New Digital Scholarship and the Unpress
Adeline Koh, Richard Stockton College (http://www.adelinekoh.org)

Google Docs Link:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/15vGpqp9WZV16p2MiCAdcCy5fBHOxGYHjVXLWM7VCVNk/edit?hl=en_US

Proposal Session Link
http://philly2011.thatcamp.org/09/22/new-digital-scholarship-and-returning-to-the-unpress/

Basic points
-Roger Whitson's notion of the 'unpress': comes out of Mark Sample's injunction to create an indie academic press
-Two things: academic presses, academic journals--> problems of closed access and cost, gatekeeping function of editors/peer reviewers
-Several problems: open access, getting taken seriously for promotion and tenure, peer review, support for peer review
- Open, post publication peer review models (K. Fitzpatrick, Shakespeare Quarterly)
-NYT article: libraries and movement to open access journals (posted by Janine Utell): http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/19/world/europe/19iht-educLede19.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1
-accessibility of writing/academic writing (do we need to make academic writing more accessible to the public?)
-PressForward: new type of press that may marry old forms and new forms
http://pressforward.org/

Questions
--> New form of peer review/positives and negatives / Open access
--> How to integrate this into tenure and promotion process/ or change T&P process?
--> Changing Genres of Publication
--> Institutional Support

Notes:

Janine Utell referred her to NYT article on OA

Adeline's experience: published book review on HNet last year. This became the de facto resource because not as many people have access to the more established journal.

Traditional academic presses are going under now. Economic model is broken.

Mark Sample suggests the Kindle Single as a lightweight model for scholarly publishing going forward.

Peer review is another issue: Kathleen Fitzpatrick, directing MediaCommons project. Published Planned Obsolescence under a new model of open peer review.

Shakespeare Quarterly has also done this. Kathleen Fitzpatrick's reflections. She received a Mellon Grant to study open peer review.

How can these projects be evaluated? How to responsibly measure impact?

What is the real controversy around new models of scholarly communication--is it the economics, peer review, P&T crisis?

Where is the labor? The cost? The value in the current model and how are these out of balance?

What economic models actually do work?
Think about pluses and minuses of:

- For-profit publisher
- Not-for-profit publisher
- Institution/research center based
- Scholarly society based
- Self-publishing
- Publishing different versions in different ways

SPARC addendum to rights agreement: http://www.arl.org/sparc/

Problems of self-publishing: who is your audience and how are you going to develop and keep it? How are you going to preserve it? These are values that traditional publishers can add--how can scholars/writers go about doing these things in other ways?

What if libraries took responsibility for self-publishing apparatus and preservation and scholarly societies took responsibility for curating/aggregating/reviewing these publications?

How can we reserve the value added of publishers without the burden of all the other aspects of labor that are so costly?

Cornell's ArXiv as a model: pluses (high impact, efficient) and minuses (sustainability problems)

Jack Docherty now doing an open version of a book to be subsequently traditionally published by U Mich Press.

Digital Culture Books: digitalculture.org

M Publishing: http://www.lib.umich.edu/mpublishing

http://www.plannedobsolescence.net/

How can we unbundle the work going into publishing and share responsibility? What parts are essential? What parts can be taken or left? Who should do what? What types and genres/classes of publication should there be? Publishing is now a system of multiple activiites and functions rather than a single enterprise and no single institution or organization can handle all of these things.

- Field-building—commissioning of new work
- Advising authors on how to go about planning and marketing their work
- Managing infrastructure for knowledge construction
- " for teaching and learning
- " for editorial work
- " for Peer review
- " for P&T review
- " for preservation

"Game of chicken"—who will try a new model of publishing first and risk failure?

Steve Ramsay's blog post on how nobody reads your tenure file.

Jason Mittell TV scholar blog: published his book proposal draft on his website. Very useful and informative---also gave scholar a record of comments—
demonstrated readership in the field.

MLA Guidelines for evaluating digital work