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acquisitions responsibilities; how might XML enhance the value and visibility of the scholarly monograph; could the critical edition be better served by a digital format that more closely integrates text and scholarly apparatus? What we had not done, until recently, was approach these problems and opportunities in an organic and systematic fashion. We needed data: where were the emerging fissures in the lifecycle of scholarly communication and how might our joint efforts respond to those gaps in a sustainable and scalable fashion?

**Hunting and Gathering: Assessing the Local Publishing Needs of the University**

In 2006, Catherine Candee, then Director of Publishing and Strategic Initiatives, CDL, and Laura Withey, Director of UC Press, embarked upon a project to gauge the publishing needs of UC scholars and to survey scholarly publishing activities across the university system. Candee and Withey interviewed vice chairs for research, deans, librarians, and faculty at all ten UC campuses; in addition, UC Press and CDL teams collected and analyzed a substantial amount of Web research on active UC publishing programs. Our findings were outlined in an important study, “Publishing Needs and Opportunities at the University of California,” sponsored by UC’s Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee. The SLASiAC Report, as it came to be known, revealed a significant amount of publishing activity outside of traditional presses. Some of this publishing was happening within the CDL’s eScholarship repository, but a good many of these activities were independent of both our organizations. We agreed that facilitating the scholar-to-scholar communication was at the core of both of our missions. Was there a way that we could support these publishing programs? To what extent and in what capacity might they need us?

In response to these findings, the study made five broad recommendations:

1. Establish a university publishing program. Such a program should build upon the existing activities of UC Press and eScholarship, as well as campus-based programs.

2. Create a system for publishing in alternative formats that would include the following components: selection criteria, editorial and technical development, criteria for determining if the project will be sold or made available on an open access basis, and sales strategies, and maintenance and preservation.

3. Work with campuses to establish local services to assist faculty with publishing options, especially technical advice on digital projects.

4. Begin a systemwide discussion of criteria for evaluating work published in nontraditional formats for purposes of tenure and promotion.

5. Analyze the economic issues associated with an expansion of university-based publishing.

These recommendations reflect the strong message Candee and Withey received during their systemwide interviews that “UC faculty would like to see the university play a more active role in blunt the effect of the commercialization of academic publishing, but they will not and cannot risk their own academic lives to make it happen. The university must step in.” In other words, it was time for the University to take on some of the responsibility for managing the academic publishing environment. We focused on the concept of the “University as Publisher,” and took the report’s recommendations as our mandate for a more formalized collaboration.

**Benefits of the Harvest: Sustainable Collaboration Planning**

Following the report, the CDL and UC Press set out to define this new form of collaboration. Rather than creating a new organizational structure between us, we wanted to describe a set of activities that would extend the capacity of both organizations to respond to the publishing needs of faculty across the UC system. We hired a consultant and began a business and strategic planning process that forced us to take stock of our organizations’ respective goals and priorities. We then explored the strategic benefits and structural hurdles of a formalized collaboration. The opportunities were compelling: extending services to meet the needs of the university, engaging in the problems of tenure/promotion and intellectual property, and developing sustainable business models. The challenges were also considerable: limited resources (increasingly so as the California State budget contracted during our planning phase), distinct publishing agendas, and seemingly incompatible financial structures. The success of our collaboration hinged on finding a model that took neither organization too far afield from its core competencies and strategic plans but, at the same time, enhanced the value of each organization by virtue of its association with the other. We needed to articulate a joint mission, and we needed a roadmap to guide us toward achieving our shared goals.

Engaging in an explicit strategic planning...