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'The University Press phenomenon: new conditions and questions on the institutional publishing of research'

The research content of this study was drawn from a project funded in March 2023 by the University of Warwick Library and Warwick Institute of Advanced Study (IAS). The initial project lead and report author, and the author of this paper, was Dr Jonathan Vickery; the Research Assistant was Younggeon Byun, both of the Centre for Cultural and Media Policy Studies, School of Creative Arts, Performance and Visual Cultures, Faculty of Arts.

**Preface**

This paper is, in part, an extrapolation from an internal research report that was commissioned to survey the new landscape of university-based publishing, aiming to define new development pathways for the longtime established University of Warwick Press. The report featured reference to other past internal reports and discussions on the same subject, and also reference to internal governance matters left out of this present paper. While most of the original report was responding to internal questions, it also featured survey material and narrative from research interviews with key industry professionals. This material, of broader relevance, has been used to respond to a more specific internal question, albeit one that has a broader research dimension: what are the new material conditions facing university published research journals? This paper attends to the ‘conditions’ more than the specific situation of research journals (i.e. the new landscape of university-based publishing), and is the first stage in a project to define a strategic pathway for Warwick’s own research journals (with another report scheduled for July 2024). For the above original report, sixteen research interviews were conducted; in this paper we only itemise relevant points of leaving out the interview narrative (and identities of the interviewees, which were exclusive to the report). Nonetheless, a great deal was gleaned from the interview material, and it all amounted to a collective conviction that university presses can play a significant cultural, educational and scholarly role in the university sector today, and indeed more so in the future.

The purpose of this paper is largely cognitive — a framework for a discussion by the Warwick Journal Editors’ Group on the future of journal publishing at the University. While the content of this paper is drawn from our recent empirical inquiries, it is not littered with footnotes or peppered with cross-references as would be a normal a journal article. An appendix offers some important reference.

**Introduction**

The evident rise in brand visibility and publication output of university presses over the last two decades, provoke a range of critical questions on rationales, scope and institutional resourcing — why university-based research publishing is significant. The fact that universities publish or maintain publishing operations may seem a banal historical fact of university
institutions, which are, de facto, one of the principal facilitators of any country or society’s learning and teaching. But, the increased technological, legal and economic complexity of publishing as an organisational enterprise — with or without access to the growing global publications market and its de facto governance of the putative global knowledge economy — raises a question on whether this can or should be considered part of a university’s range of core competencies and responsibilities. Indeed, most universities have either withdrawn from institutional publishing or never participated, especially the case with newer universities. Older universities in the UK, before the digital era, tended to see printing presses as part of a standard inventory of their institutional infrastructure; but, it is equally evident, that an historical legacy of a ‘press’ has no necessary relevance to the material conditions and operational demands of publishing research today.

Of course, of unquestionable success in the contemporary business of university publishing are Oxford UP and Cambridge UP, whose historical legacy is obviously central to their brand and the standards of their editorial and publication operations. It’s difficult not to see them as a ‘top tier’, indeed Oxford is reportedly the largest university publisher in the world. The medium tier is broad and diverse, where Edinburgh, Manchester, Bristol, Liverpool, UCL, LSE and others, represent a huge breadth practice – and more importantly, for us, a breadth of institutional values and priorities. They each demonstrate, in their own way, value added to the public role of their universities. Though not all university presses have succeeded, but those who have endured tend to maintain a certain operational and professional autonomy from their institutions, whatever their level of resourcing or form of governance. Publishing is an industry, with sector-specific skills, and the more one scrutinizes successful publishers the more one does not equate the existing campus-based publishing or academic self-publishing with the work of an actual university press; moreover, the new range of material conditions for the practice of university publishing (technological, legal, social and scholarly, considered in this paper) change complexion depending on the ‘positioning’ of the press – on the degree to which it is operationally independent or interconnected with the central service role of a university library. In the new economy of Open Access — and an increasingly diversity of administrative support demanded by an increasingly diverse university research constituency — the university library has become an unlikely new leader in the enterprise of university publishing.

Further, by way of background, the following preliminary points act as basic assumptions to this paper (general observations or common knowledge to anyone who knows anything about university presses):

1: The traditional upper tier of high profile university presses — Oxford (OUP), Cambridge (CUP) — are defined by their specific institutional histories, i.e. do not visibly offer viable organisational ‘models’ of university publishing enterprise for today. Consequently, it seems, new university presses around the country are more investing in local innovation, institution-specific aims, distinctive and defined context-specific ‘mission-based’ approaches to strategy and organisation.
2: Paper-print publication has obviously been in rapid decline, and most universities no longer have the facility to print publications (or, for commercial reasons, choose to use POD or print-on-demand commercial print companies). Yet, print-based publishing is far from over, and retains a priority in many parts of the broader publishing market (commercial and educational) and for many public institutions, particularly for books and for books with quality-sensitive images.

3: New partnership-based press enterprises have emerged, and have demonstrated different ways and means of capacity-building in university publishing. In the UK, these may include the Scottish Universities Press (based on a university library partnership) and White Rose University Press (of publishing offices in the universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York), and UCLAN publishing (internally partnered with one of its own MA courses); there’s also the production partnership whereby UCL Press provides the new Dublin City University Press with editorial services.

4: University libraries have become significant actors in new press landscape (both publication and distribution), either as hosts and managers of new press projects, or as partners, consultants, governance members, gatekeepers, quality monitor and/or resource providers.

5: While the ‘prestige’ publishers (the ‘traditional upper tier’) still tend to be preferred by authors (scholars and academics) for reasons of professional profile-building and scholarly credibility — and various academic fields tend to maintain their own informal sense of a qualitative ranking of credible publishers — the range of academic outputs, (forms of writing, documentation and documentary, reporting, and so forth) has hugely increased, in part on account of research funders’ demands for dissemination, access and public engagement.

6: Digital media products (video; podcasts, etc.) and cultural events (e.g. authors’ talks) are now common and often an intrinsic part of the production and distribution of academic publications (i.e. not, as previous, of a post-production marketing promotion or public relations).

**Definitional and strategic issues**

By way of definition, a university press is a publishing facility within a university, centered on the production of scholarly or educational texts. However, ‘publishing’ was always more than just the production and distribution of printed matter. It involved a range of professional skills in commissioning, editing, communication and managing highly scheduled production — along with a broad knowledge of institutional and legal frameworks, changing scholarly conventions, standards in linguistic expression and communication, the behaviours, expectations and preferences of authors and readers, and the market for publications and many other areas.

University publishing, at its most expansive, involves a strategic management of publications, their bibliographic transmission and preservation, brand and distribution, peer review and editorial oversight, gatekeeping, quality monitoring, supporting new projects, young scholars, collaboration and interdisciplinary exchange. It may also involve managing the relationship between the market and public realm, and maximising the value of this
relationship within the mission and priorities of a university that is increasingly invested in performance indicators and its reputational capital. Press websites have become sufficiently detailed to act as indicators of their effectiveness, range and population penetration: [see Appendix 1 for a list of current university presses surveyed for the original report].

While the broad aims of a university press may seem obviously in the interests of all universities, not all universities are interested. Indeed, the current landscape of university presses is diverse and has witnessed some failed aspirations or simply an inability to attain to any significant level of scale or output by even eminent university institutions. The political economy of the university ‘sector’ as it is in the UK, seems to disincentivise even core activities with low capital yields — or, at least, a necessary long-term investment. Successful older medium-size presses – Edinburgh, Manchester, Bristol and Liverpool, for example — did not emerge from a wealth of patronage and funding, but have evolved with some determination through decades of professional commitment (not necessarily on the part of their institutions but of particular individuals — research will reinforce an impression that leadership has been central to the historical development of all notable university presses in the UK. But even established presses need to outsource a range of their production and operational activities, and [as registered in research interviews] consistently face challenging economic pressures. Almost all university presses in the UK are either subsidised business enterprises or Library-based (funded as part of the core services of the university). In large part, the emergence of research repositories and the new economy of Open Access research has directly implicated university libraries and activated their latent or semi-active knowledge on the resourcing, legal, dissemination and institutional-professionalism of research. The role of associations, networks and professional advisory organisations, have also become more important in the changing institutional landscape, indeed JISC’s new innovation is the Open Institutional Publishing Association (Appendix 2).

Open Access is obviously a central driver in a re-thinking and strategic re-alignment of research, material or data, and publisher and stakeholders in the global knowledge economy, and major changes are continuing. As stated by the UK Publishers Association: ‘UK academic publishers […] over the last decade have helped ensure that the UK offers one of the highest proportions of Open Access research content in the world. Academic publishing is a vital part of the research cycle, ensuring that results are validated, presented effectively, discoverable and have greater overall impact. Publishers add value to the quality, integrity and accuracy of the UK’s research outputs and, at a time when the volume of untested and misleading “research” is higher than ever, it is vital that the critical role played by publishers is understood and championed by policymakers’: https://www.publishers.org.uk/our-work/open-access/ As the original scoping report was being compiled during the first half of 2023, several developments in the institutional landscape of Open Access appeared — an Edinburgh University Press new Open Access Fund (of 250k); a new funded post at the Birkbeck, University of London/Open Library of Humanities, dedicated to working on the Janeway publishing platform [which has appeared to have overtaken OJS as the open platform of choice], and the
OASPA and DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) released a new Open Access Journals Toolkit [See Appendix 2], among other indications of an emerging ‘economy’ of OA.

But Open Access is not simply a matter of distribution, dissemination and public value; it is an alternative system of business model options, involving different ways of configuring constituencies of active stakeholders and redistributing costs. Where commercial publishers have struggled in maintaining niche markets, print sales and public interest, academic publishing is now becoming characterised by more stable communities of reading and public engagement (academics, of course, invest untold amounts of labour and expertise and often an entire career lifetime in one small subject area). Moreover, university-based academic publishing is involving a range of institutional capabilities that go beyond commercial publishers, in respect of longer term planning, policy making, IPRs, bibliometrics and databases — taking into account the global circulation of knowledge, the evolution of academic discourse, networks, funding and projects, the role of international associations, research liaison, third sector and NGOs, relationship-building, and so forth, are things that libraries are best placed to understand, monitor and help shape. This is a topic of interest in Emery and Stone’s 2013 article [see Appendix 3], in which they identified how libraries are synthesising a critical range of knowledge-based capabilities in the context of the new OA economy.

From the growing research literature on new university presses (NUPs), the following five research publications are selected simple as instructive reference points towards our understanding of the recent organisational history of the university press (even though the UK and USA are often conflated by them at the level of general observation). They provide a conceptual basis for our identification of the new institutional conditions of university-based publishing [all accessed 30 June 2023].


It is self-evident to all these authors and publications that the new generation of university presses must (and mostly do) possess a distinctive mission and operate in a very different and dynamic environment than the historic established university publishers (whether UK or USA — Europe does have new university presses, but also a very different tradition of both institutional and scholarly publishing: Cf. The Association of European University Presses). These authors also assumed that *perpetual change* is a given state of affairs for research publishing, and new lines of connection and continuity are being formed between authors, publishers or institutions, markets and readers, media platforms and public events — to the extent that any fixed organisational model of a press will be almost entirely relative to how flexible and dynamic it maintains the relation between products, readers and context. As a basic principle, these experienced authors all express a sense that the new landscape of university publishing demands a new form of flexibility, responsiveness, and a continual engagement with both authors, readers, stakeholders and institutions.

Esposito (2010) was one of the first to identify how publishing in the digital era has become a ‘hybrid economy’, requiring a new attentiveness to what was recently ‘marketing’ or ‘marketing comms’; i.e. what was once called ‘the market’ is now a continual intelligence-based multi-dimensional interconnection with the ‘lifecycle of the reader’ (not just their rationale, motivations and experiences as consumer but their socially-embedded experiences of reading as part of their life. This includes changing responses to the publisher’s brand, but also its visibility in a range of dynamic social or cultural realms, both in terms of the different constituencies of reader it can convene and the means by which it remains engaged in the reader’s changing environments). Esposito’s paper is useful in underlining how ‘publishing’ is no longer adequately defined as the production of discrete units of printed matter for sale according to one business model; it is now an evolving and dynamic range of interconnected products, hubs and platforms, events and media communications. This probably became the case in the USA before it did in the UK.

The UK’s Lockett and Speicher (2016) asserted the need to re-assess the fundamental mission of a university press, to advance scholarly knowledge with a more analytical understanding of the new economy of that activity. Indeed ‘scholarly knowledge’ now permeates a wide range of published products not just ‘academic’ books and peer review journals. In an age of digital and OA, the relation between the institution, the business model, the distribution strategy and the audience or readers, require a more careful calibration. Books (monographs, particularly) are no longer central to most university presses, and peer-review journals have grown to create an ‘economy within an economy’, with institutional subscriptions becoming more significant than individual membership of specialist academic communities. Indeed, dominated by huge corporate publishing conglomerates, academic publishing finds itself crossing significant fault lines between private and public, market and institution, and this requires careful navigation.
Graham Stone’s significant PhD thesis (2017) centered on the strategic development of a new press at the University of Huddersfield. It is a significant study in that it identified the spectrum of organisational factors involved in a new university press venture that wanted to affirm the ‘public’ core values of the university mission as it saw it. The question of ‘value’, for Stone, interconnects the essential purpose of a press with its management and organisation, with the scale, resourcing and costs, and the business plan that gives unity to the wide range of components involved in the publishing process. Stone’s study identifies the many dimensions of university publishing — some of which involve business skills, some of which must be learned from the commercial publishing industry — and underscores the uniqueness of the university as a framework for publishing. The value of Stone’s work is that it defines how a broad-based sense of public value can be maintained even within the highly complex and budget-sensitive economy that has emerged — with its new hybrid and collaborative professional roles, skills and knowledge of the HE economy, institutional policy and strategy, readers, markets and digital communications.

Janneke Adema and Graham Stone (2017) present an advance on this with a full-spectrum study (over 100 pages) on the institutional administration and management context of such professional roles, skills and knowledge. They emphasise how a university press venture relies heavily on the capabilities and competencies of the people involved, yet often succeeds or fails depending on the strategic planning and investment of the institution. Moreover, a new economy of value production has emerged with both the digital and Open Access landscape, and key people within a press need to manage the new value chains that are operating and how they extend from the operations of publishing directly into specific communities of readers, special interest groups and other institutions. Furthermore, a university press is also an expression of the aspirations, innovation and academic work culture, of a university as an institution — among other things, a catalyst for the university on thinking strategically as it attempts to project itself into the world.

Finally, Taylor and Jensen (2019), in part based on the published work above, construct a ‘model’, defining guiding principles and key stages in the publishing process’ for university presses or universities considering setting up a press. Based on some significant professional consultation, they define three core principles around which they identify a conspectus of publishing production activities. The principles are (i) strategic alignment — ensuring that a press intersects with sectoral priorities both inside and outside the institution; (ii) stakeholder relationships – representing the connections between people, expertise, delivery and the production-distribution process; and (iii): demonstrating impact – the monitoring, communication and evaluation that can stimulate an increase in quality as much as knowledge of users or readers. They are both descriptive of an effective press enterprise, and normative for a new venture.

Readers of this paper can find this publication and this model (in diagram form) online: here are reproduced these core elements in tabulated form by
way of determining the categories of information required from the original report interviewees. The table remains a useful depiction or conspectus of the various elements of a press organisation in its inception, or at least the essential activities of a press that needs to be represented in a plan or strategic management framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic area</th>
<th>dimension</th>
<th>planning issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Mission and purpose</td>
<td>Ownership and resourcing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Policy</td>
<td>Nature of the press’s active role in its institutional context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Strategy</td>
<td>Its positioning in a planning framework or strategic model used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Governance and organisational structure</td>
<td>Management and leadership:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Representation</td>
<td>Who participates in shaping the press?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Decision making</td>
<td>What deliberation and power of decision will make it happen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Business and economics</td>
<td>Investment, delivery and returns:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Business models</td>
<td>One model or several? Monetisation or pure subsidy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Costs and investment</td>
<td>Finance and profitability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Media, formats, readership</td>
<td>The Production process and its infrastructure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Products</td>
<td>Design and communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) User experience</td>
<td>Aesthetics, navigation, platforms and accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Innovation and current challenges</td>
<td>Way forward:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Start-up</td>
<td>Initial project plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Model</td>
<td>Organisational type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Strategy-building</td>
<td>Who, what, how?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, the table represents a press’s first beginnings (the issues of governance or economics can be institutionally very detailed in an actual strategic plan). In the course of this research, it became evident that universities are highly capable in areas 1-3, but highly variable in 4 and 5. Generally, the prevailing direction of university presses in the UK is to deepen their uniqueness as university presses, and not mimic commercial publishers or US university presses, or to push into the broader market realms occupied by them. None of our original research interviewees considered of value or significant return in competing with commercial publishers — and none of them attempt to play down their ‘high’ level scholarly and scientific interests
(except where their focus is different, such as UCLAN’s expertise in children’s fiction). In fact, scholarly and scientific interests have been awarded a higher profile in the public realm, particularly where they intersect with social issues. Bristol University Press is an exemplar where their reading ‘public’ often overlaps with the commercial market, but this is less significant than their determined commitment to responding to the lives of consumers as citizens. While Bristol evidently uses many of the corporate tools and capabilities of commercial publishing (strategic brand and marketing, events and audience engagement, and so on), it remains active in the social realm of public policy concerns, of global affairs and issues of representation, contested knowledge, specialist interests and niche expertise, the role of literacy and education, of public institutions and all education sectors.

As obvious as this may seem, ‘traditional’ scholarly values have been re-phrased, or at least, re-branded as new university presses define forms of value that continue to engage with a literate public. The definitional iteration of the traditional characteristics below were confirmed by a survey of all the UKs university press websites — where some impressive web design animates these values.

1: Scholarly Objectivity and veracity: the profile of academics with specialist subject-based expertise may not be the most visible dimension of any university press site, but the symbolic value of ‘academic capital’ evidently remains high — it asserts the added value of high intellectual standards, institutional integrity, political neutrality and scientific independence.

2: Dissemination of Knowledge: asserting the intrinsic value of writing, highlighting the excitement of new research findings, new models of inquiry, theories and ideas — university presses continue to exhibit a public responsibility for disseminating knowledge, but also in making this knowledge accessible in an increasingly socially complex and politicised public realm.

3: Preservation of Cultural and Intellectual Heritage: documenting, making analysis and evaluation central understanding formative and historical events, texts, practices, and other forms of socially-framed human expression, remain important in a sustainability and historic-institutional context. The mainstream presses visibly articulate their institutional traditions to ensure preservation for future generations of a public value that transcends whatever current social or economic demands seem more important.

4: Managing Peer Review, expert scrutiny and editorial organisation: university presses have access to a major spectrum of academic expertise in ensuring editorial rigour, quality, accuracy, and of the significance of writing or material published; in practice, editorial oversight can represent the accumulation and advancement of knowledge in particular fields, along with the social, cultural or economic value that emerges from that.

5: Support for new forms of knowledge, new methods, technologies and young or emerging Scholars: presses often provide opportunity and a structure within which values and standards can be internalised and the visibility and impact of certain scholars or writers can develop careers.

6: Gatekeeping and Curatorial roles: universities can offer recognition and define fields of knowledge, disciplines and their methods, communicating the
nature of multi-and inter-disciplinarity and their importance; putting new, unusual or innovative knowledge into the public sphere in appropriate formats.

7: **Collaboration and Interdisciplinary Exchange:** possessing a critical mass of experts, facilities, equipment and resources for collaboration and interdisciplinary exchange, breaking boundaries, national borders, political and scientific limits, constructing consensus, identifying new horizons and formulating new challenges.

This list of characteristics may seem self-evident, but new university presses are finding new ways of re-asserting and demonstrating the direct value of historic scholarly research and writing within a rapidly changing public realm. A concluding point here would be that the proverbial ‘Ivory Tower’ of scholars, and common assumption that university expertise is esoteric or once-removed from social life, is no longer that relevant.

**Research Interviews findings**

For reasons of confidentiality and appropriateness, the original interview narratives of this research are not reproduced here. The pragmatic aims of this paper only require a summary of the findings, and the ‘findings’ are simply observational assertions on the part of the interviewees. As either campus-based stakeholders or highly experienced professionals in the publishing field, the interviewees provided a range of views that are critical to a press enterprise planning process. Below, they are presented simply as statements by bullet-point, and in terms of content they map onto the above tabulated components of a university press as identified by Taylor and Jensen (2019): 1: Mission and purpose; 2: Governance and organisational structure; 3: Business and economics; 4: Media, formats, readership; and 5: Innovation and current challenges.

**1: On Mission and purpose.**

- Setting up the infrastructure for a contemporary (digital media enhanced) press requires a serious investment and consistent technical support.
- The ‘digital’ is not just an easier low-cost means of publishing, but requires an orientation of traditional publishing skills within a technological working environment that must be taken seriously.
- Successful university presses are not publishers of every kind of knowledge emerging from the campus or university institution, but are a specialist enterprise with a strong strategic rationale and specific product range, generating outcomes that represent value added to the university’s public mission.
- A press requires a strong brand as it will need to convince academics and researchers, both inside and outside the university, to publish with it and not the current hierarchy of established publishers.
- Being able to network with authors and readers is a critical part of the credibility of a press and its ability to construct enduring constituencies. The new economy of OA, along with institutional funding commitments, form a crucial environment for prioritisation and decision-making. The political economy of this environment needs to be fully understood. Academic-driven presses are quite different from broader Library-
driven or other forms of strategic management: it needs to be clear who is driving the press project and aiming for what forms of value.

- The offer of a press to campus or institution-based researchers is different depending on the strategic level on which the institution is operating — a top research university will have a very different role for a press than a university or college attempting to support and cultivate a nascent research culture.

- Two of the major determining factors on deciding mission and purpose is (a) whether an expectation on revenue demands a certain commercialisation; and (b) how far the press will participate in or contribute to national public funding measures (whether OA or the REF and so forth).

2: On Governance and organisational structure.

- A new press may be an institutionally-based project but could evolve more effectively as a partnership-based arrangement — involving institutional actors in research, scholarly communications, digital, data and IT, but also people from outside (whether other universities, cultural or research organisations, or experts from industry or publishing). The composition of expertise within the press is critical where is involved consistent long-term involvement and responsibility. Publishing is a schedule-based, activity, where consistency is a given and central to professional credibility.

- Governance needs to be able to face both ways (internal and externally) with some understanding – internally (institutional priorities and decision-making) and externally (authors, products, markets and public).

- The working culture of a press – both professional (skills-based experience) and intellectual orientation (education and interests), will play a role in shaping the values of the press and hence the brand.

- Whatever governance model is used (often a university press has little say in how this is structured) the ‘advisory’ dimension can be crucial, and so advisory boards populated by external or independent professionals can be invaluable. Editorials boards, who define and ratify commissions and publication lists, are also crucial but at their best when working symbiotically with the advisory dimension.

- The clarity of the organisational structure can be critical to the productive flow of the publishing process — but publishing is a profession of a huge diversity of skills, and university presses can be short staffed and hence compress these specialist skills into too few job posts.

- Revenues often need to be generated even where there is no commercial dimension: institutions are always cost-sensitive and hence a clear definition of ‘value’ in press production is a management-necessity.

- Within the governance and organisational structure, the space for leadership, innovation and autonomy of professional judgement, is important if the press is to be more than just an institutional ‘print-shop’.
• Organisational teamwork may seem obvious but is critical in small-scale publishing. This means that a priority focus for strategic thinking is ‘staffing’ – not something at which the UK public sector is traditionally very effective.

3: On Business and the economics.
• The strategic dimension of production – what your product line will look like, and how much investment of time or money it takes to produce — needs to be assessed economically even where there is no commercial pressure. A University needs to generate value one way or another, and that value needs to be defined, visibly, and supports a strong argument for continued investment.
• The economy of publishing within an institutional system is more complex as it will mean negotiating a legal and regulatory environment (for education, research, data and processing and so forth).
• Brand strategy is important given how many publishers there are, commercial competition, the hierarchy of prestige and academic careers, and all kinds of other factors that determine whether a press looks serious and worthy of anyone’s attention.
• Few university presses attempt to work competitively in the commercial market, or if they do it is on the basis of partnerships or specialised knowledge: most market-based publishing would not find a rationale in a university, and the emerging ‘civic engagement’ agenda of universities open up a range of constituencies that can be more diverse and rewarding than the market segments or niches of retail.
• The business and economics of a university press can be diversified if interconnected with the range of funded research projects or academic activities on campus. OA means an increasing amount of funded academic research requires publishing dimension (in presentation and dissemination or even impact). A university press can develop skills and capabilities in these areas, whereas a commercial publisher would not and academic or research projects themselves are usually limited or amateur in the strategic management of their own presentation and dissemination.
• Economically, a press needs to do something UK universities are not good at doing: long term planning.
• Even without a commercial dimension, a university press will need 4-5 revenue streams to build resilience and grow over the long term.
• Investment in staffing – given the increasingly specialised nature of the different segments of the publishing process — is critical, as will be the means by which academic skills can contribute to a press enterprise (i.e. collaborative-staffing with the on-campus faculties).
• Unlike science, the arts and humanities might always have a print dimension and hence book publishing might become a specialist enterprise in itself (a collaborative-staffing consideration).
• New innovations in information access, informatics, data storage, digital libraries and so forth, all present revenue-opportunities for university presses; OA might also become more profitable and enabling the cross-subsidy of other in-house innovation-based
activities.

4: On Media, formats, readership.

- A university press, in a crowded industry and market, will need to think creatively about providing something compelling and that attracts the right kind of attention. Brand will be crucial to visibility, but that brand needs to have substance in terms of the non-commercial, public and user value the public will expect from a university (whatever commercial activity it does engage in).
- Digital media has changed everything in relation to the products but not the readership — the relation between reader communities and published products needs more research.
- Formats are essentially about communication – reminding a press that the research content and product is not enough, it all has to be communicated. That is where a consciousness of a public, a social intelligence, and an understanding of value, is of strategic importance – and why a press requires leadership and not just management.
- Media, formats, and readership are now often connected with event programmes and actual activities.
- A successful publisher – given today’s immediate global distribution and accessibility — is a potentially huge ‘soft power’ for a university: a publisher’s social media could be more strategically used in this way.
- It is traditionally the case that a university publisher is either a ‘book-publisher’ or a ‘journal-publisher’. However, books and journals have now assumed very different roles in the strategic development of a press.
- Data, metadata, stats and the information ID back-end processing of publications is now as crucial as marketing and sales – discoverability, visibility and access are central aims in an effective publishing strategy.
- It used to be that publishers’ lists, of publications and authors, were their defining characteristics – but no longer; innovation and visible value can be formed from a whole range of activities. Nevertheless, specialist subjects and areas of concentration can still be more effective than an attempt to represent all the research in an institution or produced on campus. A ‘print-shop’ approach is to respond to any researcher who happens to come along and want something published. In this sense, a professional press needs to differentiate itself from the range of ‘on-campus publishing’ that will always take place.

5: On Innovation and current challenges.

- Innovation is a means of creating value. Current research output and publication in the UK suggests that the higher level of quality research (exemplified, for example, by the UK REF) will always be dominated by the large university publishers (US and UK) and US corporates. A small press, therefore, has to identify or create value in areas other than those defined by established measures of nationally-ranked ‘quality’.
• Past British publishers (Penguin, OUP, etc.) achieved success through a pioneering public literacy-driven mission (especially through quality fiction for children and adults). A need for a public literacy has returned, along with a need to re-engage children and especially young people.

• Covid did not destroy paper-based print, as was assumed — there are still significant markets for tangible publications. Public engagement is becoming a significant area of university capability, and a press can greatly contribute to that.

• Journals are one of these ‘taken for granted’ areas, largely propelled by the volunteer-based labour of academic researchers invested in the subject. However, like many other aspects of publishing, the market is becoming less stable and over-crowded, and in need of new rationales and strategy (at least, in the arts, humanities and social sciences — now existing in a very different sphere of economic production than the medical, hard or natural sciences).

• Specialist subject areas, and an outstanding reputation in these areas — which is what you will need in an industry of huge competition — will require editorial staff being part of academic sub-cultures of research production, looking after their authors, and cultivating lines of content or work for forthcoming years.

Concluding the findings:
All interviewees were at pains (perhaps indicative of their age and experience) in emphasising the realities of rapid change and the new conditions of production for publishing. They all made reference, to greater or lesser degrees, to new economic and industrial developments that are the external conditions of any new press enterprise, which we can iterate in summary form in terms of:
1: The Digital — from e-books, audiobooks, and online platforms, to the concomitant shift in Library purchase, subscription, reader and consumer behaviour, the role of mobile devices and online distribution channels, the digital has radically changed all publishing and this will become more the case with smaller and revenue-limited university presses.

2: Self-Publishing and Independent Publishing: the accessibility of non-specialist, technology-based, publishing capabilities, have changed the relation between publishers, author, revenues and production timelines. Moreover, the brand superiority of the established publishers have been challenged, with more flexible standards in language, communication and product quality now tolerated by the consumer or reader – as their rationales for their choices expand. More independent publishers have emerged in the mainstream retail market, often with no ‘background’ in publishing and often exclusive to one digital platform (e.g. Amazon).

3: E-commerce, Online retailing and expanded distribution channels: huge online retailers now engage in device-adaptable curating, promotion and distribution of huge ranges of products – where selective browsing, instant purchasing, fast delivery and creative sales strategies all combine in a way that gives a publisher a more direct point of contact with the reader and yet where the reader experiences more freedom and awareness of the role of reading and publishing within the spectrum of cultural life.

4: Print-on-Demand (POD) has generated a means of low print runs (hard
copies) without prohibitive economic consequences in an age of rising paper, machinery and labour, costs. Large print inventories, storage, physical distribution logistics, are all but dissolved, and small or independent publishers can continue to offer quality monographs or partner with organisations in publishing reports or other limited circulation items.

5: **Education as leisure**: with the rise of digital devices, the pervasiveness of the internet, and the penetration of commerce or retail-based forms of behaviour in public and social life more generally, has seen a radical change in the relation between publisher and reader: this change involves a separation of ‘form and content’ and the technological adaption of a text to multiple formats, a range of concurrent distribution channels, the use of multimedia and an ease of use in the social or leisure contexts of the reader.

6: **Data-driven Publishing**: data and analytics on all stages and phases of the publishing, selecting, purchasing, reading, experience, inform decision-making and publisher commissioning, listings and marketing strategies.

7: **Online community and Social Media**: author or publisher brand, image, promotion, audience or reader engagement, are all hugely enhanced by both online, social or event-based activity – where even physical or in-person events can generate multiple forms of online content. Moreover, formal or reader-organised online communities of interest or reader/ book interest groups can provide publishers with vital information on consumer behaviour but also communication channels.

8: **International Markets and the global economy**: the expansion of US corporate publishers has perhaps had a detrimental impact on UK academic IP, but has also increased the profile and function of publishers in the global economy (expanded in terms of generating a greater range of digital products, serialisation and modularisation of digital content, and also data or information-based products). Even ‘traditional’ books and articles can be distributed across national and cultural borders, increasing the need for translation and cultural adaptation, but also the internationalisation and linguistic flexibility of national and local markets, education and research.

9: **Education and Research has become globalised** in terms of its knowledge flows, strategic management, academic standards and ethical codes, collaborative opportunities and the recognition of scholarship and value of published research.

However, in contrast to rapid industrial and social change, and like the scholarly values listed above, many of the professional skills and roles involved in the ‘publishing’ process remain. Indeed, pointed out by interviewees with experience of commercial publishing, publishing roles may have expanded but the historic editor-based skills of working with texts, remain basic — and indeed, even in a Library-based press venture, personnel with commercial publishing experience may be crucial.

This raises a question on skills and roles — what aspects of the publishing process remain essential in a Library-based, Open Access, and digital press production? This can be tabulated as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task and Role</th>
<th>Status (E / essential or NE/ not)</th>
<th>Academic staff?</th>
<th>Library staff?</th>
<th>Normally Outsourced?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Commissioning and editorial expertise (knowledge of authors; disciplines, fields of knowledge; value, prestige and conventions of writing and manuscript preparation).</td>
<td>E / not for Library-based Press</td>
<td>Some editorial skills</td>
<td>Some; person dependent</td>
<td>No – this defines the publishers’ listings, USP, and strategic aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Editing and Manuscript Production (proof reading; copy editing; style and readability, revising, illustration, diagrams, data; format conversion).</td>
<td>E / not for Library-based Press</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some; person dependent</td>
<td>Production, Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Submission, scheduling, costing and contractual agreement (including copyright, IP, formats and platforms).</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not normally</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Production management, No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Design and communication (visual style, presentation; from cover to layout to brand values).</td>
<td>NE for library-based</td>
<td>Not normally</td>
<td>person dependent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Product Sign off: legal inspection, digital or print files; quality control).</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not normally</td>
<td>person dependent</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Bibliographic registration, publication ID, meta-data, global accessibility.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Not normally</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Standards and Compliance: legal, institutional and scholarly consistency.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>perhaps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Marketing and Distribution (communication and engagement; perhaps launch events, author events, digital media and audience development).</td>
<td>NE for library-based</td>
<td>perhaps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Promotion, resourcing, finance (professional field, reader constituency, channels and outlets, other publishers and distributors).</td>
<td>NE for library-based</td>
<td>perhaps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Post-Publication: monitoring, reviews and online media, author development, potential corrections or changes, reissue or translations, licensing and IP.</td>
<td>NE for library-based</td>
<td>perhaps</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a number of the interviewees noted, the publishing industry is a realm of distinct professional skills – not to be conflated with an academic or library staff skills set, however they overlap. The next section will consider the question of ‘models’.

**Models**

This report does not address the internal dynamics of economics and governance in a developing university press; nonetheless, emerging from the interviews, was the significant observation that business models and models of organisation, while converging in practice, at the planning stage of a university press enterprise need to be differentiated. In the UK right now, the business models for NUPs are simply based on the extent of production capability in direct relation to costs — what a university publisher can and
cannot do to produce the desired outputs. At the lower end, a university publisher need only be one staff member with responsibility for administering the commissioning, editing of texts, and the outsourced production of a coherent line of publications. And much of this could be managed by committed groups of contributors (academics; researchers; PGR students). This is not, however, a stable arrangement, and potentially expensive in relation to outsourcing — and not a model open to obvious pathways to growth or development. At the other end of the spectrum, is the ‘publishing house’ or fully independent enterprise model — where a dedicated team of professional staff manage the whole spectrum of publishing needs. Outsourcing is not necessarily a compromise in a fully independent operation, it is often inevitable and desirable (for specialist production, or for cost-effective and faster turnover of graphic design, web development, marketing and sales data, distribution, and so on). To clarify, these models can be defined as follows [and for a helpful report stimulating decision-making in relation to models, see ‘Proof of Concept for a Scottish University Press: Final Report’, Tracey V Clarke Consulting (August 2019)].

(i): Central-service model, i.e. fully subsidised and defined by strong institutional priorities (usually Library-based and staffed: UCL has become a large and internationally successful publisher while remaining Library-based).
(ii): Partnership model – commissioning and text-editing are ‘in-house’, the rest managed by publishing company agreement – e.g. Ubiquity Press manages all production for Cardiff, Westminster, White Rose and others).
(iii): ‘Boutique’ model (e.g. Goldsmiths), academic editorial management of all production for small cohesive and agenda-driven publications line – marketing and distribution handled by a contracted publisher (here, MIT).
(iv): Publishing House or full business enterprise model – developing the full-range publisher expertise in management, business and production. (And yet, even for the larger publishers of Edinburgh, Manchester and Liverpool, a lot of product design, technical production, technology and digital servicing, procurement, even some HR and financial management, can be outsourced).

A Library-based press, even though it is often fully subsidised, can appropriate or exhibit features from each of these above models. Yet, benefits also come with limitations, and Libraries can be challenging places in terms of their multiple priorities, sustaining complex resources, specialist staffing, and central service responsibilities. It is therefore necessary to consider basic organisational models or arrangements that may be adopted as a means by which a Library-based operation can extend beyond the strong institutional orbit of responsibility. From the research undertaken, there are seven distinct internal model of university press organisation that may be considered — the first four evolve from the common operation of a publishing in a Library’s Scholarly Communication section; the three that follow move toward a semi-independent or independent enterprise with varying degrees of financial independence.

1: The current Library Scholarly Communications-based operation
   – A service-based scholarly communications (SC) service, which includes a digital commons platform accessible to academic or student (volunteer)
editors and producers, incrementally builds a publication line on the basis of internal interests and projects. 

**Pros:** maintain a focus on developing internal capacity to play a leadership role in the OA arena, advising and servicing the OA publishing needs of the university community; ensuring institutional compliance of academic population in relation to changing funder and legal demands; Library SC staff will possess both academic and publishing skills. 

**Cons:** capacity development (and thus innovation and significant achievement) will be potentially limited, visibility and public engagement also; SC perhaps institutionally-confined, given the breadth of demands on a Library; this is ‘Library-based publishing’ rather than a distinct ‘university press’

---

**2: Library Internal Partnership Model A**

A Library-academic department/unit collaboration (a library’s SC continues to manage a press, but partners with an internal entity, e.g. a centre, institute, or department, enabling another dimension of production, either specialist, or outward-facing).

**Pros:** no necessary financial investment (drawing on a partner’s, albeit internal, resources); low-risk; could harness academic productivity, offering scope for more creativity allowed by mainstream publishing.

**Cons:** the rationale or benefit for the partner, and the exact terms of the commitment, would need definition and consistency assurance; it could become exclusive (involving one Faculty) and by implication excluding others — unless the partnership is replicated for each faculty. The strategic value to the university is not explicit and will appeal only to ‘local’ interests.

---

**3: Library Internal Partnership Model B**

SC continues its own spectrum of responsibilities; an internal partnership (as above) is established as a distinct project (i.e. outside the orbit of the Library entirely – potentially with independent funding).

**Pros:** potentially attracting funding, inspiring academic participation, and forging a distinctive creative unit; can add a distinctive value, aiming ‘outwards’, to publish and promote the university, research and writing in the public realm.

**Cons:** a location and space (infrastructure) is not easy to find on a campus; a hybrid staffing arrangement can be a compromise; investment and return for the central operation would need careful definition, support and routine reviewing. The strategic value to the university is not explicit and will appeal only to ‘local’ interests.

---

**4: Library Internal Partnership Model C**

A collaboration (as above) is set up, but with a *new imprint* (branded publishing line) is created (not branded as ‘the university’ press and so open to range of non-academic publishing opportunities, local or niche projects, and perhaps a consortium-based arrangement — with other universities or cultural organisations); the university positions itself as ‘publishing hub’ offering SC
institutional knowledge and advisory capability to a wider social community. 

**Pros:** a more experimental (and thus uncertain) aspiration, but as the university’s name is not used, the risk is low; may mean more freedom (if less internal support); freedom can mean multiple or project-specific collaborative partnership arrangements, or purchasing of other titles or publication lines; as experimental, it can position itself within local/regional creative industries and develop apprenticeship or training potential, particularly in digital publishing. 

**Cons:** this option side-steps the original mission of a university press; it could become too complex for SC to manage, and a ‘symbolic’ failure if it does not succeed; the value of its outputs would tend to be specific to the product or project, and a pathway to development would need a separate scoping exercise to determine beneficiaries and stakeholders.

---

**5: Subsidiary model A**

— SC oversight would continue, but an independent university press brand would find independent leadership with an independent strategy framework, aims and contractual relation to the university, i.e. run by an independent board (perhaps established as research centre). 

**Pros:** potentially a cross-faculty arrangement, with other campus-based agencies (drawing on their resources and need for publication or dissemination); develop a specialist service for each faculty’s publishing needs, co-opting small specialist advisory groups (perhaps for faculty or project-based funded publishing); incentivise participation. 

**Cons:** investment risk; need strategic oversight to ensure productivity; the relation between specialist staff and volunteering academic staff would need definition, especially in its strategic relation to central SC/Library services and their internal responsibilities.

---

**6: Subsidiary model B**

– A student-staffed publishing enterprise, as strategic partner to a new revenue-generating masters or other degree (in publishing, librarianship, media or business entrepreneurship, or another ‘high profile’, internationally attractive subject). 

**Pros:** various hybrid and adjunct staffing arrangements are possible (a course leader would be central to the press enterprise); it would allow for student training and internships, residencies, scholarship schemes for publishing professionals, etc.; it could integrate with existing international masters-level education provision, and would facilitate an annual revenue and provide staff for various roles in publishing production. 

**Cons:** risks and liabilities; potentially unstable in annual student turnover; the use of students legally problematic; unclear outcomes in terms of value to the central university brand.

---

**7: Subsidiary model C**

– Establish an independent ‘publishing house’ — a substantial independent branded company; develop commercial publishing capability, but maintain university identity and mission.
Pros: clear organisational aims; large potential gains in publishing science and data for a university with large medical, scientific or engineering community; exciting professional undertaking involving industry specialists, extending the social reach of the university into areas of the market and global economy; publish branded educational/training publication lines.

Cons: a large investment, and separate set of aims from a central service (Library, OA) operation; given the market (along with university constituencies and stakeholders), the value of the considerable outlay (and chance of success) is not promising (or unlikely in the medium-term); is not necessarily an exclusive option to any of the above arrangements.

Conclusion
The original scoping report from which this paper is drawn, engaged in some deliberation on the appropriate model for the University of Warwick. The value of this paper is in the conceptual mapping the landscape of new conditions of university published research in general — a specific report on the implications specifically for research journals is the next stage in this project. Journals are not often stand-alone enterprises — or rather, to maintain the editorial standards, rate of scheduled production, and reach of distribution, journal production is usually situated within a publishing enterprise or company. Some specialist journals (largely in the hard sciences, but sometimes social sciences) are very lucrative, yet the recent ‘Serials Crisis’ in journal publication and subscription flagged up both the economics and ‘political economy’ of journal production: the Serials Crisis (which even has a Wikipedia page: Appendix 3) revealed how lucrative journals were dependent on publicly-funded institutions whose vulnerability to routine increase in subscription costs was greater than anticipated — the supposed ‘market’ was not so much a market but a partially concealed form of public-subsidy; and this subsidy was playing a less than democratic role in determining the structure of knowledge production and distribution (within institutions, nationally and globally).

The purpose of this paper was not to characterise the current challenges facing research published journals, but by surveying the new institutional landscape of university publishing, we identified the material conditions of production — the shifts in organisational, professional (skills), editorial, production and readership dimensions. These, of course, have been identified in generic terms, but with reference to actual developments and transformations testified to by key industry professionals and others (re: our extrapolated interview data). Of significance — and in some ways fundamental to the enterprise of a ‘university’ press as a public institution — are the rationales for, and value of, university publishing. This is most vividly identified when considering some of the potential areas in which a new university publishing enterprise may engage. This following list of potential areas of engagement is a stimulus to our second stage looking more closely at the role and potential role of university published research journals:

- The permeation of digital media, AI, big data and IT-based competencies throughout education, research and knowledge-based
enterprises, calls for a more systematic understanding on how journals, specifically, can extend knowledge into the global knowledge economy through the internet and digital products.

- The growing national funding agency call for expanding the ‘impact’ agenda along with ‘research culture’ within research-active institutions, requires a more assertive approach to the strategic branding and design of research projects with a view to constructing case studies, using mapping of distribution networks, and generating digital media products.

- A strategically managed journal project could internally enable PGR and early career researcher professional development and training opportunities, in research media, research networks and global profile-building.

- A strategically managed journal project could externally contribute to (i) making globally visible the university’s research brand, and (ii) act as gateway to the university’s knowledge economy (for locating and connecting to its members, institutes, projects, products, services, specialists, and so on), and (iii) participate in the university’s Knowledge Diplomacy (or international cultural relations – both educational and research).

- Journals are invested in specific areas of knowledge, commanding high concentration and interest from its constituencies: more could be made of both (i) the need for pedagogies that are more closely interconnected with new research practice and knowledge; and (ii) engage directly with audiences of reader engagement through events (e.g. author interviews; publication launches, talks).

- Neurodiversity remains unacknowledged in large areas of specialist and based publishing, but this needs to happen if the deficit of neurodiverse pedagogies is to be addressed.

- Research journals are a high-value low-cost mechanism for meeting large institutional aims, especially in constructing communities of knowledge between universities, cultural institutions and other relevant organisations, public and private.

### Appendices

1: University Presses (NUPs) in the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Established in</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>OA</th>
<th>Etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Aberdeen University Press</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Ltd (since 1992)</td>
<td>Partially OA</td>
<td>renovating their press’s digital platform in 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>External Status</td>
<td>OA Type</td>
<td>OA Platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham Press</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Ltd since 1985</td>
<td>Commercial: Legend Times Ltd Group</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Library of Humanities</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Exempt charity (academic-led)</td>
<td>Diamond OA</td>
<td>28 Journals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkbeck Law Press</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Imprint of the School of Law and Cavendish Publishing</td>
<td>Cavendish Publishing is incorporated into Routledge</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol University Press</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Within University (in Faculty of Social Sciences and Law)</td>
<td>Partially OA</td>
<td>Own platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Press</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>The original press, now an imprint of BUP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Own platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Exempt Charity</td>
<td>Partially Gold/Green OA</td>
<td>Own platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff University Press (CardiffUP)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Within University (library-led)</td>
<td>Diamond OA</td>
<td>Ubiquity (platform)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lancashire</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Project publisher (not registered as a charity/ltd co.)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Related to MA course children’s book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester University of Chester Press</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Ltd Co.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Accommodates regional, niche and short-run pubs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry University Press</td>
<td>In formation</td>
<td>Within University (library-led)</td>
<td>forthcoming</td>
<td>OJS (platform)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin City University Press</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Within University (Library-led)</td>
<td>Fully OA</td>
<td>Ireland’s first fully OA press UCL provided / white labelled (platform)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh University Press</td>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>Ltd (since 1992)</td>
<td>Partially Green OA</td>
<td>Firsty (platform)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow University Press</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Ltd (since 1972)</td>
<td>Operates as a database</td>
<td>No official website NielsenIQ (book data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths Press</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Within University (Academic-led)</td>
<td>Partially Green OA</td>
<td>PubPub (MIT provided platform)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire Press</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Partially Gold OA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support the research community within their own university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Huddersfield Press</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Within University (Library-led)</td>
<td>Partially OA</td>
<td>Multimedia publishers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial College Press</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Imprint of World Scientific Publishing Europe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Former Imperial College Press merged to WSPE (based in Singapore) in 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool University Press</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Ltd (since 2004); founded 1899.</td>
<td>Partially OA</td>
<td>Own platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London University of London Press</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Within University (in the School of Advanced Study)</td>
<td>Predominantly OA</td>
<td>University platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE Press</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Library-led</td>
<td>OA</td>
<td>Ubiquity platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton St Press</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Imprint of LSE press</td>
<td>Student publishing (taught programmes/ student-led publication enterprises)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester University Press</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Within University (not Ltd Co.)</td>
<td>Partially OA</td>
<td>Own platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Press</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Within University</strong></td>
<td><strong>Platinum OA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partial OA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxford</strong></td>
<td>The Clarendon Press</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Imprint of OUP (for publications of particular academic importance.)</td>
<td>Partially OA</td>
<td>Own platform Clarendon Press and OUP were labels to distinguish publishing offices, ceased in the 1970s when London office of OUP closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Andrews</strong></td>
<td>St. Andrews University Press</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Within University</td>
<td>'First undergraduate press'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCL</strong></td>
<td>UCL Press</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Within University (Library-led)</td>
<td>OA</td>
<td>The first fully Open Access Uni Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
<td>University of Wales Press</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Within University</td>
<td>Partially OA</td>
<td>Own Platform Humanities, Arts and Social Science centred academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westminster</strong></td>
<td>University of Westminster Press</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Within University</td>
<td>OA</td>
<td>Ubiquity platform Digital-first OA publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>York</strong></td>
<td>University of York Music Press</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Charitable Ltd company</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Own platform Department of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Leeds, York, and Sheffield</strong></td>
<td>White Rose University Press</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Under the White Rose University Consortium (based on partnership of libraries)</td>
<td>Diamond OA</td>
<td>Ubiquity platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warwick</strong></td>
<td>University of Warwick Press</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Ltd</td>
<td>OA</td>
<td>OJS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winchester</strong></td>
<td>Winchester University Press</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within University (a division of the uni)</td>
<td>Partially OA</td>
<td>Ubiquity platform books and journals in the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plymouth</strong></td>
<td>University of Plymouth Press</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within University (in Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Business)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>University platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roehampton</strong></td>
<td>Fincham Press</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Within University (in School of Humanities and Social Science)</td>
<td>Partially OA (Journal)</td>
<td>Own platform based in the department of English and Creative Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td>Scottish Universities Press</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Consortium of 18 academic libraries --</td>
<td>Partially OA (Journal)</td>
<td>Platform managed by Scottish Confederation of University and Research Libraries (SCURL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ltd : Private limited Company, registered in Companies House  
* Uncertain Information is left blank

## 2: Relevant Links for references

**Edinburgh University Press new Open Access Fund of 250k**

Job openings (Publishing Technologies Librarian – Janeway publishing platform) at the Birkbeck, University of London

OASPA (Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association) and DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) released a new Open Access Journals Toolkit


JISC New University Press Toolkit


Statement on ‘The Value of University Presses’ (Association of University Presses)

https://aupresses.org/the-value-of-university-presses/

US university presses, if only for comparative purposes, are worth surveying in this context: while almost all distribute to the UK (and without access to sales figures), and both Oxford and Cambridge are very active in the USA, the most visible US brands in the UK scholarly publishing tend to include Harvard University Press, Yale University Press (particularly for art); Princeton University Press; University of Chicago Press; MIT Press; Columbia University Press. The University of Michigan Press is interesting in this context as it is part of the university library's Publishing division (also known as Michigan Publishing): https://www.publishing.umich.edu/

The Serials Crisis:
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