

# “The Best We Can Find in Our Travels Is an Honest Friend”

By Tom Radko, Editorial Director

This issue marks the tenth appearance of the University Press Forum. The Forum began as a completely unguided (by *Choice*) public discussion—in the voices of university press directors and editors—of university presses: the joys, the trials, the changes, the disappointments. This year we decided to steer the direction of the conversation to a topic of current interest to our readership: namely, *the relationship between university presses and libraries*.

Because the topic is of such keen importance to the scholarly publishing community, it was not difficult finding directors/editors of six university presses—The University of Arizona Press, the University of California Press, Cornell University Press, the University of Georgia Press, Purdue University Press, and Temple University Press—to address a series of questions: What is the nature of the relationship between your press and campus library? Is the relationship in need of repair these days? Is it a relationship you are seeking out? What is the common ground between presses and libraries? What are collaborations between the two supposed to accomplish? The essays crafted in response to these questions follow, and they vividly make clear the increasing importance of strong alliances in a scholarly communication environment likely to become only more challenging over time.

Linked to this forum is a listing of titles deemed by university presses to be particularly valuable to the audiences *Choice* has served for fifty years: librarians, faculty, students, scholars, and the public interested in academic materials. We would like to thank both our contributors for their time in crafting such thoughtful responses and the

university presses that mined their rich title listings for the books most suitable for the audiences we serve—with a special eye on undergraduates. For supplemental material, we direct you to the Press and Library Collaboration Survey released by the Association of American University Presses at a time that coincided with the preparation of this forum; that survey is available online at [www.aaupnet.org](http://www.aaupnet.org). We hope you find much in this forum that stimulates your imagination, encourages dialogue with colleagues beyond your immediate circles, and acknowledges the rewards of forging alliances based on respect that support a rich and diverse publishing environment.—TRR

---

## CHARLES WATKINSON

DIRECTOR, PURDUE UNIVERSITY PRESS AND  
HEAD OF SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING  
SERVICES, PURDUE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Over a decade ago an influential article by Michael A. Mabe and Mayur Amin, researchers then employed by Elsevier, examined the strange case of Dr. Jekyll and Dr. Hyde and author-reader asymmetries in

scholarly publishing, memorably referencing the split personality plot of Robert Louis Stevenson's best-selling novella. Among other things, the article showed how the same faculty members can think and behave in very different ways when they wear the hats of "author" and "reader" respectively. The truth of this observation is shown in many spheres of publishing. Think, for example, of the open access environment in which the same faculty members who are gung ho about having everything their colleagues publish openly accessible to them online can be very reticent about sharing their own work outside a closed circle—much to the irritation of those (including most press directors) who believe in maximizing access to information.

As a university press director integrated into an academic research library to an almost unique extent, I daily observe the same Jekyll and Hyde characteristics in my colleagues. The librarians who may be most supportive of the efforts of not-for-profit university presses to publish an abstruse but important monograph with their "scholarly communication" hats on may find themselves unable to support the acquisition of an online collection of such monographs (DRM-free, reasonably priced, liberal in their license terms) when they are in "collection development" mode. They need to continue to prioritize the acquisition of large packages of outrageously priced STM content because the patrons who matter most are the scientists and engineers who bring in research dollars to the university.

I know many of my colleagues in the university press world perceive a double standard, hearing messages of support from academic librarians yet seeing their revenues from monograph publishing decreasing every year. However, it is my privilege to sit on the Information Resource Council at Purdue, contributing to "big ticket" decisions about what to license and what to cancel, and I see how hard my librarian colleagues try to be good stewards of the

resources allocated to their care, negotiate down the science vendors with the few cards they have in their hands, and make evidence-based decisions on what to keep and what to cancel from the unbelievable range of offerings out there. It is an environment where pragmatism usually has to triumph over vision.

Of course, I am not immune to frustration with some aspects of the traditional relationship between university presses as suppliers and libraries as consumers of published products. I wish, for example, that academic libraries would give monographs a chance to prove themselves. The general perception within the library world of monographs as poorly used dust gatherers is at least partly based, I think, on the slower migration of books into digital availability. While many issues exist in the comparability of usage data, evidence seems to be emerging that monographs may be at least as well used as periodicals when they are easily available on a chapter level in a networked electronic environment.

The vendor-client relationship (presses as producers, libraries as consumers) is never going to be easy, of course. What is much more exciting at the moment, however, is the growing number of examples of libraries and presses partnering to be joint producers, publishing scholarly work together. Here is an area of true common ground where collaborations once merely opportunistic in nature (e.g., a library digitizing press backlist books to feed the institutional repository) are turning into strategic alliances well designed to meet the changing needs of the scholars we all exist to serve.

The year 2013 saw the number of press directors reporting to deans and directors of libraries exceed 25 percent of the university press membership of the Association of American University Presses (AAUP). It was also the year in which the Library Publishing Coalition project, with its sixty supporting academic libraries, started to articulate the scope and aims of library-based publishing as complementary rather than competitive with the university press tradition. In a digital environment where scholars are making their works available in ways that explode the traditional dissemination packets of “books” and “journal articles,” the ability to offer a range of publishing solutions across a spectrum of informal to formal scholarly communication presents a competitive advantage. With sophisticated electronic tools and skills, plus rich links across their parent institution, library publishers are the ideal partners for university presses will-

ing to bring their tried and tested editorial judgment, market knowledge, and content development processes to the table.

When looking at such relationships, university presses have inevitable concerns about loss of editorial and financial independence. They are wise to be cautious. The “university press” brand must be kept separate for products that have passed through the traditional gauntlet of peer review, editorial board, and savvy developmental editing, while open access without a sustainability model makes no long-term sense. These relationships also depend on mutual respect and personal chemistry and are not appropriate in every context. However, every university press I know that has entered into serious partnership with its parent institution's library is finding new excitement, enlarged capacity, and greater relevance to the university whose name it bears.

If *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* is perhaps the most-filmed of Robert Louis Stevenson's works, *Treasure Island* follows closely behind. It is through the unlikely and complex partnership of the pirate Long John Silver and the young hero Jim Hawkins that the rest of the pirates are outwitted and the treasure of the title is eventually recovered by the right group. Who the pirates are in any analogy must of course depend on one's perspective, but the theme of rewarding alliances that initially appeared unlikely to succeed may be relevant to the next few years as forward thinking academic libraries and university presses find new ways of working together. After all, the scholarly communication environment is only likely to become more challenging, and good alliances are essential. As Stevenson said, “We are all travelers in the wilderness of this world, and the best we can find in our travels is an honest friend.”

---

### ALISON MUDDITT

DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA PRESS

UC Press is a team of publishers who champion progressive scholarly work that promotes a deeper understanding of the world and drives progressive change. Throughout our 100-year history we've consistently nurtured and brought breakthrough scholarly voices and study into critical and emerging academic disciplines. As the needs of the communities we serve evolve, we are continuously looking for ways to tap power of technology to deliver work the way it can best be accessed and used.

UC Press faces many of the same challenges as the libraries we serve: diminishing institutional support, the dominance of commercial publishers, the growing agenda-setting power of large technology organizations, and the sheer, unrelenting pace of change. We both share a commitment to the transformative scholarship of our institutions, yet in reality our relationship can be fraught and all too often antagonistic. Why should this be, and what can be done about it?

The university press community as a whole is guilty of slow response to the dramatic changes reshaping our markets. As a consequence, there is a real perception on and beyond our campuses that university presses have perhaps reached the end of their useful life cycle, our role to be swallowed up by the open web. And as publishers, we should be doing a better job of demonstrating the value added to scholarly work during the publication process. Our shortcomings are amplified by a lack of understanding among librarians of all publishers do to add value. This goes far beyond managing peer review and is, at heart, about acquiring, shaping, and connecting content to the right audiences—all of which are essential if our message is to have impact.

In discussing the relationship between libraries and presses, the entrenched, oppositional rhetoric surrounding open access has to be acknowledged. For better or worse, OA has become the lens through which all discussions are framed. University presses have mounted an achingly slow response, largely due to difficulties in developing models that address constraints within the humanities and social sciences. On the library side an inability to understand the complexities around OA and the tendency to tar all publishers with the same brush have damaged the relationship between libraries and university presses. These hamper our ability to have a productive and wide-ranging discussion about possible OA models that balance the needs of access and sustainability.

One key difference is that we—and other university presses—are in the unusual position of being both a nonprofit and a business. We have to generate revenue to cover the vast majority of our costs (university subsidy represents less than 5 percent of UC Press revenue). This means we must take a different approach than other organizations—like libraries—that largely receive funding, albeit declining. We both operate under constraints; they simply manifest in fundamentally different ways.

University presses and libraries are united in a desire to better serve faculty

and students and make scholarship broadly accessible. How can we find a way to move forward in a more collaborative mode? I believe a truly transformative approach would find community solutions to challenges such as these: 1) open access and the review process; 2) building semantic tools that facilitate selection of content; 3) integrating research literature into other aspects of scholarly communication (data sets, research reports); and 4) better connecting to research workflows for improved productivity.

UC Press is engaged in a series of sweeping changes in our publishing program that will help us survive and thrive. And in each of these, we are actively thinking about how to engage with the library community to help support solutions that benefit the entire scholarly community. One of our first steps was to create, staff, and fund a new Digital Business Development unit. Priority number one for this team is development and implementation of our own OA strategy, one we believe will complement the recent UC faculty policy. We will be working closely with faculty and libraries to understand the needs in this area, and find ways in which the libraries can participate. To that point, we have also created a library advisory board that discusses issues affecting the library community.

Monograph publishing—specifically the early-career monographs required for tenure and promotion—represents another area where libraries and presses should work together. These titles are threatened: they usually lose money for presses; libraries cannot afford them; and limited distribution means they are not easily discoverable or read. UC Press is in early stage development of an open access monograph model, in close partnership with faculty and the libraries. However, many of the challenges in this area are systemic, and we believe institutions, publishers, and libraries must come together to explore ways we can support a rich and diverse publishing environment.

To stay in tune with the evolving needs of scholars and students, we are hosting focused events and initiatives such as a recent workshop on the digital humanities in which we collaboratively explored new ways to deliver content with faculty and several librarians.

Digitally-enabled scholarship by UC faculty has reached a high level of maturity, and libraries have undergone a massive transformation over the past decades to digitize resources and to partner with scholars in developing preservation plans for digital assets of every kind. Our goal is to identify concrete ways UC Press can support

and amplify these efforts. One possibility is to work with UC libraries to identify and develop important archives. The purpose is not simply digitization, but to “curate creatively,” to contextualize content, and to reinterpret the material and add scholarly value to materials that will resonate with a broader public.

Given the common ground we share, both sides need to acknowledge our differences and similarities to clear the communication channel for frank and productive discussions. It is clearly in our shared interest to do so: a renewed partnership is essential to us both if we are to fully realize the promise of new technologies, and to meet the evolving needs of our communities and the expectations of university administrators.

---

---

### PETER J. POTTER

EDITOR IN CHIEF AND CO-ACTING  
DIRECTOR, CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS

One of the more thought-provoking pieces I read in the past year was a post in *The Scholarly Kitchen*, by Joe Esposito <<http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2013/07/16/having-relations-with-the-library-a-guide-for-university-presses/#comments>>, in which he asks readers to take a step back from all the “fashionable” talk about collaboration between university presses and libraries. In particular, he calls into question the wisdom of “organizational marriage,” in which a press has an administrative reporting line to a library. “It’s taken for granted,” he writes, “that publishers, at least academic ones, and libraries have a great deal in common and that putting them together organizationally will yield multiple benefits.” Esposito goes on to consider what those benefits might be (cost savings, new products and services, new business models) but cautions that that they aren’t a necessary by-product of partnership. In fact, he argues that there is little evidence to support the notion that formal partnership actually yields positive benefits. His conclusion: “Both libraries and presses are better off pursuing their own aims, cooperating when it is useful, working separately when it is not.”

There is a ring of truth to what Esposito says, although I suspect that much depends on the particulars of each institution—history, administrative context, even the personalities at play. I also have to admit that in my own career I have been a part of

the sort of “organizational marriage” he is talking about, and frankly I found marriage to be better than living alone (especially with no suitable prospects on the horizon!), so I doubt I could ever fully share Esposito’s skepticism. Still, since reading his piece I have thought a lot about the nature of collaboration and the benefits to be had by presses and libraries working together without actually going the marriage route. That is, deciding instead to be “just friends”—or, perhaps, “friends with benefits.” Such is the case at Cornell University, where the library and the press are administratively separate units, and yet we have managed to work together quite successfully in recent years. I have a few ideas about why this is so.

A key to our success, in my view, is that very early on we decided to find tangible areas that could serve as testing grounds for real collaboration. A case in point is the monograph series *Signale: Modern German Letters, Cultures, and Thought*, which we launched in 2010 in response to the narrowing of publishing possibilities in the discipline of German studies. Cornell has been a leading center for German studies nationally and internationally for many years, and the library has strong collections in this area, so it is no surprise that both the library and the press had “skin in the game.” In other words, for both of us the problem fell squarely within our respective institutional missions, which gave us the incentive to work together to find a solution. This shared incentive was critical, for it gave us something to fall back on when complications arose, as they inevitably did when, for instance, questions of cost sharing and allocation of staff time came up. Ultimately, we worked through them, and *Signale* gave us a real working space in which to do so. And, perhaps ironically, one of the most positive aspects of the entire experience came about because the press and the library were *not* administratively tied. As separate entities, we had to develop a memorandum of understanding that spelled out each party’s risks, responsibilities, and rewards. In the process, we learned a great deal about the cost of doing business together. We also learned about each other—what each of us does well, what each of us does differently, and consequently where there is room for true partnership built on interlocking and complementary strengths.

*Signale* is still an ongoing experiment, but one sure sign of success is that this past year saw the publication of the tenth book in the series. Perhaps even more significant is that we renewed the memorandum of

understanding for another three-year term, with Cornell's College of Arts and Sciences formally joining on as a third partner. In addition, the testing ground provided by *Signale* has led to further experimentation, this time a more ambitious venture into the digital humanities. We launched an interactive website, growing out of a *Signale* book, devoted to Aby Warburg's brilliant but enigmatic visual experiment, the *Mnemosyne Atlas*. The project required the press and the library to reach outside our respective comfort zones yet again while simultaneously bringing in an external party, the Warburg Institute in London. Ultimately, I came away convinced of the power of collaboration, especially when that collaboration grows organically out of the complementary skill sets that publishers, librarians, and scholars bring to the table. Together we were able to accomplish more than any of us could have accomplished on our own. At the same time, I am more aware than ever of the uniquely distinctive roles that publishers, librarians, and scholars play in the scholarly communication system.

And this brings me to another significant development I have been watching this year—the emergence onto the scene of the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC) and of the notion of “library publishing” in general. As I see it, those of us in the university press community should welcome this development, if for no other reason than it shows the maturation of scholarly communication in the digital era. Indeed, the LPC, which now counts some sixty participating institutions, has begun to articulate what may be the most practical way forward for an ailing system of scholarly communication, one in which university and college libraries, university presses, scholarly societies, and other mission-related publishers all work together as part of a coalition in sustained dialogue with one another. I think we all realize that any solution to the problems of scholarly communication must be inclusive, so rather than viewing library publishers as interlopers or competitors, we should be supportive of their efforts, realizing that the sooner we all find our roles in the new landscape, the sooner we can all get on with doing what we do best.

---

### LISA BAYER

DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA PRESS

When asked to respond to the question of library-press collaborations for this forum, I was not aware that the Association

of American University Presses would release its 2012-13 Press and Library Collaboration Survey to coincide with my assignment.

The entire report is worth a close read, and its summary findings are clear: library-press publishing relationships are on the rise. In many cases, these two closely related campus units have moved beyond friendship into a deeper commitment, whether cemented by a formal reporting relationship or simply intentional efforts at partnership and innovation around opportunities (and challenges) in scholarly communications.

When I describe the mutually beneficial relationship enjoyed by the University of Georgia Press and its parent unit, the UGA Libraries, I find myself constantly contextualizing and qualifying my value statements. Even though according to the AAUP report, twenty U.S. university presses currently report to their campus libraries, the topic remains both intriguing and vexing, as evidenced by two sessions at the 2013 Association of American University Presses' annual meeting in Boston and by the increasing numbers of librarians at the AAUP conference each June and university press publishers at Charleston each fall.

There are many reasons why presses might report to libraries as part of their publishing activities. In some cases these reasons may be bad ones. In many other cases (such as ours at Georgia), this has been a splendid decision. I can speak only to my current experience, as the university presses where I worked previously reported, as is fairly typical, to provosts and vice presidents charged with academic programs during my tenure. At Georgia we are still articulating all the reasons why we like working together in the same building, exchanging professional advice, strategizing for the future, solving problems together (and, lo, there are many!), discussing our commonalities and our differences, and sharing resources. Because of the practical logistics of the campus physical environment, we would never have had these opportunities if not for the current arrangement that affords the Press office space in the main library.

What can the press and library offer one another? The press brings publishing expertise that the library does not currently have: acquisitions relationships and acumen, manuscript editing, marketing, promotion, design and production, relationships with vendors for digital delivery channels, an established peer-review process based on clearly articulated scholarly standards, and, not least, existing relationships with faculty both on our campus and the world over

that result in the production of scholarly content. In exchange, the library brings expertise that we would not have the means to easily secure, including a larger environment in which the scholarly record is both valued and cultivated, crucial feedback on collection development practices, and a large and robust infrastructure that includes campus bargaining power, administrative and operations services, and IT support. For a press of our size, these are no small services.

Our commonalities are many. We share principal stakeholders. We are keenly concerned with the economics of our operations and seek sustainable support from a variety of sources in a changing information environment. We both grapple with the complexities of an environment that is simultaneously print and digital. We each play critical and complementary roles in executing the university's mission “to teach, to serve, and to inquire into the nature of things.”

Finally, a most promising benefit to the organizational marriage between the university press and the library is that the bond stimulates collaboration as the field of scholarly communications continues to define itself. Prior to a formal reporting relationship, our press already had a good working relationship with the library, which included hosting open access e-books through the Digital Library of Georgia and launching and maintaining since 2004 the groundbreaking born-digital *New Georgia Encyclopedia*.

New opportunities continue to present themselves, and not just from the digital realm. The press is working on a series based on the holdings of the UGA Special Collections Library. With the imminent establishment of a Digital Humanities Lab across the hall from the press offices in the library, we are brimming with fundable interdepartmental ideas. I currently serve on the library strategic planning committee. The plan will include a new goal that articulates the library's unique position to develop a strong scholarly communications program based on organizational units that include the largest research library in the state, the oldest and largest publisher in the state, a statewide digital program, and an institutional repository that includes an OA journals platform.

There are challenges, of course. For one, it is important to the press to maintain the separateness of our strong identity among scholars and other stakeholders. In addition, the Georgia State case provided interesting discussions of copyright and fair use between the librarians and the publishers, as well as questions about open access

and so many other aspects of the scholarly community that we share. Our currently successful relationship is largely dependent upon supportive administrative relationships. For now I will count our many positives and thank UGA's incoming provost for inviting me to serve on the search committee charged with hiring the new University Librarian and Associate Provost, my boss.

---

---

### ALEX HOLZMAN

DIRECTOR, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Reflecting upon university press-library relations at the moment of my retirement seems apt. It is a topic that has left me befuddled, discouraged, frustrated, confused, hopeful, and finally encouraged over the course of almost thirty years working in university presses. As I exit stage left I'd say we are making good progress that is even accelerating, but we still have a ways to go. I would also argue that presses and libraries genuinely need each other, perhaps more than they always understand.

Allow me to present a little history. When I entered the university press world in 1986 I quickly noted that libraries, mostly academic but some public, were collectively our largest customers, along with students. But when I asked my colleagues—both at my press and in the broader AAUP—how libraries made book-buying decisions, I was amazed at how little people knew or cared about the answers. Selling to libraries was left to the wholesalers, who at the time had their own interests in keeping the process locked away in a black box.

Two catalysts around the turn of the century forced an end to university press ignorance about the concerns of libraries and librarians. First, sales of monographs continued on a steady path of decline that finally began to catch everyone's attention, a decline that continues today and has even been exacerbated by some new library practices. Second, as journals evolved from primarily print to primarily electronically based instruments, presses designing e-delivery systems had to think long and hard about the services their best customers (the libraries and, through them, the faculty) required.

Other developments improved mutual communication and understanding between presses and libraries. As the century's first decade progressed, more and more presses began to report to libraries, a number that grew to one in six in 2014. Presses and

libraries began to conduct experiments with open access monographs. Some libraries began their own publishing programs, and some even got their own physical press (i.e., an Espresso Book Machine). The rise of institutional repositories accentuated for libraries the difference between making material available and ensuring a public that was aware of it. In short, many of our activities grew closer and closer. Scholarly communication, always a continuum, began to morph from clearly delineated boundaries among the participants to much fuzzier ones.

We also learned more about each other from our conflicts, not least of which were the two infamous lawsuits involving Google, the Author's Guild, and the Association of American Publishers in one instance and two university presses (plus a commercial one) versus Georgia State in the other. Both cases evoked lots of blather, but they also gave libraries and presses insights into each other's concerns, whether it be the kinds of restrictions that can be imposed on purchased material, fair use, the need to recover costs, or digital reserves and course adoptions.

Where are we now? Although we are making progress we still share mutual misunderstandings. That will probably always be the case, but two opportunities—one local, one global—offer encouragement.

Locally, Temple University Press began reporting to the dean of the libraries in 2010. I have had the opportunity to learn from and educate two deans and an interim dean, no feat. My successor will assume the position of scholarly communication officer as well as executive director of the press and as such will be working with both librarians and publishers on a daily basis. The opportunity for synergies is huge and at its best will be enormously exciting and potentially pioneering on both ends of the partnership. If it works (Purdue is the only other press-library that has anything close to this model, although at this writing Michigan and Indiana are conducting their own experiments), it could even provide a new model for disseminating scholarship.

The global opportunity involves an initiative to begin publishing science, technology, and medicine (STM) journals within the university. The cost of commercially controlled—and even some scholarly-society controlled—STM journals is crippling the acquisitions budgets of libraries and in turn contributing to the severe reduction in the purchase of university-press published monographs. In short, both institutions are suffering from STM serials costs and

both would benefit, if in slightly different ways, by bringing a significant portion of such publishing back within the university. Presses—with some notable exceptions—have been strangely and almost scandalously science journal averse, but I do not see how they can claim to represent their home universities broadly if they stick solely to the humanities and social sciences.

For libraries, the benefit of university press-based STM publishing would be at least some relief from the drain commercial STM publishers are to their current budgets. This move could even free them to purchase more monographs in the humanities and social sciences, where the shrinking outlets for narrowly based studies are creating their own havoc in launching and sustaining the careers of young scholars. Additionally, libraries would be better able to build areas of individual strength. Whatever the use, libraries would have a bit more flexibility in managing their collections.

A library-press coalition to further STM journals publishing will not be easy. Neither will it be quick. STM serials costs are not going to change dramatically any time soon. But a partnership that even partially addresses this issue would generate enormous benefits to the overall scholarly communication effort in the university. It would also mark a new and significant level of cooperation between our respective two institutions, both of which are simultaneously critical to and somewhat endangered in the larger institution that is the university.

Whatever forms our cooperative efforts take, I am certain that the only way either a press or library can truly thrive is to pool their complementary talents and work together. The resulting sum will surely be greater than the individual parts.

---

---

### KATHRYN CONRAD

DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PRESS

When the University of Arizona Press began reporting to the Dean of University Libraries some years ago, complex questions immediately surfaced. How might we find efficiencies in working together, and what might we do better collaboratively as a team rather than as separate entities? Critical to the relationship is our dean, who felt strongly that the university press should be as central to the mission of the university as the university library.

The move was met with the expected apprehension by press stakeholders, but the reality is opening up new possibilities for both organizations. Our new location in a main library has been a visible testament to the centrality of the work of the press, yet much work remains if we are to realize the full potential for a press-library partnership.

The University of Arizona Press was founded in 1959 by scholars in the department of anthropology, and during the last fifty five years it has developed a publishing program that reflects the university's land grant mission. Our publishing program includes emphasis in this institution's greatest strengths, including anthropology, indigenous studies, Latino studies, and space science, and we are proud to publish some of the finest work by our own faculty. The University of Arizona Libraries (UAL) is an active partner in the teaching, research, and learning goals of the university. It maintains an active repository service and hosts several journals. In addition, our special collections houses substantial collections in the history of the American Southwest and the U.S.-Mexico borderlands.

We know instinctively that there is tremendous potential in our partnership, but despite being eager to collaborate, it is difficult when each does not understand the work the other does. Despite the obvious overlap of our missions, such understanding has not come quickly. Heavy workloads and the essential differences in our work conspire against us.

The press, like many of its peers at other institutions, is sometimes left out of critical conversations where our expertise could add value. Our small relative size, our status as academic professionals rather than faculty, and our operation as an auxiliary unit all contribute to our challenge in building awareness and understanding of our work. One year we may be asked how much it would cost for our small press to become the publisher for all of the textbooks to be used at our three state universities. Yet another year, we are not invited to participate in a campus group working on a digital textbook pilot.

In a broader context, the tone of press-library dialogue continues to be less than productive when there is dialogue at all. Thanks to our new role with University of Arizona libraries, I have been excited to attend several gatherings of librarians on topics such as open access and library publishing, both on campus and at national forums. I have

noted at these gatherings that the presence of a university press publisher seems to be of little significance. My sense has been that we are not seen as the resource and potential collaborator that we should be. During these gatherings, I am left with the impression that our colleagues in some libraries building publishing programs see us as a sideline, at best, as they work to re-create what we've been doing expertly for decades.

I have heard acknowledgement that peer review is essential and that marketing is critical for launching open access or non-traditional publishing initiatives, whether a project is freely available for not. These are concepts that university press publishers know a great deal about. In addition, I have observed an absence of the subject of authors in these discussions about library publishing initiatives. There are prosaic calls for open access but little discussion of what content producers get from traditional publisher relationships that will need to be replicated or abandoned in library-based publishing models.

The fierce anti-publisher bias in some of the conversations belies the fact that university libraries and university presses belong to the same institutions and serve the same academy. In trying to engage librarians regarding the tone of our dialogue and how we might foster more productive discussion, I have been dismayed by the variety of responses. On the one hand I have heard denial that such an issue exists because negative comments about publishers are really only about commercial publishers, not university presses. On the other hand, I have even been told that productive dialogue is not possible because university presses are too often on the side of the "big pigs."

As libraries advance their publishing agendas—and they should—university presses should be seen as allies. My small staff of twelve has more than 120 years of combined experience in scholarly and nonprofit publishing, and libraries can benefit from our broad-based expertise. Even beyond our expertise in e-book standards, XML workflows, content development, and marketing, we know authors. Authors appreciate the editorial partnership that helps develop their work for the greatest impact. Authors do care about marketing and, yes, sometimes about royalties. Authors are happy to see their material reused, but they are very happy to have their publisher manage that use and collect fees when appropriate. Authors—

even academics—sometimes have agents, and they sometimes ask for advances. We know authors with OA requirements from their funding agencies who are concerned that while an institutional repository can fulfill that requirement, it does not meet their needs as scholars, or best serve their scholarship.

Our understanding of these needs can help build better scholarly publishing systems for the future. Unfortunately, in our eagerness to do things ourselves, presses, libraries, and even universities are often reinventing the wheel instead of building the car of the future.

At a gathering of library and information science leaders, I heard a library dean state, "I don't care where the commas go." As an institution of higher learning, we *should* care where the commas go. We should care whether the scholarship we produce has an impact, just as we care whether our faculty are actually educating our students. These are institutional values, and the press should have a seat at the table as they are discussed. We know the costs of maintaining quality, and we can help develop standards for where that quality should be added, how we pay for it, and where that added value is less critical.

This is a time of enormous opportunity for university presses. Our environment at the University of Arizona is increasingly collegial and full of promise. Working with our libraries, we have a unique opportunity to take a leadership role on our campuses. By leveraging the press's strengths—content development, editorial and production management, marketing and branding—with the expertise of librarians in digital collections management, preservation, and data management, we can make more scholarship available at the highest standards and the lowest cost than ever before possible.

Let's begin with the assumption that we are all on the same team. Let's publish, host, and preserve as much scholarly work as we can. Let's make it as inexpensive and accessible as possible. Let's meet the needs of authors and readers. Let's agree on standards that make us—and our parent institutions—proud. Let's link research data to text. Let's explore open peer review and investigate social reading. And let's develop the best containers for emerging forms of scholarship. Let presses and libraries work together to fulfill the promise of digital publishing for scholarly books.