

## Dartmouth Digital Library Services: Refining Our Structures and Direction

In 2001, Dartmouth College Library announced a Digital Publishing Program (DPP) under the auspices of Librarian of the College Richard Lucier. T nvisioned with two distinct streams of activity: to publish original scholarship created at Dartmouth, and to selectively digitize existing materials held by the Library. In the years that followed, the program became essentially identified (as its online presence makes clear) with the publishing stream, which has produced three open access journals and is poised to produce a new, digital edition of an important, yet exceedingly rare, medieval text. Digitization of Library holdings began more slowly than in some peer institutions, but is now moving forward on a separate track. In many ways, the Digital Publishing Program serves as a good example of the “Let a hundred flowers bloom” model of digital experimentation so characteristic of its time, and a successful one. With several years of experience upon which to draw, and with the Library envisioning a robust Dartmouth Digital Library Services, the time is appropriate to evaluate our experience and to think about the future, including the structures and directions that will enable us to move forward along desired and sustainable pathways in advancing our digital publication and production goals.

### Publishing: the lessons of experience

Looking back to 2001, one of the strengths of the DPP’s entry into original publishing was the early recognition that a robust journal management software structure would enable ongoing production of journals and provide necessary back-end editorial support. The Digital Library Technologies Group (DLTG) created the software structure that is still in place and functioning well. The three journals published through DPP use this software.

Another early important decision in regard to building a successful publishing program was to participate in CrossRef.org, the publishing association responsible for DOI link registration. This enables citation linking that brings readers directly to Dartmouth materials from other, external and internal sources. This exposure of our original content is essential in building readership and impact. In these and other areas of technical planning, such as ISSN registration and copyright retention, the Library built to succeed. The ongoing success of the journals program in DPP demonstrates the richness of the Library’s technical expertise and the ability and willingness of staff to reflect on their knowledge base in service of a new and different enterprise. This commitment continues, as is evidenced he début publication of the Journal of e-Media Studies this spring.

The Library has extensive technical experience and an intellectual framework that allowed it to see the possibilities for new streams of scholarly communication and knowledge sharing outside of the established model of traditional print publication. The launch of the program was a risk, in that the College does not have a press with a journals division from which it might draw advice or observe processes at close hand. It was entrepreneurial as well, evincing a desire to move forward with a minimum of assets (especially staff assets) under Library control. The scale of the program has allowed for success, given the limited availability of staff and funds.

Factors unknown at the launch of DPP were actual cost factors, the need for continued, not-necessarily-technical editorial assistance, and the impact of journal publishing on the Library. These could not be calculated without real-time experience, which we have now.

To be able to move quickly and launch DPP, it was necessary to depend upon existing staff positions and funding. The Library could shepherd a project through start-up, provide training, and archive the content. Faculty editors and authors were and are expected to manage all of the editorial process and ongoing publication. Adherence to technical standards was strongly advised; as editorial expertise lay in content, not in underlying technologies, advice was not always possible to follow. It is now clear that this early expectation is untenable. Assigning a staff position to find and coordinate such assistance is imperative. The many calls upon DLTG staff for immediate advice and assistance, often after long periods of silence as authors and editors attend to other priorities, also indicate that this individual should participate in managing the relationship between the project and the Library.

Six years of experience have taught us that a new journal costs approximately \$12,000, chiefly to purchase needed external services and products. Graphic design, customized programming when needed, support for various information formats, any special software licensed, ISSN registration, initial copy editing, and marketing materials are familiar expenses. In addition to these hard dollars, the Library calculates that project start-up and launch requires around 100 (one hundred) hours of Library staff time.

The journals program has afforded the Library a view of publishing costs and benefits that would have been impossible to gain otherwise. The prestige that journals bring their publishers accrues from their ability to bring important voices and new thought to a wide readership over time. The value of this prestige is also overwhelming. It is worth in pursuing such a goal, the Library does not currently have the means to nurture and sustain a growing program of new journal publications. At the same time, the last six years have also demonstrated the distinct difficulties experienced by learned societies and small presses in moving their journals online. In some cases, societies have begun to work with large commercial publishers; the concomitant subscription price increases have been extremely difficult for libraries to absorb. Other publishers are now turning to research libraries for assistance in moving forward to maintain their voices in the scholarly conversation. The Library should consider such a publishing partnership if approached by an established journal.

Going forward, the Library is advised to direct its energies and its limited resources towards projects of more immediate and direct impact. In regard to publication of original scholarship, this may be accomplished through support of monographic and other “encapsulated” publications (e.g., an edition of letters, a video, a collection of visual objects accompanied by text) that require a finite span of intensive work and attention followed by the lower-energy phase of archiving. Monographic publications (in the broadest sense) may have the dual benefits of supporting teaching and growing the Library’s collections.

### Structuring library publishing

For our original publication work to move forward, it should be more appropriately situated within the wider context of campus publishing and be designated by the current Association of Research Libraries nomenclature: library publishing, which ARL defines as library-based publishing services that produce traditional publication forms, chiefly journals and monographs (Hahn, 2008). This terminology sets the Library’s publishing activities within a familiar terrain, understood as one part of a research institution’s publishing output, which often includes technical reports, white papers, research reports, educational publications for patients and consumers, and other outlets maintained by departments, programs, institutes, and other campus units.

For the Library Publishing Program to continue to be successful for all involved, addressing management and financial issues is a matter of high priority. Three issues must be dealt with: editorial support, a shared understanding of responsibilities, and cost sharing.

The Library should, for the short term, cap the launch of new journals, maintaining support for the three titles we publish currently. We have an ongoing commitment to publish and archive these titles in perpetuity. Projects centering on monographic publications or transfer of established journals should be considered, with preference given to monographs. The creation of new journals should be reevaluated once other recommended changes are made and their success may be measured.

The Digital Resources Program Director should be designated to work with faculty editors and authors for the lives of their publications. This individual should step into the process early, handling all of the non-technical aspects of the publication and assisting as appropriate to the circumstances (e.g., helping a faculty editor bring her editorial board together). At the programmatic level, the director must develop a list of outsourced copy editors with requisite disciplinary backgrounds and plan who—on staff, students, or externally—might be trained to provide low-end but required technical assistance, such as XHTML mark-up, PDF production, and OCR clean-up as needed. The director should work closely with liaison librarians, who have close knowledge of faculty and departments, for information sharing and advice. When working with a faculty author on a monograph, liaisons should be encouraged to participate at

the level which they find comfortable. In the case of our journal publications, the director will have the sensitive task of keeping editors on time for each issue.

Within the Library, the director and DLTG must maintain a positive working relationship marked by open and proactive communication. The director should become as knowledgeable as possible about the structure and function of the journal management system, current standards in mark-up language and metadata, and the Library's use of these in other areas of digital production. This will require education from and conversation with members of DLTG in order to develop a sound knowledge base. A well-versed director should be able to respond to many of the inquiries that come from authors and editors to DLTG currently. An early task for the director should be to work with Cataloging and Metadata Services to apply the Library's current standards for metadata and mark-up to our three existing journals.

For some forms of publications, such as single-author monographs and edited volumes, it will continue to be necessary to utilize many of the tools of traditional publishing: peer review and selection, copy editing, marketing, and solicitation of outside reviews. These capabilities should not be developed in-house. For this work, the Digital Resources Program Director should forge a relationship with an established publisher who is willing to collaborate with the Library. The new director of the University Press of New England has signaled such an interest. A model of subvention or grant support that shepherds monographs through professional publishing services, followed by open access online publication by the Library, builds on the strengths of each party and is mutually advantageous.

Successful business management always includes effective relationship management. Expectations must be clear and shared, especially in an area of value-added services that extend the Library's mission. A memorandum of understanding should be developed for each new publishing project that delineates timelines, services and assistance offered, any limitations on staff time and responsibilities that may need to be expressed, editorial responsibilities, and potential sunset dates or events. Open and detailed discussion on the memorandum and modifications as needed in advance of signature should be envisioned. Such documents should be interpreted not as limitations on service but as mutual pledges of support and understanding. A list of elements for such memoranda will be found in the accompanying appendices.

Cost sharing structures that enable sustained production of high quality publishing projects are essential. A cost share of 50% from Library funds and 50% from faculty author(s)/editor(s) for initial, regular expenses should be considered. This scale gives the Library a low enough price point to consider more than one project in a given fiscal year; the dollar amount should be accessible to the content creator(s) and their funding sources as well. Monographic authors should look for subventions or grants as sources of support for their publications. Beyond regular start-up costs, additional and/or custom work, such as graphic design or database construction, should be negotiated. It is advisable that the Library not pay the majority of customary ongoing expenses for our journals, such as costs of printing at might be reasonably

paid by authors or the sponsoring academic department. Additionally, should a publication become profitable (through advertising, etc.), the Library should not hesitate to ask to be reimbursed for its expenses.

#### Building on success for the longer term: Dartmouth Digital Library Services

The near-term recommendations listed above make no mention of the digitization side of the original DPP vision. This recognizes the current development of a parallel track for those activities within the Library, which engages some of the same staff but corresponds to new and separate vetting, funding and production processes. In addition, the Manton Foundation endowment will fund the hiring of a Digital Production Director to manage this new Digital Production Program and provide seed funding for some associated expenses.

These two streams—Digital Production and Library Publishing—should re-converge, though, in thinking about the longer term, under the overarching umbrella of Digital Library Services. At some points they may connect or even overlap. Original publications linked to digitized Library materials are attractive potential projects for faculty authors who might work with the Library Publishing Program. We will also need to more fully develop our collaboration with Academic Computing and Research Computing related to this area, as it is likely that faculty will turn to the Library for assistance in publishing new forms of scholarship in addition to monographs, such as media-rich content “sites” with newer Web-enabled technologies, or large datasets with complex user interfaces, or other forms yet to be imagined. They may create elaborate Blackboard-based course materials to connect to digital surrogates of Library holdings. We will need strategies for knowing how to manage the projects we accept, which projects may be better managed by our Computing colleagues, and how to manage projects where the constituent parts are distributed between the two.

Collaboration between the Digital Resources Program Director and the Digital Production Director will be key as well. One of the distinctions of this Library from so many of its peers is the very fluid way that ideas and projects move across departmental or divisional lines. The Digital Production Director will have primary responsibility for reformatting, or republishing, Library holdings in digital format, such as unique or rare works from Rauner Special Collections Library, while the Digital Resources Program Director concentrates on publishing original monographic and journal content. Both individuals should direct prospective authors and partners to the pertinent party. Each should call upon the other for assistance, advice, and cooperation as needed and appropriate. Possible areas of collaborative publication include new critical editions of unique or rare Library holdings (with new and extensive critical apparatus), collections of essays around Library materials, or monographic studies of Library holdings. Setting priorities for collaborative work will need to be a consultative process, especially in view of the extensive digitization projects the Library anticipates. Most often, digital reformatting of Library collections will be driven by faculty and curricular needs. The Library should adopt the following priorities, in order: selective digitization of holdings, publication of

original monographic works, journal transfer and publication. The accompanying appendices offer suggested actions for a variety of possible requests.

Dartmouth's original efforts to build a Digital Publishing Program should be seen as a source of great pride as it demonstrates early adoption of new technologies supported by excellent technical planning and structure. As we look back at the thought and the decisions that led to the launch of that program, our challenge is to be equally thoughtful and expert in moving forward with our new Digital Library Services programs. Inevitably, there is a price to success when we operate in an environment where we must choose a subset of impactful activities from a broader roster of attractive possibilities; the price always includes not doing something else. Looking ahead, we need to move in directions that will bring the greatest returns for the price of our success.

Elizabeth E. Kirk

July 2008

#### Works consulted

Brown, Laura, Rebecca Griffiths, and Matthew Rascoff. 2007. University Publishing in a Digital Age. New York, NY: Ithaka. <http://www.ithaka.org/strategic-services/university-publishing>.

Candee, Catherine H., and Lynne Withey. 2007. Publishing Needs and Opportunities at the University of California: SLASIACTask Force on "The University as Publisher." [http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/102207/Publishing\\_Task\\_Force\\_DRAFT\\_18\\_Oct\\_07.doc](http://www.slp.ucop.edu/consultation/slasiac/102207/Publishing_Task_Force_DRAFT_18_Oct_07.doc).

Hahn, Karla L. 2008. Research Library Publishing Services: New Options for University Publishing. Washington DC: Association of Research Libraries. <http://www.arl.org/bm-doc/research-librarypublishing-services.pdf>.

Harley, Diane. 2008. The University as Publisher: Summary of a Meeting Held at UC Berkeley on November 1, 2007. Berkeley, CA: Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/publications.php?id=295>.

## Appendices

## Issues to Address in Library-Editor/Author memoranda of understanding

- § The responsible parties: the Library and... a faculty member, or an academic department, or some other person or body
- § What the parties agree to do: publish, ingest, digitize, etc.
- § The nature of the publication (monographic, etc.)
- § The extent of the publication (one volume? fifty?)
- § The current status of the work at the signing of the memorandum, with a timeframe for completion where necessary
- § Permissions
- § Payment of fees for publishing services (e.g., copy editing)
- § Payment of other additional fees, cost sharing
- § Special treatment of and standards for files
- § Ownership of intellectual property
  - The Library owns the copyright on all software and infrastructure it develops to support publications
  - The Library owns the copyright on all digital surrogates it creates of its holdings
  - For journals: copyright of articles remains with authors; copyright of the journal remains with the Library
  - For single-author monographs: copyright remains with author; Library retains exclusive, perpetual license to publish
  - For multi-author monographs: copyright of individual components remains with authors; copyright of full work remains with the Library
- § Distribution: open access
- § Right to print (when work includes digital surrogates of Library holdings)
- § Foreign rights, translations (when work includes digital surrogates of Library holdings)
- § Distribution of fees received, if any
- § Warranty of right to publish( Author's)
- § Retention of right to cease publication (Library's)
- § Timelines for project completion/dissolution
- § Indemnification
- § Limitation of agreement (extends to the life of the specific project; not a promise to publish whatever the author/editor wishes)

## Examples of Requests for Service and Suggested Responses

Request	Priority	Response
Faculty member requests digitization of a set of 19 <sup>th</sup> c. manuscripts held in Rauner Library for use as the primary focus in a course.	1	Digital Production Program digitizes the collection and makes it available to the public in perpetuity. Costs to be paid by the Library.
The same faculty member requests that the Library maintain the Blackboard site that he developed for the course.	0	Digital Production Program recommends that the faculty member work with Academic Computing to archive the course content.
Professor asks that the Library publish his most recent monograph in literary studies, as he is aware of low sales and high prices if he works with his usual publisher.	2	Library Publishing Program sets up meeting with UPNE to discuss joint imprint; UPNE provides vetting/editing/review processes, Library Publishing creates files and hosts as open access publication. Subvention/cost share will be required to meet UPNE and Library expenses. UPNE to keep any print-on-demand profits.
Graduating student asks that Library maintain the very large dataset on the 1980 US presidential election that he compiled while working with a faculty member in order to continue using it when he enters graduate school at Duke next year.	0	Library recommends placement in the Dartmouth repository with the faculty member as the "owner" of the files.
President of the 1848 Society, a learned society of historians of 19 <sup>th</sup> c. Europe, asks Library to take on publishing of its flagship journal, Restoration/Revolution, in order to transition from print to online.	3	Library Publishing determines that several faculty members in History, French and Italian, and Russian contribute to and use this journal. The Library adds the journal and publishes as open access. Costs to be paid by endowment set up by the society.
Yale University Press is working with an independent historian of the book writing a monograph on publishing in 18 <sup>th</sup> and 19 <sup>th</sup> c. New England. The press is interested in developing an extensive companion Web site of examples and is especially interested in materials in the Class of 1926 collection.	2	Digital Production agrees to digitize materials requested with the stipulation that Dartmouth be given a site license for the e-version of the book and all associated online components. Costs to be paid by the press.
Faculty member requests online publication of her new critical edition of Rupert Brooke's complete works.	1	Library works with a university press for publication processes, digitizes relevant holdings. Subvention/cost share to pay press expenses; Library pays for digitization. Publication as open access monograph.