



MINUTES

MEETING	University Publishing Advisory Committee
MEET No.	Meeting 2, 2012
PRESENT	Professor James Fox Lorena Kanellopoulos Professor Robin Stanton Professor Jenny Corbett Professor Nicolas Peterson Dr Walter Fernandez Professor Brian Kennett Ms Roxanne Missingham Mr Colin Steele Beth Battrick (minutes)
APOLOGIES	Associate Professor Don Anton Dr Brok Glenn
DATE/TIME	Tues 20 November 2012 / 10:30am
VENUE	Graneek Room, Chifley Library, Building 15

Part 1. Formal items

ITEM 1. Apologies

Apologies from:

- Don Anton
- Brok Glenn

ITEM 2. Minutes

The minutes from the University Publishing Advisory Committee (UPAC) Meeting 1, 2012 (15 May 2012) were approved.

ITEM 3. Matters arising

Before discussion of Matters arising, Colin Steele raised a query regarding the membership of UPAC: at the previous (15 May 2012) UPAC meeting, it was proposed that the two new ANU Deputy Vice-Chancellors be invited to join UPAC. Lorena Kanellopoulos answered that this has happened. Professor Margaret Harding (Deputy Vice-Chancellor Research) declined with apologies, and offered a representative if UPAC thought it would be useful. James Fox invited Jenny Corbett (Pro Vice-Chancellor Research and Research Training) (attending) to be an ongoing member of UPAC as a representative from ANU Chancery. Jenny Corbett accepted.

3.1 Minutes of the UPAC meetings available on ANU E Press website

The minutes of previous UPAC meetings are now available on the ANU E Press website. Future minutes will also be available. It was agreed minutes prior to 2012 would not be included on the website.

3.2 ANU Press ownership

James Fox spoke in regards to the document containing his correspondence with Rachel Vance (Acting University Counsel, University Legal Office) on the matter of ownership of the ANU Press name and colophon. In this correspondence, Rachel Vance states "On a closer review of the 1984 agreement between ANU and Pergamon and the subsequent 2004 agreement between ANU and AS Wilson...I am not convinced that AS Wilson (I gather it is owned by Mr Chuck lossi) has any rights in the ANU Press name or colophon." James Fox explained that Chuck lossi owns the rights to republish around 35 ANU Press titles, from a list of about 500. If ANU E Press wants to republish any of those 35, we will have to request or purchase permission. Roxanne Missingham requested an email to all UPAC members listing all ANU Press files (including those owned by Chuck lossi) so any resources of interest can be made available by Open Access or included in the ANU digitisation project.

Roxanne Missingham explained that 2013 marks the 60-year anniversary of the first ANU PhD thesis, and as part of the celebrations, the theses published in that year will be digitalised. Roxanne Missingham proposed (as part of the digitisation project), that ANU Press publications get digitalised to keep them available.

Action: Lorena Kanellopoulos to circulate (by email) entire list of ANU Press publications to UPAC members for review.

3.3 CAUL Library Publications Advisory Committee (CPLAC)

Roxanne Missingham reported on the CAUL Library Publications Advisory Committee (CPLAC). CPLAC is a committee of university presses set up to share information and resources. During 2012 they have had one teleconference and one face-to-face meeting in Adelaide. CPLAC has representatives from University of Technology Sydney, University of Sydney, ANU, Adelaide University, and Victoria University. It has extended an invitation of membership to Monash University. The CPLAC workplan for 2013 will include two major topics:

1. The profile of University Presses within university libraries and what they are doing to share their industry knowledge/experience to help emerging university library presses.
2. Plans for a symposium/THAT Camp (The Humanities and Technology Camp) during OA week 2013, which may include inviting speakers from the US.

Colin Steele raised the matter of the Book Industry Collaborative Council (BICC) Expert Reference Group, chaired by John Byrne, whose report on the future of the academic monograph may be of relevance to CAUL; this report is due to be released in June 2013.

3.4 Co-publishing agreements

Lorena Kanellopoulos reported that ANU E Press investigated possible copublishing arrangements with other international academic publishers, but for now ANU E Press will focus on JSTOR to benefit its international distribution/circulation goals. Inclusion in the Books on JSTOR program offers many of the benefits of a copublishing arrangement, but its deadline for participation gave it higher priority than individually-negotiated copublishing agreements. Inclusion in JSTOR will expand access and visibility of ANU E Press, as it is a distributor recognised by many universities, especially in the US. Lorena Kanellopoulos has also made contact with Project MUSE to investigate the possibility of distribution through their model, but has yet to get a response. James Fox asked Roxanne Missingham to explain the benefits of JSTOR and Project MUSE, and why ANU E Press has pursued JSTOR first: Roxanne Missingham answered that both have benefits of widespread distribution, and the deadline on inclusion in JSTOR determined its priority.

Jenny Corbett asked how JSTOR distribution relates to copublication arrangements. Lorena Kanellopoulos explained that this copublishing refers to bundled distribution arrangements with other publishers, not the shared production of works. James Fox commented this arrangement is similar to the ANU E Press/CreateSpace arrangement. James Fox suggested making ANU E Press epub/mobi files also available for download through Amazon. Roxanne agreed, saying all ANU E Press text should be on CreateSpace, including eView titles. Nic Peterson asked if eView should be so public, and James Fox responded that although not peer-reviewed, eView is nonetheless another element of ANU research and publishing, and ANU E Press should not be embarrassed by it. For example, Routledge doesn't apply a blanket rule requiring peer-review to all publications, yet retains its credibility as an academic publisher.

Brian Kennett commented that documents like lecture notes are very valuable but not really appropriate for peer review, and eView would be a good way of making those available.

3.5 Web statistics – new software, new reports

James Fox reported on the new ANU E Press web statistics analysis software package, which was discussed at the May 2012 UPAC meeting. James Fox explained the background to the issue: previously ANU E Press relied on Webalizer for its web statistics, but when ANU E Press transferred its website (in keeping with the ANU-wide website rebranding) to a customised Wordpress installation, Webalizer was no longer compatible. In addition, the figures Webalizer reported were suspiciously high, despite repeated investigation by DOI IT. James Fox spoke about the figures produced by the custom-built software UpStage, explaining that these figures, while significantly lower than those reported by Webalizer, appear to be more accurate and reasonable.

Lorena Kanellopoulos announced that ANU E Press would be sending a username and password to all members and editorial committee chairs, so they can access reports about downloads detailed by month, visits and referring sites (for example).

James Fox spoke about the paper reporting rates of download sorted by country, noting that a significant number of downloads are coming from Asia, indicating that ANU E Press is gaining attention in the market it should be targeting. James Fox then asked if UpStage can provide reports on individual article/chapter downloads in books; Lorena Kanellopoulos said this it could, but at present ANU E Press has not requested this from the developer. Roxanne Missingham suggested implementing another statistics analysis software package (Urchin) in parallel, to provide comparative figures as a check.

Nic Peterson asked if there was any way of evaluating the impact of Open Access publishing on a book's rates of citation (through referral data in UpStage). Roxanne Missingham stated that Open Access publishing generally increases a book's citations by 8-9%. James Fox stated that UpStage will allow heads of editorial boards to evaluate trends and investigate citations themselves. The heads of the editorial boards will meet on Thursday (Thursday, 22 November 2012) to discuss their use of UpStage further.

Colin Steele noted that the BICC Expert Reference Group (of which he is a member) will ask about the sudden change in reported download rates, from Webalizer figures to UpStage figures, and he is concerned some careful wording will be required. Brian Kennett commented that the important fact is that the market for ANU E Press ebooks exists and is growing: the reduction in absolute numbers of download rates doesn't affect that. Roxanne Missingham suggested there are no reliable statistics software packages available.

Colin Steele asked if UpStage would have retrospective reports (pre-2011); Lorena Kanellopoulos said no, and Roxanne Missingham explained this would be too time-consuming and expensive for E Press. Colin Steele then asked what the best way of explaining the change in reported figures would be: Roxanne Missingham encouraged him to admit that previous software was less accurate than hoped, but that an annual download rate of around 600,000 is still an excellent figure.

Robin Stanton suggested the only way to confirm reported download statistics would be to have a group of volunteers downloading at a predicted time, and compare the reported rates of download for that period to see how the report corresponds to actuality. Robin Stanton also asked what the statistics data would be useful for. James Fox answered one of the goals of the statistics reports was to indicate who is downloading ANU E Press books (based on referral sites, location, and similar user data), both for promotion and to provide this information to authors. James Fox offered to work with Lorena Kanellopoulos to prepare a statement regarding the difference in reported figures and emphasising confidence in the present reported figures. Robin Stanton expressed concern that the statistics software would be limited in what details they offer, not necessarily providing details on research use, for example. Lorena Kanellopoulos reported that the only reliable way to confirm usage statistics would be to implement a user survey as part of the download process, but this would potentially drive away users.

Action: James Fox, with assistance from Lorena Kanellopoulos, to prepare statement on UpStage statistics report for distribution to heads of editorial boards.

Part 2. Reports

ITEM 4. Discussion paper (prepared by Lorena Kanellopoulos and Roxanne Missingham)

Lorena Kanellopoulos tabled the ANU E Press Discussion Paper. James Fox initiated discussion on the major issue of the paper: ANU E Press 2012 budget. PoD sales are declining. 2009 rates of PoD sales are unique because there was a special order of 4,000 copies of one particular book; even with that consideration, the rates have been growing slowly, but are reaching a plateau. This is a problem because the 2011 operating budget granted to ANU E Press was reduced based on the assumption that the income from PoD sales was assured. Thus, ANU E Press has entered a deficit for 2012 of about \$35,000. Lorena Kanellopoulos suggested by the end of the year, the deficit would be approximately \$45,000-60,000. Roxanne Missingham confirmed it would be approximately \$45,000 and that this loss would be covered by the Library budget. James Fox asked what the implications of the deficit would be for future budget rounds. Roxanne Missingham responded: last year ANU E Press' funding was allocated from the DoI budget. With the upcoming DoI/Library separation, ANU E Press' funding will come from Library budget. The first meeting for Library budget planning took place in September 2012, and currently plan to provide ANU E Press with a break-even budget. There may be a small increase in expenditure funding for ANU E Press, but this must be negotiated at the next round of budget negotiations. Generally, ANU E Press' funding will be aligned with scholarly communication projects.

Colin Steele noted there seems to be some suggestion about ANU E Press undertaking more non-high-profile projects, such as student journals. Roxanne Missingham responded that invitations to contribute to other activities may assist ANU E Press' budget, as other areas can be asked to pay for ANU E Press staff time.

Robin Stanton proposed that UPAC reaffirm the ANU E Press business model, updating it from the original model if necessary. The ANU E Press business model originally relied on a block of funding for the first few years, and then would be supported by existing area budgets (DoI or Library, for example). If this is not longer practical, it's now time to reaffirm/adjust the business model. For example: PoD books were originally a supplement to core funding, but now PoD income impacts budget allocation. James Fox commented that similarly, eView has attracted more interest and incurs more cost than anticipated in the original ANU E Press model. Brian Kennett suggested a review of the ANU E Press model should propose better funding for eView, as having a separate budget for eView would encourage submissions. Additionally, a revised/reaffirmed business model would also be a chance to decide if ANU E Press will start publishing non-ANU authors, provided this could be done within a beneficial cost model. Nic Peterson noted that he had already been approached by four authors from outside ANU interested in publishing: if ANU E Press opens up to non-ANU authors, there will be huge demand, and it will offset potential 'vanity press' criticism. Brian Kennett restated the importance of this not causing any financial loss to ANU E Press.

Jenny Corbett noted that this is a good time for ANU E Press to make a pitch for its business model (either revised or reaffirmed), as the Chancery has undergone significant staff changes and needs updating on the value of ANU E Press, with an emphasis on attracting HERDC points to the university. James Fox emphasised ANU E Press' insistence on peer review ensures that we maintain HERDC points. Roxanne suggested she, James Fox and Lorena Kanellopoulos prepare a case for ANU E Press redirections. Jenny Corbett recommended it should discuss changes in ANU E Press business model, publishing platform development and the growth of eView. Robin Stanton commented that ANU E Press draws additional (non-financial) benefits to ANU that are harder to articulate. Jenny Corbett agreed those benefits need to be asserted as part of reaffirmation of ANU E Press. Lorena Kanellopoulos encouraged all members of UPAC to pass any feedback they get on ANU E Press' impact to her or James Fox. James Fox noted the editorial board members would be encouraged at the forthcoming meeting to investigate their statistics closely and offer feedback on the ANU E Press business model.

Action: James Fox, Lorena Kanellopoulos and Roxanne Missingham to provide a presentation on ANU E Press to the Office of the Vice-Chancellor

[Jenny Corbett departed at 12:00]

Nic Peterson mentioned that one of the ways non-ANU authors are being accepted for publication with ANU E Press is through visiting fellowships. He then noted that maybe ANU colleges should be supporting ANU E Press more. Brian Kennett said that there is committee-level support of ANU E Press, as seen through the support by the editorial boards and the grants allocated to them. Brian Kennett suggested that ANU

E Press (as part of its revised business model) should begin publishing etexts. He had been approached by Cambridge University Press to comment on what makes a good topic for etexts, and suggested publishing texts in a series of short volumes: 10 x 128pgs. This is a size that is challenging in traditional publishing, but lends itself well to epubliing, and is a model ANU E Press should consider. James Fox noted that ANU E Press publication of texts is inevitable, but should be done properly: there should be consultation across the university, asking what colleges are interested in publishing. James Fox invited Brian Kennett to be part of that process: Brian Kennett accepted.

Robin Stanton noted the primary value in ANU E Press is its ability to disseminate scholarly work. If ANU academic enterprise can now find other avenues for dissemination, then the value offered by ANU E Press changes. ANU E Press should therefore be mindful of those other avenues, although ANU E Press still promotes and shares otherwise invisible research. Roxanne Missingham commented ANU E Press offers ANU experimentation with new forms of production. James Fox commented ANU E Press incorporates other media into its books; Brian Kennett agreed and emphasised the benefits of using new media. Robin Stanton agreed, and suggested in reemphasising ANU E Press' mission, to draw attention to how great a contribution ANU E Press' development of the digital platform is. Robin Stanton emphasised that this innovation is too important a benefit to be funded by unpredictable income from PoD sales.

Lorena Kanellopoulos raised the matter of ANU E Press governance, noting that Jenny Corbett will now be included as a permanent member of UPAC, representing the Chancery. Brian Kennett moved that the point regarding ANU E Press accepting non-ANU authors remain on the table.

Action: UPAC members are invited to pass comments/suggestions on the subject of non-ANU authors publishing with ANU E Press to James Fox.

ITEM 5. ANU E Press progress report

Lorena Kanellopoulos tabled the ANU E Press progress report for UPAC members to read at their leisure.

Part 3. Other business

ITEM 6. Other business

No other business.

ITEM 7. Next meeting

The next meeting of the University Publishing Advisory Committee will be in 2013, date to be confirmed.

Meeting adjourned 12:15pm.