



THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN
UNIVERSITY PRESSES

The EXCHANGE

FALL 2004

CONTENTS

<i>DPubS: Open Source Publishing System</i>	1
<i>New Directory Available</i>	1
<i>Madwoman Speaks</i>	2
<i>OFAC Suit Update</i>	4
<i>Campaign for Reader Privacy</i>	4
<i>Miscellany</i>	5
<i>Issues Index</i>	
<i>Eco Task Force</i>	
<i>Font News</i>	
<i>NIH Open Access Plan</i>	6
<i>Good Literature from Small Publishers</i>	7
<i>Calendar</i>	8

STAFF

Editor: *Brenna McLaughlin*

Assistant: *Yejide Peters*

Contributing Editor, Journals:
Rob Dilworth,
Duke University Press

DPUBS

The Development of an Open Source Publishing System
by Terry Ehling

The Internet timeline is short and frenetic. The net has spawned occult acronyms, stupendous commercial failures, and now—for those of us who commerce in scholarly journals and monographs at the shallow end of the 21st century—many costly choices but few affordable options for the delivery of content.

In the less complicated 1990s university presses thought small and worked alone. The first books and journals to be distributed electronically had established marquee value in the mid-90s: *The Concise Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia* (Columbia University Press) and *The Chicago Journal of Theoretical Computer Science* (MIT) are often cited as examples of “greenfield” projects.

Technical innovations and economic pressures still cast a long shadow over the scholarly publishing community. Readers’ and users’ appetites have become more sophisticated while the cost structures for managing and delivering book and especially journal content electronically have become far more complex.

Five years ago, the Cornell University Library submitted a proposal to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for the support of the design and deployment of a mechanism and environment for the online distribution of serial literature in mathematics and statistics. Project Euclid was funded in 2000 and launched as a multi-model publishing service in early 2003. Today Euclid delivers nearly 40 journals to libraries and individuals under subscription, hosting, or open access delivery plans.

Project Euclid’s technology infrastructure is based on a modular digital library architecture and protocol developed at Cornell in the early 1990s. The model developed by the Library from this early digital library instantiation is now known as DPubS (Digital Publishing System). DPubS was designed specifically to organize, navigate, access, and deliver both open access and subscription controlled scholarly publications.

continued on page 3

AAUP 2005 DIRECTORY NOW AVAILABLE

The 2005 *Directory of University Presses* contains information on 125 presses, including AAUP’s newest member, the Edinburgh University Press. Listings for each press include contact information and editorial profiles. The *Directory* can be purchased through the University of Chicago Press at www.press.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/hfs.cgi/00/16565.cfl. AAUP members receive five free copies annually, and may purchase additional copies at a special discount. Visit www.aaupnet.org for ordering details.



AAUP & ARL
PROMOTING EFFECTIVE SCHOLARLY
COMMUNICATIONS

Index of *The Exchange* Online:
www.aaupnet.org/programs/publications/exchange

MAKING THE NUMBERS

or, The Madwoman Speaks

by Barbara Hanrahan

This talk was delivered as part of the panel "Endangered species: projects with small markets, tight budgets, and high costs," Monday, September 23, 2004, at the Midwest Presses Meeting in Oak Park, IL.

When Maggie Hivnor asked me last summer to participate in a session at Midwest Presses and to speak on the subject of acquiring "worthy projects that just do not seem to be able to make the numbers," I thought: sure, who would be better than *moi* to speak on this subject. I am certain that I personally have acquired more scholarly books that haven't sold 'worth squat' than any person attending the meeting. In fact, I'm sure I'm one of those special people who have, in the immortal words of Don Collins, "your own room in my warehouse with your full name over the door."

We all know, in these interesting days, what we are up against in terms of acquiring scholarly books. The libraries won't buy them (our own library director has declared she's buying digital first and print second); text adoptions are increasingly difficult to obtain and then to maintain; and fewer and fewer individual scholars have much interest in the concept of the personal library. As universities and colleges in increasing numbers adopt business models of operations, university presses follow suit and adopt business models as well, ones that govern every department and therefore the most basic decisions a press makes. We do this even though we know a university is not only a business any more than a university press is only a business. So, we watch expenses rise, spend increasing amounts of time wrestling with budgets, with the cost of every single thing, with overhead, and so on.

We know very well indeed how all of these pressures eventually come home to roost in the acquisitions department, and the landing is especially hard on the scholarly books. Many marketing and business departments notwithstanding, most acquiring editors are not, in my opinion, a taco short of the combination plate. We implement all the sensible strategies described just now by my colleagues on this panel:

- We try to balance the composition of the list so that we don't put all our dinosaur eggs in one handwoven basket.
- We turn away most proposals, and we make every effort to take on manuscripts that are suitable for the publishing program.

- We find the best reviewers we can, and we use all sorts of personal and professional strategies to make sure manuscripts are successfully revised and strengthened before publication.
- We work with our colleagues to enforce manuscript and disk preparation instructions; we try to edit efficiently and realistically; we try not to waste money on design and to produce books as efficiently as humanly possible.
- We encourage authors to seek subsidies from their home institutions; we work with our own development people to raise enough money in restricted funds to help publish scholarly books and put decent prices on them.
- We are constantly looking for more efficient ways to accurately identify the audiences for our books and reach those audiences effectively.

*I've decided
to be less*

"sick and tired."

And where do we end up, after all these heroic efforts? More often than not, we end up where this session began, with worthy books that just can't seem to make the numbers.

I have to digress here for a minute to report that about a month ago I was stopped by two staff members from the local comprehensive mental health facility on the grounds that they recognized me and thought I was "a patient who had gotten away" from either the adult psychiatric ward or the Alzheimer's unit. Funny, though not flattering. But as long as the game is up, I might as well make the most of things by speaking candidly.

I am sick and tired of thinking of serious scholarship as an "endangered species." I am sick and tired of constantly having to pit "worthy" against "making the numbers." I am sick and tired of feeling guilty when I receive a proposal from a young scholar in early modern studies for a book that will make a genuine contribution to the field. I know it's worthy and I know it won't make the numbers. If I acquire book projects for a university press, if that is my job as an editor, why am I on the defensive so much of the time? Why do I feel apologetic for thinking about the fields in which I acquire, trying to bring in manuscripts that will, when reviewed, edited, designed and published, strengthen a given academic discipline?

continued on page 5

DPubS, continued

This past spring Cornell University Library in partnership with the Pennsylvania State University Libraries and the Pennsylvania State University Press were awarded a \$670,000 grant to generalize and enhance the DPubS system and release the resulting improved version of the software under an open source license. The development goals for this project include:

1. *Creation of a general purpose publishing platform*

- Redesign of the DPubS User Interface Service module to allow for the implementation of a scalable and extensible XML/XSLT architecture. This major upgrade to the system will provide a growing and diverse cohort of publishers with the flexibility to cost-effectively modify the look and feel of publication-specific pages and customize any related sub-components.

- Redesign of underlying configuration and metadata services to support a full range of publishing entities and object types.

- Enhance DPubS's capability to handle non-serial literature.

2. *Provide on-line editorial management services to support "peer review" activities.* These services would provide a suite of document management tools for use by journal as well as monograph publishers. Editorial management services might include: an online manuscript submission environment, with automated alerts; a reviewer database; multiple mechanisms for distributing papers to reviewers; a tool to collect and organize feedback from reviewers; a tool to track accepted papers through the editorial and composition process; sorting/queuing capabilities for organizing prospective journal issues; access mechanisms for forthcoming articles; and the ability to publish articles or entire issues by efficiently moving final copy from the editorial workspace to the public distribution space.

3. *Enhance the administrative functionality and interface.* This work would rationalize production workflow, allowing greater segmentation of tasks and the creation of simple tools to manage lower-level processes (adding new publishers, adding new content, producing usage statistics, troubleshooting user login problems, answering mail, etc.).

4. *Provide interoperability with institutional repository systems.* We anticipate broad interest from adopters of institutional repository systems, especially DSpace and Fedora, in providing electronic publishing services via DPubS.

The first joint DPubS v.2 beta project between Cornell and Penn State will involve the delivery of *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, a publication of the Pennsylvania Historical Association, published by the Penn State University Press. Current and backfile content for this journal will be available in late 2005.

Penn State University Press has forged a strong alliance with the Penn State University Libraries (see www.aaupnet.org/arlaaup/projects/pennstate.html) and this signal relationship, supported by senior administration at the university, makes Penn State an ideal development partner for this initiative.

Cornell University Library is also working with its own Press to deliver digital editions of the Press's prestigious Comstock Publishing Associates titles, a distinguished list of general interest handbooks and reference works in the life sciences and natural history.

The DPubS v.2 collaboration between Cornell and Penn State, while focusing primarily on technology developments, is also very much about establishing a framework for an intra-institutional partnership between university presses and libraries. The project's overarching agenda involves fostering a community that will support the on-going development of an open source publishing system, and exploring sustainable business models for scholarly publishing activities within the academy.

Presses and libraries can leverage each other's strengths. Together they can offer a broad range of sophisticated, cost-effective publishing services to their communities. Our hope is that DPubS v.2 and the collaboration that will deliver this system to the stakeholders in the scholarly communications ambit, will result in a blueprint for vigorous alternative publishing and distribution programs.

Terry Ehling is Director of Electronic Publishing at Cornell University Library. Prior to her Cornell appointment, she was Manager of the Digital Projects Lab at the MIT Press.

A panel discussion on library-press collaborations and status report on DPubS v.2 developments is scheduled for the 2005 AAUP Annual Meeting.

Project Euclid: Mathematics and Statistics Journals On-line:

<http://projecteuclid.org>

DPubS: <http://dpubs.org/>

ARL & AAUP—The Year of the University Press:

<http://www.aaupnet.org/arlaaup>

UPDATE ON THE SUIT AGAINST THE TREASURY

There have been a number of positive developments in the AAUP suit against the U.S. Treasury Department and its Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC). Filed in late September by AAUP, the Professional & Scholarly Publishing division of the Association of American Publishers, PEN America, and Arcade Publishing, the suit seeks to overturn restrictions on acquiring, editing, and marketing works by people living in embargoed nations.

On October 27, the suit was bolstered by a further complaint filed in federal court by Shirin Ebadi, the Iranian human rights lawyer and 2003 Nobel Peace Prize-winner, and the Strothman Agency, a Boston-based literary agency that wishes to work with her. Ebadi hopes to write a memoir and publish it in America, which she feels is a necessary audience for greater knowledge and understanding of the complexities of life and opposition in Iran. The OFAC regulations make it impossible for any American literary agent, editor, or publisher to undertake Ebadi's work. This new suit has been joined with our original filing.

In the weeks ensuing our original filing and even more so after Ebadi's, media coverage has been widespread and extremely favorable to our arguments. Editorials have

appeared in *The New York Times*, *The Baltimore Sun*, *Rocky Mountain News*, *The Chicago Tribune*, and *The Boston Globe*; and additional op-ed columns have run in *The Washington Post*, *The Christian Science Monitor*, CNN.com, and others. The *Times* also published an op-ed by Shirin Ebadi herself, which fact of publication highlighted one of the most troubling aspects of the OFAC regulations: their sheer inconsistency and absurd application. OFAC has declared that the editing of op-ed pieces by newspapers is exempt from their regulations, although the practical differences are nigh impossible to articulate.

The most recent development has been a request from government lawyers to delay responding to our filing until the new year. The reasons for this request give some cause for optimism on our part. The Treasury Department has decided to amend the regulations at issue, probably before the end of the year. It is hoped that these changes will see a removal of OFAC's assertion of extralegal authority to regulate the free flow of "information and informational materials."

To learn more about the suit, please visit: www.aaupnet.org/ofac.

THE CAMPAIGN FOR READER PRIVACY

Amending the PATRIOT Act

Surprisingly quickly after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the U.S. Congress passed the unwieldy USA PATRIOT Act, which gave sweeping new powers to law enforcement in terror investigations. Not surprisingly, the urgency with which this became law masked a bill that contains as many problems as it does needed reforms.

Amongst those problems is the now infamous Section 215. This section allows the FBI, without showing of probable cause, to order any person or entity to turn over "any tangible things," so long as the FBI "specif[ies]" that the order is "for an authorized investigation...to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities."

Librarians and booksellers, whose records of First Amendment-protected activities are suddenly open to the FBI at whim, have led the charge to amend this provision of the PATRIOT Act. Publishers are also concerned by Section 215, and not only because of commitments to reader privacy.

If, for example, the FBI becomes interested in a book about terrorism and wants to pursue the author for more information, all of the publisher's records

pertaining to the book, including but not limited to editorial correspondence, proposals, drafts of the manuscript, marked-up proof and royalty statements, would be subject to seizure. Similarly, Section 215 could...[allow] the government to obtain without judicial safeguards information about subscribers to various publications, notably scientific journals. As Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas wrote: "Once the government can demand of a publisher the names of the purchasers of his publications, the free press as we know it disappears."

—quoted from www.readerprivacy.org

Members of both the AAUP and the Association of American Publishers have joined the Campaign for Reader Privacy, to help gather at least one million signatures demanding an amendment of Section 215.

Individuals and press representatives are invited to visit the web site of the campaign: www.readerprivacy.org. There you can sign the petition, learn more about Section 215, or sign on to an industry letter of support for the campaign.

Making the numbers, continued

During the limited time I have left before I am re-apprehended and institutionalized, I've decided, too, to pursue the goal of being less sick and tired than I was in the last paragraph. How will I do that? Well, I'm making our Editorial Board a staunch and sturdy ally. I ask important and influential faculty to serve on the Board. I make sure we discuss the "endangered species" problem directly. I also make it clear to them that I need their active support and that I expect it, not just in Board meetings but in department and divisional meetings as well, in terms of arguing for subsidy funds for faculty publications.

I make it a point to have lunch with every chair in the humanities and the traditional social sciences to make sure they understand what the press does and what challenges are facing their younger colleagues. I go to job talks when there is a significant hire about to take place. I offer to talk to graduate students about publishing. I'm working

to set up two internships for bright undergraduates, thus strengthening the press's ties with humanities departments.

I make it my business to know the Dean of Arts & Letters and the associate deans as well. I want them to keep the press's needs in mind when they work on budgets or when they receive special grants from alumni and other donors. I am building a solid relationship with at least two development officers: I don't ask for huge amounts of money, but I do ask them to help me identify those willing to provide support for scholarship in specific fields.

In other words, it seems to me that it is still the university's responsibility to make a contribution to the publication and dissemination of serious scholarship, and I intend to keep reminding them of that responsibility.

Barbara Hanrahan is Director, University of Notre Dame Press.

MISCELLANY

Issues Index

A new resource on the AAUP web site, www.aaupnet.org, is the Index of Issues in Scholarly Publishing. The Index contains links to information about some of the issues that are of particular importance to the Association and scholarly publishers. Topics covered currently are:

- The Future of Scholarly Publishing
- Copyright
- The First Amendment
- OFAC Suit
- Open Access

Information linked to includes press releases, other online resources, relevant articles and conference proceedings, AAUP statements, and member alerts. Please visit the Index at www.aaupnet.org/aboutup/issues. If you would like to suggest additional topics or links, please contact Brenna McLaughlin at bmclaughlin@aaupnet.org.

Eco Task Force

As written of in the Summer 2004 *Exchange* ("Paper Pushing") Deborah Bruner of Cornell and Tony Crouch of California have long worked for the adoption of environmentally responsible practices at university presses. In November of this year, they formed a "green" task force to take on some of the necessary work of advocacy and coordination. Bruner will serve as chair, and in addition to Crouch, the committee

will consist of Julia Fauci, Design and Production Manager, Northern Illinois University Press; Holly Keller, Assistant Director—Production and Editorial Services, University of British Columbia Press; and Karen Schmidt, Production Manager, Getty Publications.

The task force will set its goals more firmly in 2005, but the general aims of the group are to serve as a resource for the AAUP community at large, helping other presses join the Green Press and Markets Initiatives, and to spread the word about university press eco-friendly practices to other indie and trade publishers.

Stay tuned for more information from the new eco task force. If you have questions or suggestions, please contact Deb Bruner at dnb5@cornell.edu.

Font News

The Society for Biblical Literature, a member of AAUP, has issued an Opentype/Unicode Hebrew font to ease the communication difficulties that scholars and publishers of the ancient world and biblical studies have long experienced. The new font is designed to look well on both screen and page and transfer easily between computers. SBL, along with the SBL Font Foundation and Tiro Typeworks, plans to issue Opentype/Unicode fonts for Greek and other ancient languages. Please visit www.sbl-site.org for more information.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH OPEN ACCESS PLAN: RESPONSES

On November 16, the period closed for public comment on the controversial National Institutes for Health (NIH) proposal to require the deposit of peer-reviewed and accepted articles that result from NIH-funded research in PubMed Central for open access after six months. The NIH has requested additional time to read and consider the more than 6000 responses submitted. On November 20, Congress signaled its approval of the plan through an acknowledgment of the proposal in the conference report on the recent omnibus appropriations bill, but did direct the NIH to give “full and fair consideration to all comments before publishing its final policy.” Following is a summary of many of the arguments that have been presented against the NIH proposal.

- While commonly referred to as the NIH’s “Open Access” policy, opponents of the proposal have no beef with the general idea of Open Access (OA) publishing. Many criticisms of the plan arise from the fact that it would mandate one particular model of OA publication, possibly retarding the dynamic development of the most sustainable and appropriate OA models.

- Some publications, notably *The New England Journal of Medicine*, make their content freely available via the web six months after publication, as called for by the NIH. This time frame is not sustainable for many society journals, particularly those that publish quarterly. Scientific and scholarly societies often rely on the subscription income from journals to fund other society activities—including research programs.

- Several patient advocate organizations, including the American Cancer Society, American Diabetes Association, and American Heart Association, have expressed their opposition to the NIH proposal. These organizations have expressed several major concerns, including the probable shift of NIH funds away from research and into supporting the infrastructure that this proposal will require; and that it is the wrong solution to the problem of improving access to medical information for patients. Studies have shown that patients are best served by well-presented information on widely accepted medical findings, and that access to very new research out of context is often of little use in improving patient care, health, or education. The three associations have already partnered with publishers to launch a program of patient education called patientINFORM, announced in early December. To be in any way useful to patients, these

associations argue, the government repository would need to be easily searchable and present contextual information for a bare research article.

- “Taxpayer interest groups” are staking claims on either side of this proposal. A group named the Association for Taxpayer Access argues that American taxpayers should have free access to the peer-reviewed articles that discuss research funded by the NIH. Another group, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste has weighed in against a plan that comes with no cost estimate and has so far seen little official evaluation of consequences. Many see the NIH proposal as both badly reinventing the wheel and demonstrating a dangerous naïveté about the costs of electronic publishing. Stanford University has pointed out that its Highwire Press initiative—working with several nonprofit publishers—has made considerably more research openly available than the government’s own efforts through PubMed Central. Successful models such as Highwire should be a part of any attempt to widen public access to medical research.

- What precedent does this set? The federal government funds research in a wide range of fields, which results in far more than just the publication of peer-reviewed journal articles. For example, patents for drugs developed with federal dollars are surely open to similar claims of “taxpayer access.”

- The troubling question of government control of the scientific record is one that has not been answered, and probably cannot be satisfactorily so. Laws currently on the books, such as the Data Quality Act, require any federal agency that makes information available to the public to respond to public criticism; the response may include modification or removal of the information. The integrity of posted research in areas that may be politically unpopular could be at stake.

- Finally, many scientists are worried about the integrity of the peer review system and scholarly record as a whole. Journal publishers now undertake the costly peer review process. Furthermore, implementation of the proposal seems to entail that there would be two “published” versions of each article: the author’s final manuscript posted on the NIH server, and the publisher’s edited and corrected version, complete with any post-publication errata. In essence, this means that the government’s version—available to the public—could well be less than reliable.

A DEFENSE OF GOOD BOOKS, SMALL PUBLISHERS, AND NATIONAL AWARDS

by Susan Betz

The 2004 National Book Awards, recently announced, proved—oddly—more controversial than the 2003 edition. In 2003, you may recall, the National Book Foundation recognized genre writer Stephen King for his contributions to American letters. Horrors! (Pun, of course, intended.) In 2004, however, controversy settled on the fiction award shortlist. All the books were short (gasp!), written by women (stop!), who live in New York City (nooo!), and had low sales figures (um, what?). Yes, that's right—low sales figures. Reputable newspapers filled column inches with the singular theory that literary success and commercial success must be judged as one in order for American literacy to survive. This inspired Susan Betz of Northwestern University Press to an eloquent defense (below) of the work university and other smaller presses do in finding and publishing literature of great cultural value.

*In addition to the Northwestern title included on the fiction shortlist, other AAUP members were represented in the 2004 National Book Awards. The winner in the poetry category is Jean Valentine's *Door in the Mountain*, published by Wesleyan University Press. Washington's *Crossing* by David Hackett Fischer from Oxford University Press was a finalist for the nonfiction award. —Editor*

I'm the Northwestern University Press editor who acquired Christine Schutt's novel *Florida*, the National Book Award finalist cited for low sales in the opening line of "New Novels, Big Awards, No Readers" by Edward Wyatt in *The New York Times* on October 17.

I don't think anyone would argue that the worth of a work of art or even a product can be determined by its sales. It's pretty much a given that high revenue from books, TV shows, movies, even food, don't indicate anything about quality. So the value of Christine's work is not up for debate. It's a wonderful book, and she is a gifted writer who deserves wide recognition.

The issue seems to be whether recognition of a work published by a small press—with its low print runs and minimal advertising budget—somehow hurts the publishing industry as a whole, "closing [us] off from the culture at large" and "not helping the book business."

These comments left me perplexed. Yes, we are a small nonprofit press. We have only one acquisitions editor and one acquisitions assistant handling sixty titles per year; our budget is limited; and our print runs are usually around two thousand.

But none of that affects the quality of our books or their appeal. People do have to find their own way to our fiction, poetry, and theater books, unaided by directives in *The New York Times*, *The New Yorker*, and other venues that large houses rely on for advertising. Many of our sales are to libraries, to universities for course adoption, or directly to the reader through conferences. Our fiction and poetry lists depend on readers and reviewers who can evaluate a work without the benefit of an ad campaign or, often, even a press release.

The great thing is that even though in the corporate world success seems impossible without a huge budget, sometimes talent and dedication do pay off, at least in terms of recognition. We have other award winners on our list (see www.nupress.northwestern.edu), from Imre Kertész (Nobel Prize) and William Meredith (National Book Award) to Robert Rosenstone (Barnes and Noble Discover New Writers) and prizewinning translators. It is appropriate that the playwright Mary Zimmerman publishes with our small press. Her play *Metamorphoses* had its roots here at Northwestern University and of its own power moved from venue to venue, ultimately winning her a Tony Award for best director. But no one would argue that when the play premiered at Lookingglass Theatre in Chicago for a local audience it wasn't a brilliant work, beneficial to theater as a whole.

Generally, when a worthy and previously unrecognized artist of any sort receives attention, it encourages everyone who feels overwhelmed by the odds. So Christine Schutt's nomination should have a positive, rather than a negative, impact on the publishing industry. Many readers have already benefited by finding out about a work they might not have otherwise read. New writers benefit because they will feel there is hope, and there might be future award winners among them. And the publishing industry overall will benefit, because the nominations show readers that we have their interests, not just our profits, at heart. And best of all for me as an editor, Northwestern University Press will be encouraged to continue publishing fiction and poetry.

Susan Betz is Editor-in-Chief, Northwestern University Press.

CALENDAR

Modern Language Association

December 27-30, 2004

Philadelphia, PA

AAP Professional and Scholarly Publishing Division

Annual Meeting

February 7-9, 2005

Washington, DC

Southern University Presses

February 25-27, 2005

Lexington, KY

AAUP Financial Officers Meeting

March 3-5, 2005

Santa Fe, NM

Humanities Advocacy Day

April 6-7, 2005

Washington, DC

BookExpo America

June 3-5, 2005

New York, NY

AAUP Production Managers Meeting

June 15-16, 2005

Philadelphia, PA

2005 AAUP Annual Meeting

June 16-19, 2005

Philadelphia, PA

2005 American Library Association Conference

June 23-29, 2005

Chicago, IL

2006 AAUP Annual Meeting

June 15-18, 2006

New Orleans, LA



THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITY PRESSES
71 WEST 23RD STREET, SUITE 901
NEW YORK, NY 10010