

NEH Application Cover sheet (HAA-284855)

Digital Humanities Advancement Grants

PROJECT DIRECTOR

John Sherer
Director, University of North Carolina Press
116 South Boundary Street
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-3808
USA

E-mail: jsherer@email.unc.edu
Phone: 919-962-3748
Fax:

Field of expertise: Interdisciplinary Studies, General

INSTITUTION

The Association of University Presses, Inc.
New York, NY 10018-9228

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Title: *Understanding the Impact on Print Revenue When University Press Books are Open Access*

Grant period: From 2022-02-01 to 2023-07-31

Project field(s): Interdisciplinary Studies, General

Description of project: The project seeks to understand empirically whether the availability of Open Access (OA) editions of scholarly books has a quantifiable effect on the sales performance of print editions. University presses publish an estimated 4000 monographs annually. While many university presses have pursued experiments with OA publishing, sustainable financing of all publishing operations is a significant concern. This study will gather sales data on a significant number of both OA and traditionally published titles across multiple disciplines from a wide array of non-profit scholarly publishers in order to answer one of the biggest questions in humanities book publishing: does an OA option decrease sales, increase sales via greater discovery, or have no discernible effect? The research will be essential to inform future OA book programs and models, pointing the way to expanding sustainable open publishing operations.

BUDGET

Outright Request	49,680.00	Cost Sharing	0.00
Matching Request	0.00	Total Budget	49,680.00
Total NEH	49,680.00		

GRANT ADMINISTRATOR

Brenna McLaughlin
1412 Broadway
New York, NY 10018-9228
USA

E-mail: bmclaughlin@aupresses.org
Phone: 917-244-2051
Fax:

Understanding the Impact on Print Revenue When University Press Books are Open Access

Grant Administrator (GA):

Brenna McLaughlin, Research and Communications Director, Association of University Presses

Co-Directors:

John Sherer, Director, University of North Carolina Press

Erich van Rijn, Director of Journals and Open Access, University of California Press

Consultants:

Laura Brown, Ithaka S+R

Roger Schonfeld, Ithaka S+R

Understanding the Impact on Print Revenue When University Press Books are Open Access

****Narrative****

Enhancing the Humanities

The collective work of university presses to publish and distribute monographs is one of the cornerstones of the creation and advancement of scholarship in the humanities. By some estimates, more than 4,000 new monographs are published by university presses annually.¹ With the development of digital distribution tools, there is the potential for increasing the accessibility, use, and impact of these monographs. The most ambitious strategy for achieving exponential increases is through Open Access (OA)², which essentially removes paywall barriers and allows for widespread sharing of digital editions. Any expansion of OA will have a concurrent expansion on the impact of these monographs, especially among the general public and in geographies which have historically lacked the resources to access such works. During the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic, many university presses allowed platforms like Books at JSTOR, EBSCO, and Project MUSE to temporarily make their digital monographs OA. All these platforms experienced dramatic increases in use during this time, including a six-fold spike at Project MUSE.³

There have been a number of university press OA pilots in the past five years including NEH/Mellon Open Book grants, TOME (Toward an Open Monograph Ecosystem), Knowledge Unlatched, NEH Fellowship Open Book Program, and the Sustainable History Monograph Pilot. Individual presses like MIT and California have also shown extensive leadership in opening their own books. Foundations (such as the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Arcadia Fund) and government entities (like the NEH) have contributed millions of dollars to initiate pilots and support capacity-building for open models of publications. Through these and other initiatives, there are now thousands of university press books that have been published in open digital editions with print copies for sale.

While there is a prevailing desire among members of the Association of University Presses (AUPresses) to do more OA publishing, presses cite long-term, sustainable funding models as

¹ *Monograph Output at University Presses 2009-2013: A Report Prepared for the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation* <https://3spxpi1radr22mzge33bla91-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Monograph-Output-of-University-Presses.pdf>. This report excluded Oxford and Cambridge University Presses, so that actual number is likely over 6,000 new monographs annually.

² In its simplest form, OA is defined as literature that is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions. <https://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm>. Most OA book publications do not meet this definition, but instead could be called free to read, download, and share. In this application, we use that more restrictive definition of OA.

³ (b) (4)

the top problem in implementing OA.⁴ Even with the millions of dollars spent in experimentation, OA remains very much on the fringes within the university press world, making up less than 5% of new monograph output.⁵ In an already challenging fiscal environment, the prevalent assumption that open digital editions will cannibalize revenues is stopping OA from growing, resulting in the suppression of a substantial body of humanities scholarship. But as our environmental scan suggests, there is not a body of research to justify any assumptions on what happens to print sales when digital editions are OA.

Even if it is true that OA erodes print revenues, then understanding the degree to which print is reduced could be a key guidepost in modeling a sustainable OA subsidy. But if it is not correct—if OA has only a marginal impact on print revenues—then there could be a substantial opportunity to expand OA publishing. Could there even be a more surprising result? What if the discoverability afforded by OA leads to an increase in print revenues?⁶ It could have a transformational impact on the future of monograph publishing and the accessibility of humanities scholarship writ large.

We seek a Level I Digital Humanities Advancement Grant of \$49,680 to investigate this question about whether revenues decline, increase, or remain relatively unchanged when digital editions of monographs are OA.

Environmental Scan

Much has been written about the benefits of expanded access and the growing efforts to track usage. Perhaps even more has been written about funding challenges for OA. But there has been no comprehensive effort to study the impact on print revenues when digital editions of university press monographs are OA.

We are aware of anecdotal reports on print activity, including [AUPresses OA Monograph Case Studies](#), published in 2017. There is a [classic report from the National Academies Press](#) on their print sales when they released their books as free pdfs, but it was published in 2003. The TOME project has done some [early reporting on usage](#), but they have only provided “snapshots” of

⁴ Based on AUPresses surveys conducted 2019 and 2020. Survey summary is provided in an appendix with this submission.

⁵ The majority of OA publications have been older, sometimes out-of-print, books which have been digitized and re-released. Books that are OA from initial publication are much rarer. See appendix 2020 survey, question 3.

⁶ The 2018 Ithaka S+R Faculty Survey suggests scholars discover monographs in digital formats, but strongly prefer print editions for reading and engagement. See figure 10 at <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/2018-us-faculty-survey/>

print sales for four of the sixty-eight books published in the program. In 2017, the [University of California Press reported](#) on its own OA program.

These studies have shown that it is relatively easy to collect this data, but they also reflect the fragmented nature of OA pilots.

History of the Project

This proposal is derived from the work of the AUPresses OA Task Force, which has included this topic in its OA investigations for two years. The importance of this work to presses is reflected in the fact that the “Task Force” is being converted to a committee of the Association. The Association has conducted annual surveys about a host of OA topics two years in a row with very strong response rates. These surveys have also indicated that presses do not have a firm understanding of what happens to print when digital editions are OA.⁷

Questions about monographs and open access are a regular feature of ITHAKA S+R's survey work with faculty and libraries. They also conduct landscape reviews of OA models, and consult with a variety of publishing clients about their open access strategies.

Activities and Project Team

Project Team:

Grant Administrator:

- Brenna McLaughlin, Research & Communications Director, Association of University Presses
- Co-PIs:*

- John Sherer, Director, University of North Carolina Press
- Erich van Rijn, Director of Journals and Open Access, University of California Press

Consultants:

- Laura Brown, Ithaka S+R
- Roger Schonfeld, Ithaka S+R

1. Working together, Project Team identifies key data points to be gathered in a questionnaire. For example, sorting between born-OA books versus ones which have been retroactively “opened” or brought back into print and made open. Additionally, we might want to know the discipline, print price and format, and publication date for each OA book. More subjectively, we could try to gauge the level of specialization of the monograph.

⁷ See Appendix with AUPresses OA Survey data. In particular, see question 8 in 2021 and question 7 in 2020.

Presses could attempt to identify “control group” titles that remain paywalled to try to compare performance of their own lists when they are OA or not. The Project team could also tap into other resources for this stage, including members of the AUPresses OA Committee and the AUPresses Business Committee. (Months 1-3)

2. AUPresses will work with member presses to collect the data. AUPresses has a strong track record and infrastructure for soliciting and gathering data among its members. (Month 4)
3. The Project Team will make an initial evaluation of the data to confirm it is satisfactory and to begin scoping how the data will be presented and the areas of focus for narrative analysis. (Months 5-6)
4. Subcontractors will take the lead in analyzing the data and write a draft report for the Project Team. A final draft will be authored by the Project Team. (Months 7-11)
5. Project Team publishes and begins to promote the final report, jointly authored by Ithaka and AUPresses. (Month 12)

Final Products and Dissemination

Final Products:

1. We will publish the anonymized and aggregated original data on accessible on the public-facing portion of the AUPresses website. Users will be able to download application files to manipulate the data. We will work with the ongoing OA eBook Data Trust⁸ project to ensure that our data are easily ingested into their ongoing work.
2. We will create an ingestion tool which can be readily re-used either by AUPresses or other entities to contribute future data in order to enrich its long-term value. This has been identified by the AUPresses OA Task Force as a critical infrastructure gap.
3. We will publish our final report on the public-facing portion of the AUPresses web site and on the Ithaka S+R site.

Dissemination Plan:

1. AUPresses and Ithaka will jointly announce the publication of the data set and research report.
2. The report will be delivered to academic leaders and institutions and foundations which have historically supported humanities scholarship.
3. AUPresses will host a public presentation/webinar to share the results and field inquiries.
4. AUPresses will work with partner associations and conferences (e.g., ARL, ICOLC, ACLS, Council Graduate Schools, Library Publishing Coalition, SSP, Charleston Library Conference, COPIM) to present the research results.

⁸ https://educopia.org/data_trust/

Understanding the Impact on Print Revenue When University Press Books are Open Access

****Work Plan****

Project Team:

Grant Administrator (GA):

Brenna McLaughlin, Research and Communications Director, Association of University Presses
Co-PIs:

John Sherer, Director, University of North Carolina Press

Erich van Rijn, Director of Journals and Open Access, University of California Press

Consultants:

Laura Brown, Ithaka S+R

Roger Schonfeld, Ithaka S+R

Activities:

1. Months 1-3: All five members of the Project Team will meet to identify key data points to be gathered. They will develop a methodology to maximize press participation and to ensure a high level of utility of the end product. Questions to be addressed at this stage include:
 - a. What categories should be indexed (e.g., subject discipline, print price, format, and publication date)?
 - b. Can the project try to gauge the level of specialization of the monograph?
 - c. How can the project sort between born-OA books versus ones which have been retroactively “opened” or brought back into print and made open?
 - d. What methodology is needed to preserve the proprietary sales figures of individual presses while ultimately creating an aggregated data set which can be shared and re-used?
 - e. How can the project develop an ingestion tool that permits future data to be added?The Project Team will also potentially tap into other resources for this stage, including members of the AUPresses OA Task Force as well as Books at JSTOR (a subsidiary of Ithaka with significant experience in OA and data collecting).
2. Month 4: McLaughlin, Sherer, and van Rijn will work with member presses to collect the data. Presses could attempt to identify “control group” titles that remain paywalled to try to compare performance of their own lists when they are OA or not.
3. Months 5-6: All five members of the Project Team will make an initial evaluation of the data to confirm it is satisfactory and to begin scoping how the data will be presented and the areas of focus for narrative analysis.
4. Months 7-11: Schonfeld and Brown will take the lead in analyzing the data and writing a draft report for the Project Team. A final draft will be authored by the Project Team.
5. Month 12: Project Team will publish the data set and the final report on the public-facing portion of the AUPresses web site and on the Ithaka S+R site.

6. Months 12-18: Project Team will promote the final report
 - a. The report will be delivered to academic leaders and institutions and foundations which have historically supported humanities scholarship.
 - b. AUPresses will host a public presentation/webinar to share the results and field inquiries.
 - c. Team member Schonfeld will publish a post on the *Scholarly Kitchen* blog
 - d. AUPresses will work with partner associations and conferences (e.g., ARL, ICOLC, ACLS, Council Graduate Schools, Library Publishing Coalition, SSP, Charleston Library Conference, COPIM) to present the research results.

Risks

As with any survey, the level of participation is the primary challenge. The Project Team acknowledges this risk, but AUPresses has a strong track record of previous participation which suggests that this risk is quite low. AUPresses already collects quarterly sales data from its members, so robust infrastructure exists to do this work. And there is a culture of participation among members who understand that collective data benefits individual presses as well as the community as a whole. Additionally, the Association's OA Task Force has conducted surveys about OA in the past two years and the majority of member presses have participated. Lastly, while our goal is to collect data on every OA book published by university presses, even a partial response will advance our understanding of this vital issue.

There is no travel, software development, or any third-party technical requirements for this project. Each member of the Project Team could be replaced by a peer at their own organizations should they be unable to continue.

Data Sensitivity

While university presses embrace collaboration, sales results is one of the few areas where they have historically insisted on shared data being anonymized and aggregated before it is publicly shared. Presses will be allowed to publicly share their own data, but our ingestion process will require presses to submit their own data anonymously. Further, we do not intend to publish data at the level of an individual press. The data set we will publicly post will be anonymized and aggregated across the full reporting group of presses.

Understanding the Impact on Print Revenue When University Press Books are Open Access

****Project Team Biographies****

Brenna McLaughlin is the Research & Communications Director at the Association of University Presses (AUPresses). She has worked in various roles for the Association since 2001, including as the staff lead on past projects ranging from the popular Books for Understanding reading lists to the AUPresses Digital Book Publishing Surveys, and as the staff liaison to working groups such as the Research Task Force, the Library Relations Committee, and the Open Access Task Force. Brenna has a BA in English from Carleton College, a degree from the Master's in Liberal Studies (MALS) Program at the CUNY Graduate Center, and an MS in Information Studies from the University at Albany.

Erich van Rijn is currently Director of Journals and Open Access at the University of California Press where he oversees the press's journals publishing program and open access efforts across the press's books and journals portfolios. From July 2019 through June 2021, he chaired the Association of University Presses Open Access Task Force. The task force was charged with exploring ways that the association could better support university presses' open access publishing efforts and resulted in the establishment of a standing committee of the association on open access that will begin work in July 2021. Erich has been with the University of California Press since 1997 and has held positions in marketing, sales, operations, and information technology. Prior to joining the press he held positions in marketing at Oxford University Press and HarperCollins Publishers.

John Sherer was named the director of the University of North Carolina Press in June of 2012. Since his arrival the Press has published two *New York Times* bestsellers and has been the recipient of several major foundation grants including two grants of nearly \$1 million each from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to support new scaled models for high quality monograph publications. He is also the President of Longleaf Services, a leading provider of distribution and general publishing services for university presses. Previously, he was the publisher of Basic Books in New York, Publisher of Nation Books and Counterpoint Press, member of the AAP Trade Executive Committee, and adjunct professor at New York University's School for Continuing and Professional Studies. He has held marketing positions at Henry Holt, the Brookings Institution and was a manager and buyer at Olsson's Books and Records in Washington, DC. He is a graduate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Roger C. Schonfeld is director of the Ithaka S+R Libraries, Scholarly Communication and Museums Program. In this role, he leads Ithaka S+R's studies of academics' and students' attitudes, practices, and needs, as well as research on the changing role of the academic library, scholarly publisher, learned society, and museum. He also consults with libraries and library consortia, digital humanities projects, distinctive collections and centers of excellence, and scholarly publishers. Roger has served on the NSF Blue Ribbon Task Force for Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access and NISO's Open Discovery Initiative. Roger has a degree in English Literature from Yale University.

Laura Brown is a senior advisor at ITHAKA, where she has held a variety of positions since 2008, serving for more than a decade as the Managing Director of JSTOR. Before joining ITHAKA, Laura was the president of Oxford University Press, USA. She serves on the boards of Yale University Press and the Gordon Parks Foundation as well as the library advisory board of University of the People. Laura has a Bachelor of Arts from Goucher College, a Masters in Literature from Johns Hopkins, and a Masters in Fine Arts from Indiana University.

Understanding the Impact on Print Revenue When University Press Books are Open Access

****Data Management Plan****

We are not developing any software or writing any code.

This project will use a survey to university presses requesting sales results for a set of their book titles. The data from individual presses ("Publisher Data") will be delivered in Excel or other spreadsheet and anonymized in its ingestion. Original Publisher Data files will not be preserved by the project after the conclusion of the grant. Publisher Data will become part of an aggregated set of sales data ("Combined Sales Data") which will be the basis of our analysis and narrative reporting.

We intend to publicly post the Combined Sales Data as an Excel file and portions of it will be part of a companion narrative report. This will allow other entities to explore further interpretations based on their own manipulation; it can be the basis for an ongoing project (outside of this grant) to develop processes for future data collection; and individual presses can compare their own proprietary data against the Combined Sales Data.

The survey will be administered by the Association of University Presses (AUPresses). Currently, AUPresses already collects quarterly sales data from its members and provides a secure, anonymized method for doing this. The only Project Team member who will have any access to the Publisher Data is McLaughlin (who is on the AUPresses staff); all other Project Team members will only access and analyze the Combined Sales Data.

We will also be publicly posting a narrative report which will draw conclusions from the Combined Sales Data. That report will include a section on the methodology for collecting the data.

The narrative report and Combined Sales Data will be posted for at least five years on the public facing AUPresses website (www.aupresses.org) and in the Humanities Commons CORE repository.

Understanding the Impact on Print Revenue When University Press Books are Open Access

****Appendix****

2020 and 2021 AUPresses Survey Summary Results

2020 AUPresses Survey Summary Results

What does the studied community look like?

- The survey was distributed in January 2020 to 153 members of the Association of University Presses.
- 103 presses, or 67%, responded.
- Responses were received from presses in 11 nations.
- 100% of Canadian AUPresses members responded.
- 102 responding presses publish books and 55 publish journals.
- 62% of book-publishing respondents are Group 1 presses; 15% Group 2; 14% Group 3; and 9% Group 4.¹
- 28 presses have less than 50% of their backlist books in digitized formats; 10 have their entire backlists in digital formats—7 of these are presses established since 2000.

1. How many presses have published Open Access content?

- 69% of respondents have published either books or journal content Open Access.
- OA Books: 64 presses
- OA Journal content: 34
- Both OA books and OA journal content: 27
- None: 32
- Of the presses who have not published OA content, 66% are among the smallest (Group 1) presses.
- Note: As universities and libraries shut their doors in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, many teachers, students, and researchers were cut off from access to needed materials. 88 members of the Association reported opening content or removing license restrictions temporarily in response.

2. Perspectives on Open Access:

Group 1: net book sales up to \$1.5 million per year
Group 2: net book sales of \$1.5 to \$3 million per year
Group 3: net book sales of \$3 to \$6 million per year
Group 4: net book sales over \$6 million per year

- At the time of the survey (pre-pandemic), 45 presses planned to begin or increase OA publishing, while 23 presses did not plan on any OA publishing and 2 expected decreased OA publishing (as major grant programs wrapped up.)
- 34 presses are affiliated with an institution that has in place an OA policy; 43 are at institutions without such policies or mandates; 23 do not know whether their home institution has a policy or formal position.
- 86% of respondents selected “funding model” as one of the most significant challenges to publishing open access; 44% selected “internal systems/resource limitations”; 36% selected “rights issues.”
- To the best of presses’ knowledge, OA is a priority for the following communities and stakeholders:

Parent institution/organization	29 presses
Campus/organization library	59
Institution’s faculty or organization’s researchers	16
Authors	29
Institution’s students	9
Organization’s members	7
Foundations and government agencies	31
None of the above	7

* Several comments elaborated that while individuals in these categories may be very interested, these presses were not seeing generally strong interest from any stakeholder groups.

3. Open Access Books

Title categories published OA:

Frontlist “born OA”	54 presses
Frontlist embargoed (≤12 months)	13
In-print backlist	40

Out-of-print backlist	30
Special collections material (not previously published by the press)	5

4. Sales/revenue-generating formats produced alongside OA editions:

Print	59 presses
Consumer ebook formats	32
Subscription ebook packages	10
Audiobooks	3
None	2

5. Funding sources used to make backlist titles OA:

Press self-funded	30 presses
Institutional funding (including library)	28
NEH-Mellon Open Humanities Book grant	19
Arcadia Foundation/IA grant	3
Knowledge Unlatched	10
Other grants/ad hoc subventions	8

6. Funding sources used to make frontlist titles OA:

Self-funding (through press operations)	8 presses
Press-institution (including library) funding	5
TOME grants	18

Author-institution grants (not TOME)	28
Foundation/government/research grants	21
Knowledge Unlatched	26
Membership programs	1
Book-processing charges (BPC) or similar	11
Donor funds	2
N/A	10

7. Experience or expectations of the effect of OA on print sales:

17 presses expect or have seen no effect from the availability of an OA edition on print sales; 18 see or expect a decline in print sales when an OA edition is available. 7 presses expect or report that OA availability correlates to an increase in sales; 5 presses expect those sales bumps will be eliminated as libraries solve the discovering/cataloging OA editions problem. 14 presses do not know what the impact of OA editions is or will be on print revenue.

Comments in response to this query were thoughtful, ranging from many notes about how little data there is available as yet, to reflections on how title-dependent performance is (one respondent wrote: “how can you A/B test the same title?”), and presses reporting very different experiences on whether backlist or frontlist sales are impacted more (in either direction) by the availability of OA.

8. Editorial Standards and Processes:

Same for OA as similar non-OA publications	63 presses
Can differ in certain respects*	5

* Differences mentioned included minding the graphic or illustrative content affordances of digital OA, different consideration of third-party materials, and review processes for publishing special-collections or out-of-print materials in OA series.

2021 Survey Summary Results

1. What does the studied community look like?
 - The survey was distributed from 21 January 2021 through 26 February 2021 to 154 global members of the Association of University Presses.
 - 83 presses, or 54%, responded. This is down from 103 respondents in 2020.
 - Responses were received from presses in 9 nations.
 - 65 responding presses are located in the United States.
 - 7 Canadian member presses responded.
 - 82 responding presses publish books and 39 publish journals.
 - 54% of book-publishing respondents are Group 1² presses; 21% Group 2; 14% Group 3; and 11% Group 4. In 2020, Group 1 participants made up 64% of respondents which is more in line with this sales-tier representation of 67% in the Association's total membership. Bandwidth considerations in a year considerably pinched by pandemic adaptation and increased care work demands may have impacted the participation of presses with smaller staffs.
 - 100% of book-publishing respondents publish scholarly monographs; 85% publish nonfiction trade titles; 31% publish trade fiction; 35% publish poetry; 43% publish textbooks/content primarily intended for courses; and 26% publish reference works.
2. How many presses have published Open Access content?
 - 82% of all respondents have published some (books and/or journals) Open Access content.
 - 10% are fully OA presses; another 19% report moderate-to-significant OA activity. 53% reported publishing limited or experimental OA projects.
 - OA Books: 57 presses (70% of responding book publishers)
 - OA Journal content: 24 (62% of responding journals publishers)
3. What do non-OA publishing presses report?
 - 15 responding presses currently publish no OA content.
 - 60% of this category are among the smallest (Group 1) presses.
 - 21% plan to begin publishing OA content in 2021.
 - 53% report funding model as the greatest barrier to OA publishing; 13% report publishing philosophy as the greatest barrier; 17% report internal systems or skillset limitations as greatest barrier. Comments here indicated that field-specific or audience (trade/crossover) publishing profiles, institutional revenue expectations, and authors-rights perspectives are factors that influence a press's deprioritization of OA.

² Group 1: net book sales up to \$1.5 million per year
Group 2: net book sales of \$1.5 to \$3 million per year
Group 3: net book sales of \$3 to \$6 million per year
Group 4: net book sales over \$6 million per year

4. Open and Free Access and the COVID-19 Pandemic:

- Over the course of spring and summer 2020, a total of 88 member presses had reported to the Association's COVID-19 reading project that they had made content freely accessible or lifted license restrictions in response to campus lockdowns. The 2021 OA Survey asked for more detail about these offers from participating presses:

- For book content, these are the arrangement reported to the Task Force:

No*	31 presses
Yes, during the Spring 2020 semester	28
Yes, during the Fall 2020 semester	8
Yes, continuously	3
Yes, via aggregators (e.g., Project MUSE)	30
Yes, to our institution/system only	2
Yes, via our press proprietary platform	10
Yes, via agreement with Internet Archive	3

* 4 of the presses responding "No" are fully OA; 1 press provided PDFs upon request.

- 50% of non-OA-publishing presses made book content available for free access during initial phases of the COVID-19 pandemic, and 4 out of the 6 presses in this category that also publish journals made similar accommodations for journals content.
- When asked if the pandemic had changed a publisher's perspective on Open Access, 29% replied that it had not had a significant impact on their thinking. These presses ranged from fully OA operations to no-OA publishing. Another 29% noted the impact of increased usage of content made freely accessible in this time. 22 presses specifically noted concerns with sustainable funding for OA publishing, with several mentioning a withdrawal of institutional or library support as budgets are cut across universities.
- One press commented, within the context of a longer OA-supportive response: "But if anything, the pandemic has made us refocus on the importance of ebook editions in general, rather than OA specifically."

5. Perspectives on Open Access:

- 35 presses report planning to begin or increase OA publishing in 2021, while 3 presses expected to decrease OA publishing.

- 35 presses are affiliated with an institution that has in place an OA policy for its faculty or researchers; 34 are at institutions without such policies or mandates; 11 do not know whether their home institution has a policy or formal position.
- 71 presses selected “funding model” as one of the top three challenges to publishing open access (for 56 presses, it was the #1 challenge); 40 presses “internal systems/resource limitations” was among the top challenges; “rights issues” was selected as a top-three challenge by 32 presses. Additional challenges to OA publishing noted in comments to this question included inequities in current OA models and the need to respect indigenous knowledges.
- To the best of responding presses’ knowledge, OA is a priority for the following communities and stakeholders:

Parent institution/organization	27 presses
Campus/organization library	54
Institution’s faculty or organization’s researchers	17
Authors	18
Institution’s students	7
Organization’s members	4
Institutional/organizational funders (including gov’t agencies)	21
No press/institution stakeholders	9

* Several comments elaborated that OA perspectives vary widely within faculty or between departments or research centers. Comments also added that some, but not all, journal editorial boards are press stakeholders interested in prioritizing OA.

6. Open Access Books

Title categories published OA:

Frontlist: “born OA”	47 presses
Frontlist: flipped OA <6 months post-pub	10
Frontlist: flipped OA 6-12 months post-pub	10
Frontlist: flipped OA >12 months post-pub	12

In-print backlist	34
Out-of-print backlist	26
Special collections material (not previously published by the press)	2

7. Sales/revenue-generating formats produced alongside OA editions:

Print	52 presses
Paid consumer ebook formats	26
Subscription ebook packages	9
Paid audiobooks	4
Manage subsidiary rights for author w/revenue potential	23
None	5

* In comments: 1 press indicated interest in offering audiobook formats; and 1 press that selected “subscription ebook packages” is in the process of ending this.

8. Experience and Expectations of Paid Format Sales Performance of OA Books

- The 2021 Survey asked presses who offer paid formats to give a general impression of the sales performance of those formats. 46% selected “Depends on the book, sales performances have been as variable as with non-OA titles”; 26% selected “Generally no impact; sales are similar to comparable non-OA titles”; 14% selected “Generally see a decline in format sales/revenue compared to non-OA titles”; 4% “Generally see an increase in format sales/revenue compared to non-OA titles.”
- Comments on that question included more detailed notes on what data is available, potentially better performance of paperbacks versus cloth editions, and the fact that pricing strategies seem to affect this.
- The 2021 survey also asked respondents to forecast their general expectations for the effect of OA editions on print and other paid format sales over the next several years. 44% of the respondents to this question expect it to continue to be highly dependent on book and author; 24% “Expect an increasingly negative impact on sales, as libraries and other book discovery channels resolve the presentation of OA edition availability”; 15% “Expect a continued positive impact on sales, believe OA discovery leads to print acquisitions”; and 26% selected “I truly don’t know what to expect.”

9. Funding models used to support OA books:

Self-funded (underwritten by paid formats and press budget)	28 presses
Press-institutional funding (including library partnerships)	27
Author-supplied grants and subventions (e.g., TOME, other institutional awards)	36
Foundation/government agency grants	34
Subscribe-to-Open*	0
Pledge-to-Open (e.g., Knowledge Unlatched)	25
Membership or donor programs	6

* 1 press will begin a subscribe-to-open book program in 2022

RESEARCH & RELATED BUDGET - Budget Period 1

OMB Number: 4040-0001

Expiration Date: 12/31/2022

ORGANIZATIONAL DUNS: (b) (4)

Enter name of Organization: The Association of University Presses, Inc.

Budget Type: ☒ Project ☐ Subaward/Consortium

Budget Period: 1 Start Date: 02/01/2022 End Date: 07/31/2023

A. Senior/Key Person

Prefix	First	Middle	Last	Suffix	Base Salary (\$)	Months			Requested Salary (\$)	Fringe Benefits (\$)	Funds Requested (\$)
						Cal.	Acad.	Sum.			
	John		Sherer						0.00	0.00	0.00
Project Role: Project Director											
	Brenna		McLaughlin						(b) (6)	(b) (6)	(b) (6)
Project Role: Grant Administrator											
	Erich		Van Rijn						0.00	0.00	0.00
Project Role: Co-Director											

Additional Senior Key Persons:

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

Total Funds requested for all Senior Key Persons in the attached file

Total Senior/Key Person

(b) (6)

B. Other Personnel

Number of Personnel	Project Role	Months			Requested Salary (\$)	Fringe Benefits (\$)	Funds Requested (\$)
		Cal.	Acad.	Sum.			
	Post Doctoral Associates						
	Graduate Students						
	Undergraduate Students						
	Secretarial/Clerical						
	Total Number Other Personnel					Total Other Personnel	
Total Salary, Wages and Fringe Benefits (A+B)							(b) (6)

C. Equipment Description

List items and dollar amount for each item exceeding \$5,000

Equipment item	Funds Requested (\$)
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Equipment: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="button" value="Add Attachment"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete Attachment"/>
<input type="button" value="View Attachment"/>	
Total funds requested for all equipment listed in the attached file	<input type="text"/>
Total Equipment	<input type="text"/>

D. Travel

	Funds Requested (\$)
1. Domestic Travel Costs (Incl. Canada, Mexico and U.S. Possessions)	<input type="text"/>
2. Foreign Travel Costs	<input type="text"/>
Total Travel Cost	<input type="text"/>

E. Participant/Trainee Support Costs

	Funds Requested (\$)
1. Tuition/Fees/Health Insurance	<input type="text"/>
2. Stipends	<input type="text"/>
3. Travel	<input type="text"/>
4. Subsistence	<input type="text"/>
5. Other <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> Number of Participants/Trainees	<input type="text"/>
Total Participant/Trainee Support Costs	<input type="text"/>

F. Other Direct Costs

		Funds Requested (\$)
1. Materials and Supplies		
2. Publication Costs		
3. Consultant Services		(b) (6)
4. ADP/Computer Services		
5. Subawards/Consortium/Contractual Costs		
6. Equipment or Facility Rental/User Fees		
7. Alterations and Renovations		
8.		
9.		
10.		
Total Other Direct Costs		(b) (6)

G. Direct Costs

	Funds Requested (\$)
Total Direct Costs (A thru F)	49,680.00

H. Indirect Costs

Indirect Cost Type	Indirect Cost Rate (%)	Indirect Cost Base (\$)	Funds Requested (\$)
Total Indirect Costs			

Cognizant Federal Agency
(Agency Name, POC Name, and
POC Phone Number)

I. Total Direct and Indirect Costs

	Funds Requested (\$)
Total Direct and Indirect Institutional Costs (G + H)	49,680.00

J. Fee

Funds Requested (\$)

K. Total Costs and Fee

	Funds Requested (\$)
Total Costs and Fee (I + J)	49,680.00

L. Budget Justification

(Only attach one file.)

1234-justification.pdf

Add Attachment

Delete Attachment

View Attachment

RESEARCH & RELATED BUDGET - Cumulative Budget

		Totals (\$)
Section A, Senior/Key Person		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center;">(b) (6)</div>
Section B, Other Personnel		<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>
Total Number Other Personnel	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
Total Salary, Wages and Fringe Benefits (A+B)		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center;">(b) (6)</div>
Section C, Equipment		<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>
Section D, Travel		<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>
1. Domestic	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
2. Foreign	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
Section E, Participant/Trainee Support Costs		<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>
1. Tuition/Fees/Health Insurance	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
2. Stipends	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
3. Travel	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
4. Subsistence	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
5. Other	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
6. Number of Participants/Trainees	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
Section F, Other Direct Costs		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center;">(b) (6)</div>
1. Materials and Supplies	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
2. Publication Costs	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
3. Consultant Services	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center;">(b) (6)</div>	
4. ADP/Computer Services	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
5. Subawards/Consortium/Contractual Costs	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
6. Equipment or Facility Rental/User Fees	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
7. Alterations and Renovations	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
8. Other 1	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
9. Other 2	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
10. Other 3	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 120px; height: 20px;"></div>	
Section G, Direct Costs (A thru F)		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: right;">49,680.00</div>
Section H, Indirect Costs		<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>
Section I, Total Direct and Indirect Costs (G + H)		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: right;">49,680.00</div>
Section J, Fee		<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>
Section K, Total Costs and Fee (I + J)		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: right;">49,680.00</div>

Understanding the Impact on Print Revenue When University Press Books are Open Access

****Budget Justification****

Section A.: Senior/Key Person

Grants Administrator Brenna McLaughlin is expected to require 90 hours toward the project. She is participating in all aspects of the project, but most especially taking the lead in the survey work among university presses. At a pay rate of (b) (6) per hour and (b) (6) for fringe benefits, we are requesting (b) (6) in salary support. A breakdown of her proposed salary support for each stage of the project is enumerated below.

Project Director John Sherer and Co-Director Erich van Rijn are not seeking salary support.

We are not requesting support for any travel, equipment, facilities, or any indirect costs.

Section F. 3.: Consultant Services.

Laura Brown and Roger Schonfeld of Ithaka S+R are each committing approximately 106 hours to the project. In addition to their participation in developing our methodology, their primary task is taking the lead in analyzing the data and drafting the narrative report. Their total fee of (b) (6) is aligned with Ithaka's customary rates to perform similar services. The breakdown of their fees over each stage of the project is enumerated below.

Activities and budget:

1. Months 1-3: All five members of the Project Team will meet to identify key data points to be gathered. They will develop a methodology to maximize press participation and to ensure a high level of utility of the end product.
[McLaughlin-(b) (6); Ithaka (b) (6)]
2. Month 4: McLaughlin, Sherer, and van Rijn will work with member presses to collect the data.
[McLaughlin-(b) (6); Ithaka \$0]
3. Months 5-6: All five members of the Project Team will make an initial evaluation of the data to confirm it is satisfactory and to begin scoping how the data will be presented and the areas of focus for narrative analysis.
[McLaughlin-(b) (6) Ithaka (b) (6)]
4. Months 7-11: Schonfeld and Brown will take the lead in analyzing the data and writing a draft report for the Project Team. A final draft will be authored by the Project Team.
[McLaughlin-\$0; Ithaka (b) (6)]
5. Month 12: Project Team will publish the data set and the final report on the public-facing portion of the AUPresses web site, on Humanities Commons, and on the Ithaka S+R site.
[McLaughlin-(b) (6); Ithaka (b) (6)]
6. Months 12-18: Project Team will promote the final report
[McLaughlin-(b) (6); Ithaka (b) (6)]