My name is Katherine Skinner. I am the Executive Director of the Educopia Institute which is a 501c3 that was founded in 2006 to catalyze and host networks and collaborative communities. Among our other projects and programs, we currently serve as the host for the Library Publishing Coalition project, which is the two year initiative that involves 60 research libraries that really has brought us here today. They’re engaged in the founding of a new network and a new community right now, as most of you know.

The LPC project, we’ve come to call it, is fundamentally a community effort. In July 2013, it began when three universities came together with Educopia Institute to explore the possibility of launching a new organization that could bridge the libraries that are engaging in publishing activities, and do so across a lot of different models, ranges of behaviors and experiments that are going on across the field. We weren’t interested in just one flavor, and we also weren’t interested in having three institutions, which were the ones that came to Educopia with this idea, take the lead and found the organization for the community. Instead, what we wanted to do was actively engage the community in the founding of the organization.

So we did what I’ve called a “grand experiment” ever since. We threw the doors open and we said “We think that there is a need for a coalition around library publishing. We think that there is enough activity in this area that it warrants closer study and that it warrants the building of a network and a community. So come along with us if you are interested and let’s see what we can do together.” We laid out deliverables for the project; we laid out a basic game plan and literally just sent it out to the community and said “If you are interested, please join us and seed fund the project.”

Well we had 60 institutions step forward to do just that. As part of our arrangement with those institutions, what we wanted to do is not have those three institutions or Educopia start to define the parameters of this organization or the governance or lay down any of the kind of framework for where we were going. Instead, we’ve involved the community in every step of that process.

Now that means that it takes a little bit longer than if somebody had just sat down and written it down. Anything collaborate takes a little bit longer, but it also means that the eventual Library Publishing Coalition, which will officially launch later this year, will be very, very strong as a community from its onset.

The other thing that I will mark is that we have lots of strategic affiliates that are colleagues and collaborators with library publishers. From the beginning, we’ve had a vested interest in making sure that we are building relationships and building bridges across the different communities that interact in the scholarly publishing world.

That project is really where this forum begins, even though this forum is larger than that project. Many of you in the room are not part of that project, that’s great. We are glad to see you and we hope that eventually you might even become members of the Library Publishing Coalition. The forum is a space where we can gather people across communities to exchange ideas and talk about the things that are relevant to the scholarly communications cycle today.
I know that many of you, like us, had to undertake some rather adventurous journeys to get here. I want to say, I appreciate your perseverance in making it for those of you who did have travel challenges. We promise that we will make it worth all of our while.

I want to start by thanking those 60 institutions that have made this possible. They have contributed both the seed funding and the people power to enable the Library Publishing Coalition project to move forward and I would appreciate if you guys would stand and be recognized for a moment. If you represent a founding or contributing organization, please stand. It’s a really wonderful effort and I will say that most of those who stood up have not just come to this event. They have also been contributing through subgroups, working groups, and being a part of the life of the project. We greatly appreciate all of the effort.

I also want to thank our generous sponsors: bepress, Bookmaster, BiblioLabs, Public Knowledge Project, Easy ID and UP. If you can all also stand and be recognized. That generous sponsorship goes a long way. Thank you for helping to make this a reality.

Finally, I want to thank that amazing folks who have served on the program committee. As you will soon see, they have served this community well in putting together a dynamic and interactive program that is sure to lay a solid foundation for future forums it will host in the years to come. So, Sarah Beaubien, Dan Lee, Sarah Lippincott, Mark Newton, Melanie Schlosser, Marcia Stokham, Allegra Swift and Evviva Winerub, thank you so much for all of the help that you’ve given. If all of you can also stand for just a moment and be recognized.

Those are the people you go and find if you can’t find Sarah or me and something is going wrong. On that note, I know that the internet is already going wrong. I also know that that happened to SPARC. It’s not just our conference, it’s something with the way the hotel has it set up. I deeply apologize for any inconvenience that people face. Know that we will do everything in our power to try to fix it. Those of you who have hosted events know that this is always tricky and it’s always at the will of the facility rather than at the will of the host. Again, my deep apologies. We will do everything we can.

I will say that, those of you who have not already heard me say this, we also sent out the wrong password. Our apologies, they gave us the wrong password, we gave you the wrong password. It should have been a capital “E” on Educopia and it’s “Educopia 123.” We’ll announce that multiple times. We’ve also tweeted it out at this point. If you are on Twitter, you can see it, but sometimes it’s hard to get on Twitter if you can’t get on the internet. We will try to make sure that we continue to announce that over the course of the time that we are here.

We will man the registration desk to the best of our abilities. I will be out there for a good portion of this, but as you can imagine, I’m delighted to be here and I want to hear all of the speakers, too. If I leave the registration desk, know that I will leave my phone number at the registration desk. You can text me or call me at any point if something has gone awry and you need us, or you can call on any of those program committee members that you just saw.

Quick logistics, bathrooms, I was told that they are around the corner. I haven’t gone to check this out, yet, but they are evidently around the corner from the elevator. I was told “If you just walk around, you’ll find them.” So, if you just walk around, you’ll find them.

Do note that we will be hosting a reception and poster session tonight from 6 o’clock until 8 o’clock this evening. We hope you will all join us for that. It will be a lot of fun. Also note, if you are a poster bearer, hopefully we already have your poster. If we don’t, then please do bring that down. Come to the registration desk and we’ll take
care of it. All of you who do have posters and are going to be part of the poster session, please meet us at the very beginning of this first break in the little lobby area that is off to the left as we come into the room. We just want to talk to you about the poster set-up. We’ve got a lot of posters and we want to make sure everybody is happy with the way those are set up.

00:07:27-00:07:48
Also note that in your folders, there are a lot of items of relevance including a call for submissions for a forthcoming publication that is based around the ideas exchanged here at this forum. It’s not just for presenters. It is for anyone who is participating because as you’ll see, this is designed to be a very participatory event. We expect all of you to be engaged in the conversations we are going to have over the next day and a half.

00:07:48-00:08:02
Finally, there is also a flyer in there regarding the Library Publishing Coalition project that will give you a little more background on the project if you’re not familiar with it and also give you contact information if you want more information than is there.

00:08:02-00:08:23
Finally, attendee lists, I’ve already been asked several times, know that those will be sent out by email. We think it’s more effective to do than have the printed version, and then you guys can print them if you’d like to. Hopefully that doesn’t offend anybody’s sensibilities, and we will have those out to you guys. We’ll try to do that actually today so that you can see who among your colleagues are at this event.

00:08:23-00:08:44
We have quite a program in store, starting with brief introductory remarks from the Library Publishing Coalition’s awesome program manager Sarah Lippincott. I just want to thank you all for joining us today. Thanks.

00:08:44-00:09:07
Lippincott: Good morning everyone. Many of you know my voice and most of you have seen my name in your email before, I’m Sarah Lippincott, program manager for the Library Publishing Coalition and I’m very pleased to open this event, which promises to be an enriching experience for all of you here representing libraries, university presses, scholars and other publishers.

00:09:07-00:09:48
This field has a lot to be proud of and this project has a lot to be proud of over the past year. I just wanted to mention a couple of the highlights from the Library Publishing Coalition project, foremost among them, this gathering here. We have an amazing turnout for this event. It really speaks to the interest and momentum in this field. The other, our publishing library directory, which has been downloaded over 500 times since its publication last October. It’s a wonderful showcase of all of all of the activities that are going on across this field.

00:09:48-00:10:20
This event is a little bit different from others in the field. The program committee wanted to prompt discussion, sharing and conversation. The day and a half ahead was carefully designed to foster and provoke exactly that. Our theme of “Alignment” really underscores the need for this community to think about the ways in which its activities are meeting the needs of its stakeholders- scholars, students, other publishers, the broader campus communities and the library field.

00:10:20-00:10:54
Instead of spotlighting separate presentations, we are hosting panels in which some of the most accomplished leaders in our field will engage with each other in conversations about some of the most important topics of interest to the scholarly publishing community today. These panelists represent a range of viewpoints and communities including those of librarians, scholars, publishers and serve providers. Each panel will be followed by three simultaneous breakout sessions and I hope the only frustration you’ll feel while you are here is that you can’t be a part of all three at once.
The breakout sessions provide an opportunity for all of you, our participants, to become more than an audience. The breakouts will seek to engage each of your voices and the expertise each of you brings in discussing the critical issues our presenters will be raising. To that end, please note that the three rooms are intentionally capped at around 60 participants each. If there are sessions you feel particularly moved to attend, I encourage you to grab a seat early in those sessions. Those sessions take place on the pavilion level, which is accessible by the escalators in the foyer.

Also, we’ve left ample time for the networking opportunities that we know all of you are looking forward to during breaks, meals and the reception this evening. Fostering and deepening connects in the library publishing community and between library publishers and their many allies in the scholarly publishing field is a key goal of this event.

It is my pleasure to introduce our opening keynote speaker, John Unsworth. In February of 2012, John was appointed Vice Provost for Library and Technology Services and Chief Information Officer at Brandeis University where he is also university librarian and professor of English. In August 2013, he was appointed by President Obama to serve on the National Humanities Council. Before coming to Brandeis, he was dean of the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign from 2003 to 2012. In addition to being a professor at GSLIS at Illinois, he also held appointments in the department of English and on the library faculty. John is a pioneer in the field of digital humanities and his work situates him at the intersection of scholarship and the libraries. For this reason, we are really delighted that he is here with us today.

Unsworth: Good morning. Some of you will recognize the reference. My life seems to have 10-year periods to it. I’m looking back in this talk to a talk that I gave in 2005, in December of 2005 at a meeting of the Society of Scholarly Publishing in Boston, which I will come to in a minute. As I was sitting, thinking before I got up, there’s another 10 year period before that, and I’d say my interest and involvement in the subject of library publishing and the many things it can mean began at around 1995.

That was a long negotiation. It did not issue in a publication. The experience was tutelary, to say the least. I maintained an interest from that time forward in trying to figure out the proper relationships and collaboration for librarians, scholars and publishers, especially around new forms of digital scholarship. I’ll be talking about some of those topics today, nearly 20 years later. Hopefully, a little bit of wisdom with have accrued in the interval.

At that point, I was the director for the Institute of Advanced Technology and Humanities. I had started there in 1993 when they hired me by mistake. I was working with the Rossetti Archive and negotiating with Eve Trager and some other people at the University of Michigan press to make the Rossetti Archive one of the University of Michigan press’s first electronic publications.

That was a long negotiation. It did not issue in a publication. The experience was tutelary, to say the least. I maintained an interest from that time forward in trying to figure out the proper relationships and collaboration for librarians, scholars and publishers, especially around new forms of digital scholarship. I’ll be talking about some of those topics today, nearly 20 years later. Hopefully, a little bit of wisdom with have accrued in the interval.

I had a much better opening slide for the last time I talked about this. I not only invented one, but two, new professions. Interestingly, “liable-sher” hasn’t caught on. Nobody wants to be one of those. So “pubrarians” it is. I do think some of the things that we have to negotiate in this territory have to do with professional identity and how we think of ourselves in our professions.

This has intersected, for me, just recently, in the classroom as well, with the teaching I’m doing, yesterday and tomorrow. I have taught and will teach a course at Brandeis in the English Department on 20th century American bestsellers. In this course, at the moment, we are reading Babbitt, which I recommend if you haven’t read it lately. Many of us haven’t read it since high school. It’s actually a very good book and one of the things that Babbitt talks about is the rise of the professional class in America. It’s very interesting on that subject. I’ll come back to that in just a slide.
This is one marker, December 2005. In this talk on “pubrarians” and “liable-shers,” there were a number of points made, by principally, I was noting the overlap at that point in the activities of academic publishers and research libraries. I was calling at the end of the talk for the intentional development of some cross-trained professionals who would have education and experience in both professions- librarianship and publishing.

Library publishing, according to the LPC website, is based on core library values and building on the traditional skills of librarians is distinguished from other publishing fields by a preference for open-access dissemination, and a willingness to embrace informal and experimental forms of scholarly communication and to challenge the status quo. That’s not just the mission statement. That’s also a statement of professional values and aspirations.

As I was looking at that, and looking at some of the reading that we were discussing in class yesterday, I was struck by this passage in an article that we were reading from an MLA publication. This is an article about Babbitt, Mainstreet, Arrow Smith, Dodsworth, a set of novels in which Lewis really explores the rise of the professional managerial class. The author, Michael Augsburger, who wrote this as part of his dissertation and had it published by Cornell University Press, had some very interesting things to say about this. The true professional ideal, he said, encouraged doctors, layers, engineers, scientists, ministers and professors to approach their jobs as “callings” that demanded disinterested objectivity, devotion to public service, professional autonomy, and a rejection of material ambition. That’s an interesting set of values to take as defining characteristics of the professional ideal.

Elsewhere in this article, Augsburger talks about a split in the professional class and a bifurcation into what he calls “adversarial professions” and professionals who accommodate themselves to bureaucracy and capitalism. I think one of the challenges we have in the library publishing world is actually that split. We have two groups of professionals in the room, one of them is perforce, accustomed to interacting with market places, to dealing with money and to selling things. The other does not have that as part of their job description and feels vaguely queasy about all that stuff. I think that’s one of the humps that we have to get over in order to work together effectively. We have to recognize that really, if you are in academic publishing, you have a fair claim to have rejected material ambition. I mean, really.

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

This is actually a really nice round-up, this article by Nancy Herther from the University of Minnesota Libraries- a nice round-up of up-to-the-moment activities, perspectives, some from Sara Lippincott and others involved with the Library Publishing Coalition, others like Doug Armando from the University Press world, and Sandy Thatcher. There are good voices, some very interested perspectives. It’s a nice compilation of markers of the current moment.
One of the things that we learn in the piece is that there are now more university presses who are reporting through their libraries, or as part of their libraries, and that 60 libraries now belong to the Library Publishing Coalition. Well, Brandeis belongs to both of those categories. Brandeis is a contributing member of the Library Publishing Coalition, and as of last spring, the Brandeis University Press, which had reported through the president’s office, is now reporting through the library.

The story of that change is instructive. I got a call from one of my more senior managers in the president’s office who said, “This press, do we need it?” I said, “Give it to me and you won’t have to worry about it. I’ll take care of it.” The Brandeis University Press is, in my view, an incredibly important part of the Brandeis brand out there in the world. It defines us in some scholarly circles, and it is also part of the critical research infrastructure for the humanities and for the social sciences at Brandeis.

It’s unusual, in university presses, in the way that it is grounded in the campus. It is integrated; series editors come from institutes on campus many cases. It’s more connected to campus life and activity than university presses sometimes are. I take that as a good sign and it is one of the reasons that I wanted to adopt the press because I think one of the challenges that university presses have is that their activity is essentially altruist from the point of view of the university and the funders.

It is easy to see why you would give a library money and not expect them to give you money back. You give the library money because they procure collections and resources, which are used by your local constituency. It’s not at all clear in the same way that university presses provide a local good, and therefore the logic of subsidy is a lot more difficult. One of the things that I am hopeful for in the library publishing coalition is that we can change that calculus as more presses and more libraries start to work together, that there will be seen to be local goods that are not just forms of vanity publishing that accrue to the campus as a result of having a press.

I am hopeful, but we haven’t quite figured it out. Libraries, having been subsidized to produce a local good, don’t want to charge people for information. That seems like double-dipping somehow. University presses, who honestly believe in the value of the content they are producing, don’t want to think that people might pay for the format in which that content is delivered. And that’s not just university press publishers; I think that is true of publishers everywhere. It’s a little bit of an insult to think that if somebody could get the intellectual content in another thing for free, that they would pony up $9 for an ebook format just because they like reading on their Kindle.

But, in fact, that is how people behave. And nobody in this picture is fully funded for innovation, much less for altruism. So we need to grapple with those issues. There is a saying attributed to Einstein and probably to a lot of other people, it’s one of those sayings, “Not everything you can count measures- not everything that counts can be measured, and not everything you can count matters.” With respect to the Library Press Coalition, it began by focusing on the libraries and even in cases where there were presses reporting through those libraries, taking those presses off the table in the initial headcount.

I asked about this. The reason given for excluding them is reasonable, I think: to enable to direct comparison across library programs, including those who do not work with a university press. And, because the press often operates independently in terms of acquisitions, production, etc., from other library publishing activities, even if it housed within the library.

All true, very reasonable, I think, to want to compare apples to apples, especially in the early stages of defining a new kind of activity and disseminating best practices, excreta. But I am happy to see many publishers here and happy that subsequent conversations with people at the Library Publishing Coalition have made it clear that library publishing can also be an activity see to include those university presses that report up through libraries.
This is from Sarah Lippincott in the “Against the Grain” article. “Monograph publishing has been a fruitful area of collaboration between libraries and university presses. In one collaborative model, the press contributes editorial expertise and distribution mechanisms for print media,” - and “ebook” is my rubricated insertion- “while the library provides sophisticated technology for digital versions of the monograph or supplemental material.” I think it is telling that in much of this stuff that the Library Publishing Coalitions puts out and says about publishers, they are defined in some ways as an earlier version of themselves. They do print, they are not interested in open access, and they do distribution mechanisms and things like that.

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

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

In the 2005 talk, I noted a few things about the parties here. There are some things that publishers do that librarians have not traditionally done, not an exhaustive list, but it is a list that does not overlap a lot with traditional library activities. Now, there are people in this room who come from relatively venerable library publishing operations and would be able to produce examples of some of these activities, but by and large, these are things that have characterized the profession of publishing and the activity of publishing.

Libraries have a separate set of things that they do that haven’t overlapped much with things that university presses do. Some of these activities have changed quite a bit in the last 10-15 years. We don’t select in the same way that we used to in libraries, for example. We don’t do as much original cataloguing. But these are still activities that are deeply imbedded in the professional identity of librarians.

So, if we did work together, deliberately, what could we do? One thing we could do is that thing called for back in 2005, which is to educate and train “pubrarians”- cross trained professionals in publishing and libraries. The Library Publishing Coalition is involved in an effort that is focused at the University of Illinois- go Illinois! I should say “Go Illini,” excuse me, to work with that I-school to develop such a program. I would be very interested in seeing that.

We have some problems that we may be able to address together. These are also problems you’ll notice from the background that this is 2005. When we go back to 2005, it gets brown and old looking. There is no business model for preservation by publishers. This is a long story, actually. Publishers have been melting down plates forever. It’s just not their business to keep them around after they have outlived their usefulness for production.

There is no mission in libraries to work with authors. Some libraries have worked with faculty who are editing journals, or doing other things, but it’s not a…we aren’t used to working with authors as producers in the same way.
Publishers aren’t particularly trained in the organization and collection of information. Within certain boundaries and activities they do this, but it’s a particular view of the activity. And librarians aren’t trained in marketing, graphic design or business. Again, in certain domains, they do things that look like that, but that’s not really a core part of the business.

There are “pubrarians” out there. By and large, in 2005, and probably to a less extent but still in the majority today, you will find them in commercial publishers. I think university presses are in this game probably only if they are collaborating with their libraries, partly because this is a question of infrastructure and who has capitalized to have it. The particular kind of infrastructure involved here is more likely to be found either in commercial publishing or in libraries than in university presses.

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

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

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

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

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

The first thing I will take about is the HathiTrust Research Center. This offers the opportunity to develop data communities and serve data communities without lots of redundance in infrastructure. There is so much data being pooled in the HathiTrust, not just from the Google Books projects, or things that libraries themselves have digitized maybe for the Internet archive or other places, but even later, we’ll see in Knowledge Unlatched, there are multiple sources of material coming in to the HathiTrust.

It represents in some real way, the contents of an ideal research university library. There’s a lot to work with there. There are three billion pages, plus, on all subjects and many languages, about half in English. There is just a ton of opportunity, and the fact that the basic infrastructure exists, removes a huge barrier to innovation for this community. If we can figure out how to build on top of that infrastructure, we only have to deal with the part where we could produce value, not all the stuff that had to be done before that.
At Illinois, there is a grant from Mellon that has just started and is kind of a re-granting operation to work with specific projects that are interested in developing more clear understanding of the work set in the context of these huge collections. So if you are working with three billion pages, you aren’t working with three billion pages. No one can work with three billion pages.

You are working with some subset of that very large collection and how do you cut through the mass of stuff to get the subset that interests you. How do you manipulate that subset of data once you have it, how do you share results? How do you share your data, just the selected set, with other people? What happens as the work set goes through its life cycle and what are its parts? Are they different in different disciplines? Are they different in different languages? How do we understand this fundamental building block of scholarly work in the presence of big data?

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

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

Part of all of this is the rights management piece. We are very excited in the HathiTrust Research Center, right now, to be working through the final stages of a security review at Illinois and at Indiana with oversight from Michigan. That is a necessary step on the way to our being able to provide people with computational access to the copyrighted material that is in the HathiTrust. That is the 75 percent of material that you can’t get at under any circumstance right now.

Managing those rights, like building the infrastructure, is a huge undertaking which could swamp any of our efforts to build services on top of that. To give you a sense, this is the HathiTrust’s matrix of rights. I hope it’s kind of legible. It’s okay if it’s kind of illegible, too. It’s just vaguely scary. Across the top is the type of work, whether it is searchable as bibliographic information and full text, whether it is viewable, whether you can download a full PDF, whether it’s available to the data API, whether it can be printed on demand, whether it can be made available to people with print disabilities, and whether it has preservation uses. That’s the top row.

Down the left hand column, (are) types of work. For example, one type is public domain worldwide. That’s the least problematic stuff. It’s probably maybe 10 percent. Public domain in the U.S., non-U.S. works published between 1872 and 1923, works that rights holders have opened access to (HathiTrust, where rights are known and the right holder has made the work open access), works that are in copy right or of undetermined status (that would include the difficult category of orphan works, which is the last category below). And then, where are these conditions obtained? Is public domain worldwide searchable? Yes, worldwide. Is it viewable? Yes, worldwide. Are works that are public domain in the U.S. and non-U.S. works published between 1872 and 1923 searchable? Yes, worldwide. Viewable? When accessed from the United States.
categories. That in itself is a huge boon to being able to do work without ending up in court, or let’s just say, ending up in court very often. Michigan is in court all the time, but they seem to like it. They have been wining lately, so go Michigan.

00:46:26-00:47:06
This is the infrastructure that you don’t want to have to build. And like that last slide, it’s not really meant to be legible. It’s meant to be kind of vaguely scary. This is high performance computing hooked up to data stores that are provided to the research center from the HathiTrust and various processes, authentication, passing algorithms back and forth across fire walls, etcetera. (It’s) great stuff not to have to do.

00:47:06-00:47:53
Why would we do those things? Here are some of the actual interesting questions that we get…these are things that people want to do with this data. I see lots of opportunities here for us, collectively. Can we identify all the works that deal with Francis Bacon? What musical scores are in corpus? What works contain music notation? Which works have back-of-book indexes that I might analyze? How would I gather works by 16th century women? By 19th century men? Which works are fiction? Which are nonfiction? Which are essays? Poetry? How would I gather works similar to those that I currently have in hand? Can I define different kinds of similarity?

00:47:53-00:48:26
So, we didn’t make up those questions. Those are real questions that real researchers have and you can sort of see an implied research program behind those questions. They are all questions that are, in principle, answerable. They are all questions that you can’t answer right now with existing metadata. Even though, like in the Mark record, there is a place to identify genre, we don’t do that when we catalog things so it’s not in there. The gender of the author, likewise.

00:48:29-00:48:57
There are interesting computational ways to deal with some of these problems. There are all kinds of things to be learned by trying to answer questions like this. I think a combination of publishers who work with authors, and libraries who support scholarly research is a good group to be working with some of these questions.

00:48:57-00:49:30
My second example is the University Press of New England. One of my reasons for accepting the invitation to come here and talk to you is that I really see a strong opportunity here for library publishers, in particular. I understand that the focus in library publishing is and should be on open access and that implies electronic distribution for free.

00:49:30-00:50:21
However, given that we know that people will pay for format, why not offer people the chance to pay for what they can also get for free and see what they do? Why not work with a group like the University Press of New England who has a large program of publishing services and affiliates, and say, “These titles seem like they might (work)…you take them and make them into ebooks, get them up on Amazon, iTunes, all your distribution channels that you already work with, and let’s see what happens. And while you are at it, if someone wants print, make it available so they can print on demand. We think it will be too expensive, but, you know, let’s see what happens.”

00:50:21-00:51:20
I think there is enough interest in format to potentially make certain kinds of open access sustainable in economic terms, if we don’t, sort of, deliberately, cut off that market. This is what the University Press of New England is focusing on at the moment in terms of list building. They have both general interest and academic lists, and they have an interest in books for course adoption. Some of the topics here might chime with some things that you are considering doing in your own library publishing operations. If so, there might be some advantage to having those titles available to be found where people are finding other titles on those subjects.

00:51:20-00:52:07
But these are really what the UPNE focuses in their work with publishing affiliates. The topics are at the discretion of the affiliate and cover a very large range. The kinds of services that UPNE provides, manuscript editing and book design; project management; domestic and Asian print brokering; ebook production conversion; and national and international distribution to major channels including Kindle, Nook, iBooks and library ebook aggregators; financial
management and business operations; metadata management; book marketing and publicity; book sales; order entry; customer service; warehouse and fulfillment including print on demand coordination.

00:52:07-00:52:42
As a library, those are a lot of things that I don’t want to learn how to do, and I would be very happy not to have to do them. But I wouldn’t mind print-on-demand in Asia or international ebook distribution. That would be great. Ebooks are kind of the heart of the matter here at the moment. This is Doug Armado from that Against the Grain article. The ebook transition has been a major hurdle, but it is well underway.

00:52:42-00:53:21
In some ways, the biggest challenge in the academic library market is that it hasn’t transitioned to electronic fast enough and presses are still running parallel print and digital systems for library products, which is costly. So, from the library side, the ebook, the advent of ebooks, has been kind of overwhelming and confusing. Brandeis is part of an ebook pilot project in the Boston Library Consortium where we went to a bunch of publishers and got negotiated prices. No two publishers price their ebook the same, incidentally. It’s enough to make you pine for Amazon.

00:53:21-00:53:55
The pricing is all over the map. Publishers will offer you terms like, “Four people can view it and then the fifth person that looks at it, you buy…you’ve bought the book.” But another publisher will have different terms. It’s the overhead, and just figuring out what you are buying in some of these ebook deals is kind of staggering. If we could work together to make any of that easier, more rational…

00:53:55-00:54:39
I don’t think it’s that libraries aren’t interested in ebooks. They are interested in what their patrons want, and increasingly, people do want ebooks. And they are interested in technological innovation; libraries have always been interested in technological innovations. So they aren’t in some spiritual way, adverse to this. But it hasn’t been easy to figure out how to work with it. At the same time, I think Doug is absolutely right that running parallel systems is expensive and if you don’t have a system that seamlessly produces multiple outputs with a single input, it ups your cost of doing business.

00:54:39-00:55:14
My third and final example is Knowledge Unlatched. Again, many people in the room participate in that and are aware of it. I’ve been looking at things like this since I got to Brandeis. I’ve spent some time speaking to the Unglue It people; Unglue It is a kind of kickstarter model for making titles open access. It’s great, but it totally doesn’t work with library budgeting. It’s great if you are an individual, but libraries couldn’t plan a budget around Unglue It to save their lives.

00:55:14-00:55:58
Knowledge Unlatched, on the other hand, has really taken that problem and solved it in what I think is a very neat way. It represents an interesting collaboration, as well, between libraries and publishers. There is a group of libraries who select titles that are offered up by publishers, and that selection is sold, licensed as a bundle to participating libraries. Once the publisher has earned back the title fee, which the publisher gets to set, it’s not a uniform fee, then the book becomes open access with a creative commons license.

00:55:58-00:56:59
This is a way that libraries could see their subscription budget as buying books out of bondage, and that’s attractive. And you can budget it. The open access infrastructure for distribution is the European OAPEN and the HathiTrust. Some of the problems that this addresses: with more titles and fewer sales, there is more risk per title for publishers. If you contribute a book to Knowledge Unlatched as a publisher, you have basically zero risk. In fact, you are likely to have, on average, better results with that book than with your other titles because you have a guaranteed source of income for it, which there are no guarantees in publishing, I think.

00:56:59-00:57:47
(Problem two): Monograph sales being squeezed out of library budgets by journals. Libraries need to figure out how to increase open access to monograph materials. What we’ve been doing so far is providing funding for authors to pay page charges, which is okay in the sciences, but it does nothing really for you in the humanities and social
sciences. It’s just not a model that works there. Some title fee examples from Knowledge Unlatched: if you have a $10,000 title fee, and there are 250 libraries participating, the cost per library for the title is $40. $40 is not an unreasonable price to pay for a monograph.

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

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

(The second way is) supporting data communities, which I talked about before. I think that is a very real possibility right now, and one that we should jump on. Other people certainly will. (The third way is) the publishing incurration of gray literature, a lot of important scholarship and communication goes on in the form of conference proceedings. I’m involved with the Alliance of Digital Humanities organization, which puts a great deal of care into its conference proceedings every year and it is a publishing operation that they do, year in (and) year out because they want to preserve that record.

(The fourth way is) publishing faculty at edited journals experimenting with some new business models and promoting sustainable open access; those are all things that I think are on the table that we could be doing together. And, because I came out of an English PhD program in the early 1980s, I have to end with deconstructing some binary opposition for you.

Libraries versus publishers: that one is breaking down, isn’t it? Open access versus commercial: one of the things that I learned early on about the University Press of New England that interested me in knowing more about them was that they had done a simultaneous open access and on demand ebook publication in classics, of all fields, and that it had been a success. The opposition of print versus electronic: problematic. Everything is electronic to begin with, some things are electronic at the end, some things are print in the middle. I don’t think we should be slicing our world according to those oppositions.

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

Research versus publication: much more of a continuum now than it used to be. I think maybe it was always more of a continuum than it seemed, but a lot of that continuum was hidden from view- people writing letters to each other. The kind of communication and development of ideas that takes place now, on the way to publication, is much more public. It is done in blogs, it’s done in various online forums. The moment of publication, it is an interesting problem. When did you publish that idea? When it came up in a blog entry? When you published it in the ebook?
Last but not least, this is one that I think will be one of the more difficult ones to tackle, but the opposition between vanity publishing and scholarship, where vanity publishing is defined as publishing at home and scholarship is defined as publishing abroad. That one we have to get around and I don’t know how we do that other than by addressing it head on. If you are at a university that has a library publishing operation or a university press operation, publishing with your local publishers should not be a stigma. It should assume the same level of peer review that characterizes whatever else goes through those channels and we need to get past this in order to, for one thing, bring a little more of the logic of local goods and the subsidies for local goods to bear on our publishing operations.

So, that’s it. I’ll see you all again in 10 years.

Inaudible audience questions