

Chapter 8

The Publisher in the Library

Michael J. Furlough
Penn State University

Introduction

In the last decade, academic libraries have begun to claim an active role in the arena of scholarly publishing. Their involvement consists of experiments in the electronic distribution of journals, monographs, and conference proceedings, as well as distinct forms of scholarly work that apply researchers' subject expertise and librarians' information management skills to digitized library collections. This remains a highly experimental and fluid field of library programming, one typically cultivated through direct engagement with faculty, and sometimes in collaboration with service partners in campus computing and university presses. Much of the early emphasis on library publishing services drew energy from advocacy efforts that sought to counterbalance the control of research by commercial scholarly publishers. But the success of these services will depend not on advocacy, but on identifying significant needs and promising trends in research and scholarship and creating services to meet them. These programs depend heavily upon IT infrastructure, but also encompass many activities that require capabilities beyond IT management. Developing the appropriate staffing resources and skills to implement and extend such programs will be challenging. This chapter reviews the operations of several library publishing programs to examine their staffing models and the expertise found among the staff, and attempts to describe what publishing demands of librarians and how it may extend their existing and historical roles.

This essay draws extensively upon a series of 13 interviews conducted in May and June 2008 with librarians who direct publishing programs and their operations. I also interviewed university press directors and editors who were involved in collaborative work with a research library. The organizations represented are Cornell University (both the library and the press), Emory University, Indiana University, New York University (both the libraries and the press), Ohio State University, the University of Kansas, the University of California (both California Digital Library and the press). I did not interview anyone at Penn State University, where I am employed, but I drew upon my own knowledge of its publishing services for details included here. (See appendix B for a complete list of interviewees.) Each interview was conducted by telephone and lasted from 30 to 60 minutes. I provide a general script for these interviews in an appendix C of this essay, but each interview was unique and tailored to some degree to the circumstances of the individual. When possible, I reviewed documents supplied by the subjects, such as program proposals, activity summaries, job ads, and job descriptions. The research I have conducted might best be characterized as qualitative, anecdotal, impressionistic, and in some cases speculative. These individuals are my colleagues, and my prior knowledge of some of the subjects and of their programs influenced my choice of questions and general approach. All subjects were asked to name other individuals who might be useful to interview, though I did not pursue all leads. Only one person who was invited to be interviewed declined to respond. All of the subjects agreed to be identified and quoted in this essay, and all were given the opportunity to review quotations for accuracy before final publication.

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

The chapter first examines the status of library publishing programs in 2008, and then analyzes four sets of activities within them: strategy development and resource management, outreach and recruitment, content production and management, and distribution and marketing. To some extent, each of these areas may build on existing librarian competencies, but also necessitate the integration of additional skills and knowledge that may sometimes conflict with the existing culture. An examination of several programs then in their early stages demonstrates how pilot projects help to assess existing capacities to offer publishing services, frequently drawing upon existing staff who could be widely distributed throughout the organization. Those interviewed for this essay provide further evidence of the hybridization of library staffing, and the programs reviewed in this chapter have capitalized on the diverse professional backgrounds of their staff to create and sustain innovative services. They need a high tolerance for risk, ambiguity, and experimentation, as well as the aptitude for creative problem solving and collaborative work. These programs will also provide opportunities for staff throughout libraries, perhaps especially those in liaison roles, to extend their work to encompass a wider range of services related to scholarly communications. Nevertheless, they may still prove especially challenging because libraries will have to expand their service focus from collections on a local campus to distributing data for a much wider audience in a competitive information environment. Sustaining library publishing will entail unique decision-making processes and financial models, as well as true commitments to collaboration and partnerships. The future growth of such programs will depend upon leadership that can articulate to the campus community the library's role in creating more comprehensive content management strategies for the university or college.

This is a rapidly changing service area for libraries. Nearly two years have passed since I first drafted this chapter in summer 2008 and when it was readied for final publication. Since then a serious economic crisis has had an impact on all institutions represented here, and some of those impacts have been dramatic. In some cases significant organizational changes and realignments have occurred, and some individuals interviewed have assumed expanded duties, new roles, or have since left the organization. I would hazard a guess that many of them would respond to my questions differently now, and I would probably address some of the topics differently as a result. In no case, however, has a publishing service been eliminated, and all have evolved and even expanded. However, I leave a study of the impact of the recession on library-based publishing services for another day and another author.

Overview of Library Publishing Services

Publishing services have built upon expertise developed in library digitization programs and in institutional repository services (IRs) over the past decade, through which librarians have articulated expanded service roles for fulfilling their mission for collecting, organizing, and preserving information. Many libraries link new publishing services very closely to preexisting institutional repository services, often based on tools such as DSpace and Fedora, and may also use open source publishing software, such as Open Journal Systems and DPubS. These links suggest an organic growth in the library's strategy for supporting scholarly communication needs on the campus. The most comprehensive picture of library publishing services in 2008 can be found in *Research Library Publishing Services: New Options for University Publishing*, a report authored by Karla Hahn and published by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL).¹ Of the 80 member institutions replying to Hahn's survey, 44% (35) reported that their library offered some form of publishing services, and another 21% (16) were planning such services. These libraries

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

publish traditional formats that have well-established print equivalents: journals (88%), conference proceedings (79%), and monographs (71%), and all together reported 265 discrete titles that were either already online or in development. Hahn confirms that each library, in addition to providing hardware and software, directly subsidizes these programs primarily through reallocation of staff time, while a few rely on fee-based services, grants, and other external funding sources. The survey showed that these programs generally do not attempt to replicate full-scale publishing operations, such as those found at university presses. Instead they “are intentionally exploring the boundaries of what several program managers conceptualize as a service core,”² built around Web hosting of publications.

The study reports a wealth of information about publishing programs and services, but offers limited specific data about staffing or the roles these staff played in the service. In a later e-mail to the author on July 3, 2008, Hahn explained:

Although data on staffing were requested, questions about the consistency of the data prevented it from being published in the study report. Comments accompanying the counts suggest that different institutions defined involved staff differently. A second issue is that service managers indicated that startup of a title was much more staff intensive than maintenance suggesting that staffing demands could fluctuate substantially over time. Average FTE was 3, a range from under .25 to over 10, a median of 2 and a mode of 4. The number of individuals averaged 7, with a range from 0–14 (0 representing a vacancy), a median of 5, and a mode of 4.

My interviews with librarians and publishers confirmed Hahn’s report of wide variation in levels of staffing. There were also substantial differences in how individuals’ time was allocated across projects, and not surprisingly, these variations related to the scale and scope of the program. The report suggests that most library programs are small and have not grown to maturity. But several quite well-developed programs, with well-defined services and staffing, can provide us with illustrations of how the work can be divided and organized.

Three well-established and -staffed programs include Project Euclid and related projects at Cornell University Library, the Scholarly Publishing Office at the University of Michigan Library (SPO), and the eScholarship Publishing Program at the California Digital Library (CDL). Each of these programs has distributed or published a significant number of titles or projects in previous years. [Insert note: The details in this paragraph and in the one following were compiled from interviews and the public websites of each organization as they appeared in July 2008. See appendix XX for the URLs.] Project Euclid began at Cornell in 1999, the Scholarly Publishing Office at the University of Michigan was formed in 2001, and eScholarship Publishing Program at CDL dates from 2000. All have responsibility for a large number of titles or projects and each hosts journals, monographs, and some additional formats. As of July 2008, Project Euclid aggregated and marketed 53 math and statistics journals from 34 different publishers, as well as monographs and conference proceedings. Cornell Library also distributes four other publications that originate from Cornell faculty, using either an open-access model, or a mixed open-access/subscription model. The Michigan Scholarly Publishing Office listed 23 different journals or projects in July 2008, including the hosting of several large for-fee aggregation services, such as the American Council of Learned Societies History E-Book project. CDL’s eScholarship hosted 25 “Journals and Peer-Reviewed Series” at the same date. Only CDL provides publishing services exclusively for University of California researchers and programs and distributes exclusively in open-access mode. Both SPO and Project Euclid rely on revenue from external clients and subscription-based titles to underwrite a portion of their operations, and

This document represents the author’s final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

each fund about half of their staff from those revenues. Project Euclid operates as a discipline-oriented, branded business operation, but SPO and eScholarship Services act as distributors for multiple publications across a range of disciplines

At Cornell, Project Euclid staff report through two different lines: Terry Ehling, Executive Director of Euclid and Director of the Center for Innovative Publishing, reports to the associate university librarian for Scholarly Resources and Special Collections, while technical staff, led by director of E-Publishing Technologies David Ruddy, report to the associate university librarian for Digital Library and Information Technologies. Currently at Cornell, three people contribute about 2 FTE support for Project Euclid.³ Seven FTE in the Scholarly Publishing Office report to Director Maria Bonn, who in turn reports to Michigan's university librarian. Catherine Mitchell, director, eScholarship Publishing Program at the California Digital Library, manages a group of seven FTE and reports to the executive director of CDL. These small groups cannot be very hierarchical, but rely upon specialized work assignments divided among leadership and operational duties. In addition to permanent staff in the publishing group, these programs rely in varying degrees on the IT infrastructure in place throughout the organization and on the financial management operations in the library. Each makes heavy use of external vendors for digitization, markup and metadata creation, or hosting software platforms.

Smaller programs, such as those at Kansas, Indiana, Ohio State, and Penn State, have been operating in start-up mode, having brought projects online only within the year leading up to the date of the interview and not having fully settled on a clear staffing model and plan for publishing. In interviews, their staff described implementations employing teams numbering from two to eight, usually located within a multiple units. These start-up programs tackle many of the same tasks that Euclid, SPO, and eScholarship must, but as start-ups they focus significantly on learning tasks and establishing processes that will be adapted later. Every program discussed in this essay continuously explores various possible new services, but New York University's program was almost entirely investigative at the time of my interview, with a single staff member, the Digital Publishing Program Officer, leading preliminary needs analyses. Finally, Emory University offers publishing services somewhat different from the others discussed in this essay. While the Digital Programs Group unit at Emory Library has provided software to host conference proceedings and journals, the unit focuses on more experimental types of digital scholarly projects and on larger scale digital content preservation and management.

Roles and Staffing for Publishing Services

Several commentators have noted that librarians carry competencies and skills deeply rooted in a service orientation, which can prove valuable in providing publishing services. Kate Wittenberg suggests that librarians have embraced change and that electronic publishing experiments will benefit from the "expertise of librarians in information architecture, design, preservation and retrieval, indexing, and support for users [that] is already available within such library-based publishing organizations."⁴ In their 2007 report for Ithaka, *University Publishing in a Digital Age*, Laura Brown, Rebecca Griffiths, and Matthew Rascoff address library skill sets in relation to those of publishers and include an appendix that compares complementary "strengths and weaknesses" of both libraries and university presses.⁵ The report identifies the library's most useful strengths as IT infrastructure and staff, expertise in information management and retrieval, as well as librarians' first-hand knowledge of user needs and behaviors gathered through public

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

services, liaison work, and collection development. However, Brown and her colleagues also point out that this service orientation, which is focused on single campuses, has the potential to isolate libraries from forces that commonly affect academic publishing, which tends to address a much broader potential audience. The report notes that strong service-oriented approaches do not always allow for easy prioritization or evaluating demand among competing service needs: library budgets, largely expenditure- and subsidy-based, provide the organization with flexibility to take risks on new services, which for university publishers would be a rare luxury. However, these budgets are not infinitely flexible, and it can also be difficult to continually absorb new services with existing staff. If the library's publishing services do not rely on a revenue-capture business model, like those of a university press, it will likely need to deploy the commercially oriented discipline or expertise to create sustainable new services and programs over longer periods of time. Libraries operate as campus-focused service centers, not market-facing organizations, so they have less incentive to specialize in needs assessments and marketing that will create demand for their content beyond their home campus.⁶ Brown refers to one librarian who remarked that "putting these resources online for free is much easier than charging for them, because then they would actually have to consider who the user base would be."⁷ Perhaps most significantly, Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff point out that historically libraries have little direct involvement in the set of processes that go into publishing scholarship.

Raym Crow, in his highly useful SPARC guide, *University-Based Publishing Partnerships: A Guide to Critical Issues*, discusses the cultural, logistical, and business factors that must be negotiated in order for libraries to successfully collaborate with university presses when starting a publishing service.⁸ Crow provides a table mapping out the core competencies for university publishing activities that are found in university presses, libraries, academic units, and campus computing. These are: funding, content acquisition, editorial, IP/rights management, pre-press/production, distribution, business management, marketing and sales, archiving and preservation. These competencies cover a broad range of business and technical operations, some of which may demand uncommon or unusual specializations for library staff if a viable collaborative service cannot be established. (This table is reprinted as appendix D.) Crow's listing of library competencies emphasizes those related to content production and management and faculty service and consultation, again pointing to these two areas as the base from which libraries should launch the publishing program.

The following sections examine these specializations in more detail to identify potential gaps, how publishing might expand the skill sets of librarians, and what factors these librarians may find to be most critical to address. I will group my discussion of these competencies more broadly than Crow because the same person or persons may perform multiple functions in these services. Some of the more important competency gaps may be found in *Strategy Development and Resource Management*, suggesting most clearly how the library's mission and culture might frame the operation of publishing services. *Outreach and recruitment* for publishing services overlap in some ways with university press editorial and acquisition activities. But libraries' approaches to recruiting and evaluating projects remain very different from the university press model. Publishing services are one of the many factors changing how libraries may think of their subject specialists' outreach roles. *Production and content management*, comparable to the prepress operations in a publishing house, draw most heavily on existing competencies found in digital library programs. However, orienting the operations towards distributing original scholarly works often forces staff to become more familiar with a range of different standards

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

and to scale operations up for high efficiency. *Distribution and marketing* appear at first to be the simplest of publishing services. But making the content more visible goes beyond putting it online, requiring library staff to focus on the wider audience of scholars and the public that exist beyond the local campus environment.

Defining the Scope: Strategy Development and Resource Management

Maria Bonn explains that when the Scholarly Publishing Office began at Michigan, they defined themselves as an “alternative publisher,” but soon had to ask “alternative to what?” A similar question faces each leader of library publishing services, and answering it will be the most complex, and most critical, aspect of beginning a program. Libraries are filled with leaders who engage in strategic thinking when writing collection development plans, disaster recovery protocols, and plans for new services and new facilities. The processes employed in managing and providing access to collections, as well as staffing libraries seven days a week, speak to a strong culture of resource management. At an abstract level, such skills transfer to other domains, but publishing services leadership needs both specific expertise and an ability to adapt an existing culture to include elements of others. Leaders of publishing services must balance oversight of day-to-day operations with longer range planning for program growth and alignment with the larger mission and vision of their library’s leadership. These leaders will need specialized knowledge of publishing procedures that move content from raw to readable forms; an understanding of trends in academic publishing, higher education, and information technology; and the legal and policy issues that frame these matters. They must be able to translate these issues to researchers and faculty who may have limited understanding of this framework, while also demonstrating a sensitivity and appreciation of the distinctive research processes and methodologies employed by the researchers in many disciplines. They may be deeply involved in long-range financial planning complicated by multiple funding and revenue streams, and might also manage multiple internal and external relationships with authors, editors, or publishers; subscribers or users; commercial vendors; and possibly units within their own organization that provide them with the support necessary to offer these publishing services. To help incubate these new programs, the leader must have a strong understanding of the goals of the host library, how the service contributes to those goals, and how such service can fit within a continuously changing network of scholarly communications. The program director should be a strong communicator and be capable of feeding strategy up to the administration, especially in linking the program to related issues such as collection development, public services, and digital content services.

Organizational and professional culture may have a special impact on how leaders carry out strategic and tactical planning for their publishing services and operations. Crow and Brown and her colleagues suggest ways that librarians may bring an “outsider” perspective to existing publishing problems, and but also suggests that the culture of libraries (and publishing) can be limiting for new service programs.⁹ Their emphasis on “market forces” should not be understood to suggest that library publishing must always be based on revenue generation and fee-based access models. But librarians must acknowledge that publishing by nature exists within a wider set of systems in which information must compete for attention. Sound and exacting attention to questions of sustainability should be applied to any new service in an academic context, and common business-planning processes will still be necessary, even in an open-access model. Given the uncertain future of academic publishing in general, publishing service managers in any

This document represents the author’s final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

operation will likely need to bring an entrepreneurial approach to the work, must be highly tolerant of ambiguity and risk, and must be open to new ideas or collaborations that may in fact radically shift the direction of their program. Terry Ehling explains that start-up library publishing services present “a counterintuitive challenge,” noting that the academy’s simultaneously decentralized and bureaucratic environment may not offer hospitable environments for incubating start-up services aimed at creating organizational and cultural change. For their publishing services to thrive, librarians will need even “greater flexibility, greater creativity, and [to promote] more risk-taking. . . . Libraries need people who went to business schools and arts schools, not only the traditional I-school.”¹⁰

Monica McCormick, the Digital Scholarly Publishing Program Officer at New York University Library, has previously worked in both academic publishing and other research libraries. She comes into this role with a sympathetic understanding of the financial situations of both institutions, as well as a clear-eyed take on how their organizational cultures may support but also inhibit new publishing services. Academic publishing, a bottom-line-oriented environment even in not-for-profits, relies upon a particular set of rigorous and formalized processes for decision making around book projects: “Publishers, by definition, make choices. Choose one project and you are not going to do another one. There are clear decision-making processes for ruling out” manuscripts for publication. With the exception of collection development, where materials acquisition may well be a zero-sum activity, in libraries decision processes for new services appear more fluid and opaque, with a less urgent sense of binary choice. “My job now is to start a conversation about the criteria for what we will and won’t include in a digital publishing service,” according to McCormick.¹¹

Strategic collaborations with other organizations, such as a campus computing unit, an academic program, or an academic publisher, bring special challenges for management and strategy development. In such cases, cultural differences could prove difficult to overcome, even when well-defined opportunities and needs guide the relationship. As Raym Crow points out, potential partners must see that the benefits and risks of a collaboration are in balance for both sides in order to yield a powerful collaboration that provides a more comprehensive set of services for the researcher.¹² California Digital Library (CDL) and the University of California Press (UCP) present a useful case study. In 2007, the California Digital Library and University of California Press surveyed potential publishing opportunities within the UC system through extensive site visits to and interviews at all system campuses. Together they recommended that the university system create a well-planned, sustainable, and coordinated university publishing program that could allow space for publications derived from novel methodologies and requiring alternative formats.¹³ Both organizations had a prior history of working together on the Mark Twain Project Online and other isolated projects. To implement the report, Catherine Mitchell and Laura Cerruti, Director of Digital Content Development at the press, focused on how to move from such opportunistic efforts to the more strategic direction recommended. Working with an outside consultant for several weeks, both acquired what Mitchell diplomatically called “a keen understanding of dramatic differences in cultures” that at times seemed insurmountable. Yet they eventually determined how to structure a working plan and defined a pilot project to initiate it. Their future work will identify shared publishing services, rather than jointly fashioned monograph imprints or journals, according to Mitchell. Cerruti explains that both organizations want to specialize in the processes and systems that they have relied upon, but work together to promote them as “a continuum of publishing services for the university.” For an academic

This document represents the author’s final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

department or institute with a book or journal publication series, for example, CDL can provide an infrastructure for manuscript management, peer review, hosting, access, and archiving, while the university press might assist with other services, such as marketing or finding a channel for print-on-demand if appropriate. Strategically, the collaboration reinforces the visibility of both partners with researchers and allows them to begin working towards experiments that would stretch the boundaries of traditional publishing.¹⁴ The California collaboration illustrates one potential path that a strategic partnership might take when partners can align their respective missions and cultures to reinforce the others.

Publishing is about establishing partnerships. No matter who the partners are, the leaders of these programs will probably be most successful if they combine pragmatism with creativity. As managers, they will possibly need to link resources across multiple organizational lines, which will call for strong communication and persuasive negotiation. They must root themselves in their organizational culture and retain the flexibility to question that culture when stepping outside of its traditional library boundaries.

Working with the Researcher: Outreach and Recruitment

How do clients find the publishing service, and who is responsible for ensuring that researchers know who to ask? Who assesses the researcher's needs for publication services, and how? This section explores service outreach and marketing aimed at identifying potential projects and clients to serve. Library subject liaisons and publishing acquisitions editors carry out complementary tasks, and involvement in publishing services provides an opportunity, if not a need, to build on existing roles and relationships with researchers. While outreach might be carried out exclusively by the program manager, it could also be carried out by a designated outreach librarian, subject liaisons, editors in a partnering organization, or even the researchers themselves. Outreach should be based on a thorough understanding of publishing services and broader scholarly communications trends and issues in order to map the researcher's needs onto the services the program can support. More importantly, outreach staff should be able to explore the goals and objectives of researchers and scholarly groups and demonstrate an understanding of the role that scholarly publishing plays in a variety of disciplinary fields. Promoting the service and recruiting projects might include holding workshops, writing marketing materials, meeting with researchers to explore ideas, conducting needs assessments and analyses, and providing advice to solve their clients' publishing needs. This work may also involve others in the publishing services team with more specialized expertise. Because outreach activity entails close working relationships with faculty and a strong understanding of academic practice, it may suggest how library subject specialization may evolve to more actively engage scholarly communication issues.

The California Digital Library, which serves all 10 of the University of California campuses, relies heavily upon a network of liaison librarians at each campus to help CDL staff connect with users at the local level. Catherine Mitchell explains that a new position in the eScholarship Publishing Group, the Outreach and Marketing Coordinator, works closely with these eScholarship liaisons. The Outreach Coordinator works "in the field," moving from campus to campus to advertise the services and to identify new publishing opportunities. For the outreach role, Mitchell sought substantial marketing expertise, with the capability of defining and carrying out a campaign to help promote eScholarship's identity and as a provider of alternative publishing services to the University of California. Yet she also recognizes the

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

potential for marketing to be perceived with suspicion in the academy. “We don’t want it to feel like a corporate come-on,” says Mitchell, noting that the candidate she recruits must carry the “gravitas” to be taken seriously by the faculty. He or she will “have to understand the cultural differences among disciplines, and campuses” to avoid the “make a compelling case for the relevance and value of eScholarship services.”

Mitchell further explains that she saw some affinities between the Marketing and Outreach Coordinator and the role that acquiring editors play in university presses, partly because the individual will be expected to build networks in order to engage partners and identify projects with the potential to grow the service. Similarly, Monica McCormick at New York University, who was previously an acquiring editor at the University of California Press, explains how critical outreach and networking are to an editor’s success. Acquisitions editors, she says, have as a basic requirement “not being shy. . . . To be a good editor, you have to build networks” among potential authors, reviewers, and others who can serve as “feeders” to the editor. Relationship building not only helps an editor to find new manuscripts, but keeps the editor in touch with trends and shifts within her assigned scholarly fields. Editors have the power to reject, but they must also promote, even sell, their press to potential authors in order to land a promising manuscript: “Here’s what I can do for you, here’s the platform I can offer you, here’s the visibility you can get [with me and my publishing house.]” McCormick links her previous role as an acquiring editor and to that of her current colleagues at New York University Libraries who serve as subject area liaisons. A subject liaison must build similar networks to serve her assigned disciplines and departments and to promote the services and collections of the libraries.

But important distinctions remain. A liaison’s typical role has historically been tied to collections services, focusing on support for the teaching and research needs of her users through the acquisition of scholarly resources and instruction in their use. Liaison outreach may incorporate marketing elements but it tends to focus not on “selling” and recruitment, but on notification, communication, and adoption of resources. Library liaisons and selectors also do not select materials in the same way that editors do. Editors narrow the field of potential works. Selectors seek to deepen the collections to respond to local research and curricular needs. Peter Potter, editor-in-chief of the Cornell University Press, explains that while collection development clearly involves processes of evaluation, libraries rely upon reputable publishers to make good decisions at an early stage of publication, well before the library acquires the material. “Librarians don’t have the same gate-keeping mentality that press editors do,” Potter says. “We see a lot of books, and we winnow out the good from the bad. Librarians aren’t well versed in that [level of review].” Library publishing programs usually do not take on the same role in vetting original research that a publisher does, where, at least in monograph publishing, the acquisitions editor reviews manuscripts in addition to the peers who provide anonymous assessments. The library publishing service may choose to publish materials that undergo no prior peer review, or might publish materials for which the project sponsors or editors manage the peer review. For a library, the decision to take on a publishing project may rest significantly upon other factors, such as the service’s own capacities, skill sets, technologies, schedules, and basic “fit” with the potential client’s needs. Publishers may also choose not to publish books based on technical requirements—some presses specialize in heavily illustrated books, others do not and would steer a manuscript requiring many visuals to another publisher. Nevertheless, while librarians have had limited experience cultivating new content, publishing programs and

This document represents the author’s final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

their representatives will have to “sell” the benefits of their service and their distribution platform, just as editors do their press when competing for a manuscript.

In spite of these differences, publishing services within a library are among many scholarly-communications-related activities that may influence the outreach role of liaisons, whose portfolio of responsibilities continues to shift from an exclusive focus on purchased and licensed resources to a broader focus on the processes of scholarship and facilitating them. In some cases, this may still incorporate work that relates to reviewing and selecting scholarly content. Kizer Walker currently serves as an editor for *Signale: Modern German Letters, Cultures, and Thought*, a new print and digital monograph series published by Cornell University Press and in collaboration with the Cornell Library. Walker, who holds both a library degree and a PhD in German, has his primary assignment at Cornell Library in collection development with subject liaison responsibilities that cover the German program. *Signale*'s series editor serves as a senior professor of German and comparative literature, an editorial board includes five Cornell faculty in related fields, and 12 researchers from 11 other universities serve as an external advisory board. Walker's role in *Signale* is defined as “managing editor,” and he serves on the editorial board, communicating with authors, editors, and reviewers; calling meetings of the board; and reading manuscripts for discussion. Although Peter Potter, the official acquiring editor for *Signale*, notes significant differences between editorial review and collection development, he observes that Walker's involvement in managing the *Signale* effort can “develop the kind of editorial thinking to apply to projects” that demand peer review. Remarking that acquisitions editors do not necessarily need the deep disciplinary background that some librarians and some editors hold, he suggests that editorial skill relies more upon “personality than subject training. . . . [Walker's] temperament seems similar to university press editors. He has an ability to stand back and apply the right level of judgment.”

Walker, however, sees other aspects of his role as a selector for the library relating to “selecting at an earlier stage in the process” of scholarly works, noting that when librarians select and curate materials for collection digitization projects, they create packaged sets of content that shapes a viewer's understanding of the subjects, even though it may not provide the same narrative and analytic arguments found in a scholarly monograph or article. Walker agrees that not all collections librarians would be well suited to working at the level of detail in publishing services that he does. However his deeper involvement in the research and publishing process suggests one way in which the subject specialist's future role might involve more collaborative working relationships in their subject fields, which may in fact demand more specialized knowledge. Programs like *Signale*, he says are “best focused on smaller areas [of scholarship] with greater difficulty in keeping their publications going.” In fact, within these specialized niches of scholarship that form small information ecologies, libraries have some of their best opportunities to incubate more active roles in publishing.

Pre- and Postpublication: Content Production and Management

Maria Bonn defines the University of Michigan's Scholarly Publishing Office's primary business activity to be “get[ting] the data into shape so that it can be moved online.” These operations involve conversion, processing, and preparation of publishable content for online delivery in aggregations with related publications that bring additional functionality and utility for readers. These technology-dependent operations are frequently cited as a key asset for libraries engaged in publishing. The last decade's expansion of digital library programs and

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

deployments of institutional repository services have created a large base of expertise in the manipulation, markup, and preparation of digital content for electronic distribution. Karla Hahn's report on library publishing reveals that in most cases, publishing services focus primarily on hosting the publications online, a more limited set of services than those found in traditional publishing outlets. In such cases, the library plays a role analogous to that of a printer or a small distributor. As hosting becomes more routine, Hahn writes, libraries often begin to explore more value-added services in pre- and postproduction, such as technical support for workflow and editorial management, metadata production, preservation, ISSN registration, OpenURL support, layout and design, and copyediting/proofreading.¹⁵ Publishers will be more familiar with many of these, especially those that move original material from manuscript to presentable form, such as copyediting, design, and layout. Several of these services lie outside of the established competencies for many existing digital library programs. Peter Potter at Cornell University Press suggested that where complementary and sufficient expertise can be found through a partnership, libraries and publishers should continue to specialize in this way because of the expense of duplicating talent.

A mix of project managers, developers, and technicians carry out the operations in these programs. Project managers and technical leaders frequently work directly with clients and users to define the functional requirements of a publication project. Technologists in these publishing programs carry responsibilities for process automation, system management, access log analysis and reporting, software investigations, and writing of documentation. Technical staff likely will not be the primary contacts with the user community, but it will be critical for them to understand their services from the perspective of users. While these operations managers and technologists must understand the mission and context in which they work and the needs and perspectives of users and clients, their areas of technology specialization are not necessarily specific to publishing. Many of their skills, such as the ability to program in one or more common languages, as well as an understanding of XML/XSLT or webserver administration, are common to other IT operations in libraries. For example, Project Euclid employs a Publishing Systems Developer to maintain the production and hosting platforms, perform service enhancements and upgrades, and provide technical support. The position requires a computer science background, previous work experience, and familiarity with Perl and XML/XSLT, but does not specify an expectation of or preference for experience in a publishing setting.¹⁶ Other staff partially devoted to Euclid perform related duties at a higher systems level, such as architecture design and specifications for elements of DPubS and Euclid. At SPO and the eScholarship Program, junior programmers report to a technical leader or more senior programmer. At Cornell and other libraries, staff already assigned to digitization or production units, or the core IT units, are sometimes assigned duties at less than 100% effort to support the publishing services. Staff within a central technology unit thus can work on multiple digital library, publishing, and integrated library operations, relying upon cross-training or a service team approach. Proper project management and resource management in such contexts will be critical.

Maria Bonn supervises three staff members in these types of roles, including two project managers, one of whom serves as managing editor of the *Journal of Electronic Publishing*. An electronic publications librarian identifies workflow, process, and automation needs; determines appropriate publication formats; and presents clients with design and interface options. Catherine Mitchell at California Digital Library oversees a technical lead, three programmers, and an

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

operations coordinator, in addition to the outreach and marketing coordinator previously discussed. David Ruddy, director of E- Publishing Technologies at Cornell, now oversees 2 FTE technical staff devoted to Euclid,¹⁷ smaller publishing projects, and maintenance and development of the DPubS publishing platform. David Ruddy says that as Euclid has become larger in scale, distributing more journals and publishers, operational work has concurrently become “simultaneously more intense and more tedious,” requiring a detail orientation and an eye for process improvement and efficiency. Project Euclid has kept its costs lower by taking on fewer responsibilities for copyediting, design, and layout, relying on their journal editors to bring them the equivalent of “camera-ready copy.” Nevertheless, this material still needs metadata creation and standardization and reference linking via the assignment and use of Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs). Both Bonn and Ruddy discussed when and how they might outsource especially large assignments of digitization or metadata generation to another library unit or to a commercial vendor.

Although the operations staff may not be the primary public face of the program, they may manage its most visible aspect: the Web interface to the publications. Some programs have deployed new software programs, such as Open Journal Systems or DPubS, or used third-party services such as BePress, to distribute the published materials. Such platforms may also provide the editors of publications with Web-based tools to manage the processes of manuscript submission and review. In either situation, responsiveness to the users will become a critical issue. David Ruddy points out that increases in the client base and readership will inevitably entail a greater degree of help desk activity and trouble reports, requiring staff to rapidly triage the problem for referral or resolution. Help desk reports can signal a problem of such severity that it will take precedence over all other work and may take significant time away from other assignments within these small working groups. Furthermore, client needs and subscriber requests for improved service may require customization or further development of the publication software platform. At the time of our interview, the Scholarly Publishing Office at Michigan was initiating planning focused on a significant implementation of OpenURL to comply with a major subscriber’s newly announced expectations. Similarly, the eScholarship Publishing Group at CDL has recently begun significant usability testing and redesign, working closely with BePress, the vendor of their Digital Commons platform, to identify and test new functionality to improve the reading experience.

Reaching the Reader: Distribution and Marketing

Because distribution and marketing take place near the end of the production chain, they tend to be less visible to many library staff. Assisting a journal editor in bringing her publication online can be a significant first step in reaching a wider audience. But it is only a first step. Strategic decisions about the publishing business model and targeted audiences direct where the content is marketed and in what forms it will be accessible. In the most basic way, electronic distribution occurs at the moment the publication goes online. But the efforts to improve interface accessibility discussed above will have no effect if staff time cannot also be directed at improving visibility. Doing so would at a minimum entail search engine optimization of the websites and metadata publishing of a variety of forms, ranging from basic OAI publishing/harvesting to the assignment of Digital Object Identifiers to promote citation cross-linking. That may promote visibility, but it stops short of the marketing or promotion of publications that would be necessary to establish awareness of their name or their reputation as a

This document represents the author’s final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

valuable scholarly resource. A key service for a publishing program should be to help publications reach the widest possible reading market, which can entail significantly more promotional effort beyond search engine optimization and OAI publishing. Katharine Skinner, Digital Projects Librarian at Emory University Library, worked briefly in publicity and marketing for nonprofit organizations prior to working at Emory. While she believes the experience gave her “a good understanding of the importance of a broader, wider audience and the ways of reaching it,” it also has made her since realize “that’s not something that libraries are especially good at doing.” Marketing becomes critical if the publishing service’s business plan calls for cost recovery through sales or fees. In her survey of library publishing services, Karla Hahn pointed out that most libraries today primarily offer services based on open-access business and access models, but not necessarily because of their advocacy for open access: “Where libraries are supporting only open access publications, there is also a genuine element of pragmatism in the decision—they are avoiding the substantial overhead involved in subscription-based business models and traditional print runs. The costs of restricting access to a small readership may exceed the opportunities to generate revenue that subscriptions create.”¹⁸ Long-tail service providers have proliferated, and libraries can use print-on-demand services such as Lulu or outsource to Amazon’s CreateSpace or to Ingram’s Lightning Source for services more directly connected to broader sales channels. Here, however, library-based publishing begins to move towards more complicated financial arrangements that may necessitate additional expertise. Maria Bonn of Michigan’s Scholarly Publishing Office admits that over the years her steepest learning curve has been to learn how publishing works from the perspectives of a producer, marketer, and distributor. “I’m still figuring out the publishing business. [Offering print-on-demand services] has meant understanding the whole world of distribution, trade discounts” and other practices less well understood by librarians.

Where significant marketing needs exist, or when a revenue-based access model is needed or desirable, a formal publishing partner can possibly provide necessary expertise. California Digital Library’s partnership with the UC Press provides the eScholarship Program with access to marketing channels and expertise to complement its own hosting services. In early 2008, Cornell established a partnership with Duke University Press that divided responsibilities for Project Euclid operations between the two organizations. Project Euclid’s mixed open-access/subscription model involves significant business planning, journal recruitment, and marketing in order to compete with other publishers for sales to libraries and for the rights to distribute journals. Duke, which has a significant e-journal publishing program of its own, now provides marketing, sales, and order-fulfillment services to Euclid publishers and subscribers. Cornell Library continues to provide the technology platform for the Euclid journals, along with metadata, preservation, and consultation services.¹⁹ Euclid’s revenue-generating business operations are complicated and unique within Cornell Libraries and would likely be unique in any research library. Duke has extensive experience and capacity in those areas, having developed them as a not-for-profit university press. Ehling describes this mutually advantageous arrangement as another example of how libraries and publishers can partner based on their unique strengths. But not every library has needs like Euclid’s, nor can they all work with a university press that has the ability and interest in collaborating in these ways. In such cases, the library may have no choice but to handle these and other capabilities in house or to scope the programs services to a manageable set of responsibilities and provide referrals for what it cannot provide.

Starting Up: Testing the Waters and Building Expertise

The previous discussion of staffing models focused on better developed library publishing programs in order to outline the diversity of processes within them. Assigning staff solely to the publishing operation can allow the program to specialize and create economies of scale. Libraries may hire new staff specifically to begin or manage such programs, and these individuals may come from a variety of nontraditional backgrounds. But libraries just beginning a new publishing service likely cannot dedicate a large number of FTE to a start-up project and will need to link the effort to existing programs or to reallocate existing staff on a permanent or short-term basis. In this section, I will first discuss several pilot publishing projects to identify where needed expertise could be found. Following that discussion, I will look at the education and professional backgrounds of librarians tapped to manage publishing services, and the challenges for their professional development.

Start-Up Programs and Services

Start-up programs might begin in any number of ways: a detailed and concerted needs analysis, requests from one or more faculty, an opportunistic chance to experiment, or some combination of these. Start-ups frequently begin with one or more pilot projects, often defined as technology-dependent tasks and implementations, that create a learning opportunity in which teamwork and problem-solving capacities are critical. Such projects provide the groundwork to define a publishing service strategy, but typically focus first on answering the questions of how the library can publish original materials and later on assessing next steps. Staff assigned to these projects tend to be members of the library who have demonstrated a capacity for operations and process management, as well as a proven willingness to experiment and ability to succeed. The following sections briefly discuss how several publishing projects were initiated at the University of Kansas, Indiana University, Ohio State University, and Penn State University. In three of these libraries, the publishing service has been closely aligned with preexisting institutional repository services, an approach allowing the project to effectively leverage staff expertise even if the IR and publishing platforms are distinct. At Penn State University, no IR service existed at the time the publishing program was initiated. The publishing projects there gave the library an opportunity to begin its program with services that responded to specific needs and strategic collaborations and to build additional repository services from this base of activity.

Though few in number, librarians with prior publishing experience will certainly have an advantage when starting new services. At the University of Kansas, Brian Rosenblum has relied on his previous work at the Scholarly Publishing Office at the University of Michigan to initiate pilot journal and monograph publications. As the Scholarly Digital Initiatives Librarian, Brian manages no one directly, but coordinates work undertaken in the central information technology group and by others in the Scholar Services unit in which he serves. Rosenblum has guided the evaluation and selection of publishing software for the new program, assessed new content with researchers, written specifications, and communicated with vendors for digitization work. He also supports users of the institutional repository, consults with researchers on content preparation, and advises editors on subjects ranging from intellectual property and contracts to how to work with aggregators and indexing services. Rosenblum oversaw the launch of two journals in early 2008 through a service known as Journals@KU before coordinating the preparation of two additional journals and three monographs. However, he also sees limited growth potential without additional resources for technical support or production staff. At the

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

Scholarly Publishing Office at Michigan, he gained proficiency in content production, text markup, and working with faculty. But with no formal training or experience in traditional print publishing, he says that he is well aware of the boundaries of his expertise and where that will limit new services or require external partnerships, especially in the areas of marketing and distribution.

Rosenblum's prior experience allows him to perform as a "jack-of-all-trades" and to provide clear guidance to others in his organization. But where no prior experience exists, pilot publishing projects may rely on a small team with "all hands on deck." Such teams may number as few as two or three people tasked with moving one journal from concept to publication. Frequently these teams cross departmental and divisional lines, even when one department has been identified as the publishing services unit. This allows for a breadth of expertise and a needed division of labor, even though roles may not be distinct at various points in the process. At Indiana, a team of four, made up of a systems analyst, a reference/public services librarian, a graduate assistant, and the associate dean for Collections and Digital Publishing, worked for several months directly with one faculty member to launch a brand-new open-access journal, *Museum Anthropology Review*. Associate Dean Julie Bobay explained that the journal's editor, who also serves as editor of one of field's flagship journals, *Museum Anthropology*, "taught the library as much as about the editorial process as we taught him about online distribution." The project began when the editor, a user of Indiana's IR service, IUScholarWorks, indicated his more pressing need to publish new, original scholarship, rather than archiving postprints. Based on the need for supporting the workflows of editorial review, the library decided not to use its DSpace installation but instead adopt a publishing-specific tool. This small team did "just about everything" to bring the journal online, which involved choosing new software, Open Journal Systems, testing and debugging the installation, customizing the interfaces, and designing the workflows. Because the systems analyst was assigned only half-time to both the publishing effort and institutional repository services, all other members of the team took on as many tasks as possible to enable him to focus on the software services. Bobay explained that with one journal complete, Indiana now has a better understanding of the process and knows that it will need additional staff with more dedicated time to grow the program. Because the publishing project came to the library via the IR service, Bobay believes that the continuum of these services gave the library a stronger grounding for supporting scholarly communications.

Tschera Harkness Connell, head of the Scholarly Resources Integration Department, has responsibility for developing the publishing services at Ohio State University (OSU). The library has recently become the host for *Disability Studies Quarterly* (DSQ), now an open-access journal. Connell also oversees serials and electronic resources cataloging, as well as the Knowledge Bank, OSU's institutional repository. She also serves on the project team, and her unit has been heavily involved in the deployment of OSU:pro, an enterprise system for managing information about the scholarly expertise of the university, that is being phased in as a tool to support the OSU's promotion and tenure-review process. Connell's department carries out a notable range of activities, and in this case, assigning the work to a service unit that had experience in implementing services off the beaten track seems to have been a strategic and effective choice. Overall, the department consists of 10 people, counting Connell, who says that her staff, now specialized, will be asked to cross-train as publishing services become more regularized. When OSU Library initiated the migration of DSQ from a commercial Web hosting firm to OSU, available staff were few in number. At the start, only one individual was heavily involved in the

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

installation, setup, and initiation of DPubS, as well as the content preparation for the journal. Though this allowed for a deeper knowledge of the tool and how it works, Connell expected that these two tasks would be divided for more efficiency. Connell now oversees 1.5 FTE who are responsible for defining workflows, service plans, and assessment methods. Both the Knowledge Bank and the new publishing services have been assigned one FTE in the central IT group. A wider group of staff from her unit and IT services have become involved in evaluating and reviewing needs for further software implementations.

Penn State University Libraries and the Penn State Press formed the Office of Digital Scholarly Publishing in 2005, but it operates largely as a virtual organization. The office is codirected by the author, the Assistant Dean for Scholarly Communications, and the Associate Director of the press, and a distributed project model supports the its programs. Penn State had no previously existing institutional repository services per se, though it had been actively digitizing from its collections for a number of years, and it had been collaborating with Cornell Library to create the DPubS platform. Following the first public release of DPubS in late 2006, the codirectors commissioned an implementation team to publish online large back file sets for two journals, a set of conference proceedings, and three monographs in the newly launched series Penn State Romance Studies. This implementation group consisted of the members of the previously existing Digital Technologies Advisory Group, a cross-departmental team of staff who planned digitization projects from inception to completion, with two more staff added for additional expertise. Membership ultimately comprised staff from the departments of Digitization and Preservation, Metadata and Cataloging Services, I-Tech (a technology applications support and training unit), and Digital Library Technologies (IT networking, hardware, systems), as well as the production editor from Penn State Press and the newly named Scholarly Communications Services librarian. Including production staff from both the Penn State Press and Libraries allowed the two units to better coordinate specifications for design and composition to accommodate both print and electronic products. Relying on a previously existing team with additional expertise ensured that the libraries drew upon known strengths and working relationships, while also testing how well a distributed service and staffing model can work for these programs.

Given the emerging nature of library publishing programs, these experimental pilot projects have served as assessment opportunities. They gave each organization the chance to test assumptions, develop an understanding of process, identify the needed skills and resources to grow such a program, and compare these against the competencies of existing staff. During the interview discussions, several organizational glitches tended to recur. Better established and critical services within the library often placed demands on the staff involved in the pilot so that individuals, especially those assigned from an IT services group, would sometimes have to drop the project's work for a brief period. Sometimes there is no other way to begin, but dividing staff time across multiple efforts can delay or hinder the success of these projects, especially if higher level managers or administrators, who will naturally have competing priorities from other aspects of their jobs, play a critical operational role in the project. During the pilot, it may not be clear to the team how a smaller project would lead to a larger program, giving the effort a feeling of uncertainty that may prove to be unsettling for some of the staff involved. With responsibilities divided across units, internal divisions may surface over communication or protectionist behaviors over turf and influence, even when strong working relationships already exist. Nevertheless, these projects show librarians and staff creating a collaborative, energetic

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

problem-solving environment in which members will do whatever it takes to get the work done. Managers and library leaders must maintain this energy when moving to make those processes more operationally routine.

Finding and Developing Expertise

The ability to adapt and learn quickly on the job is probably the most important skill for anyone working in library publishing services. The programs discussed here have been managed by individuals who have not only experience in libraries and library science, but also advanced degrees in other fields or extensive experience working in the academic publishing or public communications sectors. Because of the small size of the interview pool for this chapter, generalizations about the career history and expertise necessary for a library-based publishing service might be shaky at best. But given the evolving nature of publishing service programs, it is not surprising to find this mix. Some had crossed over to libraries from academic publishing, or other nonprofit sector work, while others held advanced degrees in librarianship, the humanities, or both, and a few combined one or more of these backgrounds. Two of those interviewed would be considered by some to be “career librarians” who held masters or doctorates in library science, had spent many years working in a library, and came up through the ranks of collections, public services, and technical services. Five of those interviewed began working in libraries after obtaining an advanced degree in the humanities, and three of them obtained a library degree afterwards. Among those with a humanities background, all gained additional experience in library digital programs or nonprofit sectors related to publishing, marketing, or Web-content management. Each of this subset told stories of how the humanities background contributed to their success once they began working in libraries. Familiarity with the scholarly research process helps them to “speak the language” of faculty with whom they work, and a PhD often helped to counter what one described as a “degree of snobbishness” that some campus faculty display when working with employees in service units like the library.

Libraries looking to make new hires for these services have cast their net widely and sought unusual blends of education and experiences. Both New York University Libraries and Penn State University Libraries have created new positions to oversee publishing services in their libraries in the recent years, and the postings for these roles indicate a need for flexibility as well as the hope for unique experiences. At both institutions, the university press reports to the Dean of Libraries, and these positions were both structured to develop and manage collaborative programs for the libraries and the press. In their job advertisements, both libraries characterized these roles broadly, sought a blend of publishing and library experience, as well as thorough familiarity with aspects of digital content development and distribution for scholarly purposes. The most significant difference between the two position postings can be found in the scope of the roles. Penn State’s position, Assistant Dean for Scholarly Communications and Co-director of the Office of Digital Scholarly Publishing, was defined as a senior administrative role for the libraries. At New York University, the Program Officer for Digital Scholarly Publishing reports to the Dean and to the Director of the University Press and has been defined with a more specific focus on the publishing program. Both positions, however, highlight the ambiguous nature of the planned work, with expectations for facilitating cooperation among a number of nonreporting units.

At Penn State, where the partnership with the press preexisted the search, the assistant dean’s portfolio extends beyond publishing services to several related areas that focus on the

This document represents the author’s final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

context for the publishing program within the libraries and the university. The job posting for Assistant Dean for Scholarly Communications, Penn State University Libraries listed these as “planning, organization, policy development, and implementation of the Libraries’ scholarly communications program,” which would be implemented through “collaborative leadership with computing units, the Penn State Press, and the Libraries departments and collection development groups to coordinate and develop digital publications, collections, electronic repositories and appropriate software and hardware platforms.” When the posting was opened, in late 2005, the Libraries’ sought a “Masters Degree in Library Science (or an equivalent academic degree), significant experience in a major university with a least five years experience in library collection development, scholarly publishing or communications, and/or digital library programs.”²¹ I was hired into this position with a master’s degree in English and American literature, and nine years’ experience in defining and providing digital library services at another research library, with occasional collaborations with a university press. However, because I hold no library science degree, my hire into a senior leadership role was highly unusual for the institution.

At New York University, press Director Steve Maikowski explains that Program Officer position, now held by Monica McCormick, was deliberately structured as a bridge: “We had no program of any kind of collaboration on any publishing projects between press and libraries, nor the time to seriously explore such collaborations or new digital publishing and publishing services we could provide to faculty.” According to Steve Maikowski, NYU sought applicants who “understood how libraries operate and could bring the user perspective” to the job, while also demonstrating knowledge of “how a dissertation becomes a book, peer review and how it transforms content, the role of the university press in promotion and tenure, and the financial challenges that might affect what and why they publish.” The posting stated that duties would focus on “develop[ing] and manag[ing] a . . . program to design and initiate a variety of innovative digital publishing initiatives.”²² Its collaborative responsibilities involved “working with the NYU Press, Digital Library Technology Services, Faculty Technology Services, and the Digital Studio” to “provide a central, advisory, and liaison role in publishing online scholarly content.” The posting stated the expectation for “at least five years of related work experience, preferably with a scholarly publishing house or an academic library”²³ and a preference for a master of library science degree. McCormick’s position is not defined as tenure-line librarian role, but is instead classified similarly to those of the university press staff. McCormick previously worked at the University of California Press for 16 years, including 10 years as an acquisitions editor responsible for history and ethnic studies. After leaving the press, she earned an MSLS from the University of North Carolina, served as a visiting program officer in special collections at the Association of Research Libraries, and joined North Carolina State University Library as Director of Digital Publishing before moving to NYU.

Others interviewed for this study shared work histories that were similarly diverse, and a few described career arcs that would, at least retrospectively, seem to be on a track towards library publishing. Brian Rosenblum’s path from Michigan to Kansas provides one example of a career path within library publishing, but the field is as yet too new and too small to find many such examples. Maria Bonn began work at entry-level humanities text-encoding jobs at the University of Michigan Library in the late 1990s while earning her library degree. She gradually picked up more digital library project management responsibilities in successive roles leading to her assignment as head of the SPO. David Ruddy earned his PhD in English literature at

This document represents the author’s final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

Michigan and began working in digital publishing when he was an editor of the print *Middle English Dictionary* at Michigan around the same time that project began to partner with the library to bring it online. Katharine Skinner, Digital Projects Librarian at Emory's Woodruff Library, started in the library as a graduate assistant on a grant-funded project while finishing her PhD research in American studies. She has continued after completing the dissertation, taking on responsibilities that include oversight of several multi-institution collaborations. Catherine Mitchell at California Digital Library received exposure to the effect of economics on academic publishing while earning her doctorate in English when her colleagues began to write for publication with mixed success. Both Mitchell and Skinner spent time in communications, marketing, or Web-publishing jobs in the nonprofit sector during breaks from the academy. Still others, like McCormick, have crossed over from the publishing industry itself. Terry Ehling joined Cornell Libraries in 1999 after 20 years at MIT Press, where she had served as the Director of the Digital Projects Lab and helped to bring MIT CogNET online. Her previous experience in creating products within academic publishing fit well with Cornell's needs for the newly launched Project Euclid, envisioned as an alternative channel for publishing and aggregating math and statistics journals. Ehling explains that she made the leap because she sensed that libraries were an important and fertile arena for experimentation in scholarly communications and saw the potential for Project Euclid to serve as a "kernel" for the growth of other publishing services and projects within Cornell that are less market-driven and more service-focused. Among all of these stories, each contains some early exposure to and experience with communications using the Web, and a number of them involve work in a publishing environment of some sort.

Although library publishing has generated a great deal of buzz, the opportunities for training, education, and professional development have not grown quickly. Library science programs have offered new specializations in the related areas of digital library management and data curation functions, but publishing issues, if studied at all, are more likely to be treated in relation to collection development. Workshops and training programs on the subjects of scholarly communications and institutional repositories also tend to focus on broader issues, such as open-access advocacy and building awareness, or on specifics such as the selection of IR software and not very much at all on publishing as a set of services and processes for creating, distributing, and promoting content. Unlike librarianship's academic credentialing norms, the publishing profession itself relies heavily on the apprenticeship model, in which staff gain skills through successive assignments and professional networks.²⁴ Karla Hahn writes that "library publishing programs seem to be developing in something of a vacuum of community discussion."²⁵ Brian Rosenblum spoke of the difficulty he has had in identifying a network of other librarians "doing publishing." This will remain challenging so long as the field remains small, and so these publishing staff have had to find ways of networking through existing meetings and conferences, even though many of these may not quite fit the full range of topics that staff encounter. Programs specifically about library publishing have appeared at LITA, the Digital Library Federation Forum, the Charleston Conference, and SPARC's 2008 Digital Repositories Meeting. Publishing services may have developed in a vacuum because academic libraries operate primarily within the confines of their own institutions to offer services. But without a professional network, publishing librarians will have limited opportunity to learn from each other, and limited chance to identify areas for collaboration that may benefit the programs.

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

Conclusion: Staffing for Future Growth

Supporting scholarly communication is the core business of academic research libraries. In the early part of this decade, the phrase *scholarly communications* tended to serve as a signifier primarily for advocacy around the economics of publishing and library collections. It has now become more ambiguous and generally connotes the entire process of creating, distributing, and accessing scholarship and research, not only the economics of the system. Improving how that system works brings increasing needs for more specialization, for more knowledge about more aspects of that life cycle, and for the use of that specialized knowledge to consult and provide advice to faculty and students. Library publishing programs began in response to economic issues, but should be planned and staffed as part of a more comprehensive service foundation for the entire life cycle of scholarship within the network of research libraries. Linking the programs to institutional repository services can be a promising start, but higher education changes at a notoriously slow pace. The highly complex, competitive, and fast-changing information and technology market beyond the academy will likely have a greater impact on how we use technology to communicate the results of research. Developing library publishing programs requires leadership that is entrepreneurially based, creative, and unrestricted by conventional conceptions of either publishing or librarianship. Today they focus heavily on the processing of scholarly content for online delivery and discovery and sometimes for additional distribution services such as print. Bringing these services into the library can begin to reshape the culture of the organization beyond the technology units. Kizer Walker's work at Cornell suggests how librarians could become more actively engaged with faculty in their role as authors who are shaping the discourse of their field, as opposed to instructors or researchers seeking information. This will not be an overnight change, however, and liaisons will need colleagues in the area of publishing and repository services who can bridge the distance between technology-dependent activities and the specific scholarly needs that the technology should serve.

When speculating about the future, most of those interviewed discussed strategies for building scale, adding new staff, and recruiting new publication partners. Others mentioned the need to collaborate beyond their own organization, and still others mentioned that they needed to create space to explore emerging issues such as large-scale science data, digital preservation, and experimental publication formats. Any library evaluating whether to offer publishing services should assume that these now-experimental efforts will become increasingly important, and that collaborative services and technologies will drive future research and publishing needs. This underscores the need for librarians with deeper subject expertise who can conduct research and development on the same terms as the faculty member.²⁶ The current emphasis on cyberinfrastructure—those local, national and international initiatives to create more holistic networks of technology services for research and communication of its results in disciplines ranging from “big science” to “digital humanities”—have a direct bearing on how library publishing and related staffing competencies may develop.²⁷ Publishing and the related services that support scholarly communication form a critical part of that cyberinfrastructure, but the definition of the “publishable unit” and the functionality that accumulates around it will very likely expand. Cliff Lynch has suggested that proliferating data emerging from contemporary scientific research has already begun to change the relationship between scientific articles and this data. According to Lynch, authors and their articles will not simply reference the data, but that data will be incorporated into review processes and into the article in ways that may provide additional tools to allow readers to visualize or analyze the data for themselves.²⁸ Preliminary

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

efforts are underway at Johns Hopkins to build partnerships between libraries, scientists, and publishers to define new standards and model the practices and relationships necessary for such a system.²⁹ Data in different formats will drive the humanities too, where digital scholarship has been slower to take root but has begun to do so with the frequent assistance of libraries. As such, librarians have sometimes filled a role that many publishers have been less capable of filling, as Emory University has recently demonstrated in redeveloping the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database as an online service from its original CD-ROM format.³⁰

It will be critical to identify staff who can contribute to this emerging cyberinfrastructure, which will draw upon expertise beyond information management.³¹ This will be a challenge with existing library staffing patterns and budgets. Both librarians and publishers emphasized the need for more rigorous business planning to sustain these programs and to fully exploit the library's financial capacity for experimentation. Technology supports library publishing, but as a common denominator, it might be an area where libraries could consolidate services and even look to outsource more basic operations. All of the programs discussed in this chapter that needed digitization conversion of any size relied on vended services. Must the content management and delivery platforms, such as OJS, DPubS, or DSpace, remain in house?³² If libraries had more numerous and viable alternatives that allowed for autonomy over their services to their campuses, how many would choose to manage their own publishing and repository tools? What deeper levels of expertise and service could be offered? Publishing service directors should consider their strategy: whether to build their own publishing infrastructure, rely on other in-house services, or seek outsourcing alternatives outside of the library. On this topic, Laura Cerruti at the University of California Press was clear: "it doesn't make sense now to build capacities for production inside: don't build platforms, build content." CDL's eScholarship Publishing Group, with a large dedicated staff, relies on BePress's Digital Commons to host and distribute its publications and provide workflow infrastructure as well. This frees up its staff to focus on enhancing and extending services rather than building and running basic publishing infrastructure. The content these publishing programs will help to create will live (or die) within a larger scholarly communications ecology with both symbiotic and predatory relationships. Many libraries' publishing programs began in order to provide scholars with viable and economical alternatives to commercially based publishers, thus minimizing the academy's loss of control over its research and its budgets for supporting that research. It might seem ironic to suggest that libraries should outsource more of their technology services, but doing so could leave more room for specialization and for hiring staff who can focus on the activities for which we really must cultivate expertise: services to the experts on our campuses, research and development, and the leadership for both.

Notes

1. Karla Hahn, *Research Library Publishing Services: New Options for University Publishing* (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2008).
2. *Ibid.*, 5.
3. In early 2008, Cornell and Duke University Press established a partnership in which Euclid operations are shared between the two organizations. Prior to this, 4 FTE in technical and business operations supported Euclid at Cornell according to Terry Ehling and David Ruddy.
4. Kate Wittenberg, 2004. "Librarians as Publishers: A New Role in Scholarly Communication," *Searcher* 12, no. 10 (2004). In *EBSCOhost*.

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

5. Laura Brown, Rebecca Griffiths, and Matthew Rascoff, *University Publishing in a Digital Age* (New York: Ithaka, 2007).
6. The promotion and marketing of institutional repositories provides some interesting examples here. Foster & Gibbons, and Davis & Connolly have both written about how IRs services, defined as services around the collection of the institution's content, have initially focused too much attention on the needs and benefits to the library and the university in general, often resulting in poor uptake of the services. Because researchers publish to extend the impact of their research and to make their professional careers, developing and defining services that promote the researcher's "brand" and promote the findability of their work have had more success. This in fact is what publishing seeks to do. (Nancy Fried Foster and Susan Gibbons, "Understanding Faculty to Improve Content Recruitment for Institutional Repositories," *D-Lib Magazine* 11, no. 1 [Jan. 2005]. www.dlib.org/dlib/january05/foster/01foster.html; Phillip M. Davis and Matthew J. L. Connolly, "Institutional Repositories: Evaluating the Reasons for Non-use of Cornell University's Installation of DSpace," *D-Lib Magazine* 13, no. 3/4 [March/April 2007], www.dlib.org/dlib/march07/davis/03davis.html.)
7. Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff, *University Publishing in a Digital Age*, 16; this librarian is actually speaking about digitized special collections materials, but Brown et al. use the point to refer to publishing skills.
8. Raym Crow, *University-Based Publishing Partnerships: A Guide to Critical Issues* (Washington, DC: The Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition, 2009).
9. *Ibid.*; Brown, Griffiths, and Rascoff, *University Publishing in a Digital Age*.
10. In a 2008 study from Ithaka, Kevin Guthrie, Rebecca Griffiths, and Nancy Maron point out that the academic community has historically not been oriented towards the fiscal sustainability of individual products or projects. They argue that this has now become a significant liability and that core business planning principles need to be put in place in order to ensure the survivability of innovative services (Kevin Guthrie, Rebecca Griffiths, and Nancy Maron, *Sustainability and Revenue Models for Online Academic Resources* [New York: Ithaka, 2008].)
11. McCormick describes the plans for New York University in greater detail in Monica McCormick, "Learning to Say Maybe: Building NYU's Press/Library Collaboration," *Against the Grain* 20, no. 6 (Dec. 2008/Jan. 2009): 28–30.
12. Crow, *University-Based Publishing Partnerships*.
13. Catherine Candee and Lynn Withey, *Report of the SLASLAC Task Force on Publishing Needs and Opportunities at the University of California* (Oakland, CA: University of California Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee, 2008).
14. This partnership is discussed in greater detail by Mitchell and Cerruti in Catherine A. Mitchell and Laura Cerruti, "Local, Sustainable, and Organic Publishing: A Library-Press Collaboration at the University of California," *Against the Grain* 20, no. 6 (Dec. 2008/Jan. 2009): 22–26.
15. Hahn, *Research Library Publishing Services*.
16. Internal job specification document provided by David Ruddy.
17. According to Terry Ehling and David Ruddy, an additional FTE had previously been assigned prior to the establishment of a new business partnership with Duke University Press in which operations for Euclid are shared between Cornell and Duke.
18. Hahn, *Research Library Publishing Services*, 19.
19. For more detail on this partnership, see Terry Ehling and Erich Staib, "The Coefficient Partnership: Project Euclid, Cornell University Library and Duke University Press," *Against the Grain* 20, no. 6 (Dec. 2008/Jan. 2009): 32–35.
21. Email posting "Position Announcement: The Penn State University Libraries, Assistant Dean for Scholarly Communication" to SPARC-OAForum listserv, January 17, 2006. Archived at arl.org/lists/sparc-oaforum/Message/2694.html.
22. Job advertisement for Digital Publishing Program Officer, New York University. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 17, 2007, p C37.
23. *Ibid.*
24. Thanks to Chuck Thomas of IMLS and October Ivans of the Society for Scholarly Publishing for the two conversations that led to these points.
25. Hahn, *Research Library Publishing Services*, 28.
26. In its solicitations for funding proposal in the DataNet Program, the National Science Foundation stated that "librarians, archivists, and computer/ computational/information scientists are unlikely to build excellent infrastructure for science and/or engineering without deep engagement with the intended users. In that sense, domain scientists should be full partners

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

in the process.” (National Science Foundation, Sustainable Digital Data Preservation and Access Network Frequently Asked Questions December 18, 2007. [Last updated Nov 19, 2008] www.nsf.gov/pubs/2008/nsf08021/nsf08021.jsp.)

27. The ACLS has written that “‘Cyberinfrastructure’ becomes less mysterious once we reflect that scholarship already has an infrastructure. The foundation of that infrastructure consists of the libraries, archives, and museums that preserve information; the bibliographies, finding aids, citation systems, and concordances that make that information retrievable; the journals and university presses that distribute the information; and the editors, librarians, archivists, and curators who link the operation of this structure to the scholars who use it. All of these structures have both extensions and analogues in the digital realm.” (American Council of Learned Societies, “ACLS Commission on Cyberinfrastructure: Summary,” www.acls.org/programs/Default.aspx?id=644 [accessed Dec. 15 2008].)
- The National Science Foundation has defined Cyberinfrastructure as the “Computing systems, data, information resources, networking, digitally enabled-sensors, instruments, virtual organizations, and observatories, along with an interoperable suite of software services and tools. This technology is complemented by the interdisciplinary teams of professionals that are responsible for its development, deployment and its use in transformative approaches to scientific and engineering discovery and learning. The vision also includes attention to the educational and workforce initiatives necessary for both the creation and effective use of Cyberinfrastructure.” (NSF Cyberinfrastructure Council, *Cyberinfrastructure Vision for 21st Century Discovery*, 1.)
28. Clifford Lynch, “The Shape of the Scientific Article in the Developing Cyberinfrastructure,” *CTWatch Quarterly* 3, no. 3 (Aug. 2007): www.ctwatch.org/quarterly/articles/2007/08/the-shape-of-the-scientific-article-in-the-developing-cyberinfrastructure. The potential for data fraud has also begun to make it more likely that the base data will be reviewed with the research report. See Jeffrey R. Young, “Journals Find Fakery in Many Images Submitted to Support Research,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 29, 2008, <http://chronicle.com/article/Journals-Find-Fakery-in-Man/846>.
29. Sayeed Choudhury, Tim DiLauro, Alex Szalay, Ethan Vishniac, Robert J. Hanisch, Julie Steffen, Robert Milkey, Teresa Ehling, and Ray Plante. “Digital Data Preservation for Scholarly Publications in Astronomy,” *International Journal of Digital Curation* 2, no. 2 (2007): 20–30; David Reynolds, Tim DiLauro, and Sayeed Choudhury. 2008. “An OAI-ORE Aggregation for the National Virtual Observatory” (presentation, Digital Library Federation Spring 2008 Forum, April 28–30, 2008, Minneapolis, MN).
30. Cambridge University Press originally published the database as a CD-ROM in 1999 (David Eltis, Stephen D. Behrendt, David Richardson, and Herbert S. Klein, *The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade [CD-ROM Database]*, [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999].) Cambridge, like many early publishers of CD-based products, later determined that it could not affordably continue to update and release further editions and reverted the rights to Eltis. The Digital Programs Group at Woodruff Library began working with Eltis, Robert W. Woodruff Professor of History, to articulate new goals and parameters for the project. Compared to the original CD version, the Web-based service provides improved functionality for analysis and visualization, new and expanded source data, ancillary content for teachers, and it will readily allow Eltis and an advisory board to update the resource as needed. In projects such as this one, librarians take on roles similar to scholarly collaborators or publishing editors who help shape the project, define its boundaries, and seek the funding needed to create it.
31. For a discussion of the staff development needs arising from “e-science” services in libraries, see Wendy Lougee, Sayeed Choudhury, Anna Gold, Chuck Humphrey, Betsy Humphreys, Rick Luce, Clifford Lynch, James Mullins, Sarah Pritchard, and Peter Young, *Agenda for Developing E-Science in Research Libraries: Final Report and Recommendations to the Scholarly Communication Steering Committee, the Public Policies Affecting Research Libraries Steering Committee, and the Research, Teaching, and Learning Steering Committee* (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2007).
32. The outsourcing of information technology services in higher education has become an important topic, but is well beyond the scope of this essay. But with limited resources and increased demand upon our services, we cannot staff to the levels that we would hope or easily grow programs to meet emerging needs. Colin Currie writes that “one of the great ironies for those of us in higher education information technology is that, in the coming years, doing the best-possible job for our institutions will mean finding the optimal ways to replace our functions with outside services. In other words, a critical part of our job will be to outsource ourselves as effectively as possible” (Colin Currie, “Painting the Clouds,” *Educause Review* 43, no. 6 (Nov./Dec. 2008), <http://connect.educause.edu/Library/EDUCAUSE+Review/PaintingtheClouds/47441>.)

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank all of the librarians and publishers who agreed to be interviewed on the record about their work and their careers. Clearly this chapter could not have been written without their cooperation. Several also provided very helpful comments on early drafts of this chapter as did Patrick Alexander, Sandy Thatcher, Raym Crow, and Karla Hahn. Martha Ney

This document represents the author’s final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, “The Publisher in the Library” in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

provided some additional research help. Throughout the entire project Ellie Goodman provided much needed advice and support.

Appendix A

Referenced Web Sites

Amazon Booksurge	http://www.booksurge.com/
BePress Digital Commons	http://www.bepress.com/ir/
Center for Innovative Publishing, Cornell University Library	http://cip.cornell.edu/
Disability Studies Quarterly	http://www.dsq-sds.org/
DPubS	http://dpubs.org/
DSpace	http://www.dspace.org/
eScholarship Publishing, University of California Digital Library	http://www.cdlib.org/programs/escholarship.html
Fedora Commons	http://www.fedora-commons.org/
Journal of Electronic Publishing	http://www.journalofelectronicpublishing.org/
Journals@KU, University of Kansas Library	https://journals.ku.edu/
Lightning Source	http://www.lightningsource.com/
Lulu	http://www.lulu.com/
Mark Twain Project Online	http://www.marktwainproject.org/
Museum Anthropology Review	http://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/mar
Office of Digital Scholarly Publishing, Penn State University	http://www.libraries.psu.edu/odsp/
Open Journal Systems	http://pkp.sfu.ca/?q=ojs
Penn State Romance Studies	http://romancestudies.psu.edu/
Project Euclid	http://projecteuclid.org/
Scholarly Publishing Office, University of Michigan Library	http://www.lib.umich.edu/spo/
Signale: modern German letters, cultures, and thought	http://signale.cornell.edu/
The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Database Project	http://www.slavevoyages.org

Appendix B

Interviews Conducted by the Author

NOTE: The individual circumstances of some of those interviewed have changed since this research began. Titles and affiliations listed were current on the date listed for the interview.

Person	Organization	Title	Date of Interview
Julie Bobay	Indiana University Library	Associate Dean for Collections and Digital Publishing	June 25, 2008
Maria Bonn	University of Michigan Library	Director, Scholarly Publishing Office	June 12, 2008
Laura Cerruti	University of California Press	Director of Digital Content Development	June 20, 2008
Tschera Connell	Ohio State University Library	Head, Scholarly Resources Integration Department	May 27, 2008
Terry Ehling	Cornell University Library	Executive Director, Project Euclid, and Director, Center for Innovative Publishing	May 11, 2008
Monica McCormick	New York University Library and Press	Program Officer for Digital Scholarly Publishing	May 27, 2008
Steve Maikowski	New York University Press	Director	June 20, 2008
Catherine Mitchell	California Digital Library	Acting Director, E-Scholarship Publishing Group	June 6, 2008
Peter Potter	Cornell University Press	Editor in Chief	June 13, 2008
Brian Rosenblum	University of Kansas Library	Scholarly Digital Initiatives Librarian	May 12, 2008
David Ruddy	Cornell University Library	Director of E-Publishing Technologies	May 11, 2008
Katherine Skinner	Woodruff Library, Emory	Digital Projects Librarian	May 27, 2008

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:
Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

Kizer Walker	University Cornell University Library	Bibliographer for German Studies and Bibliographer for Classics, Ancient Near East, and Archaeology	June 6, 2008
--------------	--	--	--------------

Appendix C

Sample Interview Questions

These questions were used only as a starting point for conversations. The author's specific knowledge of the interviewee and his or her organization often led to more detailed lines of questions.

Sample interview questions for individuals holding publishing-oriented jobs in libraries

- What is your title?
- How is your job classified (faculty, classified staff, professional)?
- What is the nature of the program you are working within? What is your role within it? What do you think you are expected to accomplish in this job?
- Can you describe a "typical day," or can you describe what you did in your job yesterday or today?
- With which parts of your library do you work most closely? What requires you to work together?
- Why did you apply for and accept this job? Why do you think you were offered the job?
- What skills are most important in this job? What parts of your work or educational background do you draw upon most?
- How do you think your job will evolve? What other types of jobs might you imagine being necessary to support this program?
- Can you provide me with any documents that may assist me in further analysis of your publishing program and the jobs involved? These might include strategic or project plans, job descriptions, job advertisements, or web sites.
- Who else within your organization, or at another institution, would you recommend that I speak with about these subjects?

Sample interview questions for academic publishers and editors

- Are you familiar with publishing programs in libraries? Do you work in collaboration with a library that has such a program?
- If has a working relationship: What is your working relationship with the individuals in that program? Were you involved in defining or posting the job that XX holds, and were you involved in the hiring process?
- If no working relationship: What role do you believe these individuals fulfill in the program he/she supports?
- Why do you believe the position/the program/programs and jobs like these was/were created? What goal do they serve? What expectations do you have of the program and the job?
- What skills do you believe are necessary to manage and support such programs? What educational and work backgrounds are important?
- Do these programs and individuals have any similarity to traditional publishing/editing jobs? If so, which, and what is the nature of the similarity? What are the key differences?
- How do you expect that publishing-oriented jobs will evolve in libraries? What implications do such programs have for academic publishing?

This document represents the author's final edits to text prior to publication as:

Michael J. Furlough, "The Publisher in the Library" in *The Expert Library: Staffing, Sustaining, and Advancing The Academic Library in The 21st Century*. Scott Walter and Karen Williams, Eds. Association of College and Research Libraries: 2010.

- Who else within your organization, or at another institution, would you recommend that I speak with about these subjects?

Appendix D

University-Based Publishing Core Competencies

Reprinted with permission from Raym Crow, *University-Based Publishing Partnerships: A Guide to Critical Issues*. (Washington, DC: The Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition, 2009).

[See: http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/pub_partnerships_v1.pdf (page28)]_