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The Value of Publishing: What's Worth Paying For?

by Nancy L. Maron (President, BlueSky to BluePrint) <nancy@blueskytoblueprint.com>

We spend a lot of time talking about how books are expensive: on one hand, to produce, to distribute, to preserve and on the other, to buy. The question of cost has been particularly important recently, as publishers of monographs experiment with ways to adopt the open access models popular with journals. And it’s a delicate topic: monograph publishing has largely resisted OA models, despite sometimes heated rhetoric from OA advocates. (One conference presentation a few years ago underlined the revolutionary nature of the movement by featuring an image of Delacroix’s Liberty Leading the People, though the tone has cooled somewhat since then.)

Not that there hasn’t been interest in OA, particularly from university presses. Community-based organizations like Knowledge Unlatched have jumped into this space with a model that permits university presses to test the waters with a few titles. Others, like UCP, have developed models of their own. But many publishers still wonder if an “open” model can compensate them for the effort each book requires to publish.

So, what exactly does it cost? A study my colleagues and I conducted with funding from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation demonstrated that even if you include only staff time and direct expenses, spending per book averaged between $22,559 at the smallest presses and $34,686 at the largest ones. These figures rose substantially when we included overheads like technology development and support, legal, and finance.

The findings raise two key questions: Why does it cost that much to publish monographs today? And, does it need to be that way?

The essays included here all speak to the more qualitative side of the business of publishing. What is the substance of this work that takes so much time, and ends up costing so much? Noting that acquisitions work can take years is fine, but what does that really mean? Certain key elements in scholarly publishing—peer review is a perfect example—must be clarified to have real meaning: the peer review conducted by an OA STEM journal publisher is unlikely to be the same process, for the same ends, at the same cost, as the process undertaken by a scholarly book publisher reviewing an important new work in an emerging field. When publishers, funders, university administrators and library-based publications programs start talking about the “cost” of publishing, it’s

continued on page 8
When I was a kid, we moved every year. My dad wasn’t in the military; he was a struggling graduate student cum professor following the best salary he could get for his family of five. Moving was fun but it was also stressful. You know, the new school, trying to make new friends and fit in. We finally settled in New Orleans for three years, hooray! But moved again to Richmond, Virginia, where we settled for two years until I went to college.

We are moving out of our house of 40 years on the Citadel campus. It’s been a long run but we have managed and are all moved out! And ATG must go on despite all the chaos!

This issue has been guest edited by the gorgeous Nancy Maron on the theme of The Value of Publishing: What’s Worth Paying for? There are papers from Dennis Lloyd (sifting and winnowing), Richard Carlin (building a list), Jenya Weinreb (editorial production), John Sherer (the dust jacket), Kathryn Conrad (community), Jessica Lawrence-Hurt (university presses), Susan Doerr (media), Becky Brasington Clark (accessibility), and Carey C. Newman (the book).

Our Op Ed is on Digital Golf Clubs and Back Talk is about the Frankfurt Book Fair. The Special Report is about the Charleston Conference inaugural Fast Pitch. Our interviews are with Stephen Rhind-Tutt and a multi-part perspective interview on video streaming. Our profiles encouraged section continues to grow with profiles of librarians, companies and presses. Tom and Regina have done their usual stellar jobs of reference and general book reviews, as well as Choice’s Collecting to the Core. And we have a special Legally Speaking by Bill Hannay as well as Lolly’s magnificent Copyright Q&A.

I am being paged to look over the house to make sure it is really empty (yes) and contractors to ask about what goes where (could that be a future Conference theme?). Happy New Year!! Love, Yr. Ed. 🎉

Letters to the Editor

Send letters to <kstrauch@comcast.net>, phone or fax 843-723-3536, or snail mail: Against the Grain, Post Office Box 799, Sullivan’s Island, SC 29482. You can also send a letter to the editor from the ATG Homepage at http://www.against-the-grain.com.

Editor’s Note: In this issue we’d like to share some comments received regarding the 2016 Charleston Conference and Vendor Showcase. Many thanks to everyone for sharing your thoughts. — KS

Hi Katina — I’d be delighted to further share our work at Syracuse with the many readers of Against the Grain (among which I count myself). And thank you for the kind words about my presentation. More than any of us on stage, however, I think the real winner was the Charleston Conference itself. The Fast Pitch event — and the people behind it — were just another demonstration of why the conference’s relevance continues to grow year after year.

Best, Scott Warren (Syracuse University Libraries) <sawarr01@syr.edu>

Toni and Leah — thanks so much for all the hard work you put into the annual meeting. I can speak for a lot of principals who agree with me that it is the most productive, concentrated event of the year.

Thank you again. Eric Calaluca (Paratext) <eric.calaluca@paratext.com>

Hi Leah/Toni — Congrats on another successful conference. I would love to get Credo in the main hall next year. We’ve been in the Pinkney and Gold Room last 2 years ... So if it’s first in, wins ... we want to register ASAP!

Thanks, Ian Singer (Credo) <ian.singer@credoreference.com>

Enjoying the gorgeous weather and the beautiful city, and great conference!

Thanks, Tony Horava (University of Ottawa) <thorava@uottawa.ca>

Hello Toni — A quick question ... very premature but while it is on our minds: is there a way to request similar location in the Calhoun room again for the coming years? Traffic was great!

Thanks, Candace Mooney (WT Cox Information Services) <cmooney@wtcox.com>

Hi Toni — I heard great feedback from our reps that attended the Vendor Showcase last week. We definitely want to sign up, and try to get placement on the main floor.

Are you taking signups for 2017? If not yet, when should I reach back out to you?

Elizabeth Reid (Bureau van Dijk) <elizabeth.reid@bvdiinfo.com>
Adding Media, Adding Value
from page 21

completion, the author sends the permissions log to the editorial assistant at the press who will add the information to the permissions log in our title database. When media are published in a Manifold edition, or on a companion web site to a book (as on the Fulcrum platform), we must create additional descriptive metadata that is not part of our existing process. This new metadata includes alt-text for accessibility, additional or new descriptive text because these media may be viewed without the context of the book’s text, adjustment to the captions to remove references specific to the print edition (i.e., “the image to the left”), DOI assignment and registration.

The University of Minnesota Press hired a graduate student from the History department to assist the authors and editorial assistant with securing permissions and generating metadata for the illustrative material in Canoes: A Natural History in North America by Mark Neuzil and Norman Sims. Canoes has a companion website for its illustrative content, hosted on the Fulcrum platform. Our graduate student spent approximately 80 hours completing the metadata spreadsheet required for the Fulcrum platform. Canoes has 323 photos, maps, paintings, and other media, which means our graduate student’s 80 hours of work equaled approximately 15 minutes of time per item to create the metadata needed for Fulcrum.

Manifold adapted the Fulcrum metadata spreadsheet for media and the Digital Projects Editor at the University of Minnesota Press is presently at work to prepare the metadata and media for The Perverse Anatomy: Hugo Gernsback on Media, Tinkering, and Science Fiction by Hugo Gernsback and edited by Grant Wythoff for upload into the Manifold platform. As we refine the process of composing the additional metadata required — as we build it into our routine workflow — we expect the time for metadata creation will be reduced by about one-third to half the amount of time our graduate student and Digital Production Editor have spent, or approximately seven to ten minutes per media item. For a project with 323 media items this would equal 37 to 53 hours of staff time, or about a week of work.

For one or two projects an additional week of work can be absorbed by our existing staff. The University of Minnesota Press publishes approximately 110 books per year. If one-third of our list, or 36 projects, were to be published on dynamic platforms that required the creation of additional metadata this would equal 1,332 to 1,908 staff hours, or 33 and 48 weeks of time — almost a full time employee. The amount of staff time we are able to allocate to working with an author on media permissions and metadata will be a significant factor in determining how many books we can publish as Manifold editions.

The conversation between author and editor about inclusion of media is both a curatorial and practical consideration of time. Do all the media that an author proposes to include enhance a reader’s understanding and experience within this project, and if so, does it merit the time? Not every scholar will have 300 media resources to publish in their project. Not every project will benefit from the inclusion of 300 media resources, even when platforms like Manifold and Fulcrum are able to include them.

University of Minnesota Press author John Hartigan, in his blog post, “Writing the Continuous Book,” http://www.umnpressblog.com/2014/11/upweek-writing-continuous-book.html says, “The best part is that though I keep accumulating more material than I know what to do with, my anxieties over what to do with it all are dissipating. I’m just watching what unfolds and trying to learn from it all, rather than worrying about how it will fit in the next book — or anticipating all that won’t make it between the next set of covers.” Platforms like Manifold and Fulcrum will allow authors like John to include many of the materials they are accumulating in their published projects. We believe that when selected thoughtfully more media will enrich a reader’s engagement with a scholar’s work. The addition of more media in a Manifold edition will be a meaningful investment of both the author’s and press staff time and effort. Our challenge then, is to make this work an efficient part of our workflow.

Making Connections ...
from page 18

remains essential. Connecting scholarship to readers, opening the academy, and fostering the impact of scholarship in communities will remain part of our mission, as it is for our larger institutions.

Lydia Otero documented the history of a place. The University of Arizona Press helped take that history to the community. While the story of La Calle is an extraordinary example, it exemplifies our values as a publisher and the value of university presses more broadly. Books can take root in communities, and university presses help scholarship flourish.

Rumors
from page 6

created Logo art utilizing both the ATG and Charleston Conference graphics. Some audio content from the 2016 Charleston Conference plenary sessions is being configured to put into podcasts. These will be made available shortly on the Charleston Conference and Against the Grain websites. Stay tuned! http://atgheapodcast.libsyn.com/podcast

Do you keep up with libraries by reading the ATG NewsChannel? Did you read that Jackie Gleason, the television comedian and motion picture actor had “a deep and abiding interest in parapsychology and its many components.” So much so that he collected “approximately 1,700 volumes of books, journals, proceedings, pamphlets, and publications in the field of parapsychology.” His collection consists of “both scholarly and popular works published in the United States and abroad” and will impress anyone interested in this fascinating topic. (See also: Special Collections: The Jackie Gleason Collection.) Fortunately, Marilyn Gleason, the widow of Jackie Gleason, donated the collection to the University of Miami Library in 1988 and their Special Collections has assembled a website featuring numerous examples from the collection. http://scholar.library.miami.edu/gleason/index.html

The National Federation of Advanced Information Services (NFAIS) has announced that the energetic, innovative, and incredible Judith Russell, the Dean of University Libraries at the University of Florida, has been selected to receive the NFAIS 2017 Miles Conrad Award. NFAIS’s Miles Conrad Award, long considered the information community’s premier annual honor for achievement in fostering the growth of information services, is being given to Russell in recognition of her significant achievements in librarianship and for her leadership in information services throughout a career spanning academia, government, the non-profit and private sectors. Russell will be honored at the NFAIS 2017 Annual Conference, February 26-28, in Alexandria, VA, and will deliver the annual Miles Conrad Memorial Lecture. You all will remember Ms. Russell was also featured with Charles Watkinson, Associate University Librarian for Publishing at University of Michigan Libraries and Director of University of Michigan Press, at the 2016 Charleston Conference. The devil is in the details: Challenges of Collaborative Collecting. Also — Check out our Penthouse Suite interview with Judith Russell from this year’s Charleston Conference! https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VMyU294lZxx&list=PL1GL162prM6F-QS1R19JFPGM89AP-A&index=19

https://nfais.memberclicks.net/miles-conrad-lectures

continued on page 62
ment up to 50 pages is our standard at ReCAP, and some requests get filled in just a few hours. That means articles and chapters, tables of contents and collections, or selected figures and tables can sometimes be in front of a user before they could possibly find a time to go to the library, locate and check out the work they needed, and throw it on a scanner-copier or get it back to their workspace.

From this vantage point, I think libraries need to start revisiting the work habits and assumptions of users. Now, from the moment they click “request,” it is hours until the item moves from storage into its fulfillment channel. For digital requests, that means they have their item within a day. For physical deliveries, that means affiliated users can have the item within a day or two, and any user within a week, faster and more consistent than interlibrary loan. It is also possible to think about chaining together the time of the reader and library logistics constitutes a library space in a more curatorial direction.

Scott Bennett’s description of successive library service models — from the reader-centric, to book centric, to learning-centric — can be valuable here when we read it not in terms of displacement or depreciation, but as a layering of services.

Hand in hand with this approach, we ought to be rigorous in thinking on-site open stacks as a very specific user service that we offer against the backdrop of a collective collection managed at purpose-built library service centers. The chief virtue of this thinking is that it’s objectively correct, of course. Most ARL libraries see an annual circulation rate around 4% and already have a great deal of their materials off-site. Even if readers browse an actual order of magnitude more materials than they check out each year (say 40%), the majority of the collection spends its time untouched on the shelf, and all the evidence suggests that the vast majority of on-site collections are rarely consulted.

My argument does not advocate for removing books from libraries. It does, however, prompt us to consider two critical changes in our thinking about making libraries more effective. The first is to stop worrying about adjacency to a place — the campus, the reading room — and start worrying about connections to fulfillment services. The second is to shift our thinking about the content of user-accessible library spaces in a more curatorial direction.

I should also consider the Claude Shannon-esque notion that information is surprise as we think about the library collections we assemble around our on-site users. The longer we store large and static collections of materials on-site, the more we risk creating a steadily less surprising and informative environment for our readers. We risk creating the collection that fits inside a building up until a certain point in time, rather than the collection that supports and challenges the ideas in play at this point in time.

Libraries are building shared collections right now, and the decision about how and where they deploy those collections will have a profound impact on the ability to lower barriers to access and raise opportunities for research for generations to come. Do not hear what I am not saying: we are still a long way from the governance and business models that will make everything for everyone, pretty much when and how they want it, into a reality, but the decisions libraries are making at present will have a profound influence on what it takes to achieve a more perfect union. And I do think that the fundamental weight of our professional commitment to increase the diversity of readership and the diversity of collections available to each reader means that we need to be diligent at present about setting up well-managed regional partnerships that can eventually be knit into a cooperative national network. We need to work on getting a critical mass of the materials committed to those partnerships located in the kind of fulfillment center that lowers their management costs and raises their flexibility for multi-site shared use.

Most shared print projects are operating on retention commitments that run from 10-30 years, and that is a comfortable timeline to do this work. It will take several years to transition, several more to refine and perfect a new way of offering collections services, and several more years beyond for that way to become the new normal for our users. This timeline is comfortable and manageable, but it has also started.

Endnotes
1. I am focusing on the U.S. academic and research libraries in this essay, but in principle, these ideas are applicable in other library sectors and other countries. Focusing on large American research libraries brings together a clear interest group within a common legal framework and logistics infrastructure, and it’s an interest group that has a lot of books.
2. This is based on the total expenditure for ReCAP staffing, but about half of ReCAP staff activity is devoted to intake, rather than retrieval, which has a per-transaction cost closer to $2.50, including retrieval and refiling.

Rumors
Speaking of interviews and the Charleston Conference, there are many! The interview and keynote with Jim Neal, the incoming president of ALA is particularly provocative! http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/video-live-stream/ (live during the 2016 Charleston Conference)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FU PKh4HMeBEA&list=PL1GI162pr1M6FQSIR1X9FGPMS9AP-Ah&index=1

A big Shout out from the 2016 Charleston Conference! Thanks to Jason Price (SCELC) who filled in at the last minute for the closing session of the conference when David Worlock took sick! Jason Price joined Erin Gallagher who has done the closing session for three years. They did an awesome job. Jason had to rush to make a flight but, hey, he had twenty minutes to spare! Thanks, Jason!

Ramune Kubilius did one of the Dine Arouneds on Friday night at the Conference! Guess what? While the group was dining, some cameras came in, filming the reality show Southern Charm. Ramune says that about half of the group consisted of conference first timers! The Dine-Arounds were led by many Charleston Conference regulars like Tony Horava, Anthony Watkinson, Jack Montgomery, Glenda Alvin, Corey Seeman, Eleanor Cook, Rachel Fleming. They are a nice feature created by Audrey Powers and administered by Caroline Goldsmith (Leah’s sister by the way) to expand on opportunities to socialize and get to know each other. We are always looking for volunteers for the Dine-Arounds. Let Leah know if you are interested and if you have a restaurant to recommend! Obviously, 492 King Street should probably stay on the list for next year.

continued on page 71

Ebook usage was about half that of print usage between 2011 and 2015. The top users of all eBooks were (1) Biology (also the top eBook purchaser), followed closely by (2) Business (in 5th place as eBook purchaser), (3) English (placed 15th among eBook purchasers), (4) Political Science (3rd-ranking eBook purchaser), and (5) Sociology (in 7th place among purchasers). Two top eBook purchasers are not among top five eBook users, but both are among the top ten: Education, in 2nd place among eBook purchasers, ranked 7th among users, while 4th-ranked buyer Psychology is in 6th place among users. Higher-than-usage ranking among purchasers for some disciplines is attributable to purchases of high-priced eBooks with multiple-user licenses.

2015/2016 Hardcopy and eBook Usage: Preliminary Findings

New ILS, new data, new measurements: The new ILS went live July 1, 2015. The preliminary usage report of February 18, 2016 captured new circulation since the system’s go-live. Prior years’ circulation data had not yet been loaded into the new system, which provided a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to capture spontaneous usage data as the circulation history was still being populated from scratch at that time. Because the new system currently generates the number of titles circulated but not total circulation transactions, the figures below depart from the prior years’ comparisons of total circulation and eBook usage respectively. Here, the figures reflect hardcopy titles which have circulated at least once and the unique titles used from the eBook usage reports.

The biggest user of hardcopy and eBooks, as measured by unique titles used for both formats combined, is English (836 hardcopy titles used; 264 eBook titles used), followed by History, Education, Philosophy & Religion, and Business. Business eBook titles used rose to the number of hardcopy titles used; unique eBook titles used surpassed hardcopy in Sociology, Psychology, and Political Science.

Rumors

Was interested to read that the Italian publishing market has experienced a 21% increase in eBook sales in the first six months of 2016. Turns out that 65,000 titles were digitized and 63,000 were converted to eBooks. http://goodereader.com/blog/e-book-news/the-italian-e-book-market-is-on-the-rise

The busy Simon Beale (SVP, Global Sales Strategy & Operations, John Wiley and Sons) writes that they have just had a baby, and he mixed maternity and work over the holidays. Simon is planning to come to the nineteenth Fiesole Retreat in Lille France in April, 2017.

Did you see that on December 14, Ingram Content Group hosted clients and friends to celebrate the opening of their new office near Bryant Park in New York City. Ingram’s acquisition of Perseus’ distribution businesses earlier this year provided a unique opportunity to relocate, grow and invest in the heart of the publishing industry.

I hope you didn’t miss Don Beagle’s Open Letter to Greta van Susteren! He was reacting to the Inside Higher Education article about “Are Libraries ‘Vanity Projects?’” by Carl Straumsheim. Former Fox News host Greta Van Susteren attacks libraries and other construction projects for driving up student debt. I just took a look at our site stats for ATG and that article blew them out of the water! Greta
English used the most hardcopy titles, followed by History, Juvenile Literature (used by Education majors learning how to deploy children’s books in the classroom), Fine Arts, and Philosophy & Religion. The prior years’ top usage by Computer Science is not reflected here – the number of Computer Science titles circulated ranked 7th from last, and the total usage of those titles cannot be gleaned from the new ILS at present.

To match eBook usage to the new ILS’s number of circulated titles, comparable eBook measures use the aggregators’ figures for unique eBook titles used. By this measure, the top five eBook users are English, History, Education, Business, and Sociology.

continued on page 73

Rumors
from page 71

van Susteren linked to it from her site and we got 16,432 views! The related article by Julie Todaro (president of ALA) and Irene M. H. Herold, “Smartphones Can’t Replace Libraries,” points out that academic libraries are a vital part of the higher education process. We can all agree that higher education costs are too high, but libraries are not the problem!! https://www.insidehighered.com/users/julie-todaro-and-irene-mh-herold

And Don has promised part Two of his Open Letter. Stay tuned!

Last but not least, hopefully you have heard about the new collaboration between Choice and The Charleston Advisor which is being launched in Spring 2017. Choice has just released a new online platform for their book review service and is creating a separate product to include reviews from The Charleston Advisor. The new service will be called Choice Charleston Advisor (CC Advisor) and will provide up-to-date reviews of many e-resources of interest to libraries. Although hundreds of reviews will be included in the new platform, certain key products have not been covered or, if they were reviewed, the original reviewer has not been able to update the original work. The Charleston Advisor is in need of authors to help in this review effort. This could include existing authors as well as new authors who have never published through the journal. All new reviews go through a peer review process which will help academic authors in their promotion and tenure process. For more information, contact George Machovec, Managing Editor for The Charleston Advisor <george@coalliance.org>, and he will be happy to work with you on participating in this exciting initiative.


Happy 2017 to everyone! Love, Yr.Ed.