AUP Digital Publishing Committee, May 2018 Report

Committee Roster
- Michael Boudreau, Chicago
- Terry Ehling, MIT
- Lynn Fisher, Toronto, (Committee Chair)
- Kevin Hawkins, North Texas
- Beth Kressel Itkin, Vanderbilt
- Jeremy Morse, Michigan

Committee Members who have left the committee and their associated firms:
- Nicky Agate, Modern Language Association
- Neil Christensen, California (Committee Chair)

Board Liaison
- Gita Manaktala, MIT

Central Office Liaison
- Brenna McLaughlin

General Objective:
- Develop and manage tools, programs, and resources to educate Association members on emerging technologies and the opportunities they present for the publishing industry.

Specific Charges to the Digital Publishing Committee:
- Provide the Professional Development Committee with webinar content that exposes participants to emerging technologies relevant to the publishing industry; in doing this, be mindful of the heterogeneity of the membership, particularly with regard to current state of technology adoption.
- Assist Central Office with final preparations for publication of Open Access Case Studies.
- Organize activities to survey, define, educate, and identify opportunities for collaboration and discussion around shared infrastructure.
- As requested, assist the Annual Meeting Program Committee to develop and implement technology-related sessions and/or vendor forums for the 2018 Annual Meeting, including new Collaboration Labs.
- Include in your final May report to the Board suggestions for concurrent meeting topics to be referred to the Detroit 2019 Annual Meeting Program Committee.

May 2018 Report

With the assistance of Brenna McLaughlin, the ‘shared infrastructure’ survey was issued to Press Directors in mid-April with the request that they disseminate it to the appropriate individuals in their operations. The survey was open until May 14th. Please refer to Appendix A to see the survey questions.

There were 46 responses to the survey from 41 presses. 37 Press Directors began the survey with 9
others completing (2 Finance; 2 Managing Editorial/Production; 2 Digital Publishing; 1 Sales & Marketing; 1 Associate Director; 1 Acquisitions).

The survey results are with the committee for review and due to busy schedules, we aren't meeting until early June to discuss the findings. There is a ‘shared infrastructure’ panel at the upcoming meeting where survey results will be discussed. **What follows below are some highlights from the survey.**

1. Many of the respondents provided examples of shared infrastructure services they were making use of including both AUPress offerings in an array of areas along with more commercial partnerships.

2. Areas that presses indicated could potentially benefit from a shared infrastructure include (note - this is a very small sample and people were responded to a suggested list):
   - Peer review - 1
   - Book Editorial & or production system – 2
   - Journal editorial and/or production system - 1
   - Rights Management - 4
   - Sales Force – 1
   - Digital Publishing platform for OA books - 1

3. When asked to identify areas where there was higher potential for shared infrastructure development, the following were identified (worth keeping in mind that some of these services already exist or are in development but people may not be aware of – see point 4 role of AUP):
   - For production, having a service provider handle book from manuscript to PDF and everything in between would be useful. We have this with a few of our providers but having an UP-centric provider would have its benefits. Possibly develop interior templates for narrowly focused monographs with minimal sales potential.
   - For marketing, having a centralized publicist pitch select books from each press would save time and money - an invaluable resources for small UPs. More broadly, there's got to be some way the AUP or a consortium could better leverage our collective talents and content to the benefit of us all.
   - Direct sales to customers (i.e. amazon for university presses)
   - We are a small/tiny press, and we don't have and really can't afford a robust editorial production system, like AllBooks. Permissions are also costly and take a lot of time. I don't know what I envision in this area, but a low cost solution would be beneficial.
   - Unsure. I think we already use what we know we need. Though the marketing piece seems to have some potential, though I’m not a marketer so I can't speak to specifics.
   - I'm excited by Editoria for book production.
   - Sales representation could be so much better, domestically and internationally. We are barely tapping most international markets.
   - We’re not envisioning. We're doing via Longleaf
   - Rights – foreign rights, film rights, etc.

4. In response to the question of the role of the AUPresses in supporting/becoming involved in shared infrastructure, 17 of 46 supported some level of involvement. Potential involvement included:
• Provide information about shared infrastructure efforts within the AUPresses community – help in promoting (5 comments in this area)
  o Establish forums or linkages or pilot projects
  o Finish the Commons (vehicle for sharing)
• Have a publicist on staff that member presses could draw upon (particularly group 1 presses).
• Provide guidance/direction on seeking funding for large projects (3 similar responses)
• Have a pre-conference showcase on different open source software systems as LPC does – could be emulated
• Act as a conduit to connect small presses with mid to large presses for projects, grants, etc.

5. Suggested technology or digital related topics for Detroit in 2019 (note – some of these are interchangeable with possible webinars for next year):
• Marketing ebooks
• Multimedia/multimodal/digital publishing platforms (3 requests + related comment below)
• How could/should AUPresses engage with "expansive digital projects" -- the multimodal, collaborative, open-ended often humanities projects we see springing up on our campuses? What is the respective role of a press, library, and humanities institute in such engagement? How can we best work out the costs of such projects, and help with strategies to reduce those costs?
• Metadata session with outside presenters (Note – In Canada, BookNet speaks to us annually about the book trade and often shares best practices, new trends in metadata. These sessions are usually very informative and help guide members on things they aren’t doing but should be. In the US, someone from BISG would be useful).
• App development
• Manuscript submission systems and peer review management
• Case studies of effective/successful shared infrastructure projects
• Presses & university repositories – who is using what & for what?

6. Suggested webinars in 2018/19:
• Metadata
• New developments such as Fulcrum, Manifold, and other Mellon-funded platforms/initiatives
• a presentation by Scopus and Digital Science Dimensions on how AUPresses content can get indexed in these important indexing systems which underrepresent both humanities and books
• manuscript submission systems and peer review management

Any feedback, suggestions, comments would be welcome by the committee members. We are looking forward to welcoming additional members to the committee for 2018/19.

Submitted by: Lynn Fisher
May 24, 2018
Shared infrastructure survey questions for AUPresses Digital Publishing Committee

Preamble for email survey:

The Digital Publishing Committee is interested in feedback from your press on shared infrastructure. A definition of 'shared infrastructure' follows below and please keep it in mind when answering the survey. Example of 'shared infrastructure' can be found here. In order to build a broad picture of the views of member presses, please share this survey with heads of the various departments at your press (i.e. acquisitions, managing editorial, production, sales, marketing, etc). The committee appreciates your help with this project.

Definition

Shared infrastructure can be defined as any component, system, product, or service that leverages time, people, and money (resources) from multiple organizations in ways that allow individual organizations, such as AUPresses members, to optimize their own performance. In publishing, examples are found in, but not limited to, production, peer review, hosting, sales, and fulfilment. Shared infrastructure may be open source, proprietary, or a combination, and it may serve backend and/or frontend needs. Examples can be found here.

Survey questions

1. Please select your press from the drop down menu [drop down list of AUPresses]

2. Please identify your area of responsibility (check all that apply): [check boxes]
   - a. Acquisitions
   - b. Digital Publishing
   - c. Finance
   - d. Fulfillment
   - e. Managing Editorial
   - f. Marketing
   - g. Production
   - h. Sales
   - i. Other (please specify)

3. Keeping in mind the 'definition of shared infrastructure' provided earlier does your press currently depend on any shared infrastructure? [y/n].

4. If yes, what are they? Open response

5. Does your press currently lack something that could be supplied by shared infrastructure? [y/n]

6. If yes, what might this be? Open response
7. On a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 indicates no potential and 4 indicates high potential, how much potential do you see for the development of shared infrastructure in the following areas of activity? (4 pt rating scale)
   i. Production (e.g., composition, typesetting, art clean up, ebook creation) communication with copy editors, etc.
   ii. Permission clearance
   iii. Peer review
   iv. Transmittal of Manuscript to Production (and related pertinent information)
   v. Hosting (i.e. Journal content and/or ebook content)
   vi. Sales representatives
   vii. Marketing
   viii. Fulfillment

8. If you rated an area as higher potential (i.e. rated as a 3 or 4) please provide a brief description of the type of shared infrastructure project you envision. Open response

9. Are there other areas in which you see potential for the development of shared infrastructure. (y/n)

10. If yes, please briefly outline. Open response

11. On a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 indicates no interest and 4 indicates high interest, to what extent is your Press interested in using shared infrastructure? Drop down menu 1-4 or m/c

12. On a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 indicates no support and 4 indicates high support, to what extent do you think it’s important that AUPresses as an organization support the development of shared infrastructure? Drop down menu 1-4 or m/c

13. If you rated with a 3 or 4 (indicating high support from AUPresses), what kind of support would you like to see AUPresses provide? Open response

14. Are you interested in engaging further with the topic of shared infrastructure? If so, provide your email address. Open response

15. We are looking ahead to the 2019 AUPresses conference. Please identify any technology or digital related topics you would like to see integrated into sessions at the conference. Open response

16. Would you be interested in leading such a session or participating on a panel? [y/n maybe]

17. Please identify any technology or digital related topics you would like to see offered as a webinar sometime in 2018/19. Open response

18. Any final comments or suggestions? Open response