# *Open Monograph Ecosystem Impact Analysis*

## Future of Open Scholarship: Brief

May 2021

# IOI

*Future of Open Scholarship: Open Monograph Ecosystem Impact Analysis*

# IOI

## Executive Summary

Reflecting on the past year, the imposed inactivity resulting from the global lockdowns as a result of the pandemic contrasts sharply with the rapid and substantial changes that have unfolded within the scholarly economy. The pace of developments in the shift to remote education and work, the scramble to reinvent library services to meet new needs, and the still uncertain impacts on budgets and hiring freezes across this space all highlight the shortcomings of business as usual practices and models.

At the same time, the value of open access models in serving disrupted, displaced, and underserved communities has gained further traction. Certainly, the case for open and equitable access to research, data, outputs, and educational resources has been accelerated in ways that few could have predicted. This has included "emergency access" measures and a focus on equitable controlled digital lending for online resources for research, teaching, and learning from initiatives and organizations such as HathiTrust, Project ReShare, and Library Futures. This also includes over 80 members of the Association of University Presses, who issued a community response regarding their contributions and work to provide open and free access to materials.

In this report, we focus on one particular dimension of this evolving ecosystem of open scholarship: the effect on university presses and open monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences. This specific area of scholarly publishing faced uncertainty pre-pandemic as a result of declining monograph sales and strained library budgets, and is focused on in this report to examine the effects of the pandemic and subsequent economic volatility on a rapidly evolving space. Specifically, this report is concerned with the implications of prevailing production and business models currently utilized by English-language open monograph publishers.

There remains increased interest in experimentation around open access book publishing models, with a number of new initiatives continuing to be announced on a regular basis as our research went into production. This experimentation has resulted in a fluid monographs ecosystem characterized by a diversity of business models which we've detailed in this report. In addition, we've observed an increase in service offerings as university presses, such as MIT Presses Open Publishing Services (MITops), and society-oriented initiatives, like that announced by Duke University Press. Further analysis of the interplay and effects of these models and service layers in advancing shared aims of broader access and sustainability of open monographs is needed.

This research builds on interviews with over 115 participants from over 75 research and scholarship organizations for the Future of Open Scholarship project. In addition, we conducted a series of targeted interviews focusing on the impact to presses and monographs, speaking to a selection of press directors and senior staffers, representatives from industry membership organizations, technical infrastructure creators, and thought leaders to identify their areas of concern in the near-, mid-, and longer-term, as well as their ideas on prospects for additional collaboration and support opportunities. A list of those participants can be found in Appendix II.

Our findings, detailed below, reflect differing understandings around the underlying costs to produce open monographs; a lack of standardization around distribution, usage and metadata creation; gaps in sharing best practices across various publication experiments; and economic models still organized around legacy print. This report details each of these areas and offers recommendations for next steps around sharing best practices, a shift away from focusing on books only as individual titles, and a data-driven examination of open monographs produced thus far.

# IOI

## Table of Contents

# IOI

## 1.Introduction

The last decade has seen university presses and academic publishers continue to struggle to fulfill their basic mission of making peer-reviewed scholarship, mainly in the form of monographs, available to the world. Increasingly pricey Science, Technology, and Medicine (STM) journal packages continue to siphon larger portions of library budgets. At the same time, greater demands for the publication of open access scholarship have threatened existing revenue models — pushing presses to reinvent themselves.

Publishers have seen some success with open models and shared infrastructure, but the pandemic and resulting economic uncertainties have many stakeholders worried about a reduction in university support potentially resulting in press closures in the coming years. With university and scholar-led presses serving as the primary outlet for monographs in the humanities and social sciences, the loss of this publication channel also threatens the prospects for tenure as well as promotion opportunities for scholars. It also poses a serious risk to the production and dissemination of knowledge critical to the diversity of the scholarly communication ecosystem.

Since the start of the electronic (e-book) era, presses have struggled to find pricing models and dissemination channels that could meet their needs. Initially, most presses sold e-books via aggregators such as  ProQuest, EBSCO, JSTOR, and Project Muse, and through title-by-title distributors like Amazon and Overdrive. Their complicated revenue models resulted in electronic sales that did not compensate for dwindling print sales.

More recently, access to open source university- and funder-supported infrastructure, along with more widely available commercial hosting options, has enabled larger university presses to operate their own platforms and sell directly to libraries. Other smaller presses have begun working with commercial publishers to host their entire collections. These practices coincide with an increased interest in experimentation around open access book publishing models. This experimentation has resulted in a fluid monographs ecosystem characterized by a diversity of business models. Section 4 outlines some of these key models.

The  value of open monographs for scholarly communication, epistemic diversity, and knowledge equity is increasingly being recognized. However, at present actors in this space are reporting a number of challenges that leave the future of open monographs uncertain. This report aims to detail these challenges and offer recommendations towards a more sustainable open monographs future.  We identify three key findings: (1) the identification of underlying costs for the production and dissemination of monographs persists to be a significant problem for open monograph publishers across business models, (2) open monograph production has implications for metadata, and (3) there are gaps in sharing best practices across model experiments.

## 2. Research Overview

This report shares a preliminary summary of the findings and top level insights of the Future of Open Scholarship Open Monographs stakeholder interviews, run by the authors from October 29 to December 1, 2020. 27 individual and group interviews were conducted with a total of 30 participants from university presses, publishers, platforms, libraries/consortia, membership organizations, and research institutions in the US, Canada, and UK. Many interviewees represented multiple stakeholder perspectives. The

discussion guide used for these interviews can be found in Appendix I. A full list of participants can be found in Appendix II.

# 3. Key findings

The findings below illustrate the complexity and significant variance of the current open monograph ecosystem, both bolstered via experimentation with new publishing models and exacerbated by some of the most significant pressure tests of recent years with regards to economic volatility and shifting resourcing. This research effort provided a unique opportunity to work with decision makers navigating a system under extreme duress, a system that in many ways hindered responsiveness when it was needed most.

Over the course of our research, we heard a number of technical concerns regarding the viability and availability of open infrastructure to support presses and monographs. Heightened attention was paid to questions regarding costs, business models, knowledge sharing, and usage metrics, which we've highlighted below. We recommend further exploration down the road into ways to explore further open infrastructure development and usage to support open monograph production and dissemination. We also heard about the economic realities and concerns brought about by, in many if not all cases, significant impact on budgets and resources to support core operations and staffing needs, especially for 2020-2021 due to the global pandemic.

## 3.1 Challenges to identifying underlying costs

Many interviewees from different stakeholder segments established the identification of open monograph costs as a significant challenge, particularly as it relates to the implementation of sustainable business models. This is not particularly surprising as these accounts corroborate the premises of similar work conducted prior to the pandemic. Here, we outline some of the specific challenges to the identification of the costs underlying the production and dissemination of open monographs.

### 3.1.1 A lack of standardization surrounding monograph costs

One significant impediment to the identification of underlying costs is a lack of common terminology and taxonomy to describe monograph publishing workflows. The absence of these standards obscures the allocation and appraisal of costs.  Significant portions of publication costs —such as salaries, building costs, and infrastructure — are often classified as simply "overhead".. Conflating this issue is the lack of comprehensive naming conventions for publishing departments or functions. The designation of EDP (Editorial, Design, and Production), for example, can obscure cost allocation across what might be separate departments for some organizations. Recognizing these issues, a  collaborative project between the University of North Carolina Press and Longleaf Services was developed to investigate the standardization of costs for print publishing.

On the journal side, some attempts have been made to provide transparency around Article Processing Charges (APC) price points and how they map to costs of different workflow functions, including the The Consortium for a Transparent Transition to Open Access (TTOA) Consortium Meeting in September 2019.

# IOI

We also heard from participants the need for additional research into the costs of staffing and labor, especially for streamlined digital production and dissemination. This resourcing dimension arose frequently throughout our interviews for the Future of Open Scholarship project, and warrants additional attention and consideration given it's complexity and effects on the costs and resiliency of open scholarship.

### 3.1.2 *The persistence of print legacy models in the digital era*

Another contributor to the challenge of cost identification stems from attempts of applying economic models from traditional print to the production of open, digital-first monographs and materials. Pricing models for print books are derived from the need to create and distribute a physical object via a [complex supply chain](#). In the advent of publishing's digital transformation, electronic versions of these print books were created near the end of the production process, with the prevailing print model largely unmodified. That is not necessarily the case today, with some open monographs choosing a digital-first form of development, making many of the other expected print costs and approaches less relevant.

Furthermore, the notion of guaranteed library sales continues to drive many pricing decisions. This is in spite of [libraries seeing a long decline in their sales](#) —particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences in a process that threatens these as disciplines. We explore this more under the challenges in calculating cost recovery for open materials.

### 3.1.3 *The complexity of calculating cost recovery*

The cost recovery model that many presses depend upon looks to digital monograph sales to replace lost print sales and, to open digital to replace potential lost print revenue. However, attempts to determine the kinds of subvention or support that is required for the publication of an open monograph can be ineffective as the data to support this decision making is not there.

Presses look to projects like Towards an Open Monograph Ecosystem (TOME), [which uses a figure of $15,000](#), as a baseline for determining standard costs. However some practitioners, like John Sherer, have suggested that the revenue difference between an open and non-open monograph is closer to $5000. Others believe that TOME's $15,000 baseline [should be higher.](#) The difference in these valuations is rooted in trying to recoup close to the total cost of production from start to finish versus trying to recoup potential sales losses as a result of the availability of an open copy.

Interviewees also spoke of the need to stop seeing books only as discrete, individual items but also as "networked resources" that stretch beyond individual presses. This includes shifting towards thinking of the individual components that make up a singular digital open monograph title as separate access points to a larger network of knowledge products. This conceptual approach has long been employed by online journals, allowing researchers to initiate searches across broad amounts of content without specific regard to a journal or publisher imprint. Books, too, are now frequently searched as a corpus of material, while access models still focus on the book as a whole.

Additionally, thinking of books and monographs as networked resources may enable a deeper shift in how cost recovery is calculated more broadly, looking instead at models that offer subsidies for a series of open monograph titles and content. Questions remain over how costs to support a corpus of open monographs would compare to what libraries currently pay for electronic journals. Interviewees estimate

that the costs would significantly differ, given what is currently known about library expenditures for publishing fees, article processing charges, and subscriptions to journals. This warrants further exploration and cost modelling to index and assess the costs and benefits of collective investment in shared, networked resources of open content. Our research brief ["Costs & Benefits of Collective Investment"](#) further explores this idea and provides a modelling tool for planning purposes

### 3.1.4 What about antitrust?

A complication around cost transparency is sensitivity to antitrust considerations which might steer publishers away from candid discussions on what steps in a workflow cost. [In regards to publishing](#), antitrust laws center around price fixing, resale price maintenance, and price discrimination. Certainly, there are legal cases where antitrust issues have been invoked, so publishers are understandably cautious.

As we began our scoping for this work, we were cautioned by a number of industry leaders about the issue of antitrust and its chilling effect on sharing cost information. Clearer guidelines around what is allowable under current antitrust laws would be helpful to promote meaningful discussions around cost transparency and even around where savings might be possible.

## 3.2 Implications of business models on understanding usage

While the creation and dissemination of open monographs is not that different from the creation and dissemination of traditional, print monographs, the $0 price tag for consumers can lead to unintended consequences. Subsequently, the dissemination flow of produced monographs, which may bypass conventional suppliers, can lead to issues downstream in terms of discovery and visibility, affecting usage and impact of openly available monographs. This can directly complicate assessments of impact, need, and cases for additional subsidy or funding.

### 3.2.1 The role of third party systems

[Distribution for a typical non-OA digital monograph routinely touches many third party systems](#), such as [EBSCO](#) or [Amazon](#). These suppliers create or augment metadata generated by the publisher to improve discoverability by populating feeds intended for retail channels and library systems. Presses that underestimate the importance of this process do so at their peril as a lack of robust metadata [can impede discovery and use of open content](#). Items with a $0 price can be difficult to ingest into aggregator platforms, and having one format with $0 might inadvertently trigger a request for a $0 Kindle edition, for example. Inclusion of open content in aggregation raises concerns with librarians that they are being charged for no cost titles, while at the same time the addition of such titles is not without associated costs.

### 3.2.2 The consistency challenge

Because metadata requirements can vary so widely across the dissemination ecosystem, smaller presses with fewer staff in particular can face resource constraints in adding and maintaining the generation of robust metadata to their workflow process. This can be attributed to a lack of cohesive standards, gaps in specialized training, or merely a lack of time or resources. Downstream distribution mechanisms might even override publisher-provided metadata, making corrections or updates challenging to disseminate into those systems.

# IOI

Collaborative efforts such as [Longleaf Services](#) have attempted to [improve consistency of metadata](#) by taking on that function from the individual presses. Some interviewees believe that librarians could contribute to the metadata creation, but systems and staffing are not currently set up to support such frictionless cooperation, especially given the staffing reallocation and effects on labor seen over the past year due to sweeping budget cuts, layoffs, and furloughs.

### 3.2.3 Consolidating widespread usage metrics

Open monographs tend to live on multiple platforms across the web, including the open access book platform [OAPEN](#), [Knowledge Unlatched](#), [MUSEOpen](#), [Internet Archive](#), and more. Each of these platforms have their own ingest mechanisms. [Downstream usage across these platforms](#) would ideally be aggregated for publisher, library, and author information; however, each host can calculate usage in a different manner, at differing timeframes, and retrieve them in various ways. This can be an enormous headache for those attempting to gather impact metrics which currently requires significant manual work and many caveats around data inconsistencies. In an attempt to solve this issue, [Project COUNTER](#) has developed standards for the assessment and comparison of usage across publishers and content types.

To gain better insight into the usage of open monographs, alignment and investment in interoperable and/or shared identifiers is key. We know that persistent identifiers such as DOIs and ORCIDs are foundational to the architecture of the physical and digital scholarly ecosystem, ensuring sustainable discovery, identification, integrity, linking and analysis as well as access to scholarly objects. For open monographs, there are a number of initiatives working to develop and maintain similar identifiers to track usage and other key metrics.

European open access book publishers, for example, joined forces to collaborate around a number of key work products intended to benefit the book publishing ecosystem. [Open Scholarly Communication in the European Research Area for Social Sciences and the Humanities (OPERAS)](#)' [HIRMEOS](#) project is one example, working with the large European-centered open monograph and book publishing platforms to create a common layer of value added services across platforms, implement standardized usage, cross-linking and identifier data.

Unfortunately, not all open monograph projects will include identifiers. Many titles in the Knowledge Unlatched collection, have not been assigned DOIs which drive the underlying linking that researchers have come to expect on the journal side. The W3C established a [publisher working group](#) to work on standards, but no academic or university press is among the participants.

## 3.3 Gaps in sharing best practices among various publishing experiments

While there is a plethora of experiments underway in the open access monograph space, sharing best practices among them has been challenging. Nearly every interviewee indicated a desire for more inter-experimental collaboration and sharing. Projects like [TOME](#) (Towards an Open Monograph Ecosystem) and the [COPIM](#) (Community-led Open Publication Infrastructures for Monographs) project meet regularly as communities of practice to share insights, findings, and advance models for open monograph publishing and dissemination. Progress reports are shared widely with great interest, but many would like to see opportunities for broader interactive discussion and brainstorming across

# IOI

initiatives. COPIM, which makes their [documentation available openly](#), was mentioned repeatedly as a model that other projects might emulate. This wider sharing and collaboration would naturally bring more collaborators on board, increasing the number of folks who see value in an initiative, perhaps with the consequence of increasing funding opportunities and pathways.

When it comes to wider sharing of findings, a particular focus might be on educating newer presses for whom the need for a sustainable model might be more pressing. One of the drivers behind the COPIM project was to share information with smaller and newer presses. Such presses face challenges around certain models, for example [those that depend on monetization of the backlist to support the frontlist](#) in the [Central European University Press (CEUP)](#) and [MIT Press Direct to Open](#) models. Other models may depend on the ability of a press to run their own platform, as that may well be needed to go for direct library support.

## 4. Glossary of open monograph business models

**Subscribe to Open (S2O)**
First launched by [Annual Reviews](#), developed in conjunction with Raym Crow, with funding from the [Robert Wood Johnson Foundation](#), wherein subscribers receive a discount, backfile access, and/or other incentives in return for committing to continue to subscribe to journal content. The publisher guarantees to open the current year's content on the condition all subscribers participate. If the participation requirement is not met, content remains gated via a regular subscription; but institutions that commit to the offer receive the incentives even if the offer fails. Subscribe to Open (S2O) is not a voluntary contribution model: an institution must either commit to S2O or subscribe conventionally to ensure access. The pilot began in 2020. Frontlist articles carry a [Creative Commons Attribution license](#); backfile content does not. Because the model is not article based, it benefits authors and fields without funding for APCs. Variations include Martin Eve's model for society publishers, [Berghahn's Open Anthro Project](#), and [EDP Sciences journal, Mathematical Modelling of Natural Phenomena](#). More information can be found at: [https://subscribetoopencommunity.org/](https://subscribetoopencommunity.org/)

**Direct to Open**
Developed by MIT Press, and also designed by Raym Crow, Direct to Open will open collections of the Press's frontlist monographs contingent on specific financial targets being reached. Direct to Open is similar to Subscribe to Open in that institutions that commit to supporting the frontlist gain term access to substantial collections of gated backlist titles, even if the open frontlist offer fails. Unlike S2O, Direct to Open is a collective funding approach, and the support fees will be reduced if more institutions participate. Titles are available in Humanities and Social Sciences and Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and the Arts packages. MIT intends to make its model freely available for other presses to adapt. More information can be found at: [https://direct.mit.edu/books/pages/direct-to-open](https://direct.mit.edu/books/pages/direct-to-open)

**Opening the Future**
This is a library subscription model wherein libraries pay for access to a portion of the press's backlist with the revenue then supporting frontlist titles being published open access. [Central European University Press (CEUP)](#) is working with the [COPIM project](#), [Project MUSE](#) and [OAPEN](#) on hosting, and [LYRASIS](#) and [Jisc](#) on coordinating library membership). This is a modified version of the Subscribe **to Open** model described above. This model benefits publishers with existing backlists. Value of the backlist

shifts over time as more of it is published openly. More information can be found at: https://www.openingthefuture.net/

**Towards an Open Monograph Ecosystem (TOME)**
A five year pilot project of Association of American Universities (AAU), Association of Research Libraries (ARL), and Association of University Presses (AUPresses), started in 2017, to support monograph publishing in the humanities and humanistic social sciences through which "monograph publishing costs are met by institutionally funded faculty book subsidies" of $15,000 per title with the objective of publishing an open access edition. This model avoids the need for an author to pay. Institutions can participate regardless of whether they support a university press. Participation by both presses and institutions has increased as the project progresses. Electronic downloads are on average six times the average print sales, and print sales for participating titles are only 10% lower than non-TOME titles. More information can be found at: https://www.openmonographs.org/

**Sustainable History Monograph Pilot (SHMP):**
A collaboration among the University of North Carolina Press (through its subsidiary unit Longleaf Publishing Services) and 19 university presses to transform the monograph publication process and outputs in the discipline of history. The objective is to use a standardized, digital-first work-flow to "explore how open digital editions can enhance discoverability and engagement of original scholarship by readers across the globe—while maintaining the high standards of peer review and publication that are integral to university press publishing." Funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation cover the costs of copyediting, composition, and file preparation and Presses receive a $7,000 subsidy to cover their costs of acquisitions (loosely based on ITHAKA's The Costs of Publishing Monographs study). Standardization reduces the overall costs and Mellon support helps offset the financial risk to the Press. More information can be found at: https://longleafservices.org/blog/the-sustainable-history-monograph-pilot-041219/

**Open Book Publishers**
A mixed model for producing open access books that can be sustained "from a mixed range of modest income streams, including sales of print and a library membership program." Books are freely available to read online or download, and authors face no book processing charges. Open Book Publishers is a participant in COPIM (see below), and part of ScholarLed, a consortium of five scholar-led, not-for-profit, open access book publishers formed in 2018. More information can be found at: https://www.openbookpublishers.com/

**Community-Led Open Publication Infrastructures for Monographs (COPIM) project**
COPIM is an international project, building much-needed, community-governed, open systems and infrastructures to develop Open Access book publishing. COPIM is supported by four universities, Coventry University; Birkbeck, University of London; Lancaster University and Trinity College, Cambridge), together with OA presses that include the ScholarLed consortium (Mattering Press, meson press, Open Humanities Press, Open Book Publishers and punctum books), libraries at the University of California Santa Barbara (UCSB) and Loughborough University) and infrastructure providers, the Directory of Open Access Books and Jisc. COPIM is funded by a grant from the Research England Development Fund, Arcadia, and contributions from partners. COPIM promotes the idea of "'scaling small': the idea that publishing Open Access books should be something that a wide range of publishers, of differing sizes and with a variety of business models, can accomplish sustainably and at manageable cost through collaborative effort and effective network-building." They aim to create "a significantly

enriched not-for-profit, open source and community-governed ecosystem for OA book publishing, to support and sustain a diversity of publishing initiatives and models, particularly within the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS)."

# 5. Recommendations

Our discussions produced many areas for additional exploration and suggestions for next steps. As the open monograph ecosystem is interwoven with issues concerning publishers, libraries, consortia, and higher education, teasing out specific recommendations can be challenging. Nevertheless, we have identified three topics that show potential for near-term next steps: mechanisms for sharing best practices; education around thinking of books as a networked resource; and a data-driven examination of what's working in open monographs so far.

## 5.1 Incentivize and facilitate cross-program knowledge sharing

Interviewees from all stakeholder segments expressed an ongoing need for transparency and shared insight into available services, models, costs, and impact. Recommended paths forward include hosting of collaborative workshops, project vetting, and both the development of and support in aligning initiatives around community-developed standards and best practices.

We recommend investment and experimentation in incentivizing more knowledge sharing across and among initiatives globally. This is essential to help reduce duplication in innovation as well as unnecessary competition, and a step needed to incentivize further transparency over cost modelling and opportunities for additional efficiency and collective investment among initiatives. A particular request was to expand consideration to encompass additional non-US based initiatives, such as the established Central and Latin American models SciELO and Redalyc. Most projects have regular meetings for participating organizations and universities, but opportunities for cross-initiative learning have been rare.

Pandemic travel restrictions have enabled virtual collaborations that could be used to bring together a variety of participants on a regular basis without the need for extensive travel budgets. Examples of outputs from such workshops could include a focus on robust documentation, along with a place to share it, toolkits and checklists, as well as discussion of success metrics. Many organizations could use these workshops as an occasion to share lessons learned and identify continuing gaps.

We also recommend further exploration into the development of cross-project data collection mechanisms and data trusts for usage and other impact metrics (discovery methods, referrers, baseline metadata), building on the work of the Open Access e-Book Data Trust.

## 5.2 Seeing books as a networked resource

As detailed above, as online research continues to grow, we need to shift our thinking from books solely as individual units to books as a networked resource to break out of print-established patterns and workflows. While longform publications continue to have standalone value, collective search capabilities and interlinking demonstrate the considerable value of books as a collective — across types of books, disciplines, and publisher lists. Thinking less about individual titles and more about the collective

offering will increase creative thinking around business models that move beyond cost replacement ideas to ones that support the generalized activity of book creation.

Standardization whenever possible can facilitate cost reductions, and exploration of new funding models can mitigate the perception of "lost sales" and enable understanding of the real impact of open. This will mean taking a look at how universities with presses treat them budgetarily and how universities without presses can bear a fairer share of the buren.

Some networked solutions may be national in scope, such as monographs produced by German academics, or those that are discipline specific, such as a history collection that crosses countries and languages. Community building will play a key role in collective action models. Community might include stakeholders across multiple verticals.

### 5.3 Invest in cross-platform standards for usage metrics

The number of open access books has increased dramatically in recent years, providing a large corpus of data about their development and use. But mechanisms for safely and securely sharing data across publishing outfits, institutions and platforms are still nascent, with efforts such the pilot data trust for Open Access e-Book Usage and others in development. Additional investment in mapping means to assess transparently and securely usage metrics across multiple platforms would aid in providing critical information to press directors, those leading publishing efforts, and budget holders about the efficacy of their efforts.

## 6. Conclusion

In summary, the prevailing logic underlying the monograph production process is slowly shifting from that of the legacy of the print model. This framing hinders a malleable approach to knowledge production that facilitates consideration for additional knowledge outputs of the production process such as chapters, data, and metadata. The outcome is a business model that focuses on the creation of a singular book — as opposed to networked resources —its cost recovery strategy aimed at replicating the elusive dollar amount.

It's clear that there needs to be more efficiency in the production pipeline to lower costs so that it is easier for presses to break even on open books. A challenge is that an increase in efficiency doesn't mean an increase in revenue, and many costs are staff-related. Some participants pointed to the need to shift presses from an auxiliary budget item to an operational budget item —to treat them more like university departments.

There remains a sentimentality around books that has no real counterpart on the article side. Success of a book should not be measured solely by its sales, but by its impact, including downloads, geographic reach, and engagement.

This is also a time of great experimentation and enthusiasm for shifting to open access models, driven by desires to approach service to communities differently, meet current need and demand, and to provide equitable, affordable means of scholarly publishing. We encourage further examination of the interplay of these models to identify areas for further convergence, data and knowledge sharing, and collective action.

# IOI

## 7. Appendices

*Appendix I: [Interview discussion guide](#)*
*Appendix II: List of participants*

| Institution / Organization | Name |
|---|---|
| Open Book Publishers; COPIM | Lucy Barnes |
| punctum books; COPIM | Dan Rudmann |
| Big Ten Academic Alliance | Maurice York |
| University of Michigan Press | Charles Watkinson |
| Association of Research Libraries | Judy Ruttenberg |
| Michigan State | Kathleen Fitzpatrick |
| Erudit.org – Université de Montréal | Tanja Niemann |
| Temple University | Joe Lucia |
| Iowa State | Curtis Brundy |
| Center for Research Libraries (CRL) | Greg Eow |
| MIT Press | Nick Lindsay |
| Educopia | Christina Drummond |
| University of Westminster Press | Andrew Lockett |
| Wayne State University | Jon Cawthorne |
| SPARC | Heather Joseph |
| UCalifornia | Erich von Rijn |
| Educopia | Katherine Skinner |
| Johns Hopkins | Barbara Pope |
| Brown University | Allison Levy |
| Open Book Publishers | Rupert Gatti |
| Virginia Tech | Peter Potter |
| Lyrasis | Sharla Lair |
| PKP | John Willensky |
| Birkbeck University | Martin Eve |
| UNC Press | John Scherer |
| Longleaf | Clay Farr |
| OSU | Tony Sanfilippo |
| Duke | Dean Smith |
| University of Minnesota Press | Susan Doerr |
| JHUP, Project Muse | Wendy Queen |

# IOI

## 8. Acknowledgments