

New Platforms and Discovery Tools: Toward 21st-Century University Presses and Libraries

Angela Careno
New York University

Helen Cullyer
Mellon Foundation

Susan Doerr
University of Minnesota Press

Ellen Faran
MIT Press

Leila Salisbury
University Press of Mississippi

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston>

An indexed, print copy of the Proceedings is also available for purchase at:

<http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston>.

You may also be interested in the new series, Charleston Insights in Library, Archival, and Information Sciences. Find out more at: <http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/charleston-insights-library-archival-and-information-sciences>.

Angela Careno, Helen Cullyer, Susan Doerr, Ellen Faran, Leila Salisbury, Tyler Walters, and Charles Watkinson, "New Platforms and Discovery Tools: Toward 21st-Century University Presses and Libraries" (2015). *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316237>

Presenter Information

Angela Careno, Helen Cullyer, Susan Doerr, Ellen Faran, Leila Salisbury, Tyler Walters, and Charles Watkinson

New Platforms and Discovery Tools: Toward 21st-Century University Presses and Libraries

Angela Careno, Head of Collection Development, New York University

Helen Cullyer, Program Officer, Mellon Foundation

Susan Doerr, Operations Manager, University of Minnesota Press

Ellen Faran, Director Emerita, MIT Press

Leila Salisbury, Director, University Press of Mississippi

Tyler Walters, Dean, Virginia Tech University Libraries

Moderated by Charles Watkinson, Associate University Librarian, University of Michigan

The following is a transcript of a live presentation at the 2015 Charleston Library Conference.

Leila Salisbury: Good morning. I am thrilled to see all of you here this morning. We're very fortunate to be joined by some very sharp thinkers from publishing on funding and librarianship who are going to talk with us about how scholarship can be curated and interpreted and used better by our patrons. First thing this morning we're going to hear about two Mellon-funded projects designed to break new ground discovered only in the linking of humanities texts and to create iterative editions of scholarly that will work alongside scholarship itself. Talking about these two programs will be Susan Doerr, who is the operations manager at the University of Minnesota Press and co-principal investigator for the Manifold Scholarship Project, and Ellen Faran, who is the director emerita of the MIT press and is the project manager for the UPScope project. Then we'll hear from Helen Cullyer, program officer in the scholarly communications division of the Mellon Foundation who is helping fund these two projects and many others, and she's going to talk with us a little bit more broadly about Mellon's work and interest in this area. Then we're going to hear from Angela Careno, head of collection development for the division of libraries at NYU, and Tyler Walters, who is dean of university libraries and professor at Virginia Tech. So we'll hear from all ends, and I'm just going to

turn it over to the panel and listen and leave little time for questions this morning.

Susan Doerr: Good morning. I'm Susan Doerr with the University of Minnesota Press and I'm pleased to present to you Manifold, which is our new publication platform for a new type of scholarly publication, which we are calling the "Internet edition." Manifold is close to two parts in the project. The first is the development of the platform itself, where you will publish the work. The other is changing the workflow for authors and for publishers so that we can produce these works in a consistent and revocable way without re-creating them over and over each time.

So, Manifold has inspired some experiments that we've done at Minnesota. One of those is called Forerunners: Ideas First. And, so the idea with Forerunners is trying to create a new place where scholars can formally publish their work that they are doing that is in progress, so Forerunners are 25 to 30,000 words. They are what we have been calling "gray literature," that space where they are not yet meant to be a full monograph, but they are ideas and scholars want to publish them and start having dialogue on them. We've used some new tools to publish them quickly. These can be done in 12 weeks instead of 12 months and some of them are turning into full monographs, and so for example the green book *At the Anthropocene* by Jussi Parikka is now a book called *A Geology of Media*. In the Manifold platform that could've

happened, and the Forerunner could exist with the monograph, and you could just move between them to see the changes and adaptations that Jussi made. Now you have a print object and a field project, and you have to go from one to the other.

So, this new monograph format, the integer edition, not a great word integer edition, but the idea here is that they are networked. They're of the web. They are published with enhanced resources like video. They can have audio; they can have additional maps, additional photos, whatever scholars can think of they can turn into a digital file as part of the project on Manifold. And it is really important for us—we're not thinking about Manifold publications as books per se. Instead we are calling them "projects," and those "projects" are basic resources and texts, and they will be monographs, and we will produce a released version in Manifold and in print so it's going to be a hybrid project where we will have both the container, a static addition, and the dynamic addition living on the web.

So, in creating Manifold we have a prototype called Debates in the Digital Humanities. This is an open access website. It is currently housed at CUNY, and you can read the full book, you can interact with the book, you can interact with other readers through the annotation features, but to date it wasn't scalable. It was designed for one book and you needed some programming knowledge in order to get the text on there. What we've done with Manifold or are in the process of doing is making this something that any university press or just generally publishing production staff will be able to upload and put text into Manifold. You don't need to be a programmer in order to use it as a tool. So this is Manifold on a skylight. And we want readers to be able to read on whatever device they have in their hand. If they're sitting at their computer, they can read on that screen. If they've got their phone, they can read it on that screen. For a tablet, they can read on that screen. We want them to be able to interact on any device that they're using, and so in doing our wide framing and considering our features we've got all the potential devices in mind so that we

can make a good experience, a beautiful experience, no matter what they're reading.

So, the platform is built for authors and publishers. This is a publishing tool. It is not a production tool, and it is important to make that distinction. When you are loading a work into Manifold, the two platforms that we are taking and adjusting are either E-pub or Markdown. You still have to do all of the production work in the publication process to get to that E-pub. You still do your copy editing outside of Manifold. You still do your proofreading outside of Manifold and what you bring into Manifold, what we process, is the E-pub file and then all the resources.

The Manifold library is a collection of projects, and it's a collection of formally published books. And these are not books in Manifold. These are just some pretty covers we've done. But the idea is that it will be a mix of works in progress, the early editions and then the formally released version, and we are preparing Manifold in a way that it will be a toolset that you can use and install yourself if you want to publish books and we will be giving it away. This is open source and it will be free. And it should be—anybody with basic tactical knowledge should be able to install it and use it to publish. But, reading is really only the beginning for scholars, students, readers, anyone coming to a Manifold pub, we want them to be able to do more than read, and so annotate, contribute, discuss, all of these are the kinds of features, social media integration, we want it to be networked, and we want this to be a dynamic experience, not the flat replication with the static reading experience we have today. Reading is interactive, so why can't you interact? We want to be able to add that interactivity, and we want in some cases if the authors want to have dialogues with their readers, we would like to be able to have that on the platform.

Going back to our Debates in the Digital Humanities platform, we are currently doing an assessment analysis of how annotation has been used on that platform so that we can anticipate and solve some of the problems we have there in the Manifold platform. We are committed to

open, so as we do the code, as we do the process, everything will be visible if you want to follow along. You can either follow along on your log and we'll be releasing development versions as we go, and we've in fact decided to adjust some of the previously published books so you can see how content renders and interact with it as we build it. It will be an open source code-based, so anybody can use it, adapt, it take it, and do your own thing if you don't like how we've built it. But, if you want to use it the way we've built that, you're welcome to do that too. And some of the books that we publish will be open access. So that doesn't mean that everyone has to publish in open access if they use Manifold to publish themselves. We feel like open is a really important priority, is part of this project. So follow us along, and if you have any questions you are welcome to e-mail me, or you're also welcome to tweet me and I will respond.

Ellen Faran: I'm Ellen Faran. I am the project manager for the planning grant for UPScope, which is the working title for an online resource for university press monographs. UPScope is a project of the Association of American University Presses, AAUP, and a planning grant is funded by the Mellon Foundation. We are hoping to have a full implementation proposal for the project next spring.

UPScope will provide a single place for peer-reviewed scholarship collected and curated by university presses. We are exploring a full range of access and delivery models for the platform, seeking to meet the current and evolving research needs of scholars. The improved discoverability of our content will support existing purchasing practices, and as a service to UPScope users, we plan to provide purchasing and paid access options on the platform. Beyond gathering university press content in one place, UPScope will feature an innovative search function. Our inspiration is AcademyScope, now online at the National Academies Press. AcademyScope uses a natural language search called Related Engine and uses the full text of books to go deeper than metadata in order to identify connections among titles. This search algorithm is what's known as an inference engine. It can extract key terms from full

text to create indexes; they can map to existing taxonomies, thereby revealing relationships across fields and leading to novel discovery. And they have a way cool visualization, which I am not able to show you because I have a mere screenshot here, but this is all animated. If you select a major topic on the right-hand list, subtopics literally bubble up to show you what's happening and you get a spider web network of the book you're after and the books that are connected to it. This is so inaccurate that I'm sure you want to check it out. The way to find it again is AcademyScope or go to nap.edu.

Many of us have long envisioned the collaborative all university press catalog in the sky. Even better the timing of this planning effort for UPScope means that we can marshal tools for uses far beyond a catalog: desemantic search and options for process sharing and content delivery. So, please stay tuned for more news about UPScope.

Helen Cullyer: I don't have slides, so I'm just going to sit here I think and talk for a few minutes. So, I'm Helen Cullyer. I'm the program officer for scholarly communications at the Andrew Mellon Foundation and I worked very closely with Don Waters, who I'm sure many of you know. I just very briefly want to take you through some of our funding priorities and strategies. I'm not going to speak in depth about Manifold and UPScope, but rather place those initiatives in the broader context.

So, since sort of mid-to-late 2014, we've been engaged in a pretty major scholarly publishing granting initiative. Our goals are to assist not-for-profit publishers to disseminate and produce high-quality humanities publications on the web, to do that in a way that's financially sustainable, and to make those publications as broadly accessible as possible. We are focused on sort of a couple of broad areas. Firstly, the sort of financial and economic questions, more sustainable financial models, and we have quite an emphasis at the moment to try to determine the cost allocation, so some of you may have seen Nancy Mera's presentation yesterday. This is a study still in progress, Ithaca SNR, to really do a pretty broad survey of monograph publication costs across US

university presses, so it will be a very large sample, and to figure out standardizing out what those costs really are, and I think having seen some of that preliminary data, the important thing to really realize that you can't really reduce the cost of the monograph to one number and there are questions about direct costs, indirect costs, and kind costs. And we've also been doing some work with institutions: Michigan, Indiana, and Emory to figure out institutions' appetite really at the senior level of the administration to pay fees for their faculty to publish open access monographs, assuming standard peer-reviewed editorial procedures, revocable processes, and it seems actually that for those three institutions there is some appetite to do that. Obviously there are some issues surrounding sort of equity, what about the institutions that couldn't pay? What about non-tenure-track faculty? So, this has been an interesting set of investigations to really figure out at the level of not discipline variants but deans and provosts sort of pushing a little bit on how institutions are going to think in going forward about funding publication in the humanities and social sciences.

The other area that we're really focusing on is the development infrastructure, both human and technical, for peer review, editing, production, marketing, dissemination, discovery of scholarly publications and humanities, and by scholarly publications we're really thinking about sort of three different areas: journals, books, and also non-book-like things, so things like the products of digital scholarship that could really only be disseminated on the web and can't be printed, and that really stretch the definition that we have sort of the monograph to its breaking point.

Just to give you a few examples of the UPSCOPE and Manifold that we will be funding in the general space that will combine the humanities collaboration between Montgenevre, now at Burbank, and the Ubiquity Press. So this is a mega-journal in the humanities, so a journals funding model contributed by—funded by—contributions by libraries, and if you saw Brian Hall from Ubiquity Press' presentation yesterday or day before, the great thing about this is really the low cost of journal production on that level. In the

book space, sort of the evolving e-book space, the monograph I think is an evolving genre as we've heard with Manifold. One project that is just in the planning phase right now and will be moving forward to the implementation phase next year is Muse Open. Project Muse has been planning—is planning right now—to develop the capacity to host already E-pub books on its platform alongside content behind a paid wall. So that seems really important. As the publication becomes more mainstream, to get those homemade publications on the platforms along with subscription content.

And then the third one, and this is relating to the space of the non-book-like, non-monographic forms, Stanford University Press has received funds from us to start publishing what's called an interactive scholarly works. So these are works that really can't be considered books—like in any sense—may be so rich in multimedia, data, also interactive, they may have interpretive text, but it may be nonlinear that they really can't be thought of like a monograph or like a book in any meaningful way. And so they are developing not only sort of production and dissemination workflows, mechanisms for those, but they're also just figuring out peer review. How these objects, complex projects peer review. There needs to be a level of sort of technical peer review as well as peer review of the content, so they will be developing hopefully some best practices or something that will move toward best practices for peer review of those new genres.

I want to address very briefly the role of libraries. UPSCOPE and Manifold are actually two projects that don't really involve libraries in the development, but we do have a number of grants that do involve libraries and publishers working together, and I think those libraries increasingly supporting digital scholarship, some are becoming some publishers themselves, and some libraries are becoming integrated with the presses. There are multiple roles libraries can play. So just to focus on sort of one of those roles, actually publish those roles, we have a grant at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, one of several grants, that is helping institutions and their libraries provide better support for humanities

scholars who want to develop nontraditional humanities publications. So it's these interactive scholarly works and humanities projects. And helping them to think about the early stage of research and development what the publication outlets are going to be. What the formats are going to be. What the venues, channels for publication are going to be, and in the case of UYUC, it may be that some of the faculty are working with some of the people on digital scholarship and scholarly communications, and the library may end up publishing with university presses, and in other cases they may end up publishing through the library, but the idea is to get scholars thinking about publication as they are developing new research. That's all. Thank you.

Angela Carreno: I'm Angela Carreno, head of collection development at New York University, and I do not have slides either so I'll just stay here. Even before I heard about Manifold, I was definitely aware of the need for some outlet for linear, static text that makes allowances for what scholars are working on, and as a librarian, there was no easy way to think through it when those questions came in. And, on September 15, Rick Anderson posted something on *The Scholarly Kitchen* about an experiment taking place at the University of Utah in collaboration with Oxford University Press, and a library effort in collaboration with a scholar to add to the print version of the book primary source material and allowances for scholarly commentary and crowdsourcing options for gathering additional primary sources, etc., and I know that they used a blog platform. I said, "Okay, well . . ." And it was kind of exciting that a press was okay experimenting with a library and was going to be okay with the static print version combined with full-text coverage of the open version with all of this iterative functionality, so that sounded exciting to me, and I have a colleague in my library who was approached by a scholar in our Hebrew and Judaic Studies Center; she published a book with Yale University Press. And what she wanted was some sort of way to map their world using GIS technology. And the question was whether or not the librarian could help her, can we get this online, and is there some way to connect it with the book? And I know that she has been engaged

in an effort in collaboration with this scholar to make it happen and is very excited about the work she's doing. So, and she's using Omeka. Okay? Then, I am involved in collection stewarding committee meetings where we worry about the dissertation and our archiving role and the excitement in monographic students about digital humanities and experimental ideas and how important it is for us to think of ways to archive whatever it is, any kind of book. So platforms are very important, and the fact that it's open source is very important, and finding a collaborative, central way to take advantage of the platform that scales and is sustainable is important, and I'm glad we have these projects going on because I sure need help. When it comes to UPScope, I do not see libraries using it for vendoring, distribution, workflow, and processing. That isn't the idea. I am super excited about search that's taking advantage of natural language queries, and I'm super excited about the metadata, and I think both need to be shared to the advantage of both.

Tyler Walters: Good morning, everyone. So, my challenge is to say a few things that everyone hasn't said yet. Right? Two good essay projects I need you to pick up on UPScope, in essence we can talk about that, I mean I would agree in terms of the library perspective. It has this potential to be this really great search discovery resource of course for our users, for students and faculty on our campuses, and frequently this is mediated by libraries who are looking at specialized resources for teaching; students and faculty have utilized such specialized resources to find things. I'm particularly struck by the nature of a lot of publishing. Academic publishing these days is highly interdisciplinary, and I think as a faculty member or student we are looking for resources. If you have an engine like this you've probably discovered things from authors and probably even subject areas that you may not have thought about on your own, have for the system. It is just that you are able to find things that are written in just the right way and perhaps learn of people in certain disciplines working together and drawing from one of those works that again you haven't previously thought of on your own. More specifically, I think the data that will come out of this search tool is going to be a lot of use not just

to publishers, but to the library student who would really like a better understanding of user behavior, user searching, and being such a highly specialized database, I think these libraries would like to learn from this as well and to better understand what our users are doing, what they're seeking, work that has been produced in universities. I, too, I don't think that libraries are going to use it as a vendor tool, again that's not the purpose of this. Again, I think a lot is to be said for the data and interdisciplinary-ness of it all. Maybe also think about with all of this material online. Inevitably you can't print an online resource, and the thing you wonder about as AAUP and presses in general is the electronic path as libraries are self-serving, if there wasn't any off-duty potential of collaboration with another institution for preservation of these materials down the road.

Manifold—this is another very terrific project where I think many of us have thought about, “Yes, we need this dynamic, iterative, web-based resource that is based on library literature.” I'm sure many of us probably had that thought 20 years ago and think about it. Hyperlink, on the web through a browser, obviously, all of us in this ecosystem have struggled with this in these last few years. How do we get to this point where it is very easy to build such resources and sustain them and use then them in an instructional way? So, Manifold has I think, I don't want to set too high a bar for it, but Manifold points in that direction of being an open source platform that would be very easy for people to use, for presses to use, for the builders of content especially to be using and pushing out there. It reminds me of a lot of the digital humanities resources that we see in this building oftentimes in conjunction with the libraries who help produce these matters and to manage and maintain them. So, again I think it applies to that future of, wow, this is actually being built really of the press at the University of Minnesota. There's a lot of interest, a lot of potential stakeholders and others involved, and I think to with any classically or digital humanities resources, once these things are built, how do we preserve and sustain them? They take on a scholarly life of their own clearly in conjunction with the monograph that published. They become

a value-added scholarly resource on their own, these dynamic versions of these books, and I like to think that they're called projects. We know what books are in print, but we also know what e-books are, we always think of e-books right? It's a PDF or E-pub file—very, very flat. It's still kind of black letters on white paper, open screen. So this gets us far beyond that and helps us to think about using the dynamic web in a way that it was really intended from the beginning. That some of the questions going forward for Manifold is, it's great, it's going to be offered as an open source tool to be used in part for this to be built and sustained over time, will others contribute to sustaining Manifold and developing it, evolving in overtime. Because usually you see those really great open source platforms that really make it for the long haul arose from the main stakeholders at the same time, it usually is a visionary institution and/or a person who is putting this platform together, and they have that here at the University of Minnesota, and I'm in great support, and I think Manifold is tracking right where it needs to track. Also from the library perspective of libraries are certainly production units in a lot ways, and some of us run publishing programs, so this will be interesting to see the future of library publishers actually pick up the use of Manifold in their own operations. That's all of my comments right here.

Susan Doerr: So, Tyler, if I could just respond really quickly. So, I didn't name our partners and that was an oversight. We are partnered with the Digital Humanities Center at Manifold, and that is the digital scholarship opportunity and that goal specifically. So, as we are building this, digital humanities projects are very much top in mind because those are the folks that we are working with to build it as well as our technology partner called Cazgir Coding Technology and our dataset programmer is a humanities scholar himself, so everyone coming together around this project, our scholars and authors and interest in building the tools they wanted to see because of the tools they want, and in terms of the code development, we've committed 10 years of funding to continue support for the Manifold platform, and that is coming from both CUNY and the University of Minnesota because we want to see this succeed.