



THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN
UNIVERSITY PRESSES

The EXCHANGE

SPRING 2009

CONTENTS

<i>E-Duke Books Tests New Model</i>	1
<i>Tracing the Effects of the Google Settlement</i>	2
<i>A Conference is a Place</i>	3
<i>Practical Advice on Bridging the Library-Press Divide</i>	4
<i>Making Information Pay 2009</i>	5
<i>Advocating for the Humanities</i>	5
<i>Miscellany</i>	10
<i>Calendar</i>	11

STAFF

Meredith Benjamin
Editor

Brenna McLaughlin
Electronic & Strategic Initiatives
Director

E-DUKE BOOKS TESTS NEW MODEL

By Meredith Benjamin
Communications Coordinator, AAUP

Laments on the plight of the monograph abound of late, but Duke University Press is attempting to shake things up with its new program, the e-Duke Books Scholarly Collection. Modeled on the pricing structure of the e-Duke Journals Scholarly Collection, e-Duke Books offers online access to at least 100 new titles per year to subscribing libraries, in addition to access to many of the press's backlist titles.

Michael McCullough, sales manager for the press, explained that director Steve Cohn "has been a driving force behind this for a number of years," and had long been seeking to address "two separate but complementary problems," that is, the decline in sales to academic libraries, and the challenge of finding the best way to make the press's books available in digital form. As Cohn saw these two issues converging, he and his staff began to look into ways to address them, while "control[ling] our content as much as possible," and without using multiple aggregators.

The e-Duke Books collection will include at least 100 new electronic books published by the press each year. The press typically publishes 115-120 new titles in a given year, and plans to include the great majority of these titles in the collection, excluding only "titles of regional or popular interest or titles to which Duke does not hold electronic rights."

The press launched a pilot version of the program in 2008, with the participation of 19 U.S. and Canadian libraries. Following a successful run with the pilot program, the press launched a full version in 2009. Collection prices are based on institutions' 2005 Basic Carnegie Classifications, and range from \$500 to \$6,000 per year.

By ordering, libraries also receive access to the over 900 Duke University Press backlist books which are currently available in digital form. As the program continues, this backlist will grow in two ways. The 100+ new books that are included in the collection in a given year will become part of the backlist in subsequent years. Additionally, Duke expects to continue the work of digitizing older titles, further increasing the scope of their available backlist.

Offering such a large swath of its backlist as part of the collection required a substantial amount of digitization work. Some of the press's titles had already been digitized through BiblioVault, funded by a grant which offered free or low-cost digitization services to university presses. That provided a head start for the press, although the remaining titles have required "fair amount of staff time" from the production department. The digitization efforts will also allow Duke to offer a single-title purchase model of e-books to libraries beginning this summer.

TRACING THE EFFECTS OF THE GOOGLE SETTLEMENT

By Daphne Ireland

Director of Intellectual Property and Documentary Publishing, Princeton University Press

Everyone is talking about the Google settlement. On March 13 the Columbia Law School hosted “The Google Settlement: What Will It Mean for the Long Term?” a day-long symposium with exceptional speakers assembled from the publishing, legal, and academic spheres. Conference attendees, including nine rights professionals from AAUP presses, were privileged to hear expert debate on a broad continuum of issues. The day began by considering whether this class action settlement has the effect of legislation, continued with discussion of anti-trust concerns, and moved to projections about the future of book publishing, Google Book Search as compulsory license, and possible complementary orphan works legislation.

The first session of the day was “Legislating through Settlement.” Mary Beth Peters, U.S. Register of Copyrights, observed that the settlement has a legislative effect without having been considered or approved by Congress. It incorporates aspects of legislation for orphan works, Section 108 library exceptions, treaty obligations, and compulsory licensing. Peters said she had many unanswered questions, including whether the Settlement is actually a compulsory license for the benefit of one company and what effect it might have on foreign authors and journal articles. She found it interesting that she had not been asked by Congress to comment on or study the scope of Settlement.

The technical aspects of the anti-trust question were addressed in “Competition Issues” by Randal C. Picker, Professor of Commercial Law at University of Chicago Law School. He identified in the Settlement three key features to measure how easily they might be multiplied to allow competition: digital files, scope of the rights license, and the mechanism of the Registry. How would competitors gain access to digital scans: will they negotiate anew with libraries for their own access and scanning, or will Google allow copying of their digital files? Is the scope of the settlement’s rights license able to be multiplied among competitors? Is it possible to have multiple registries? For Picker, the core of the settlement is its “one-way most favored nation clause,” which guarantees no other party can be offered license terms that are more favorable than Google’s terms in the settlement. Another anti-trust consideration is that even with competitors in this digital marketplace, Google could privilege its own book material through its Google

search engine results ranking. Picker sketched an intriguing analogy between Google’s search engine/digital file access regime and the public utility access regime of the nation’s electricity grid. Finally, he explored the idea of the settlement as a compulsory license, where exclusive right holders are required to license works without prior approval on the condition that they receive royalties – similar to ASCAP and BMI in the music industry.

In “The Future of ‘Books’,” Richard Sarnoff, a chairman at Bertelsmann and Chairman of the Board of the Association of American Publishers (AAP), described the settlement as a confirmation of copyright law that sets up a mutually beneficial framework to speed the co-existence of print and digital publishing. Alan Adler, AAP, explained that it looks backward to resolve litigation and creates a path forward by designing a licensing structure to plug in with other competitors. He suggested that publishers may decide to place new works not covered by settlement terms (i.e., those copyrighted after January 5, 2009) under a Google Partner Program contract, the terms of which will likely parallel settlement terms. Lois Wasoff, former counsel at Houghton Mifflin, confessed to everyone’s relief that the settlement is “a little tough to get your arms around.” Business model and contract differences mean implications will be different among trade publishers, STM publishers, and university presses. Wasoff reported that most publishers will likely opt-in to the settlement, remove many of their works, and continue to participate in Google Book Search through the Partner Program. Richard Sarnoff summarized it well: “If you look at the settlement, there’s one thing that’s shot absolutely through it. It is the rights holder’s choice—in every possible circumstance—that rules what happens with the rights holder’s works. Outside of what I hope will be a radically shrinking number of truly orphaned works that are never claimed by anyone (and even within those, I hope with the right legislation we can handle them more actively), you are going to have the rights holder deciding whether the book will be in there in the first place, what the display uses are... and pricing...The entire settlement is set up with the full flexibility to decide how their work is to be used by Google or by anybody else.”

Authors’ opinions were surveyed in the panel “Authors and Incentives.” Jan Constantine, counsel for the Authors’

continued on page 6

A CONFERENCE IS A PLACE

Tools of Change 2009 and Other Interesting Meetings

By Brenna McLaughlin

Electronic and Strategic Initiative Director, AAUP

In February, I attended the third O'Reilly Tools of Change for Publishing conference (TOC) at the Times Square Marriott Marquis in New York. I found myself thinking that the ecstatic vision of a changed human relationship with “content” is growing stale apace, even as e-publishing platforms, models, and devices become a more workable reality.

As the economic picture seemed to get bleaker each day, it was mildly surprising how few of the sessions made reference to how the changing financial climate may affect not only publishers' ability to retool, but readers' desire to pay for gadgets and access. To be fair, this conference (like some others we're familiar with!) suffers from an embarrassment of interesting session topics scheduled concurrently, so I hope that I simply missed the speakers who addressed the economic downturn. And once again the buzz of interest in the hallways and breaks and the information about new platforms and working models shared freely by the attendees more than balanced out the occasional empty blast of rhetoric.

As I wandered from session to session with a (paper) notebook and a cranky PDA that refused to log on to the conference WiFi, my fellow attendees demonstrated the power of one “tool of change” as they twittered up a storm. While drinking in the tips and stories from one set of panelists, anyone with a connected laptop, netbook, or the ubiquitous iPhone freely eavesdropped on the other sessions. In one respect, this was fantastic—you didn't have to miss much. In another, it easily led to what one such equipped colleague ruefully termed “session envy” as I shamelessly peered over her shoulder to get a look at what was going on down the hall. (Interestingly, in May a paper analyzing the effect active twittering has on academic conference attendees was released.)

Fortunately, it is still possible to virtually attend many of the sessions, and at more than 140 often-cryptic characters at a time, too. The TOC 2009 web site makes available videos of many of the sessions, presentation files, and access to lively and continuing discussions via the conference blog, Twitter, and Facebook page. Go to <http://www.toccon.com/toc2009> for an immersion into the events and ideas of the conference. If that's not enough, the 2010 TOC is scheduled for February 22-24 in New York City.

One of the videos available is of Bob Stein's talk “A Book is a Place...” Stein, founder of the Institute for the Future of the Book, spoke of his concept of a book as a place to meet and discuss and learn; it's a concept that the Institute's projects—CommentPress, Sophie, and the networked books they've supported—have all been reaching for. The day before the Tools of Change Conference began, Stein hosted a small meeting of mostly scholarly publishing representatives and the CEO of GiantChair, a Paris-based digital distribution platform. The group, including folks from NYU, MIT, Duke, the Michigan Office of Scholarly Publishing, and California amongst others, brainstormed about the role of publishers and possibilities of collaboration both upstream and down in a digital book environment.

It was clear that the usual suspects will continue to dog university press and other scholarly e-initiatives: sorting out rights and the dirty question of financial support. But it was also clear that local realities could lead to successful ventures for university presses. Harvard shared a bit of their experience launching the *Journal of Legal Analysis*, an open-access, peer-reviewed journal of law scholarship supported by and developed from the university's law school. California indicated that they had seen—and filled—a need by developing a suite of publication services available to units across the California system, UCPubS. Both of these initiatives are fairly new, and each press is waiting to judge its effects, but they are hopeful signs of the innovation and cooperation possible amongst the scholarly communications community.

Twitter and academic conferences:

<http://apo.org.au/research/how-people-are-using-twitter-during-conferences>

“A Book is a Place”

<http://toccon.blip.tv/file/1781125/>

Journal of Legal Analysis:

<https://ojs.hup.harvard.edu/index.php/jla>

UPCPubs

<http://www.ucpress.edu/pubservices/>

PRACTICAL ADVICE ON BRIDGING THE LIBRARY-PRESS DIVIDE

New Resource Center for Campus-Based Publishing Partnerships

By Meredith Benjamin

Communications Coordinator, AAUP

Libraries and university presses have always been inextricably bound up in each other's success. While at its best this relationship can provide extensive benefits to the whole of scholarly communication, too often a lack of common understanding has led to conflicting interests. With the advent of digital publishing and the demand for new methods of scholarly communication, the need for the two institutions to share their strengths and resources is increasingly evident.

The Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition's (SPARC) new Campus-Based Publishing Partnerships Resource Center is designed to help institutions meet that need. SPARC Senior Consultant Raym Crow explained that the idea for the guide and resource center came from "a meeting on library-press collaborations in June 2007, sponsored by the libraries and presses of the University of California and the University of Michigan." Crow said that participants at the meeting, all actively involved in collaborative publishing initiatives, were "describ[ing] a common set of issues that they needed to address," and it became clear that there was "a great deal of duplicative effort being expended as new partnerships wrestled with the same issues."

It was this convergence of concerns that led Crow to create the "Guide to Critical Issues." The guide is a five-part, comprehensive overview of what form these partnerships might take and practical considerations of how they might work.

Out of the guide grew the web resource center, which expands on issues covered therein, and keeps the information in the guide dynamic and relevant. Among the resources available are case studies, a bibliography, and LIBPRESS, an email list devoted to discussion of publishing partnerships. The resource is unique in that it gathered perspectives from librarians, press staff, and some who are straddling the divide (such as Monica McCormick, Program Officer for Digital Scholarly Publishing at New York University).

The guide and case studies are focused specifically on library-press collaborations, but the guide's introduction

indicates that "most of the discussion applies as well to other academic units that may participate in campus-based publishing partnerships."

The accompanying resources have been compiled by the editorial board, which was formed after the completion of the guide to direct and support the web resource. Crow emphasized the collaborative and interactive nature of the resource center, explaining that it is "designed to grow based on user feedback and participation." Presses are encouraged both to submit sample planning documents and resources, and to submit suggestions on topics that they feel should be

There was "a
great deal of
duplicative effort
being expended as
new partnerships
wrestled with the
same issues."

added or expanded to make the resources practically useful. The direction and experience of the editorial board has been particularly valuable in developing these resources, says Crow: "These are people who know what's relevant, what's current, and what's needed by participants on both the press and library sides of a partnership." Laura Cerruti, Director of Digital Content Development at the University of California Press, and Catherine Mitchell, Director of the California Digital Library's e-Scholarship Publishing Program at the University of California, are both editorial board members who bring to the table their experience of collaboration on University of California

Publishing Services (UCPubS). Mitchell described how the two organizations had been "unofficially collaborating in an episodic or opportunistic way," and eventually came to the realization that they lacked "any kind of ongoing formal relationship that took into account the formal structure of the collaboration." It was at this point that they decided to work with Crow, as they "decided one-off projects were not going to be sustainable in the long-run," and establish a more formal collaboration that takes into account "sustainability and scalability."

UCPubS combines the open access expertise of the library with the production, print-on-demand, marketing, and distribution strengths of the press to serve the wider University of California community. Cerruti commented that it was a "reality check" for both the press and the library when Crow helped them put numbers to things and

continued on page 8

MAKING INFORMATION PAY 2009

By Meredith Benjamin

Communications Coordinator, AAUP

The Book Industry Study Group (BISG) presented its sixth annual Making Information Pay conference on May 7, at the McGraw-Hill Auditorium in New York. The conference's focus this year was "Shifting Sales Channels: and what publishers are doing about them" and featured presentations by eight industry leaders, in addition to remarks by BISG Executive Director Michael Healy.

As Healy made his opening remarks, hash tags for those intending to twitter the conference were displayed. And twitter they did: read tweets on the program by searching #mip or #BISG.

The first half of the program, entitled "State of the Markets," focused on the question "What's really going on today?" which Healy described as the genesis of the program.

Leigh Watson Healy, chief analyst for the advisory firm Outsell, Inc., gave the keynote speech and emphasized that the current recession will fundamentally change the market: "we have seen the last vestiges of the industrial age, [and are] now moving truly to the knowledge age." Hackneyed as it may be, she said the catchphrase "flat is the new up" was confirmed by BISG data. On an encouraging note for university presses, the companies

she sees thriving are "market share/brand leaders, and innovators/boutiques." The increasing importance of specialization and niche markets was addressed several times throughout the morning.

Jim King of Nielsen BookScan US and Kelly Gallagher of R.R. Bowker gave presentations on the strategic use of data, on retailers and book buyers, respectively. King encouraged publishers to look closely at data on BISAC categories—in particular the very specific subcategories—to determine trends. He also noted that BookScan just began tracking book sales in non-traditional outlets (i.e., supermarkets) in 2008, and there are other venues, including digital downloads and comic book stores, that they have yet to begin tracking. Gallagher suggested that publishers do not always know their customers well enough, and need to look more closely at the data on book buyers. He also emphasized that the majority of "book awareness" (where a customer first learned of a book) is now coming from online sources.

A particularly engaging presentation kicking off the "Publishing Innovations" portion of the program came from Dominique Raccah, publisher and CEO of

continued on page 9

HUMANITIES ADVOCACY IN 2009

By Brenna McLaughlin

Electronic and Strategic Initiatives Director, AAUP

On March 11, 380 representatives of universities, colleges, museums, historical and scholarly societies, humanities councils, and (of course) scholarly publishers fanned out across Capitol Hill to make the case for continued support and increased funding of federal humanities agencies. Big numbers were the theme of the 2009 National Humanities Alliance (NHA) Annual Conference and Humanities Advocacy Day. The NHA was requesting an additional \$75 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and a total (grants plus administration) of \$22 million for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC).

These big numbers were justified by the much smaller number that NHA presented to delegates: 16%. That is the rate at which the NEH was able to fund competitive, peer-reviewed proposals, as compared to the 26% funding rate for merit-reviewed projects at the National Science

Foundation. As a result, the NHA request was specifically geared toward increasing the funding available to the core programs of the NEH, including preservation and access, education, and research. At its funding peak in 1979, the Endowment demonstrated the capacity to operate at much higher funding levels (\$431 million adjusted for inflation). The NHPRC is up for reauthorization, and humanities advocates hope to double its funding limit.

The timing of Humanities Advocacy Day happened to coincide with the belated passage, on March 10, of the FY 2009 omnibus spending bill. We entered the congressional visits knowing that the legislature had just passed a \$155 million NEH budget, itself a comparatively handsome increase over 2008 funding levels. The NHPRC grants program, authorized at a \$10 million level, received \$9.25 million for FY 2009, after being zeroed out in the Bush Administration budget request for several years. Humanities advocates

continued on page 9

Google Settlement, continued

Guild, can see no downside for authors whose works are out-of-print, and applauded the development that authors and publishers will now move forward in mutual agreement about how works will be offered digitally. Arthur Klebanoff, a publisher and literary agent, highlighted the involvement of author estates in Book Rights Registry claims. In another vein, he commented that publishers will want to take care to remove previous editions of books from the Google offerings, to prevent inaccurate scholarship and edition confusion. Tracy Armstrong, President of Copyright Clearance Center, pondered the ramifications of Google Book Search, which she said certainly will include more self-publishing by authors. Armstrong speculated that one day Google Book Search's ubiquitous user-interface could become a storefront for self-publishing intermediaries, such as iUniverse and Blurb. She wondered about legitimate incentives for competitors since Google enjoys the "first-mover advantage from this 'ask forgiveness, not permission' model," and regretted that some parties might therefore imitate that illicit model.

"The Public Interest" panelists discussed whether the settlement sidestepped library and public interest and whether other industries might use this class action structure to settle their legislative issues. In his opening statement, Alex MacGillivray, counsel at Google, said "Google is in this to make search better," to create access for researchers regardless of whether their library is financially privileged, and to serve the needs of the print-disabled. MacGillivray echoed Alan Adler's earlier observation that the Registry will be able license the corpus to third parties.

Robert Darnton, Professor and Director of Harvard University Library, thoughtfully expressed that the settlement creates the possibility of a reader's utopia. However, he said that the Google Book Search corpus is so rich and unique that competition may be impossible. He also expressed concern that the settlement gives Google a "monopoly in fact" and that there is too great a potential for abuse of power by "ratcheting up prices" for institutional subscriptions over time, a practice he termed "cocaine pricing." But not all monopolies are bad, in particular those providing public services. Memorably, Darnton quoted an

old General Motors motto, having adapted it to: "What's good for Google is good for the United States." He openly invited Congress to examine the settlement and its effect on public interest.

Jeffrey Cunard, counsel for AAP at DeBevoise & Plimpton, expanded on the notion that the Registry can be a licensing agency, adding that it could administrate a compulsory license for non-commercially available works, should Congress decide to enact such a license. James Grimmelman, Associate Professor at New York Law School, was insightful and brief. He is concerned about concentrated power: direct price setting, a single dominant cultural source, preservation and quality issues, changing fair use, library Section 108, first-sale doctrine, and the incentive to remain exclusive. Grimmelman believes the settlement is workable with discrete changes, which include guarantees about privacy, making the Registry accountable through transparency and oversight by the Federal Trade Commission, and a modified "most favored nation clause." He believes this class-action settlement risks interpretation as a privately negotiated substitute for orphan works legislation.

Threaded through every panel were the topics of "out-of-print" and "non-commercially available works," at times imprecisely discussed as "orphan works." Google's exclusive possession of digital scans of orphan works from libraries is an indicator of monopoly. Yet all agreed that the settlement's greatest impact is the creation of new access to non-commercially available works. In Paul Courant's words: "What I've gotten out of today is that absolutely everybody thinks that meaningful orphan works legislation would greatly improve the quality of this settlement." Google and AAP have actively supported orphan works legislation for several years (as has AAUP). Access to truly orphan works is certainly in the public's interest. In listening to panelists, one can imagine Congress considering orphan works legislation in the form of a compulsory license to be administered by the Registry.

There have been a couple of developments since the outstanding March conference. On April 28, the Federal District of New York postponed the deadline for right holders to opt-out and/or file oppositions to the settlement,

Could other
industries try
to use the class
action structure
to settle their
legislative issues?

continued on page 10

e-Duke, continued

The press's files are currently digitized as web-ready PDFs, with some of the conversion being handled by their partner, ebrary. The ebrary platform also allows full-text searching, and ensures that Duke's content is cross-searchable with all ebrary content to which a library has access.

One particularly interesting aspect of Duke's program is the option to purchase a \$500 "print add-on option," which will include cloth editions of all titles in the current year's collection. Kimberly Steinle, Duke's Library Relations Manager, indicated that this has been a very popular option among subscribers, with an uptake rate of more than 75%. She noted that the press wanted to ensure this was an optional add-on, rather than a requirement, as some smaller- to medium-sized libraries may not have the space for all of the books. Not requiring libraries to purchase the add-on also helps ensure that the electronic collection is as inexpensive as possible.

The option also fits well with the way the press envisions users accessing the titles. McCullough said he feels "students still don't really want to read 40 pages at a time on screen," and that he anticipates library patrons will more likely "discover the book online, and if they want to read more, we want to make that as easy as possible." Having a cloth edition of the book available on the shelf facilitates this sort of fluidity.

Piracy issues have been a major concern for university presses of late, particularly with the advent of new e-publishing projects. While acknowledging that they are concerned with piracy in the same way as other university presses, McCullough explained that Duke feels the technology they are using successfully avoids any major risks. Ebrary's printing and downloading restrictions were attributes that made the company a particularly attractive partner for Duke. With the ebrary technology, users are streaming the content, rather than downloading the material to their own computer. Additionally, ebrary limits the number of pages a user is able to print.

The e-Duke Books FAQ section has a comprehensive delineation of the various user policies of the site license, including interlibrary loan, course packs, electronic reserves, printing, and downloading. Steinle explained that these guidelines were developed in conjunction with ebrary, first looking at ebrary's guidelines and then tailoring them to best meet the needs of the press's content. Regarding the printing restrictions for example, she said, "our goal was to

try to come as close as possible to how many pages would be in a [typical] chapter."

Another risk for the press is how this sort of accessibility might affect course adoptions, such a mainstay of many university presses. McCullough said that this is an area in which time will tell how the subscription model affects these sales, but he again pointed to what he had spoken about earlier, that assumption most students still do not want to read book-length material online. Additionally, he pointed out that traditional library sales have not been in competition with paperback course adoptions.

As is the case with so many successful e-publishing initiatives, the press enlisted the help of the university library to provide subscribers to the program with enhanced MARC (MACHINE-Readable Cataloging) records. McCullough explained that the press wanted to offer the highest level of metadata available, and thus enlisted the help of the catalogers from the Duke University Perkins/Bostock Library. With the MARC records, the cataloging happens on a chapter level – which results in a "real advantage" for both librarians and patrons. Attesting to the invaluable assistance of the library in this aspect of the project, he said, "we certainly could not be creating them [the MARC records] on our own." Feedback from librarians was also valuable in making procedural changes to the pilot program, to best tailor the program and its offerings to the needs of libraries.

While hesitant to make any sweeping assessments at this early point in the program's development, McCullough said the press is "very happy with the way it has gone so far." He noted that the ability to work with colleagues who have managed the similar e-Duke Journals program has been a great help: "They've been through this process before."

There are of course differences between the two programs, and unique challenges that the e-Duke Books staff is still tackling. While the majority of librarians and patrons are now accustomed to accessing journals electronically, McCullough feels that there is still some need to "sell them on the idea" of accessing books in the same manner. He also noted that librarians may be less likely to take a chance on unfamiliar models in "this challenging economic climate."

McCullough thinks it is possible that other presses may adopt similar models in the near future, and anticipates that they will each vary them to reflect their press's particular capacities and strengths. He pointed out that this type of

continued on next page

E-Duke, continued

model was particularly well suited to Duke's publishing program. As their list is reasonably small, they were able to include all of their new titles, while maintaining a workable size for the press and a "cost that would not be prohibitive to libraries." While some presses may choose to implement similar collections composed of titles in a particular subject area, the interdisciplinary nature of many of Duke's books made this all-encompassing program

a preferable option, as there was no need to fit books into neat categorizations. Duke's well-known editorial profile as a publisher of interdisciplinary and innovative scholarship seems to have lent itself particularly well to this new model.

E-Duke Books Scholarly Collection:

<http://www.dukeupress.edu/library/edukebooks/>

Library-Press, continued

be realistic about the financial picture for their projects. The hope is that more partnerships will benefit from this sort of practical approach, and undertake the "explicit planning" Crow advocates.

Cerruti said she sees the partnerships as particularly important for presses in that they allow them to "take steps forward towards some of the new business models that are out there – especially open access." She believes presses know that open access is becoming increasingly important, but may not always be sure how to implement it. Both Cerruti and Mitchell agree that partnering with libraries, many of which are already working on open access, can facilitate a press's move toward open access models.

On the flip side, as libraries are increasingly called upon by their universities to take on publishing roles, it is important for them to take advantage of the valuable experience and expertise of presses. Mitchell explained that these partnerships also benefit content providers who "feel strongly about open access, but also want to provide print publication," emphasizing the importance of providing all of these options in a way that is not detrimental to a press's business model.

Both Cerruti and Mitchell highlighted the fact that partnerships strengthen the case for university support of a press, as they demonstrate the institutional service provided. Cerruti pointed out that the practical nature of the guide makes it very easy for presses to make a case to their university about the relevance of university presses.

In terms of early feedback from presses and libraries, Crow noted that a survey of LIBPRESS participants indicated that the practical examples have been the most valuable.

The editorial board now "intend[s] to increase the number of case studies, sample plans, and financial templates, as well as the networking support available through the site."

Once the resource center is completely populated, Mitchell envisions it "enabling people to get a picture of the different models of what this kind of collaboration can be," and that this will assist in getting partners to a point where "libraries and presses speak the same language, or at least a compatible language." Crow hopes that the resources may encourage presses to "take the lead in creating publishing partnerships."

Cerruti described the resource center as "one-stop shopping for resources and papers published every week," facilitating easier access to curated content for users who may not have the time to devote on their own. Her hope is that the guide and resources will "reduce some of the duplicative experiments going on so that we can learn from each other."

A more in-depth look at the guide and resource center is well worth it to anyone interested in campus-based publishing partnerships and their associated issues. Those interested in joining LIBPRESS, the online discussion forum on issues of "collaborative digital publishing projects and models," may do so here: <http://listserv.ucop.edu/cgi-bin/wa.exe?A0=LIBPRESS-L>.

Campus-Based Publishing Partnerships Resource Center:

<http://www.arl.org/sparc/partnering/index.shtml>

Guide to Critical Issues:

http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/pub_partnerships_v1.pdf

Editorial Board:

http://www.arl.org/sparc/partnering/editorial_board.shtml

Humanities, continued

needed to thank the representatives and senators who had fought for that funding and make a strong case for even greater levels of support in a time of economic crisis.

What was surprising, at least on the visits I participated in (to members of the Senate Appropriations Interior subcommittee), was how few eyebrows were raised by our requests. While offered with the caveat that nothing was assured, we heard often that the need for humanities funding was recognized and appreciated, and that Senate offices were prepared to consider these larger increases.

In early May, the president's budget request for FY 2010 was released. While our moderately extravagant hopes were not met here, it is certainly a better starting point for humanities advocates than in recent budget fights. NEH would see a \$16.3 million increase, although \$10 million of that would be earmarked for taking over the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs program. Obama is also requesting the full \$10 million currently authorized for

NHPRC. Unfortunately, due to funding allocations in the president's request, this includes a "cut of 55% for NHPRC supported publications projects," according to the May 2009 NHA Policy Digest.

It is particularly key this year that NHA and its members help policymakers understand that funding for the humanities is essential to our nation's health; that work in the humanities is an integral part of our economic life and future. Fortunately, we were given a great new tool to make that case with the launch of the "Humanities Indicators Prototype" from the American Academy of Arts & Sciences (AAAS). These indicators provide the kind of data on the humanities workforce, education, funding, and research that fields of sciences and engineering have long had at their fingertips. One of the most important data points for a Congress looking at a faltering economy: the humanities sector represents at least 2.5 million jobs—distributed across every state and district in America.

Information, continued

Sourcebooks. She said her focus has been on what the next iteration of a publishing company looks like. Like Healy, she emphasized the benefits of category leadership, and predicted a "real return to the value of niche publishing." Sourcebooks has created a toolkit for their authors to engage in their own digital marketing, and is focusing on creating new approaches to content by exploring options such as enhanced digital books and iPhone applications. Raccach asked publishers whether we can "create a zero inventory model" and if not, "how low can we go?"

Marcus Leaver, president of Sterling Publishing, speaking on "The New Marketing Budget," began with a slide reading: "Question everything." He emphasized that doing things just because that's the way they've always been done has to end, and that we must only do things we can measure. He described various measures taken at Sterling, which include drastic reductions in their trade show budget ("I'm not going to Frankfurt...the trade show is over"), and cutting their list by 25%, but increasing title-by-title marketing by 33%.

The move to electronic catalogs has been a hot topic of discussion for university presses, as well as the larger publishing community. Josh Marwell, president of sales for HarperCollins, explained the various advantages of

e-catalogs that pushed his company to make the move (easier to update, more immediate, increased shareability), and how they've confronted the challenges inherent in the switch (creating a new workflow, outreach to reps and customers). He mentioned that HarperCollins will be supporting Edelweiss as well, an e-catalog system that some university presses have begun to work with.

The morning's final presenter, Dave Thompson, vice president of sales analysis for Random House, ended the program on an optimistic note, pointing out that, "even in the worst economy in our lifetimes, book sales are only down 1.2 percent." He advocated using the data available from sources like Bowker and Nielsen BookScan in innovative ways and focused in particular on indicators of "book awareness," and where particular demographics of buyers are purchasing their books, echoing Gallagher's points about the need to know more about book buyers.

The program's sentiment seemed to be best encapsulated in Raccach's paraphrase of a quote from Simon and Schuster CEO Carolyn Reidy, when she said that most publishing executives are currently running two companies: "the one that is, and the one that will be."

Presentations from the conference may be viewed here: <http://www.slideshare.net/event/making-information-pay-2009>

Google Settlement, continued

which is now September 5, 2009. In a separate move on the same day, the Justice Department announced its inquiry into the settlement's anti-trust issues.

There were many more speakers and compelling ideas, but this report attempts only to trace a continuum, highlighting possible long-term implications. It is likely the settlement will be approved in some form at some point in the coming year, and it has surely awakened interest on all sides.

Peter Givler (AAUP) was instrumental in planning the conference and roster of distinguished speakers. The following

university press attendees enjoyed this stellar symposium, as well as each others' views and good company at lunch: Lisa Bayer (Illinois), Barbara Cohen (Oxford), Carol Huppig (Jewish Publication Society), Daphne Ireland, Linda Klein (Yale), Mindy Koyanis (Harvard), Jill Phillips (California), Clare Wellnitz (Columbia), and Vicky Wells (North Carolina). No briefing can adequately convey the depth of the conference; fortunately, a video is available online.

For details and discussion, please watch the symposium at <http://kernochancenter.org/Googlebookssettlementrecording.htm>

MISCELLANY

AAUP Welcomes a New Member

In May, AAUP welcomed RIT Cary Graphic Arts Press as an Introductory Member. The press is the scholarly publishing enterprise of the Rochester Institute of Technology and is affiliated with the Melbert B. Cary, Jr. Graphic Arts Collection. In addition to the graphic arts, the press also publishes in deaf studies, business, engineering, and science.

RIT Cary Graphic Arts Press: <http://carypress.rit.edu>

University Presses Receive Mellon Grants for Publishing Initiatives

In recent months, five new university press collaborations have received grants from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Three groups of presses received grants for monograph series in underserved areas of study. Two presses have received grants from the Mellon Foundation to facilitate publishing projects in collaboration with their parent universities and other institutions.

In February, the Mellon Foundation awarded a collaborative publishing grant of \$1.16 million to Fordham University Press, University of California Press (FlashPoints series), University of Pennsylvania Press, University of Virginia Press, and University of Washington Press. The five presses will form the Modern Language Initiative (MLI), which will focus on the publication of scholarly books on the literatures of the non-Anglophone world.

In late March, the Early American Places series was announced, with a grant of \$648,000 going to the University of Georgia Press, NYU Press, and Northern Illinois University Press over five years to support the publication of early North American history.

A \$282,000 one-year planning grant will go to the University Press of Colorado, Texas A&M University Press, University of Alabama Press, University of Arizona Press, University Press of Florida and University of Utah Press to support the Archaeology of the Americas Digital Monograph Initiative.

The University of Pittsburgh Press, in partnership with the university's Department of History and Philosophy of Science and the Department of History's World History Center, has been awarded a five-year, \$750,000 grant to pursue a book publishing initiative in the history of science.

The University of California Press has received a \$722,000 grant to fund a strategic initiative in California Studies in collaboration with the UC Humanities Research Institute (UCHRI), the UC California Studies Consortium (UCCSC), and the California Digital Library (CDL). The grant will support the creation of a journal, a working papers collection, and an annual conference in this emerging field.

Book Industry Environmental Council Announces Climate Goals

On April 16, the Book Industry Environmental Council (BIEC) announced an ambitious set of goals for the book publishing industry. Called a "global first in publishing," the council's goal is a 20% reduction of the industry's greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 (from a 2006 baseline) and an 80% reduction by 2050. Pete Datos, chair of BIEC's climate subcommittee and vice president of Hachette Book Group, called the goals "aggressive but achievable," and predicted they would be precedent-setting for other industries.

continued on next page

Miscellany, continued

To achieve the goals, BIEC indicated that the industry will need to focus on “increasing the use of recycled paper, using paper efficiently, reducing returns, and preventing books from ending up in landfills,” in addition to increasing sustainability in the areas of transportation, energy consumption, and chemicals.

The council is coordinated by the Green Press Initiative and the Book Industry Study Group, and brings together more than 40 industry stakeholders. Julia Fauci and Brenna McLaughlin are the current AAUP representatives.

Books For Understanding

Having long played a highly visible role in international relations, Cuba is once again much in the news, with the 50th anniversary of the Cuban Revolution and the loosening of U.S. policy restrictions regarding the nation AAUP has assembled a bibliography of scholarly works that includes information and links to over 150 works on Cuban politics, history, foreign relations, and culture from 24 scholarly presses. The list also includes a “Directory of Experts” which provides contact information for scholars and writers available to speak to the media on these topics.

In order to ensure that AAUP’s *Books for Understanding* lists consistently feature the most up-to-date scholarship and analysis, a monthly update schedule was instituted in March 2009. Existing lists will be updated on a rotating monthly basis, in addition to more extensive re-launches of older lists and the continuing creation of new bibliographies on current events.

Cuba book list: <http://aaupnet.org/news/bfu/cuba/list.html>

CALENDAR

2009 AAUP Annual Meeting

June 18-21, 2009

Philadelphia, PA

ALA Annual Conference

July 9-15, 2009

Chicago, IL

ALPSP International Conference

September 9-11, 2009

The Oxford Belfry, UK

PSP Journals Boot Camp

September 23-26, 2009

Denver, CO

11

AAUP Partners

The AAUP Partners Program allows key service providers and related organizations to give annual support to AAUP and be formally recognized by AAUP for that support. AAUP is pleased to announce its nine partners in 2009:

Books International
BookMasters, Inc.
BookMobile
Cushing-Malloy, Inc.
codeMantra
ebrary
Maple-Vail
Marquis
Thomson-Shore

AAUP Partners Program: <http://aaupnet.org/about/partners/>

The Exchange Submission Policy

Staff at AAUP member presses are encouraged to submit article proposals to the *Exchange* about initiatives at member presses, industry news or trends, reviews of relevant books or reports, and other topics of interest to the scholarly publishing community.

The copy deadline for the summer 2009 issue of the *Exchange* will be Tuesday, August 4. Feature articles are typically 700-1300 words in length. Initial proposals should generally be submitted at least one month in advance of the copy deadline.

Proposals may be sent to *Exchange* editor Meredith Benjamin at mberjamin@aaupnet.org.

SSP “IN” Conference

September 23-25, 2009

Providence, RI

Frankfurt Book Fair

October 14-18, 2009

Frankfurt, Germany

Guadalajara International Book Fair

November 28 - December 6, 2009

Guadalajara, Mexico

MLA Annual Convention

December 27-30, 2009

Philadelphia, PA