest UPs in the United States (University of California Press, 2013). Britton (2011) points out several other issues with these apps that limit their usefulness to scholars and to UPs. First and foremost, the text within an app is not easily searchable despite the widespread availability of apps online. In addition, it is difficult for users to know whether or not the app will be useful to them without actually purchasing the app itself. The fact that these apps must be distributed through platform-specific stores also presents some difficulties in discovering the apps themselves. Apps often do not interact well with other programs, making it difficult to copy and paste content or to link to the app. Despite these shortcomings, apps pose an intriguing opportunity that UPs should continue to investigate.

Section 2: University Press Partnerships

In recent years, UPs have also begun to focus more keenly on the development of partnerships with other UPs and with libraries at their host institutions. Traditionally, UPs sought to be independent of other stakeholders in the information industry; this desire for independence, ingrained into many UP leaders, can make it difficult for partnerships to develop. Such partnerships are necessary if UPs are to survive the current economic difficulties and may become even more vital in the future as shifts in the economic and technological landscape continue to create turmoil in scholarly publishing (Benjamin, 2009b). While UPs have been mostly fiercely independent of outside influences beyond the world of UPs, collaborations between UPs have been fairly common in the past; similar missions and a mutual understanding of the need for autonomy makes such collaborations attractive to those involved. Three projects have provided much of the framework for these collaborations, and all were introduced in 1995: JSTOR, Project MUSE, and HighWire Press. Though JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization, its mission has long been to partner with academic institutions and, more recently, presses in order to provide subscribers with a more comprehensive archive of scholarly journals than any one member could collect on its own (JSTOR, 2013). Project MUSE, on the other hand, began as a collaboration between the Johns Hopkins University (JHU) Press and the Milton S. Eisenhower Library at JHU in order to provide access to JHU Press journals. In 2000, they began to incorporate the products of other UPs and scholarly publishers into Project MUSE, which has been a not-for-profit collaboration between these entities ever since (Project MUSE, 2013). HighWire Press, a development of the Stanford University Libraries, is broadly similar to Project MUSE. A major distinction between the two, though, is that HighWire was intended from the outset to be a platform used by many different publishers, societies, and UPs (HighWire, 2013).

More recently, collaborations have been developed which serve as a natural extension of the journal-related services described above to monographs; these collaborations take the form of online aggregators for the monographs produced by UPs, allowing users access to a wide array of titles from many different presses for a recurring subscription fee. One of the first attempts at an aggregator for UPs was a project of OUP called The Online Resource Center in the Humanities (TORCH), which they made available in 2003 concurrently with an online monograph platform specifically for the OUP's own titles (Polanka, 2012). The goal of TORCH was to provide smaller UPs with a digital platform that could be further developed through collaboration. Though TORCH was not successful, it was a harbinger of similar projects that have sprung up in recent years. 2011 saw the launch of two of the four major UP aggregators in existence today: OUP's University Press Scholarship Online (UPS O), and Cambridge's University Publishing Online (UPO). The remaining two, Books at JSTOR and Project MUSE's University Press Content Consortium (UPCC), appeared later in 2012.

Since their introduction, these e-book aggregators have become very popular with UPs. According to the AAUP (2013), 93 percent of member presses have an agreement with at least one such aggregator, with data from 2010 to 2012 showing that this figure has consistently been over 85 percent (AAUP, 2010, 2011, 2012). That these initiatives have been so well-received is due to the overall push for greater economic stability along with several other factors. The broad move towards digital resources and the increasing number of outlets for digital content has certainly played a part. Perhaps more important, though, to their widespread adoption is the plight of smaller UPs. Many such UPs are not well-positioned to negotiate with large, third-party vendors, nor are they able to develop content delivery platforms of their own (Polanka, 2012). These aggregators also do not require exclusivity (Colestock, 2012b), which means that UPs are

able to provide access to their materials on as many different platforms as they can afford. Though the costs of partnering with these aggregation platforms is not inconsequential, it certainly provides UPs with a wider dissemination network for their materials.

This movement can also be seen as a reaction to changing needs in academic libraries, one of the main consumers of UP materials. Academic libraries have become more concerned with flexible access, and these aggregators can be a means for providing such access (Colestock, 2012b). Salisbury (2012a) further develops this point by noting that, though most UPs are broadly similar, the needs of each UP and the institutional framework in which it resides will uniquely affect its business model. Similarly, she continues, each academic library will have its own unique needs and will want the UP to meet those needs. Attempting to satisfy each academic library to which the UP provides services would be an impossible task for an individual UP; these aggregators seek to provide a means for addressing these concerns while allowing UPs to focus on the production of content. Many such aggregators utilize a demand-driven or patron-driven acquisition (PDA) system. (The reactions of UPs to PDA will be discussed below.) There is some concern, though, that by focusing too much on these aggregators, UPs are addressing only the needs of Association of Research Libraries member libraries and are ignoring the needs of the much larger group of academic libraries that fall outside that classification. Smaller academic libraries would love to be able to subscribe to one or more of these aggregators, but the recurring costs may be too large for their already-tight budgets. They may instead prefer options that involve one-time fees and perpetual access so as to avoid any recurring costs (Salisbury, 2012a). It is important that UPs keep this fact in mind and consider other distribution methods than aggregators since alternative methods may be necessary if UPs wish to meet the needs of a broader group of institutions.

PDA is, in brief, a system by which a library pays only for those books which see actual use and is seen as the cutting edge of a revolution in how libraries purchase scholarly content (Seger & Allen, 2011). A more comprehensive definition may be found in the report prepared by Esposito, Walker, and Ehling (2013). Many argue that PDA will become the *de facto* method for collection development since methods relying on the prediction of patrons' future needs are less fiscally responsible than PDA (Anderson, 2011). UPs, however, do not necessarily favor PDA. Thatcher, in a discussion with Anderson, sees PDA as pushing UPs towards commercialization instead of publishing based on academic merit. Thatcher argues that UPs will be forced to publish based to some extent on immediate sales potential. Anderson's counter-argument revolves around the fact that libraries cannot afford to purchase UP-published materials solely to support UPs (Anderson & Thatcher, 2011). Others point out that it is the responsibility of the UP to cope with a shift away from the "just in case" model of acquisitions in academic libraries because UPs cannot force libraries to maintain previous purchasing models. PDA is seen as opening up new avenues of accessibility to UP monographs and must be taken advantage of (Seger & Allen, 2011). Indeed, PDA represents a small but growing segment of UP sales. A very rough estimate places the current UP share of the PDA market at \$2.6 million per year, while their total direct sales to libraries is in the range of \$80 million per year (Esposito, Walker, & Ehling, 2013). It is further estimated that, in the next few years, the UP share of the PDA market will grow to at least 10% of the total direct annual UP sales to libraries.

Many UPs are also investigating partnership with libraries as more and more institutions, according to Pritchard, see a strategic benefit in linking the UP and the library, a link that seems logical given the perceived similarities in administrative needs shared by the two entities (Poynder, 2010). It is also generally accepted that the challenges faced by UPs and libraries are

similar; both are struggling to cope with reduced budgets, a shift towards digital services, and the need for innovation (Poynder, 2010; Salisbury, 2012a). Though the UP has traditionally reported directly to the chief academic officer of the university, it is becoming more common these days for the UP to report instead to the dean or director of the institution's library system. Clement (2011) notes that, since the New York UP began reporting to the library director in the 1980s, this model has become increasingly popular. At least one notable exception to this trend exists; the Wayne State UP began reporting to the institution's provost in 2002 instead of to the dean of libraries. Due to the various ways in which the administration of UPs and of libraries may be arranged, the collaborations between the two entities may take on several forms. The most basic would be an open dialogue between representatives of both groups as described in Brown (2010) and Salisbury (2012b), while the most complex would be direct UP-library partnerships as investigated below.

These direct partnerships may be either a short- or long-term collaboration between separate entities or integration of the UP and the library into a single entity. Each presents unique challenges and provides unique benefits, but there are some broad similarities between the two. In general, the library is a larger entity than the UP and is often seen as being central to the mission of the institution. The UP may find that partnering with the library provides some political or financial protection along with access to resources that may aid the UP in its mission. The library, on the other hand, can gain a more rigorous understanding of the workflows involved in the production of scholarly material and will have access to new routes to interact with faculty (Clement, 2011). The institution itself will likely benefit from such a collaboration as well since bringing these two entities together can provide a more focused approach to developing the institution's "brand" in the world of scholarly communication. As UPs reach an

audience that lies largely outside of their host institution, they are seen as a key factor in this development (Alexander, 2008). As noted by Clement (2011), it is quite rare for a UP and a library to integrate; some notable exceptions are presented below.

The Oregon State University, Penn State University (PSU), Purdue University, and University of Michigan (UM) all feature some level of integration between their UPs and their library systems. The Utah State University Press was also integrated with its library system from 2010 to 2012 before being acquired by the University Press of Colorado as noted above. In the cases of PSU and UM, integration of the UP and the library has been part of a larger strategic move in how the institution handles scholarly materials. The UM library system houses Michigan Publishing, which produces and disseminates scholarly and educational materials created both internally and externally (Michigan Publishing, 2013). The UM Press, on the other hand, is a part of Michigan Publishing and focuses specifically on the subject areas of the humanities and the social sciences (University of Michigan Press, 2013). The PSU Press is similarly part of the larger PSU Libraries and Scholarly Communications, though it alone is the main publishing entity for the institution (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013). The case of Utah State may be seen as a cautionary one by indicating that the integration of a UP into the libraries is not always successful. However, the incorporation of the Utah State UP into the University Press of Colorado has allowed it to continue publication as an imprint and its time as a division of the Utah State University Libraries may have been a solution that was intentionally temporary.

An argument for a library-UP partnership on the level of complete integration may be the growing trend in academic libraries of the library-as-publisher. Many academic libraries have turned to the publishing of scholarly or locally-significant materials, often to Open Access

repositories, as an alternative to the traditional scholarly publishing framework. Some in the library world are even of the opinion that publishing, at least in digital formats, should be a core skill for academic librarians (Lefevre & Huwe, 2013). Regardless, libraries have begun to see publishing as a means by which they may bring more value to themselves and to their host institutions; 64 percent of ARL member libraries either offered or planned to offer publishing services as of 2008 (Hahn, 2008), the most recent year for which data is available. Should this trend continue, it is reasonable to expect that libraries involved in publishing will begin to encroach upon the market space of UPs. Integration of libraries and UPs, or at the very least the development of strong lines of communication, may become necessary for UPs as an act of self-preservation.

As noted above, it is far more common for UPs and libraries to collaborate as separate entities. The collaborations are, as Clement (2011) notes, often programmatic in nature; they may be marriages of convenience between groups that wish to preserve their own identities and organizational structure. These collaborations may be seen as a way to reduce administrative overhead for presses dealing with dire economic straits (Poynder, 2010), but forcing such a collaboration may be a mistake. Brown (2010) argues that they must be collaborations of individuals and not of organizations, meaning that a collaboration which does not have the support of those individuals involved in the UP and in the libraries will have a very difficult time achieving success. The needs and goals of the two groups are often quite different; and, as noted above, both are facing concerns about sustainability. It is unsurprising then that Brown (2011) insists that successful UP-library partnerships must acknowledge these concerns and be founded upon the promise of satisfying the self-interests of both groups. He goes on to outline six essential factors in successful UP-library partnerships:

1. **Communication**, both written and oral, between selected representatives from each entity on a regular basis.
2. **Well-articulated expectations** of both entities, both at the outset of the partnership and at regular intervals.
3. **Identification of the audience** of the collaboration and ensuring both entities clearly understand who falls into that group.
4. **Financial projections**, including cost projections, estimates on required staff time, and possibly projected revenues.
5. **Schedules** that delineate what needs to happen when and who is responsible.
6. **Knowing when to quit**, and being sure that both entities have an exit strategy for when the partnership is no longer a productive one.

Though no path will guarantee a successful partnership, taking the above six factors into account at the planning stages of the UP-library collaboration will provide more opportunities for a lasting and productive arrangement (Brown, 2011).

The products of any such partnership may be as varied as the UPs and libraries that initiate them. UPs and libraries may wish to collaborate in the production of a single journal or monograph; or the products of the partnership may be more widely-ranging. An example of the former that developed into the latter is the collaboration between the Wayne State University (WSU) Press and Libraries in the production of the journal *Human Biology*, as described by Neds-Fox, Crocker, and Vonderharr (2013). The development of this collaboration occurred naturally through the Press's desire that the journal have a stronger online presence coupled with the Library's interest in expanding the use of their already-existing subscription to bepress's Digital Commons service. The Library took on the responsibility of digitizing back issues of the

journal and hosting the journal in its Digital Commons repository. This was, then, a collaboration resulting from the realization that both groups had needs that could be met through cooperation. Based upon this single success, the WSU Press and Libraries began to disseminate all of the Press's journals through the Digital Commons platform. Another example, this time of a long-term strategic partnership, comes from the Australian National University (ANU) Press as described by Missingham & Kanellopoulos (2013). The ANU Press, whose history reflects that of a typical UP in the United States, established the library-managed ANU E Press in 2003 in response to several factors, including the desire to disseminate scholarship produced by ANU that had little or no commercial value and a recognition that the operational costs of the Press were getting out of hand. Though this collaboration was programmatic, it has seen success through continued advocacy and collaboration between the research community, the library, and the Press's leadership. Many of the leading Australian research universities have, as a result of this success, developed programs similar to the ANU E Press.

Two of the presented examples, that of the collaboration between Johns Hopkins University and its Press in the development of Project MUSE and that of WSU and its Press as described above, demonstrate that large-scale partnerships may develop out of smaller, simpler collaborations. Brown (2010) sees this small, first step as being essential to the success of UP-library collaborations. Too often, grandiose plans for the partnership place too much pressure on the already-overworked staffs in both organizations and, as a result, end in failure. A much better strategy is to start with a small project with low risk and low investment costs; if that project is successful, then the UP and the libraries can consider scaling up. The example of a single journal is given above; and Miller, as quoted in Polanka (2012), speculates that the joint publication of a single book may be another such small-scale project. We have already noted that the production

of digital books “enhanced” with additional content is being investigated by many UPs as a new development in scholarly publishing, and Miller points to such enhanced e-books as fertile ground for UP-library collaboration. Libraries often have experience archiving and providing access to non-traditional materials, skills that can be used in tandem with the Press’s experience in editing and production. In fact, the services most frequently provided by libraries for their UP partners are the digitization and preservation of UP materials (AAUP, 2013b). Simple interactions such as these may be the most stable benefit from these partnerships and, as in the case of WSU above, may lead to more fruitful and widespread partnerships in the future.

Conclusion

The future of UPs, and of scholarly publishing in general, is far from certain. Marginalization by host institutions, economic turmoil both internal and external, and widespread upheaval in publishing have created significant problems for UPs. Some UPs have collapsed; some have been sold off to commercial publishers; and some have been acquired by other UPs. Still more survive, though, and plan to continue to support scholarship both at their institution and in the wider academic community. With this resolve comes the acceptance that the presses must adapt their current business models in order to cope with these difficulties. Possible solutions fall into two general categories as outlined above, but a few additional trends may be gleaned from the information presented.

A few of the larger or older presses, such as Oxford, Cambridge, Stanford, Chicago, and Johns Hopkins, seem to have a more consistent, more central role both within their institution and within the world of scholarly publishing. This may provide them with additional security; and, as a result, they are better-positioned to take on the risks associated with innovation. Oxford’s TORCH served as a precursor to the UP monograph aggregators that have become

more prevalent in recent years. The NYU Press was the first of several presses to shift their place within the organization and report to the dean or director of libraries instead of the chief academic officer. Both Oxford and Chicago have begun developing apps as a way of exploring enhanced e-books and alternative forms of scholarly publishing. The University of Michigan and Penn State have integrated their presses and their libraries. Smaller presses would be wise to monitor the activities of these larger presses in order to see what works, what does not, and what lies within reach of UPs with smaller budgets.

An open dialogue between UPs and other stakeholders in the scholarly publishing process is another recurring theme. The presses serve institutions of higher education, independent scholars, and libraries of many different sizes; and it is important for the future of UPs that they keep the needs of these stakeholders in mind. UPs cannot satisfy everyone, but they should keep in mind that higher education includes more than just members of the Association of Research Libraries and that libraries are not the sole consumers of UP materials. In order for the presses to be successful, it will be necessary for them to examine how they can better serve groups beyond their traditional clientele while still meeting the needs of their core customers.

It is hoped by the authors that the examinations presented above will prove useful to others interested in the current plight of UPs. The literature gathered here should, if nothing else, provide inspiration for further research related to these long-standing members of the academic world. Further shifts in the publishing landscape, resulting from new or evolving technologies, will undoubtedly occur, necessitating further study; a thorough snapshot of the landscape as it exists at this time may provide a useful point of reference or standard for comparison. This paper may be of particular use to those that work with or around UPs. Though UPs themselves are likely well-versed in the topics presented above, these issues may be less familiar to those

working outside of the Presses. By examining the new and innovative ways in which UPs may be engaged, perhaps this paper may lead to more robust or deeper connections between UPs and those that they serve.

References

- Alexander, P. H. (2008). Publisher-library relations: What assets does a university press bring to the partnership? *Against the Grain*, 20(6), 40,42,44.
- Anderson, R. (2011). Collections 2021: The future of the library collection is not a collection. *Serials: The Journal for the Serials Community*, 24(3), 211-215. doi: 10.1629/24211
- Anderson, R., & Thatcher, S. G. (2011). A dialogue on PDA. *Against the Grain*, 23(3), 28, 30, 32.
- The Association of American University Presses. (2010). *Digital publishing in the AAUP community*. Retrieved from: <http://www.aaupnet.org/images/stories/data/0910digitalsurvey.pdf>
- The Association of American University Presses. (2011). *Digital book publishing in the AAUP community*. Retrieved from: <http://www.aaupnet.org/images/stories/data/2011digitalsurveyreport.pdf>
- The Association of American University Presses. (2012). *Digital book publishing in the AAUP community*. Retrieved from: <http://www.aaupnet.org/images/stories/data/2012digitalsurveyreport.pdf>
- The Association of American University Presses. (2013a). *Digital book publishing in the AAUP community*. Retrieved from: <http://www.aaupnet.org/images/stories/data/2013digitalsurveyreport.pdf>
- The Association of American University Presses. (2013b). *Press and library collaboration survey*. Retrieved from: http://www.aaupnet.org/images/stories/data/LibraryPressCollaboration_report.pdf
- Bartlett, R. A. (2012). University press forum 2012. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 44(1), 1-11. doi: 0.1353/scp.2012.0025
- Benjamin, M. (2009a). A view from Ithaka: An interview with Kate Wittenberg. *The Exchange*. Retrieved from: <http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publications/aaup-publications/the-exchange/the-exchange-archive/fall-2009/534-view-from-ithaka>

- Benjamin, M. (2009b). Minnesota archive editions brings the past back into print. *The Exchange*. Retrieved from: <http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publications/aaup-publications/the-exchange/the-exchange-archive/winter-2009/566-minnesota-archive-editions>
- Britton, G. (2011). Planet of the apps. *The Exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publications/aaup-publications/the-exchange/the-exchange-archive/43/269-planet-of-the-apps>
- Brown, R. (2010). From the university presses: Toward a modest agenda: academic library and university press collaborations. *Against the Grain*, 22(6), 61.
- Brown, R. (2011). *Six Characteristics of Successful Press-Library Collaboration*. Presented at the 2011 Charleston Conference, Charleston, SC. Retrieved from <http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publications/aaup-publications/the-exchange/current-issue/667-press-library-collaboration>
- Chan, J. (2012). Panel debates the future of university presses. *Publishers Weekly*, 259(50). Available from: <http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.wayne.edu/docview/1237704117?accountid=14925>
- Clement, R. (2011). Library and university press integration: A new vision for university publishing. *Journal of Library Administration*, 51(5/6), 507-528. doi: 10.1080/01930826.2011.589330
- Colestock, R. (2011a). University presses partner up with new e-book platforms. *The Exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publications/aaup-publications/the-exchange/current-issue/524-university-presses-partner-up-with-new-e-book-platforms>
- Colestock, R. (2011b). Virtual scholarship: University presses release new apps. *The Exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publications/aaup-publications/the-exchange/current-issue/525-virtual-scholarship-university-presses-release-new-apps>
- Colestock, R. (2012a). Short-form digital grows at university presses. *The Exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publications/aaup-publications/the-exchange/the-exchange-archive/summer-2012/800-short-form-publishing>
- Colestock, R. (2012b). University press e-aggregators test the waters. *The Exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publications/aaup-publications/the-exchange/current-issue/704-up-eplatforms-launch>
- Courant, P. N. (2010). What might be in store for universities' presses. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 13(2). doi: 10.3998/3336451.0013.206
- Dougherty, P. J. (2010). Reimagining the university press: A checklist for scholarly publishers. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 13(2). doi: 10.3998/3336451.0013.202

- Esposito, J. J. (2010). Stage five book publishing. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 13(2). doi: 10.3998/3336451.0013.204
- Esposito, J. J., Walker, K., & Ehling, T. (2013). PDA and the University Press. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 44(3), s1-s62. doi: 10.3138/jsp.44.3.011
- Free, D. (2012). Oxford University Press launches roaming support for mobile journals users. *College & Research Libraries News*, 73(7), 382-382.
- Greenstein, D. (2010). Next-generation university publishing: A perspective from California. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 13(2). doi: 10.3998/3336451.0013.205
- Hahn, K. L. (2008). Research library publishing services: New options for university publishing and new roles for libraries. *ARL: A Bimonthly Report on Research Library Issues & Actions* (258), 6-9. Retrieved from: <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/ar1-br-258.pdf>
- HighWire. (2013). *About HighWire Press®*. Retrieved from: <http://highwire.stanford.edu/about/>
- Howard, J. (2008). University press, with Amazon, revives and sells out-of-print books. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(14), A10. Available from: <http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.wayne.edu/docview/214645328?accountid=14925>
- JSTOR. (2013). *About our organization*. Retrieved from: <http://about.jstor.org/about>
- Lefevre, J., & Huwe, T. K. (2013). Digital publishing from the library: A new core competency. *Journal of Web Librarianship*, 7(2), 190.
- Lynch, C. (2010). Imagining a university press system to support scholarship in the digital age. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 13(2). doi: 10.3998/3336451.0013.207
- Michigan Publishing. (2013). *About*. Retrieved from: <http://www.publishing.umich.edu/about/>
- Missingham, R., & Kanellopoulos, L. (2013). A decade of change: Running a university e-press. In A. P. Brown (Ed.), *Library Publishing Toolkit* (pp. 121-126). Geneseo, NY: IDS Project Press.
- Neds-Fox, J., Crocker, L., & Vonderharr, A. (2013). Wayne State University Press and Libraries: A case study of a library and university press publishing partnership. In A. P. Brown (Ed.), *Library Publishing Toolkit* (pp. 153-160). Geneseo, NY: IDS Project Press.
- Palmer, K. (2013). *Open peer review: Bold steps towards change in scholarly communication* [Prezi slides]. Retrieved from <http://prezi.com/qxceoblqn1aa/open-peer-review-bold-steps-towards-change-in-scholarly-communication/>

- Pennsylvania State University Press (2013). *A history of the Penn State Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.psupress.org/aboutPSP/history.html>
- Polanka, S. (2012). University presses and ebooks: A new horizon. *Online*, 36(1), 53-56.
- Poynder, R. (2010). The changing of academic presses. *Information Today*, 27(6), 1, 48, 50.
- Project MUSE. (2013). *History of Project MUSE*. Retrieved from: http://muse.jhu.edu/about/history_MUSE.html
- Salisbury, L. (2012a). From a university press – Keeping the presses healthy. *Against the Grain*, 24(5), 68, 70.
- Salisbury, L. (2012b). From a university press – One size doesn't fit all. *Against the Grain*, 24(2), 50.
- Seger, R., & Allen, L. (2011). A publisher's perspective on PDA. *Against the Grain*, 23(3), 32, 34.
- Shapiro, S. (2013). JSTOR, university presses, and the serials crisis. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, 25(3), 240-242. doi: 10.1080/1941126X.2013.813319
- Thatcher, S. G. (2009). From the university presses – The hidden digital revolution in scholarly publishing: POD, SRDP, the “long tail,” and open access. *Against the Grain* 21(2), 60-63.
- Thatcher, S. G. (2010). From the university presses – What university presses think about open access. *Against the Grain*, 22(3), 56-58.
- University of California Press. (2013). *FAQs*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ucpress.edu/about.php?p=faq>
- University of Michigan Press. (2012). *About*. Retrieved from: <http://www.press.umich.edu/about>
- Wittenberg, K. (2010). Reimagining the university press. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 13(2). doi: 10.3998/3336451.0013.203