Hello
My name is Rebecca Welzenbach. I am Director of Strategic Integration and Partnerships at Michigan Publishing. Michigan Publishing is a division of the University of Michigan Library. Overall, Michigan Publishing consists of the University of MIchigan Press, MIchigan Publishing Services, which primarily supports digital, open access publishing needs on our campus, and finally, our institutional repository, Deep Blue. We're a bit in unusual among library publishers and among university presses in that our press and library are so deeply integrated.

I myself am a librarian, and my role at Michigan Publishing is to work on new tools, services, partnerships, or initiatives we're exploring that don't obviously fit into one of the three buckets I just described--or that work across all of them.

Enter, hypothes.is

We were first approached by Dan Whaley at hypothes.is in 2013. The team was seeking a grant from Mellon to support further development on this tool, basically an open source browser plug-in that supports annotation as, basically, a layer over the top of the web. As a user, you can install the hypothes.is extension and annotate any page on the web. As a content creator, you can also install hypothes.is *on* your website, so that annotations will be availalble to anyone who comes, regardless of whether they have the plug-in installed.

So--the hypothes.is team asked Michigan Publishing to be a partner on this grant, test out hypothes.is on our open access, online publications, and to help them think through other uses for the tool beyond just adding commentary on the web. The team was, at the time, especially interested in the potential of this tool for peer review, and for publishing production workflows--i.e., copyediting.

[discuss those elements]

We were the first publisher to install hypothes.is on one of our publications--the Journal of Electronic Publishing. In fact, we did this before the tool was even officially announced.

Since then, we've been exploring new and better ways to use this tool to engage with the communities that are important to us as a scholarly publisher based in a university library.

The first project we tackled with hypothes.is was an attempt to figure out a workflow for copyediting and peer review using the tool. This was really interesting—and out of it came a huge number of suggestions, requirements, and feature requests. However, in the end, this didn't get much traction simply because of the practicalities of how publishers (at least publishers of our size tend to work). For better for for worse, everyone is still really embedded in the world of Microsoft Word and track changes. It's also the case that we—like most presses today—do a great deal of work, especially this production type work—with free lancers and vendors. Folks are sometimes surprised to learn that the University of Michigan Press doesn't

do copyediting in-house, but we don't—and neither do any of our peers, really. So, it's hard to make changes like this, when vendors, freelancers, and others are tied to certain ways of doing things. Doesn't mean it's not worth trying…

All that to say, thus far, our efforts to think through innovative internal uses for annotation haven't produced much. Where we've had some more success has been with external efforts to engage our community.

What do we mean by our community? Well, it's easy to say: we're the University of Michigan ! The world! But if we force ourselves to be more specific, what we really mean is:

1) OUR CAMPUS
Students, faculty, administration. How does the work that we do support their research, make their lives easier, improve their experience at college? This, of course, is *the* central question for an academic library, but it's one that's a bit new for university presses to be dealing with.

Show: MJS article

One key way that we've used hypothes.is in service of connecting with our local community is through an event called Pub Club. This idea came from a former colleague of mine, Allison Peters. A few times a year, we invite the campus and the general public to gather for a sort of reading club centered around one of our books or journals articles. We make a point to choose one that is open access and fully available online. And, we encourage readers to use hypothes.is to annotate. Our hope is that 1) this will allow folks who may not be able to attend the actual event to participate. It also might be a way for folks who don't want to speak up in a public setting to participate behind the scenes.

The goal here is to bring people in the U-M/Ann Arbor community together, and to make us aware of what we are and what we do.

It's one element of a larger event.

Takeaways:
We used it.
Most others don't. (Indeed, they may not actually be reading the article….)

Will people actually use it?

2) FACULTY/AUTHORS

We're always looking for ways to capture the interest of authors, work with them to tri innovative things, etc.

hypothes.is is, frankly, a low-bar way for us to support some of the kinds of innovation that authors tell us they are interested in.

We used hypothes.is to support an open peer review experiment with one book, Manifesto for the Humanities

The other example I want to show you is one where the author *really* got carried away. This was another Pub Club event, in fact, it was our first one. The book, American Homes, was much more of a creative work, kind of a poetic meditation on the nature of houses, homes, and the American Dream. The author was SUPER STOKED that we were going to do a reading club for his book, and he really went over the top with h. It became a way for him to offer a sort of "director's commentary."

Takeaways: media, awesome! Easy, "safe?" way to offer innovation to authors
Notifications, engagement, moderation/administration?

3) READERS
By this we mean, readers anywhere who might engage with one of our books.

Here, the example I have to offer is an event that took place in 2016 during Open Access week. the University of Texas at Austin's Digital Writing and Research Lab (DWRL) will lead a collaborative annotation of James Brown's new book *Ethical Programs: Hospitality and the Rhetorics of Software* using Hypothes.is. Now, in this case, we at Michigan did not organize or really host these events. They happened externally. But serendipitously, because we were the publisher and we had familiarity with hypothes.is, we were able to install h. on the book in order to make the annotations more visible, and help promote the event.

It's worth noting that this event took place before h. had launched their private group function, which I'll say more about in a second, so these classroom discussioned happened entirely in the open. That might be OK for some classes, in some instances, but it might not always work.

In an attempt to raise awareness of this tool and hopefully engage more readers, I have led a couple of workshops on our campus about hypothes.is and its potential for classroom use. The most important development there has been—as I alluded a minute ago—the option to have a private group for annotation, so that annotations would be seen only by group members—other class members and the professor.

Biggest questions? Privacy, accessibility, ability to moderate.

As we look to the future, we expect to continue to use hypothes.is to support engagement with readers. At Michigan, we are currently building a platform called Fulcrum, which over the next couple of years will become the primary place where we'll host and deliver all of our publications (They will still be available in print and through other channels; this will just be the

first/primary/place of record for them). The real focus with Fulcrum is to allow authors to integrate supplementary materials like media—images, audio, video, datasets with their publications in a way that is stable, citable, and manageable for a press, without spinning up lots of individual “companion websites” that then have to be maintained. We plan to have hypothesis installed on all of these books as the primary mechanism for readers, authors, and others to annotate and engage. To that end, what we’re thinking about now:

Same questions: administration, moderation
Notification—can we monitor an entire domain, so that if someone annotates one of our 1,200 books, we know about it? And can let and author know about it?

Policy: do we apply it across the board for everything? Should authors get to choose?
I think we do it across the board, but I also anticipate pushback on this.

As a publisher, we work very closely with the author (and even more so with the greatest advocate, their editor). It’s very interesting, that moment of seeing the book being born, as opposed to an object that is just out there in the world for someone to consume. With this platform, we are collapsing some of that distance, between two perfectly reasonable and obvious stances:
1) If I’m reading a thing that’s out there publicly, I should be able to comment on it
2) The book is mine, I created it, it’s a major brick in the wall I am building toward my tenure case, and I should get to decide what special features and functions it has.

Issues:
Control
Anxiety
Role of publisher vs. role of author with new/innovative things—unwillingness to “cross” an author

The issues, as always, are the human ones! We find that hypothes.is is not *yet* ubiquitous enough, or having enough uptake, that people will just use it on their own to serve their own ends. It works better when incorporated into other stuff.

Questions about role of publisher vs. role of distributor. How close should the annotation be to the book? What about marginalia that is *part* of the book?

Biggest takeaway: our experience so far is that, at least at this stage, hypothes.is works best as a tool to enhance/support an orchestrated event. I think this may be in part because still not that many people know about it or what it is, and they may need a reason—or actual instructions—to help them get set up and familiar. Another reason is that it’s about connecting with other people—so you want to be where other people are. If you can generate the presence of other people—especially/including an author!—that really helps.

It’s a wonderful, easy-to-use tool, one that, as a publisher, has allowed us to open up a world of options in a pretty easy way.