



Plan S and UK Learned Societies:

The View from History

8 February 2019

Margot Finn (President, Royal Historical Society)¹

Executive Summary:

This report serves three main purposes. It:

- 1) provides a briefing document for UK and international historians and History learned societies on Plan S, a research initiative orchestrated by Science Europe and adopted by UK Research & Innovation (UKRI) in September 2018 which mandates new open access (OA) publication protocols for researchers (including historians) supported by specified funding bodies;
- 2) serves as supplementary material provided by the Royal Historical Society (RHS) as part of the Society's 8 February 2019 submission to cOAlition S's consultation on Plan S, which launched on 26 November 2018 and closed on 8 February 2019;
- 3) offers UK and international funding bodies—including, but not only, those that are Plan S signatories—contextual information and data on research and publication practices in the discipline of History relevant to the implementation of Plan S in the UK.

The report builds on a preliminary report by the author released on 14 January 2019 (<https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/publication-open-access/>). It incorporates feedback, additional information and corrections to the preliminary report offered by over thirty individuals, learned societies and presses. It should be read in conjunction with the 8 February 2019 RHS response to the Plan S consultation, which can be accessed from <https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/publication-open-access/>. The report has an Introduction, six substantive sections and four appendices:

- The Introduction begins by setting out the Royal Historical Society's publication activities and approach to OA and, by way of context, details the author's own engagement (outside of her role within the RHS) with OA books. It then provides basic information on Plan S and its sponsors, including the author's gloss on the '10 Principles' that underpin Plan S;

¹ Email address for correspondence: president@royalhistsoc.org. The author is Professor of Modern British History at UCL. She notes the following potential conflicts of interest: she is a member of the Executive Committee of UCL open access Press, and has published an open access book with this Press; she is president of a UK learned society which includes both Gold open access (*New Historical Perspectives* book series), Green open access (*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*) and non-OA publications (*Camden* and *Studies in History* book series, the latter terminating in 2019) in its portfolio; she is the former editor of the *Journal of British Studies* and sits on editorial/advisory boards of the *Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*, *Journal of British Studies* and *Medical History*; she is/has been a member of the editorial boards of successive Cambridge University Press monograph series.

- Part 1 offers a schematic overview of the OA landscape for in Humanities and Social Sciences (H&SS). It focuses primarily on UK-based publication in History, with some attention to developments outside Britain and outside the historical discipline that merit consideration in the context of cOAlition S and UKRI mandates. This section is a new addition, incorporating feedback from the preliminary report;
- Part 2 summarises known challenges posed by Plan S requirements for History and cognate H&SS researchers and their journals, including zero embargo periods, the interdiction of ‘hybrid’ publishing models, funding for H&SS research and for ‘Gold’ OA publication, and CC BY licences;
- Part 3 identifies 42 UK History learned societies and subject associations which sponsor scholarly journals and/or book series and a further 12 interdisciplinary bodies of this type in which History research is significant, and outlines their contribution to the discipline’s research environment in the UK;
- Part 4 identifies 38 History journals published by UK learned societies. It surveys a sample of 350 research articles published in 5 UK History journals in 2017, finding that a minority (8% overall, ranging from 0 to 17% in individual journals) were supported by funding bodies that are Plan S signatories. Additional data on other UK and international journals confirm these findings. These figures provide a very preliminary proxy for History learned societies and journal editors considering the advisability and potential impact of implementing Plan S mandates for their publications;
- Part 5 lists monograph series sponsored by History learned societies, and is intended to lay very preliminary groundwork for subsequent discussions of Plan S and learned society book publications, in the context of cOAlition S’s avowed intention to extend the Plan S mandate to books—which lie at the heart of research publication in History;
- Part 6 identifies key issues germane to History stakeholders (including researchers, librarians, universities, journal editors and learned societies) and to funding bodies planning for Plan S implementation.

The Plan S consultation exercise asked respondents to comment on two sets of issues. First, it asked if there were areas that were unclear or not covered by the 10 preliminary ‘Principles’ of Plan S articulated by cOAlition S. Second, it asked whether Plan S Funders should consider other mechanisms than those proposed in Plan S ‘to foster full and immediate’ OA for research articles. The feasibility and wisdom of effecting ‘full and immediate’ OA for H&SS journals is questioned throughout the body of this report. A synopsis of the issues raised in the RHS response to the consultation is provided here for ease of reference:

There are substantial **ambiguities and/or internal contradictions** in the preliminary documentation:

- **Definition of ‘public’ research:** How does cOAlition S define ‘publicly funded research’ and ‘research funded by public grants provided by national and European research councils and funding bodies’? Does its scope extend to all research funded by any government body, or only to selected government departments and funding streams? In the UK, for example, public tax revenue supports research not only in universities but in national and local heritage organisations (including archives, libraries and museums), in hospitals and the National Health Service and in government departments such as the Foreign & Commonwealth Office. Are all researchers funded by government bodies equally liable to Plan S mandates? If not, what are the conditions and justifications for exemptions?

- **Charity sector and Plan S:** Does cOAlition S define all (or only some) charities as ‘public’ bodies, and what definitional criteria does it deploy in this context? For example, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is a Plan S signatory. Its website notes both that ‘The foundation awards the majority of its grants to U.S. 501(c)(3) organizations and other tax-exempt organizations identified by our staff’,² and that ‘In general, we directly invite proposals by directly contacting organizations.’³ Do charities that disburse their funds by means other than public calls constitute ‘public’ grant programmes as defined by Plan S?
- **cOAlition S codes of practice:** Are Plan S Funders themselves bound by a code of good practice, or are only researchers they fund bound by such strictures? ‘Principle 10’ of Plan S asserts that ‘The Funders will monitor compliance and sanction non-compliance.’ What national or international bodies will monitor and sanction cOAlition S?
- **Timing:** Plan S specifies three simultaneous timelines for implementation in Point 5 of its Guidance document: ‘Implementation of Plan S will take place from 1 January 2020, having impact on either 1) existing grants, 2) new projects/grants or, at the latest, 3) new calls. cOAlition S members should, at the very least, implement the new requirements in all calls issued after 1 January 2020.’ Issues of timing require clarification at multiple levels. The legal framework within which Plan S Funders propose to implement Plan S mandates for existing grants is unspecified and unclear. The status of new entrants to the research community during the transition period—and the mechanisms by which they will be informed of their new contractual obligations—requires consideration to accord with good practice within the sector. Are PhD students supported by Plan S Funders, for example, liable to Plan S requirements that are implemented after the onset of their research contracts? Do funded researchers’ liabilities to Plan S mandates end when their Plan S funding ends, at an as-yet unspecified later date or instead persist in perpetuity?
- **Definition of ‘research article’:** To date, among cOAlition S funders with substantial investment in History, only the Wellcome Trust has provided a working definition of the publications to which Plan S will be applied (and has specified both the date and manner of Plan S implementation). Its policy applies to ‘any article that includes original, peer-reviewed research and is submitted for publication from 1 January 2020.’⁴ A welcome starting point, this definition leaves unclear whether several types of article that are commonly found in H&SS journals fall inside or outside Plan S mandates. Are historiographical reviews, debates, forums, commentaries and annual bibliographies published by journals required to be Plan S compliant, or can material such as this (as well as book reviews) be hosted by journals outside Plan S restrictions alongside compliant research articles?

Several key issues are not raised (or are mentioned only in passing) in the Plan S documentation. These include:

- **Equality, Diversity & Inclusion:** Plan S appears (from the limited evidence available in the public domain) to have been developed in the absence of an Equalities audit. The implications of Plan S implementation for ‘protected’ groups as defined by the UK Equality Act 2010 and comparable legislation for Northern Ireland, is untested and unknown. Unlike OA, protection of persons in the workplace against discrimination based

² <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Grant-Opportunities> .

³ <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/How-We-Work/General-Information/Grantseeker-FAQ> , Answer 1.

⁴ <https://wellcome.ac.uk/news/wellcome-updating-its-open-access-policy> .

on age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation is a statutory requirement in Britain. Plan S Funder UKRI claims to ‘embed equality, diversity and inclusion at all levels and in all that we do, both as an organisation and as a funder’.⁵ It is however not apparent how equality, diversity and inclusion are embedded at any level in Plan S. Plan S documentation makes no reference to these core rights and obligations. It is noteworthy that, in the UK and internationally, Plan S leaders and spokespersons have hitherto been conspicuous for their lack of diversity—most obviously in terms of gender, race and age. The texts and practices of Plan S debate to date do not inspire confidence in cOAlition S’s commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion;

- **Funding for Plan S mandates and infrastructure:** The Plan S documentation rightly acknowledges gaps in the available infrastructure for OA publishing but fails to offer concrete commitments to address this deficit. Researchers themselves, Plan S documentation appropriately notes, should not be liable to support OA mandates financially. This leaves unasked (and unanswered) the question of which alternative sources of funding for OA infrastructure cOAlition S considers responsible for funding its new mandates, and why it has opted to transfer this responsibility to others;
- **Knowledge Production in History/H&SS:** Plan S is predicated upon a fundamentally flawed understanding of knowledge production, one that simply ignores the place of History and many cognate H&SS disciplines in ‘science’ in the European sense. This basic misunderstanding stems in part from an implicit conflation of ‘science’ and Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics & Medicine (STEMM). But it also extends beyond this lazy assumption, reflecting a basic failure to recognise and account for methodological approaches that are intrinsic to History and H&SS research. This failure is evident in Plan S’s approach to data production and ownership, with significant impact on licencing issues;
- **Funding for H&SS Research and Publication:** Much History research in the UK is supported by self-funding, and/or by funds awarded to universities via the REF and/or by a wide range of UK and international charities. Plan S research councils and charities fund only a minority portion of this research. Given the dearth of available peer-reviewed OA journal platforms available to History researchers without charge, Plan S compliance will potentially entail substantial new publication costs for authors whose research is not funded by Plan S Funders, with knock-on consequences the journals, book series and learned societies that publish them;
- **Early Career Researchers (ECRs):** Plan S’s sponsors articulate entirely laudable goals with respect to supporting ECR research and career progressions. However, the funding norms and career structure for H&SS research suggest that Plan S implementation will pose especial challenges for ECR publication, progression and mobility. Lacking free and consistent access to compliant OA platforms and working in disciplines in which most researchers lack external funds to pay for publication costs in compliant journals, ECRs run the risk of exclusion from scientific careers under Plan S;
- **Non-affiliated Researchers:** History as a discipline benefits from the research activities of thousands of professionals and ‘citizen scientists’ who are not affiliated with universities and who lack access to university and/or grant funding. It also includes many active researchers based in archives, libraries, museums and heritage organisations. Hybrid journals are free for these researchers as authors. If Plan S compliance entails institutional

⁵ <https://www.ukri.org/about-us/equality-diversity-and-inclusion/where-we-stand/>.

affiliation to gain access to compliant forms of OA, these researchers will be excluded from research publication. The status of emeritus staff also merits careful attention;

- **Bifurcated Research Communities:** Plan S implicitly posits the researcher as a STEMM scientist based at a university or other research organisation and funded by ‘public’ grants. History and H&SS more broadly include researchers of this type, but they form only a relatively small subset of our wider research community. Plan S risks bifurcating the publication pathways open to H&SS researchers, channelling some toward ‘compliant’ outlets and others toward existing hybrid publications. History of medicine (a sub-field funded by the Wellcome Trust) provides a case in point. The Wellcome Trust (through Wellcome Open Research: <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/>) has signalled its willingness to invest financially in new, peer-reviewed OA publishing platforms. Access to a compliant online platform—if Wellcome Open Research indeed meets Plan S’s technical specifications—will place Wellcome funded researchers in a privileged position relative to UKRI funded researchers with respect to the Plan S mandate. At the same time, if History journals decline to ‘flip’ to Plan S transitional agreements, Plan S compliance will strip Wellcome-funded historians of the ability to publish in virtually all peer reviewed journals in their discipline. Antinomies such as this are more broadly characteristic of Plan S at this initial stage of its formulation
- **International Context:** Coordinated by Science Europe, Plan S is largely a UK and EU initiative, but the research community is global. The UK and Europe provide substantially more public funding for H&SS research than is typical elsewhere in the world: historians in, for example, India, South Africa and the US lack access to the large publically funded grants offered by the UK research councils and the ERC. ‘Principle 4’ of Plan S presumes that OA publication costs will be ‘covered by the Funders or universities, not by individual researchers’. Funding to bear OA costs is simply not available to many international scholars who publish in UK and European journals and collaborate with UK and European H&SS scholars. Nor are Publish and Read (PAR) agreements that pay publication costs widely available across the varied institutional types in which H&SS disciplines are researched internationally;
- **Learned Societies:** Learned societies have a broad range of charitable goals that typically include but also extend substantially beyond research publication. Several UK History learned societies engage proactively with national funding bodies in policy development and implementation, a relationship of mutual benefit. However, learned societies operate outside national funding body governance and legal regulation. Their legal status as charities requires them to attend carefully both to issues of financial viability and to wider public goods. Their staffing, in both absolute terms and relative to STEMM learned societies, is exiguous. Their ability to absorb the labour and costs associated with Plan S implementation without substantial financial subsidies is unexplored in Plan S’s documentation. The fit between their established agendas and the goals of Plan S’s sponsors moreover remains to be determined.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	7
i. RHS OA Philosophy & Practice	
ii. Plan S Principles & Practice	
1: History/H&SS in the OA Landscape	15
2: Context: Known Challenges of Gold OA for H&SS	19
i. Data	
ii. Funding	
iii. Methodology & Reproducibility	
iv. Summary	
3: UK History Learned Societies & Subject Associations	26
i. History Learned Societies & Their Contexts	
ii. Learned Societies' Structures & Functions	
4: History Learned Societies & Journal Publication	35
i. The History Journal Ecosystem	
ii. Learned Society History Journals	
iii. Article Publication Costs	
iv. External Funding for Research Published in History Journals	
5: History Learned Societies & Book Publication	45
6: Potential Impact of Plan S and Issues for Clarification	49
i. Potential Impacts	
ii. Known Unknowns: Queries/Ambiguities	
Acknowledgements	52
Appendices	53

Introduction:

On 4 September 2018, UK Research & Innovation (UKRI) became a signatory of Plan S, the initiative coordinated by Science Europe (<https://www.scienceeurope.org/>) designed to accelerate implementation of open access (OA) publication mandates for publically funded research.⁶ This decision has implications for all UK-based researchers and for the international community of scholars with whom they collaborate and publish. The launch of the Plan S initiative has also drawn new attention to the role of learned societies and subject associations in disseminating scholarly research outputs. Many such discipline-based and interdisciplinary scholarly societies publish or sponsor journals and/or book series. If/when Plan S is fully implemented, these learned societies—like the broader ecosystem of journal and book publishing bodies—will be able to publish outputs from research projects funded by Plan S signatories, only if they adhere to strict new OA mandates. At the time of writing, the main Plan S signatories for UK-based History (and, more broadly, H&SS) researchers and international authors who publish in UK-based History journals are the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), the European Research Council (ERC) and the Wellcome Trust.⁷ The AHRC and ESRC operate under the aegis of UKRI. The Wellcome Trust is a registered UK charity. UK researchers' eligibility for future ERC funding is a matter of doubt at the time of writing.

(i) RHS OA Philosophy & Practices:

Before turning to outline and assess Plan S, it is worth signalling the pragmatic and philosophical engagement of the Royal Historical Society (RHS) and of this report's author with the OA agenda.

Book and article publication has been central to RHS scholarship since the nineteenth century. The content, format and mode of our publications have evolved significantly over time, and we welcome innovations that bring historical research to wider audiences. Enhancing the reach of our publications—through OA and other available means, including the promotion of public history—is a goal actively pursued by the RHS. The Society's annual journal, published by Cambridge University Press, is *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. *Transactions* is a 'hybrid' journal: all authors are welcome to deposit Author Accepted Manuscripts in their institutions' Green OA repositories, and authors who have funding to publish their articles as Gold OA without embargo can also do so.⁸ This year (2019) will see the Society 'flip' its long-established ECR book series to Gold OA with no embargo and no charge to authors or their institutions. This decision, which represents a significant investment of time, labour and funding by the Society, reflects our willingness and ability to see beyond the short-term and pragmatic constraints on OA publishing, and to invest in new modes of dissemination calculated to reach wider global readerships. Fully subsidised by the Society and produced by the Institute of Historical Research, our *New Historical Perspectives* series will publish four volumes—both OA monographs and collections of essays—per annum.⁹

⁶ For UKRI's adoption of Plan S, see its statement: <https://www.ukri.org/news/uk-research-and-innovation-joins-europe-wide-ambition-on-open-access/>. UKRI (UK Research & Innovation), established on 1 April 2018, orchestrates the activities of 7 UK research councils and is responsible for a budget of over £6 million: <https://www.ukri.org/>.

⁷ The current (February 2019) signatories are listed here: <https://www.coalition-s.org/funders-and-supporters/>.

⁸ <https://royalhistsoc.org/publications/transactions/>.

⁹ <https://royalhistsoc.org/publications/new-historical-perspectives/>.

More broadly, the Society maintains an active interest in OA developments and seeks to support the development of OA publishing in ways that are financially feasible and in keeping with excellence as understood within History as an international discipline. Our officers attend meetings held by organisations such as the British Academy, UKRI and Universities UK to shape evolving OA policies in and beyond Britain. The Society dedicates a Policy page on its website to OA developments, and makes informed, evidence based interventions on OA policy discussions.¹⁰

In keeping with this proactive engagement with new developments in OA, the author of this report as an individual researcher has a keen enthusiasm for widening readers' access to historical scholarship. A member of the Executive of UCL Press, the UK's first university-based OA book publisher, she is co-editor of *The East India Company at Home, 1757-1857*, a collection of essays published Gold OA (with a CC BY 4.0 licence) in 2018 which has now been downloaded over 25,000 times in more than 140 countries. Her support for sustainable OA publication is a matter of public record.¹¹

Philosophically and pragmatically, the author of this report and the officers (trustees) of the learned society of which she is the President are advocates of the expansion of OA publishing for History and H&SS disciplines. The critiques of Plan S in this report—critiques which are many and substantial—do not arise from fundamental hostility to OA as a mode of disseminating research findings. This report fully accepts that OA is a good within the world of research communication. However, it also recognises that this good sits within a wider constellation of goods (or benefits) and that the absolute and relative costs of these multiple benefits deserve to be weighed as an integral part of OA planning and implementation. Abstracted from economic, institutional and legal contexts, OA readily figures as an absolute good. Located within these vital contexts, it features instead as one potential good among many competing benefits. If Plan S implementation made all historical scholarship free at the point of publication, but reduced the community of researchers in History by (say) 50%, would OA be a good? If Plan S implementation privileged some types of research—or some groups of researchers—over others for reasons other than scholarly excellence, would its advantages necessarily outweigh these deleterious effects?

These are not popular questions to ask in OA policy circles,¹² but they are nonetheless vitally important. Plan S Funders have mandated radical changes at pace and without consultation with stakeholders, a mode of proceeding that suggests bad management at best, and bad faith at worst. For UK learned societies that operate as registered charities, the speed and potentially swingeing financial impact of Plan S poses legal as well as operational challenges. Of the six main duties of trustees stipulated by the Charity Commission for England and Wales, Plan S is especially problematic with respect to the duty of prudence.¹³ In responding to Plan S implementation, UK learned societies will be mindful of their legal duties under the charity law, and especially aware of their obligation to guard against potential conflicts of interest when engaging with bodies outside the charities sector.

¹⁰ <https://royalhistosoc.org/policy/publication-open-access/> .

¹¹ <http://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/open-access/files/2019/01/UCL-response.pdf> .

¹² <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/opinion/got-unpopular-opinion-about-open-access-admit-it-your-own-risk> .

¹³ This is duty 4 in the Charity Commission for England and Wales guidance (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/charity-trustee-whats-involved#trustees-6-main-duties>). For Northern Ireland charities (governed by the Charity Commission for Northern Ireland), see esp. section 4 of <https://www.charitycommissionni.org.uk/media/1150/20180323-ccni-eg024-running-your-charity-guidance-v50.pdf> . For Scottish charity law (regulated by OSCR), see <https://www.oscr.org.uk/guidance-and-forms/guidance-and-good-practice-for-charity-trustees> .

In sum, the potential promise of generating new knowledge and understanding for researchers and their many publics through an expansion of OA is genuine. We live and work on an exciting frontier in knowledge production and dissemination, at a time when critical global challenges demand new and better ‘science’, in the European sense. It is precisely for these reasons that OA publishing merits evidence-based analysis in lieu of ideological affirmation and self-congratulation. Precisely because OA matters, it deserves to be subjected to careful scrutiny. The systematic absence of attention to, and the fundamental lack of understanding of, research in H&SS disciplines apparent in Plan S documentation is an anomaly urgently in need of rectification.

(ii) Plan S Principles and Practices:

For journal articles, Plan S requires that: ‘After 1 January 2020 scientific publications on the results from research funded by public grants provided by national and European research councils and funding bodies must be published in compliant Open Access journals or on compliant Open Access platforms’.¹⁴ Plan S defines ‘science’ as encompassing all scholarly disciplines, including all discipline-based and interdisciplinary research in the Humanities and Social Sciences (H&SS). Plan S also mandates OA book publication for research funded by signatory research councils, charitable trusts and foundations. However, in recognition of the absence of infrastructure adequate to support OA publishing of all books produced by funded researchers, Principle 7 of Plan S defers implementation of this aspect of its agenda to an unspecified date.¹⁵

Plan S is predicated on ‘10 Principles’.¹⁶ The cOAlition’s ‘Guidance’ amplifies on these 10 Principles in an 11 point document.¹⁷ For ease of comprehension by stakeholders, the 10 Principles are copied below, accompanied by the author’s gloss (that is, a gloss by the author of this report) on issues most likely to merit attention from the History (and H&SS) subject community and funding bodies.

The 10 Principles are:

- 1) *‘Authors retain copyright of their publication with no restrictions. All publications must be published under an open license, preferably the Creative Commons Attribution Licence CC BY. In all cases, the license applied should fulfil the requirements defined by the Berlin Declaration’.* Author’s gloss: Retention of copyright by the author has already become increasingly common, and has not been identified by History publishers or authors as a significant obstacle to Plan S implementation.¹⁸ Use of CC BY (as opposed to CC BY ND) licences, in contrast, as detailed below in Part 2, poses fundamental disciplinary, ethical and legal problems for many History and H&SS researchers. The ‘10 Principles’ describe use of CC BY as a preference; point 2 of the compliance ‘Guidelines’ states that ‘cOAlition S recommends using Creative Commons licenses (CC) for all scholarly publications and will by default require the CC BY Attribution 4.0 license for scholarly articles.’ **Clarification of the status of CC BY ND licences within Plan S compliance models—specifically,**

¹⁴ There are three main routes for Plan S compliance: 1) publication in open access journals or platforms; 2) deposit of Versions of Record (VoR) or Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) in open access repositories without embargo; and 3) publication in ‘hybrid’ journals but only under transformative agreements (for a period of no more than 3 years of transition).

¹⁵ <https://www.coalition-s.org/10-principles/>.

¹⁶ <https://www.coalition-s.org/10-principles/>.

¹⁷ <https://www.coalition-s.org/feedback/>.

¹⁸ In responding to the preliminary report, however, the Local Population Studies Society noted that projects such as digitising a journal’s archive are easier to achieve when the journal or society, rather than a substantial number of dispersed authors, hold the copyright to articles.

whether CC BY is required or merely recommended—is highly important for History stakeholders.

- 2) *‘The Funders will ensure jointly the establishment of robust criteria and requirements for the services that compliant high quality Open Access journals and Open Access platforms must provide.’* Author’s gloss: No mechanism is suggested for establishing these criteria and requirements, nor is the source of funding or process of agreeing criteria mooted. The reference to ‘high quality’ journals and platforms leaves unclear both the status of ‘low quality’ outlets in Plan S policy, and the rationale and process for distinguishing these ostensible quality thresholds. One hopes that ‘high quality’ is intended to refer to journals’ OA platforms, rather than to their content. If not, Principle 2 represents a novel and troubling appropriation by ‘Funders’ of the ability to make quality assessments with respect to individual research publications. Historically, public funders have relied predominantly upon peer review processes, in which researchers themselves play the central roles, to distinguish quality thresholds. Finally, Principle 2 asserts, but does not attest to, the ability of Plan S funders to dictate business models to charities and publishers. **Given the modest proportion of international H&SS research supported by Plan S signatories, and the lack of any stated mechanism to implement this ambitious goal, Principle 2 appears to require significant elaboration and refinement as well as the injection of substantial new financial and personnel resources;**
- 3) *‘In case such high quality Open Access journals or platforms do not yet exist, the Funders will, in a coordinated way, provide incentives to establish and support them when appropriate; support will also be provided for Open Access infrastructures where necessary.’* Author’s gloss: It is very heartening that Principle 3 recognises that insufficient infrastructure may exist to support Plan S. Parts 1, 4 and 5 of this report underline the lack of available compliant OA journals and platforms for History. If Plan S is implemented rapidly and without an injection of substantial resource from UKRI and other Plan S Funders to establish new OA infrastructures, it will pose a serious threat in Britain to the research opportunities and career development of PhD students and Early Career Researchers (ECRs) and likewise to more established researchers funded by Plan S signatories. The navigation of this new terrain by university staff responsible for research training, research planning and research management will, moreover, absorb staff time and institutional resources at an especially challenging juncture in UK higher education. Funding arrangements and fee regimes for taught students are contentious topics in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales in 2019. Brexit mitigation and planning processes now require substantial investments of labour, time and money and entail high levels of institutional risk and uncertainty. UKRI and Research England are newly constituted bodies, lack an established organisational record of achievement and appear to many members of the research community to be inadequately staffed to orchestrate ambitious new programmes (such as Plan S) alongside their existing obligations (such as REF). **Principle 3 acknowledges the need for Plan S Funders to support the creation of OA infrastructures where they are lacking. In History, they are lacking for most researchers. Failure by Plan S Funders such as UKRI to ensure that compliant outlets are available for researchers to publish in prior to Plan S implementation will compromise not only the expansion of OA but also individual research careers and the broader UK research base;**
- 4) *‘Where applicable, Open Access publication fees are covered by the Funders or universities, not by individual researchers; it is acknowledged that all scientists should be able to publish their work Open Access even if their institutions have limited means.’* Author’s gloss: Principle 4 implicitly refers

to two OA publishing models discussed in Part 1 below: APCs (Author Processing Charges, also known as Author Publication Charges) and PAR (Publish and Read) institutional subscriptions to journals. These mechanisms allow authors to publish ‘Gold’ OA articles, that is, to make available to all readers globally, without charge and without any embargo period, the published version of their article. As noted in Part 4, APCs for History journals typically fall in the range of *c.* £1,500-2,200 per article. Principle 4’s clear statement that individual researchers must not be required to pay APCs is very welcome indeed. However, Principle 4’s approach to ‘applicable charges’ is problematic for History (and many H&SS) researchers at multiple levels. **First**, most History research published in journals by researchers in full-time academic employment is not funded by external grants. The data in Part 4 underscore this fact. Any expectation that ‘Funders’ will underwrite APCs for a substantial proportion of History research nationally and internationally rests on a misunderstanding of the History funding landscape. **Second**, Principle 4 assumes that researchers who lack access to OA funding from ‘Funders’ will instead enjoy access to funding from universities. UK universities do not at present provide funding for all (or indeed, for most) History staff to pay for APCs. Given the current exigencies of university finance, there is no obvious internal income stream for APCs for research that is not funded by external grants, unless QR funds are diverted from conducting research toward publishing research. Such a policy of QR cannibalism would enable short-term implementation of Plan S only by feeding on resources now dedicated to undertaking new research projects. **Third**, the population of research-active historians (as revealed by the journals sampled in Part 4 and by the membership rolls of the RHS more broadly) includes many authors who work outside the university sector and without any university affiliation. These include, for example, many local and national archivists and librarians, museum staff and heritage professionals and non-affiliated researchers such as public historians, local historians and family historians. Many ECRs likewise experience periods of employment outside the university sector while they seek to gain employment within it, and/or are employed in teaching only contracts for all or part of their early postdoctoral careers. Emeritus staff in History, moreover, often continue to publish beyond retirement, but typically lack access to institutional resources to pay APCs. Women and ethnic minority researchers are disproportionately concentrated in History in ECR cohorts; like race and gender, age is a protected characteristic under UK equalities legislation. **Principle 4’s assumption that, where publication fees are required, funding bodies and universities will step in to pay them, appears to be based on a fundamental misapprehension of how (and by whom) knowledge in History as a discipline is produced both nationally and internationally. In its current formulation, it is not fit for purpose;**

- 5) *‘When Open Access publication fees are applied, their funding is standardised and capped (across Europe)’.*
Author’s gloss: This statement is quite peculiar. Plan S, as its advocates have been keen to note in public meetings, is a global vision, and will be able to attain its goals only if it operates beyond Europe. In this context, standardisation and capping across Europe alone appears to be anomalous: not all current Plan S Funders are based in or fund projects only in Europe, and cOAlition S’s ambition to include China and the US in particular among its advocates is well known. For UK researchers in February 2019, the question of whether Britain is or is not part of Europe poses further complications. **There is substantial confusion, reflected in Principle 5, as to whether (and in what ways) Plan S implementation will operate nationally, across Europe and/or globally;**

- 6) *‘The Funders will ask universities, research organisations, and libraries to align their policies and strategies, notably to ensure transparency’*. Author’s gloss: The meaning of this principled statement on transparency is opaque. Further, in the UK context, its implementation (once it has been articulated clearly and justified) will be complicated by the fact that universities, research organisations, libraries and charities (including learned societies) fall under the oversight of different regulating bodies and legal frameworks, and that these are typically not aligned. Thus, for example, UKRI and its 9 Research Councils work across the UK university sector while universities’ QR funding is allocated by four national funding bodies (the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales, the Northern Ireland Department for Economy’s Higher Education Division, Research England and the Scottish Funding Council). Oversight of museums, libraries and archives—key research organisations for History—instead falls to the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). In contrast, learned societies that publish journals are typically UK registered charities, and thus answer to the Charities Commissions for England, Northern Ireland and Wales or the Scottish Charity Regulator. **Alignment of policies and strategies across sectors and nations in the UK—much less across Europe and the globe—will require due attention to the distinctive rights, legal obligations and regulatory frameworks under which universities, research organisations, heritage bodies and learned societies operate. Happily, one key piece of legislation—the UK Equality Act 2010, and its Northern Irish equivalents—is shared across the piece in Britain. It will provide an obvious and essential starting point for Plan S implementation in the UK;**
- 7) *‘The above principles shall apply to all types of scholarly publications, but it is understood that the timeline to achieve Open Access for monographs and books may be longer than 1 January 2020’*. Author’s gloss: Open access book mandates are already under active, if as-yet unresolved, discussion in the UK, in response to HEFCE/Research England’s announcement that the REF after REF2021 will mandate OA for a proportion of book submissions. **Given the limited progress achieved to date on the OA book front, and the central place that books occupy in History and H&SS research, it will be essential for Plan S Funders to invest in high quality OA book platforms if this deferred component of Plan S is to enhance, rather than to detract from, the quality of scholarship;**
- 8) *‘The importance of open archives and repositories for hosting research outputs is acknowledged because of their long-term archiving function and their potential for editorial innovation’*. Author’s gloss: **This principle is quite anodyne and without further elaboration does not provide substance for comment;**
- 9) *‘The ‘hybrid’ model of publishing is not compliant with the above principles’*. Author’s gloss: ‘Hybrid’ OA models (in which both ‘Green’ and ‘Gold’ articles cohabit in the same journal) are neither ideal nor unproblematic. They entail staff costs for universities that maintain and monitor the repositories that host their Green content; their embargoes limit instant access to research findings; readers’ access to the Author Accepted Manuscript via hybrid journals is less satisfactory and useful than access to the Version of Record. That said, the development of hybrid journals together with REF Green OA policies have effected a sea-change in UK H&SS journal publication. In a very short interval, hybrid journals have very significantly increased the availability of H&SS OA content, allowing the minority of externally-funded researchers to publish Gold articles alongside the Green content produced by the majority of their peers. These journals and protocols are well-embedded in the UK university sector, place no charge on the individual researcher (in keeping with

Plan S's Principle 4) and are widely accepted by the publishing industry and by learned societies. The rationale for rejecting hybrid model is asserted, but not justified. Nor has cOAlition S made a compelling case for Plan S's required zero embargo period for H&SS research. In a context of fiscal constraints, inadequate infrastructures and limited labour power, it is reasonable, fair and proportionate for government bodies and charities to assess the marginal utility of implementing universal immediate OA uniformly across all disciplines. The author in no way questions the scholarly value and potential public impact of research articles that illuminate (for example) the lives of medieval nuns, trade routes in Qing dynasty China or (in her own case) the impact of imperialism on domestic British culture. However, the urgent need for global audiences to have instant access to these important research findings through Plan S compliant publications may be less than the public good derived from universal access to zero embargo research articles published on (for example) Ebola epidemiology, earthquake early warning systems and electromagnetic shielding. In the UK, the RAE/REF process has always recognised that publication practices and norms differ between broad subject groups: no Panel D (Humanities) discipline, for example, will use citation data to assess research quality in 2021, while all Panel A (Medicine) disciplines are empowered to do so.¹⁹ **The rejection of hybrid models of publishing fails to recognise substantial differences between H&SS and STEMM research and publication practices and fundamentally disrupts the current OA landscape. A cost-benefit analysis is needed to justify this high level of disruption, and the new financial investments it will demand from charities, universities, other research organisations and government bodies;**

- 10) *'The Funders will monitor compliance and sanction non-compliance'*. Author's gloss: Plan S Funders presumably will absorb the main costs of monitoring compliance from the research community, and in future iterations of their documentation will also detail the means by which cOAlition S itself will be monitored and/or sanctioned. **It is salutary to have confirmation that Plan S will not place compliance costs on individual researchers, universities or other research organisations, but unclear both how this goal will be achieved and how cOAlition S itself will be policed.**

The *Guidance on the Implementation of Plan S* issued by cOAlition S in November 2018 notes the need for learned societies to engage with these developments. Its first paragraph asserts that 'cOAlition S recognises that research funders, institutions, researchers, learned societies, librarians, and publishers must work together towards a system of scholarly publishing that is more accessible, efficient, fair, and transparent.'²⁰ This report contributes toward these policy debates on OA implementation for H&SS by outlining areas of the UK publishing landscape of the discipline of History relevant for Plan S, with especial attention to the place of learned societies and their publishing activities.

A detailed examination of the roles played by H&SS learned societies and subject associations is necessary at this juncture because Plan S compliance poses substantial legal, financial and administrative challenges to their operation. It is premature to predict the likely impact of Plan S upon these organisations—including the RHS. Nonetheless, preliminary discussions of the potentially negative impact of Plan S upon H&SS research publications have prompted

¹⁹ https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1084/ref-2019_2-panel-criteria-and-working-methods.pdf, p. 51.

²⁰ https://www.coalition-s.org/wp-content/uploads/271118_cOAlitionS_Guidance.pdf.

participants in policy discussions to ask the fundamental question, ‘What are learned societies for?’ Working primarily from the perspective of a single academic discipline, History, this report briefly surveys existing H&SS OA infrastructures (in Part 1), outlines (in Part 2) the challenges that some OA models are known to pose to H&SS research publication, sketches (in Part 3) the roles played by learned societies in the UK History research landscape, surveys (in Parts 4 and 5) the roles played by History learned societies in journal and book publishing and (in Part 6) offers a preliminary assessment of the potential impacts upon those activities of Plan S as well as noting several ‘known unknowns’ of Plan S that require urgent clarification by its sponsors.

As a learned society dedicated to an evidence-based discipline, the RHS has sought to provide data to inform this key area of policy debate and implementation. Limits of time (the Plan S consultation period is exceptionally short) and personnel (learned societies are organisations that rely substantially on their officers’ voluntary, unpaid labour, undertaken in addition to other full-time employments) significantly restrict the evidence base cited here. However, the data on History research provided in this report are substantially more robust than the evidence adduced in Plan S policy documents. Indeed, the paucity of references in Plan S policies to data on H&SS norms of funding, publication and career structure is a striking, and very concerning, feature of cOAlition S’s public statements to date.²¹ In the context of an agenda established to advance scientific inquiry and knowledge production, the absence of evidence to underpin Plan S policy is especially surprising.

²¹ Sadly, this is also true of the *Future of Scholarly Publishing and Scholarly Communication: Report of the Expert Group to the European Commission*, released on 30 January 2019: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/464477b3-2559-11e9-8d04-01aa75cd71a1>.

1: *History/H&SS in the OA Landscape OA:*

OA publication platforms have proliferated in recent years, and this schematic survey cannot do justice to this vibrant and rapidly evolving publishing landscape. Rather, in the spirit of encouraging History and H&SS researchers unacquainted with OA developments to begin to explore this terrain, it offers a rudimentary roadmap of resources and draws attention to OA platforms currently used by historians which may be of interest to learned societies and their officers. It concludes by outlining obstacles to the development of ‘Gold’ OA platforms for learned society and other H&SS journals that rely on subscriptions for access to their content, specifically the APC and PAR models.

(i) Resources for H&SS OA discussions:

Access to lively debates and accessible, informed commentary on OA relevant for H&SS is readily available. It can (for example) be found in:

- **British Academy and Open Access:** <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/british-academy-and-open-access> : offers informed commentary focused on OA and the H&SS research community;
- **Harvard Open Access Project:** <https://cyber.harvard.edu/research/hoap> : publishes a range of scholarly articles, chapters and blog posts and provides access to online tools;
- **Jisc:** <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/content/open-access> : offers a range of informed Guides on topics relating to OA publishing and compliance;
- **LSE Impact Blog:** <https://twitter.com/LSEImpactBlog> : includes information on OA within the wider higher education policy landscape;
- **Martin Paul Eve:** <https://eve.gd/posts/> : blog posts of Birkbeck Professor and OA champion Martin Eve, ranging across the spectrum of journal and book publication and related policy issues;
- **OLH Advocacy Network:** <https://www.openlibhums.org/news/320/> : resources and discussions designed to create an OA community of ECRs, editors, Humanities scholars, librarians, and other information specialists;
- **Open Scholarship:** <http://libraryblogs.is.ed.ac.uk/openscholarship/tag/open-access/> : Edinburgh University Library blogs on OA issues, with due attention to H&SS;
- **Richard Poynder:** <https://richardpoynder.co.uk/index.html> : robust commentary on OA from an independent journalist;
- **Royal Historical Society Publication & Open Access:** <https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/publication-open-access/> : reports and responses to UK OA policy discussions relevant to historians;
- **Scholarly Kitchen:** <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/> : a moderated blog is sponsored by the Society for Scholarly Publishing. Coverage of Plan S and OA more broadly is already extensive, and spans concerns of H&SS and STEM communities;
- **UKSG Insights:** <https://insights.uksg.org/> : focused on the information community, this blog includes information and debate on a variety of OA issues;

- **Unlocking Research:** <https://unlockingresearch-blog.lib.cam.ac.uk/> : blogs from OA enthusiasts in the University of Cambridge Office of Scholarly Communication including material on OA and Open Research agendas.

(ii) *OA Platforms and History/H&SS:*

Several national and international presses that publish History research in OA formats are listed below. This is an indicative, not a fully comprehensive list. For OA History journal publishing, see Part 4 of this report:

- **ANU Press:** <https://press.anu.edu.au/about-us> : ‘ANU Press is Australia’s first open-access university press. Our authors publish peer-reviewed research on a broad range of topics including Asia and Pacific studies, Australian politics, humanities, arts, Indigenous studies and science. Established in 2003, ANU Press prides itself on its innovation in the area of open-access scholarship. To date, ANU Press has published over 800 publications, all of which are freely available on this website’;
- **Amherst College Press:** <https://acpress.amherst.edu/> : ‘As a digital-first publisher we will look for fields of scholarship better served by the promise multimodal digital platforms than by the inherent limitations of print. We believe that the humanities, no less than the sciences, will benefit from avenues of scholarly communication freed from the boundaries of print—and that such works can be subjected to the same rigorous standards of scholarly evaluation as traditional works’;
- **Humanities Digital Library:** <http://humanities-digital-library.org/index.php/hdl> : ‘The Humanities Digital Library is the open access library and catalogue for books published by the School of Advanced Study, University of London. It forms part of the School’s mission to embrace the opportunities of digital content delivery and enable greater access to knowledge. The Humanities Digital Library is managed by the Institute of Historical Research (IHR) and the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (IALS)’;
- **Open Humanities Press:** <https://openhumanitiespress.org/> : ‘OHP is an international community of scholars, editors and readers with a focus on critical and cultural theory. We have operated as a independent volunteer initiative since 2006, promoting open access scholarship in journals, books and exploring new forms of scholarly communication’;
- **Open Library of the Humanities:** <https://www.openlibhums.org/> : ‘The Open Library of Humanities (OLH) is a charitable organisation dedicated to publishing open access scholarship with no author-facing article processing charges (APCs). We are funded by an international consortium of libraries who have joined us in our mission to make scholarly publishing fairer, more accessible, and rigorously preserved for the digital future’;
- **UCL Press:** <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ucl-press> : ‘UCL Press is the first fully Open Access University Press in the UK. It seeks to use modern technologies and 21st-century means of publishing/dissemination radically to change the prevailing models for the publication of research outputs. Grounded in the Open Science/Open Scholarship agenda, UCL Press will seek to make its published outputs available to a global audience, irrespective of their ability to pay, because UCL believes that this is the best way to tackle global Grand Challenges such as poverty, disease, hunger’;

- **University of Huddersfield Press:** <https://unipress.hud.ac.uk/site/about/> : ‘The University of Huddersfield Press was established in 2007 and has grown to become an open access publisher of high quality research. Our authors and editorial boards bring international research expertise and a strong orientation to practice and real-world application to their publications. The Press is keen to support emerging researchers and foster research communities by providing a platform for developing academic areas’;
- **University of Michigan Press:** <https://www.press.umich.edu/> : ‘At the University of Michigan Press, open access (OA) is one of many ways that we strive to deliver the best scholarship to the broadest possible audience. We work with every author to consider whether and how OA might raise a book’s profile, help it to reach the right audience, fulfill the author’s goals, or comply with the requirements of a funder or institution.’;
- **White Rose University Press:** <https://universitypress.whiterose.ac.uk/> : ‘White Rose University Press (WRUP) is an open access digital publisher of peer-reviewed academic journals and books, publishing across a wide range of academic disciplines. We are run jointly by the Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York but welcome proposals from across the wider academic community.’

The development of Gold OA platforms in H&SS has lagged behind the expansion of Gold OA platforms in STEMM subjects. Why might this be the case? Academics’ instinctive conservatism provides an easy explanation for commentators in the twittersphere, but more considered analyses point to a range of structural and financial impediments that limit the emergence of innovative academic publishing initiatives.²² Charity law moreover requires learned societies to exercise fiscal prudence, and in this context established publishers that have operated successfully for decades or centuries understandably appeal more to trustees than recent entrants on the market that inherently offer more risk and are unable to provide evidence of their ability to maintain their operations in challenging times.

Considerations such as these have worked to make the Article Processing Charge (APC) and Book Processing Charge (BPC) models the predominant means of meeting OA mandates in the UK to date, notwithstanding the known financial challenges they pose to researchers and universities.²³ Access to OA platforms that are Plan S compliant at a volume compatible with the current scale of publishing in H&SS disciplines will clearly demand alternatives to the APC and BPC model which now dominates OA. Publish and Read (PAR) agreements have emerged in the immediate aftermath of the announcement of Plan S as one possible solution to the APC problem for research articles. PAR offers researchers employed by subscribing institutions the right both to read a given publisher’s journal titles and to publish their own accepted research articles in these journals as Gold OA without payment of APCs.²⁴ Preferable at many levels to the APC and BPC paradigm for many university-based H&SS researchers, PAR is however a new mechanism of unknown applicability, access and cost across the research community as a whole.

Parts 2 and 3 of this report identify additional obstacles to full and immediate Plan S implementation that inhere in the discipline-based methodologies and typologies of data, normative patterns of funding, the organisation of labour and the size and legal status of H&SS learned societies. To these factors may be added further aspects of publication that

²² See for example Janneke Adema and Graham Stone, ‘The Surge in New University Presses and Academic-Led Publishing: An Overview of a Changing Publishing Ecology in the UK’, *Liber Quarterly*, 27: 1 (2017), 97-126.

²³ See for example <https://royalhistsoc.org/book-processing-charges/> .

²⁴ For an introduction to PAR and cognate developments, see Lisa Hinchliffe’s <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/01/22/celebrating-30000-open-access-articles/> .

complicate—and render more costly—editorial processes in many History sub-fields, including the density of scholarly referencing relative to most STEMM and many Social Science disciplines, the use of primary and secondary sources written in a wide range of languages and (for earlier time periods) demanding specialised palaeographical skills. Together these considerations—without ruling out the creation of effective OA platforms for History publishing—have impeded their growth at a scale that will make full and immediate implementation of Plan S both challenging and costly.

2: Context: Known Challenges to OA for H&SS:

Plan S raises a number of technical, legal, methodological and philosophical challenges for scholarly publishing conventions in the Humanities, and in several Social Science disciplines. These include significant licensing and copyright issues that have been well known to stakeholders since the publication in 2012 of the Finch Report on OA.²⁵

Plan S requires the replacement of the ‘hybrid’ OA system currently accepted by UK and European research councils with Gold OA or zero embargo Green publication. That is, Plan S requires UK research council and Wellcome Trust funded scientists (including historians) to publish their outputs in journals or online platforms that make the Version of Record (VoR) of all of their research articles available to all readers globally from the date of publication without any charge (Gold OA) or to publish the Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version of articles with no embargo period (Plan S compliant Green OA). This new mandate differs from current UK OA requirements, which allow journals and learned societies to protect their subscription bases by limiting access to the VoR or AAM for specified periods (typically 12-24 months for H&SS) for non-subscribing individual readers or institutions (Green OA). For a transition period of 3 years, journals that have committed to embrace Plan S’s strictures can maintain their ‘hybrid’ status, publishing both ‘compliant’ and non-compliant articles.

This section of the report briefly outlines the key challenges hitherto encountered by H&SS disciplines such as History in the context of OA mandates. It is not intended to offer a comprehensive discussion of highly complex issues that have been detailed elsewhere.²⁶ Rather, it provides readers unfamiliar with the obstacles Gold OA has historically posed for H&SS researchers with a short introduction to the key issues in play.

(i) *Data:*

The data and evidence collected and interpreted in H&SS research are highly diverse. They include, but are not confined to, written texts (manuscript, printed and digital), media (films and television programmes as well as social media), physical objects (including artworks, museum collections and built environments), live and recorded performances, oral testimonies and datasets (census returns, legal and military records, economic statistics and the like). Where ethnographic data has been gathered, for example through oral histories, H&SS researchers recognise the salience of social relationships that entail ethical duties and legal responsibilities.²⁷ Regardless of the nature of the data deployed, the form as well as the substance of argumentation is integral to History research publications, and jointly inform assessments of scholarly excellence.

One challenge to Plan S implementation is that access to/publication of H&SS data is often restricted by 3rd party rights. Examples include many images held by UK and international public museums, libraries and archives and in private collections; literary texts and private correspondence held by public repositories and in private collections; and musical scores in both

²⁵ *Accessibility, Sustainability, Excellence: How to Expand Access to Research Publications*: <https://www.acu.ac.uk/research-information-network/finch-report-final> .

²⁶ See for example the British Academy’s successive reports, commentaries and debates, available from: <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/british-academy-and-open-access> .

²⁷ See for example the statement of the European Association of Social Anthropologists: <https://easaonline.org/downloads/support/EASA%20statement%20on%20data%20governance.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0cOKlrgWbCYCCa5NmHrU7t57UXQ0nHYHHpILvISVKtOSIxS8sArv15B-4> .

private and public repositories. UK national institutions under the oversight of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)—including several national archives, libraries and museums—have (with DCMS approval) marketised these assets in the context of diminishing Grant in Aid from the Treasury.

Inclusion of these types of data in research articles and books (for example, the reproduction of images and/or extended citations from texts or musical scores) is often integral to H&SS scholarship. However, third party rights often prohibit or problematise compliance with Gold OA requirements for H&SS researchers. Not all rights holders allow Gold OA publication of the data they control; charges applied by rights holders who are willing to agree to Gold OA can be prohibitive; some rights holders permit only use of low resolution images (below the standard resolution used by scholarly publishers) for OA publications to protect their property or income. Permissions granted for academic use are often time-limited (for example, for 5 years) rather than granted in perpetuity, raising the cost of use and complicating licencing agreements. CC BY licences (the default licence for Plan S) cannot be obtained from all H&SS data rights holders—some chose to exercise and/or profit from their established legal rights in these materials and thus refuse to allow researchers to circulate them freely.²⁸ It is notable that whereas REF OA mandates acknowledge these well-known issues by explicitly accepting CC BY ND in lieu of CC BY, Plan S does not.

(ii) Funding

H&SS research outputs in the UK are supported by a mixed economy of multiple public, charitable and private funding streams. Comprehensive data on the proportion of H&SS research that is funded by each of the different components of this mixed economy are not available. As a discipline, History is moreover both large and highly diverse. As attested by the ‘Environment’ statements submitted by universities for assessment in REF2014, the 83 History Units of Assessment (UoAs) submitted in REF2014 included both many small subject groups located in larger multi-disciplinary departments or schools which rely overwhelmingly on REF-derived income for their research funding and several large departments and faculties of History whose staff enjoy access to substantial additional research funds from sources such as institutional endowments. Broadly, however, across these institutions as a whole, four major funding streams support History research in the UK: 1) self-funding by the individual researcher, 2) institutional/Higher Education Institution (HEI) funding, 3) charitable/philanthropic funding and 4) national and international research councils.²⁹ The data on article publication presented in Part 4 suggests that funding by Plan S signatories (such as the UK research councils, the ERC and the Wellcome Trust) provides support for only a modest portion of History research costs for outputs in scholarly journals. Likewise History researchers outside the UK appear to rely very substantially on non-Plan S sources of funding—including substantial levels of self-funding—for the research that underpins their article publications.

OA mandates and financial support for OA publication vary significantly both between and within these four major funding streams and across different universities. OA mandates which shift the cost of OA from the reader to the author pose significant challenges to Historians and H&SS

²⁸ See the discussion of these issues, and a glossary of key terms (including CC BY) in the Royal Historical Society’s report of March 2018, *The UK Scholarly Communications Licence: What it is, and why it matters for the Arts & Humanities*, esp. 14-16: <https://royalhistsoc.org/ukscl/>.

²⁹ Data from REF 2014 Environment statements suggest that a relatively small proportion of History research in the UK is also funded by business and industry.

researchers more broadly given this funding environment. In History, these challenges stretch across the career life cycle from PhD researchers to emeritus staff but appear to be especially problematic for early career researchers (ECRs).

Self-funding: This form of research funding is widely pervasive in History, and in H&SS more broadly, in sharp contrast to many STEM disciplines. At the onset of new research careers, it includes self-funding of PhD fees, maintenance and/or research costs. Of 56 History Department postgraduate research (PhD) students registered at UCL in January 2019, for example, only 9 (16.1%) were funded by UK research councils or the Wellcome Trust, whereas 32 (57.1%) were self-funded.³⁰ Self-funding at PhD level does not preclude researchers in History from subsequently entering academic employment and developing successful research careers.

Early career postdoctoral research in H&SS is also characterised by substantial precarity and by periods of self-funding. ECR postdoctoral historians are often employed on successive and/or multiple fixed-term HEI contracts (with or without intervening periods of non-academic employment). Much ECR self-funded postdoctoral research—including research centred on the publication of articles and books—is undertaken by university staff not employed on research contracts, for example, early career teaching fellows. Many teaching fellowships and other fixed-term ECR contracts are part-time and/or extend for less than 12 months, requiring research undertaken by ECRs (eager to gain permanent research contracts by building their publication profiles) to be largely or wholly self-funded.³¹ The very dim view that the RHS takes of prevalent HEI practices with respect to fixed-term contracts for ECRs is stated clearly in our Code of Good Practice, which Plan S Funders and HEI senior managers will also wish to consider in the context of Plan S implementation.³²

At many institutions, even staff in permanent posts and at senior levels self-fund portions of their research due to the limited extent of their institutions' support for travel to archives and libraries—an essential component of many historians' scholarship—and/or travel to conferences. As attested by REF2014 Environment submissions, annual staff research allowances (derived from Quality Related [QR] funding from UK government funding bodies) for historians are often modest. Several submissions record annual allocations of £500 or less for all research expenses; others make no mention of any institutional assistance for these costs.³³

Self-funded research carries no OA mandate. As noted in Part 4 (Table 1), below, History Gold APCs typically range from c. £1,600-2,000 per article. History Gold BPCs typically range from

³⁰ Statistics provided by Professor Adam Smith: funding bodies were: Chilean government (1), Japanese government (1), Swiss government (1), Thai government (1), Wellcome Trust (1), Wolfson Trust (3), UCL fellowships (4), AHRC (8). Additionally, 1 student had part-funding from an employer. The 32 self-funding students lack funding for fees and maintenance; some are in receipt of small amounts of research expenses funding from learned societies and other philanthropic organisations.

³¹ Self-funding is also evident in research conducted by both fixed-term and permanent staff who work beyond their contracted hours, a practice that the available data for UK History suggests is both pervasive and highly gendered, with 51.7% of surveyed women in 2018 and 37% of surveyed men, for example, reporting that they had given up periods of annual leave to accommodate their workloads. See Royal Historical Society, *Promoting Gender Equality in UK History: A Second Report and Recommendations for Good Practice* (RHS, 2018), esp. 40-41: <https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/gender-equality/>.

³² <https://royalhistsoc.org/early-career-historians/>.

³³ Examples can be found in the Environment statements available from [https://results.ref.ac.uk/\(S\(gt4b2wtiac0phscbwuj3rsy1\)\)/Results/ByUoa/30](https://results.ref.ac.uk/(S(gt4b2wtiac0phscbwuj3rsy1))/Results/ByUoa/30). For Anglia Ruskin, for example, the standard maximum is £500 per annum (Anglia Ruskin, page 3). For Chester, where 20% of QR is expended on Impact activities, the annual allocation is £450 (Chester, page 3).

£5,000-10,000, plus VAT per book.³⁴ The high cost of APCs and BPCs typically precludes Gold OA for self-funded historical research.³⁵

Institutional (HEI) funding: Institutional funding for History research derives from multiple sources. Its core component is QR funding from the UK government based on the results of the REF. At some—but by no means all—UK universities, QR is augmented by income derived (for example) from international student fees, and/or revenues from alumni and other philanthropic donations and endowments. Some postdoctoral research fellowship schemes in History and H&SS more broadly are funded by HEIs or by their Departments, Faculties or Colleges from these sources. In the Leverhulme Trust’s Early Career Research Fellowship scheme, which requires 50% HEI matched funding, HEI resources are combined with charitable or philanthropic funding to co-fund H&SS ECR research.

Very few of these institutional funders—fee paying students, alumni donors and most charities, for example—expect, require or financially support Gold OA publication of the H&SS research they fund. UK universities, however, in keeping with REF2021 guidelines for generating QR from outputs, typically require a minimum of Green OA for affiliated researchers’ journal articles and conference proceedings. HEI funding for Gold OA in H&SS is limited, patchy and anecdotally reported to be diminishing. An as-yet unspecified proportion of H&SS books, currently exempt from both Green and Gold OA publication, will be subject to new REF OA mandates from 1 January 2021. The fit/disparity between these new REF mandates and Plan S is at present unknown.

Charitable and philanthropic funding: History research conducted in the UK is supported by a wide range of national and international trusts, foundations, learned societies and institutions, some large (the UK Leverhulme, Wellcome and Wolfson Trusts and the US Mellon Foundation, for example) and others (including many learned societies) much more modest in scope. Wellcome Trust funding is available only for Medical Humanities (including medical history), a numerically limited portion of the wider historical discipline.

Funding from these charities and from the British Academy (BA) and Institute of Historical Research (IHR)—two institutions that combine government and charitable income streams—underpins historical research in several key ways. Both the Wellcome and Wolfson Trusts fund H&SS PhD studentships. History/H&SS research activities supported by a very wide range of national and international charitable bodies include financial support for travel to archives and libraries (historians’ laboratories), travel to deliver preliminary research findings at national and international conferences, funding for conference and workshop organisation, ECR postdoctoral fellowships, collaborative research networks and major (individual and collaborative) research projects, visiting fellowships that send UK researchers abroad/bring international researchers to the UK, funds that pay for access to data (such as images) controlled by third-party rights holders, and subsidies for prizes that recognise high calibre articles and books. As noted in Part 3 below, History learned societies are active across many of these areas of research funding.

Among major UK charitable and philanthropic funders, only the Wellcome Trust (a Plan S signatory) mandates OA publication for History, for which it also offers financial subventions.

³⁴ The RHS’s recent survey of History BPCs can be found at: <https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/publication-open-access/>.

³⁵ Of the articles in the sample in Part 4 below, no Gold OA articles appear to have been self-funded.

National and international research councils: For UK historians, the main research funding bodies are the Arts & Humanities Research Council (AHRC), the Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC) and (through March 2019) the European Research Council (ERC). All three bodies fund both PhD studentships and postdoctoral research projects in History/H&SS. AHRC funding very substantially outweighs ESRC funding for History.³⁶ Under the aegis of UKRI, both AHRC and ESRC participate in cross-council funding initiatives, for which Historians are also eligible. Access to ERC funding, which will lapse when the UK leaves the EU in March 2019 unless a separate government agreement is made to pay for continued membership as an EU affiliate, includes several schemes in which UK historians have received funding.

The AHRC, ESRC and ERC currently mandate Green OA (as a minimum) for journal publications supported by their grants. Under Plan S, from 1 January 2020 they will mandate Gold OA publication for journal articles or, failing Gold OA, Green OA with no embargo period or publication in journals with approved contracts to convert to Gold OA within three years. It is not yet clear whether this reform will apply only to new grants awarded or begun from 1 January 2020 or retrospectively applied to ongoing research projects.³⁷

What proportion of UK research in History is funded by these four main revenue streams? As with H&SS funding more broadly, learned societies lack access to fully comprehensive data to answer this question. In Part 4 below, data from History journals provide one proxy for estimating the proportions of research articles published in a small sample of UK History journals that derive from research projects funded by current Plan S signatories and by other charitable/philanthropic funders. These very provisional data suggest that less than 15% of History articles published in most UK journals are funded by Plan S signatories. History journal articles appear predominantly to be funded instead by QR and/or other HEI institutional funding and/or by charities that are not Plan S signatories and/or are self-funded.

(iii) Methodology and Reproducibility:

The research methodologies employed by historians range from forms of qualitative interpretation rooted in the Humanities (in which the distinctive ‘voice’ of the individual researcher is typically highly prized) to quantitative research based on social scientific methods and the interpretation of ‘big’ data. Some History researchers span this full methodological range, but many cluster within contiguous segments on this broad spectrum. Books (authored monographs, edited collections of research chapters and scholarly editions) play a primary role in History research publication, followed by journal articles: in REF2014, 59.7% of outputs entered by History Units of Assessment (UoAs) were books or portions of books, 38.4% were journal articles and 1.9% were in other formats (such as exhibitions, datasets and web content).³⁸

³⁶ At a meeting between several History learned societies and representatives of the AHRC and ESRC held at the IHR on 3 December 2018, the AHRC presented data on its Research Grants for History from 1 October 2017 to 30 September 2018. In this period, 117 History applications were made to the AHRC and 37 (32%) were funded. ESRC data for the period 1 October 2017 to 31 October 2018, in contrast, reported only 8 History (Social & Economic History) applications, of which 5 were rejected and 3 were in process of review.

³⁷ <https://www.coalition-s.org/feedback/>, point 5.

³⁸ A total of 6,458 outputs were entered for History: 2,071 authored books, 262 edited books, 1,464 chapters in books, 59 scholarly editions (3,856 in total), 2,479 journal articles and 123 ‘other’ outputs. See pages 51-52 of the Panel D Overview Report: <https://www.ref.ac.uk/2014/media/ref/content/expanel/member/Main%20Panel%20D%20overview%20report.pdf>.

Although many UK historians now conduct at least some of their research in collaborative teams supported by external funders, a substantial proportion of research in the discipline is published by individual researchers who lack access to significant external research funding. For both journal articles and books, it is in consequence usual for outputs to have single authors; it is unusual for History outputs to have more than two named authors, an obvious difference from most STEM disciplines. Research excellence, as understood by REF assessors and by the wider international discipline of History, can be attained through individual research predicated on institutional funds, individual research supported by charitable funders or research councils or externally-funded collaborative scholarship. It can also result from research undertaken outside universities and/or in the absence of institutional support. Many UK historians engage in all four of these broad types of research activity, either across their careers as a whole or within specific portions of their career. This mixed model of scholarship, normative both nationally and internationally, adds significantly to the challenges posed by Plan S for historians.

Reproducibility of data is central to many STEM disciplines and underpins many arguments for Gold OA, as the Wellcome Trust's policy statements on OA and open science for example attest.³⁹ Focused on biomedicine, the prevailing discussions fostered by the Trust on reproducibility, open data and the imperative need to diminish research misconduct make fundamental assumptions about the conduct of 'science' that take no cognisance of H&SS research methodologies, or of the nature and purpose of 'reproducibility' in H&SS disciplines such as History. In History, referencing systems have been developed over decades which underpin readers'/users' ability to track with confidence not only historical 'facts' and evidence but also historians' distinctive interpretations of this evidence, by a carefully-calibrated reference to a specified source. These established referencing mechanisms are essential to 'Reproducibility' in historical analysis and in the historiographical framing of research questions in our discipline. These scholarly practices are threatened by OA mandates that require CC BY licenses and interdict CC BY ND licences. CC BY allows the interpretations offered by OA authors to be changed/reconfigured when they are cited—a practice that runs directly counter to accepted scholarly best practice in H&SS disciplines such as History.⁴⁰ Whereas Gold OA is understandably heralded by researchers in biomedicine as an antidote to research malpractice, it is (likewise understandably) perceived by many Humanities scholars to offer an open door to research misconduct in the form of plagiarism.⁴¹

(iv) Summary:

As has been both well recognised and well documented since the publication of the Finch Report in 2012, H&SS research funding and the distinctive nature of H&SS research methodologies and outputs render the types of OA protocols now imposed by Plan S—especially its default use of CC BY and the banning of all Plan S sponsor-funded research in hybrid journals—highly problematic for disciplines such as History. The predominant reliance of most historians on sources of research funding other than grants from Plan S signatories significantly exacerbates this challenge. Plan S documentation currently (8 February 2019) displays little recognition of the structure or content of H&SS research and offers few concrete

³⁹ <https://acmedsci.ac.uk/reproducibility-update/>.

⁴⁰ See the '“Worked example” for historians' of CC BY creative re-use on pages 7-9 of the 2018 RHS paper on UKSCLC, which also discusses the pedagogic implications of such usage for History taught programmes: <https://5hm1h4aktue2uejbs1hsqt31-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/UK-SCL-March-2018.pdf>.

⁴¹ See for example the arguments of Peter Mandler in <https://poynder.blogspot.com/2018/12/the-oa-interviews-peter-mandler.html>.

solutions to address the longstanding, known legal and methodological obstacles to mandating Gold OA in H&SS. Green OA with zero embargo, the escape clause the Plan S Gold, is largely untested in the H&SS journals market.

Learned societies, which are substantial sponsors and publishers of scholarly articles and books in History (and in H&SS more broadly) are placed in an especially difficult position in this context. Registered charities that typically span academic and 'public' memberships, they have research agendas that have evolved over decades of engagement with diverse communities of historians. As Part 3 suggests, learned societies are not well-positioned to absorb or subsidise the new costs (of time, labour and financial input) required for Plan S implementation. For, although Plan S invites them to bear the full costs of converting from hybrid to Plan S compliant OA, learned societies (unlike HEIs) receive no direct government funding or other subsidies from Plan S subscribers which might allow them to do so, or to sustain this transition over time. These new demands will need to be balanced by learned society trustees against their financial obligations under UK charity law.

3: UK History Learned Societies & Subject Associations:

Exclusive of local and county-based historical societies, there are over 40 UK-based learned societies or subject associations that are either predominantly historical in their focus or include a substantial, scholarly History focus/membership **AND** which publish a journal and/or book series.⁴² Many of these societies are discipline or sub-discipline specific (focusing on History or a sub-field within History, defined either topically, methodologically, regionally or chronologically). However, interdisciplinary societies also play a central role in supporting UK History, and are especially significant for historical research and publication framed by Area Studies approaches (African Studies, American Studies, Asian Studies, and Slavonic and East European Studies, for example). At least a dozen UK-based interdisciplinary societies that publish journals and/or book series include substantial numbers of historians within their memberships.

The exclusion of most local History societies from consideration is a serious short-coming of this report, unavoidably resulting from the very short duration of the consultation period. Many academic historians engage actively with and promote the research activities of these organisations. The extent to which Plan S OA requirements would limit their ability to undertake research in conjunction with unfunded, voluntary members of local history societies, family history societies, local antiquarian societies and local record societies remains to be explored.⁴³ The potential impact of Plan S on projects such as (for example) the Victoria County History (established in 1899 and currently based at the IHR, published by Boydell & Brewer) will require critical attention by historians during the UKRI consultation on Plan S.⁴⁴

The sections below explain and contextualise the definition of learned society used in this report, provide a preliminary indication of the number and membership of national and international UK History learned societies and subject associations, and outline their function within the UK research environment.

(i) History Learned Societies and Their Contexts:

Definitions: The report uses the terms ‘learned society’ and ‘subject association’ interchangeably. These categories encompass a wide and variegated array of organisations, which differ in size, constituency, type and mode of membership and activities. The organisations discussed here share, however, a common goal of promoting and enhancing the study of the past in and—in many cases—substantially beyond UK universities. In addition to their academic members, many of these societies benefit from the active engagement of archivists and librarians, museum and heritage professionals, school teachers and other ‘lay’ historians. Their activities include substantial elements of public engagement.

‘History’ in this document predominantly refers to the scholarly study of the past from the early medieval ages to the present. This definition comports with the distinction between ‘Classics’ and ‘History’ observed in REF exercises. It excludes from consideration here several journals supported by Classics learned societies which share many characteristics with the History journals

⁴² Given the focus of this report on Plan S, societies which publish neither a journal nor books—for example, the British Association for Victorian Studies—have (their valuable contribution to historical scholarship notwithstanding) been excluded from consideration here.

⁴³ A comprehensive list of these organisations is lacking, but the RHS listing notes many of these societies: <https://royalhistsoc.org/publications/national-regional-history/> . Hertfordshire alone has at least 40 such societies: <http://www.local-history.co.uk/Groups/herts.html> .

⁴⁴ For VCH, see <https://www.victoriacountyhistory.ac.uk/> .

discussed in this report. These include for example the *Journal of Roman Studies* (Cambridge University Press, for the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies), the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (Cambridge University Press, for the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies) and the *Classical Quarterly* (Cambridge University Press for the Classical Association).⁴⁵ However, some learned societies and their associated journals and book series cross this chronological and topical divide. Like interdisciplinary organisations and outlets with substantial historical membership or content, they are included in the discussion of ‘History’ where appropriate.

Numbers:

The UK Arts & Humanities Alliance (AHA) numbers 4 History learned societies and subject associations among its 42 current member organisations: the British Society for the History of Science, the Economic History Society, the Oral History Society and the Royal Historical Society.⁴⁶ Including the 4 affiliates of the AHA, the report has identified a total of 42 UK learned societies that focus on History **AND** publish research journals and/or book series. Appendix I lists the national History organisations that match these two-fold criteria.⁴⁷

The combined UK and international membership of History learned societies is unknown, but evidently numbers in the thousands. For example, in 2018-19 there were 130 members of the Society for the Study of French History, 144 members of the History of Education Society (UK), 356 members of the Society for Social History of Medicine, 800 members of the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1,221 members of the Economic History Society, 4,200 members of the Royal Historical Society and 6,054 members of the Historical Association. Some individuals, of course, belong to more than one UK History learned society. For comparison, in the selective REF2014, excluding historians returned in UoAs other than History (such as Area Studies), 1,786 FTE historians were submitted by the 83 submitting HEI History UoAs.⁴⁸

Many societies’ membership are international: roughly 30% of RHS members, for example, are not domiciled in the UK, and this is likewise the case for the History of Education Society. UK History society members include both university-based academics at all career stages and researchers based in organisations such as museums and heritage bodies, several of which the AHRC recognises as Independent Research Organisations (IROs).⁴⁹ Funding to support the payment of APCs and BPCs by staff in these institutions who hold research council and/or Wellcome Trust awards (but who typically work in organisations under DCMS rather than UKRI oversight) will require serious attention in the Plan S implementation process. Likewise, the inclusion or exclusion of these researchers in PAR agreements will have important implications for their ability to publish their research in ‘flipped’ journals. Societies such as the Local Population Studies Society—which originated in a ‘citizen science’ project that crowdsourced parish register

⁴⁵ Many thanks to Helen Lovatt for this information.

⁴⁶ <http://artsandhums.org/affiliates/> .

⁴⁷ This list was compiled by cross-referencing the RHS lists of societies with journals in the IHR.

⁴⁸ Panel D overview report, p. 50: <https://www.ref.ac.uk/2014/panels/paneloverviewreports/> .

⁴⁹ A full list of current IROs can be accessed from: <https://www.ukri.org/funding/how-to-apply/eligibility/> .

IROs with significant numbers of historians include: the British Film Institute, British Library, British Museum, Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, Historic Environment Scotland, Historic Royal Palaces, Imperial War Museum, Museum of London Archaeology, National Archives, National Gallery, National Maritime Museum, National Museum Wales, National Museums Liverpool, National Museums Scotland, National Portrait Gallery, Natural History Museum, Science Museums Group, Tate and the Victorian & Albert Museum. Oversight of most of these organisations lies with DCMS, which does not subscribe to Plan S, and indeed encourages organisations under its aegis to marketise their data as an income stream in the context of diminishing government Grant in Aid, in clear opposition to the open science goals of cOAlition S.

data for the Cambridge Group for the History of Population & Social Structure—identify the publication of non-academic research alongside academic outputs as core aims. History is a broad church, and the discipline encompasses many non-affiliated researchers whose interests must be considered in the Plan S implementation process.

Interdisciplinary context:

In addition to (or instead of) membership in UK History learned societies, many UK historians belong to interdisciplinary learned societies and/or publish their research in interdisciplinary journals and book series. Roughly a quarter of the interdisciplinary learned societies affiliated with the UK Arts & Humanities Alliance, for example, include historians. Appendix II lists the 12 UK-based interdisciplinary scholarly societies identified to date which include historians **AND** publish/sponsor scholarly journals and/or book series.

Together, these 54 discipline-based and interdisciplinary organisations represent the minimum number of UK learned societies that meet two threshold criteria: 1) they sponsor/publish research articles and books in the discipline of History, **AND** 2) they sponsor/publish outputs by UK-based researchers to whom Plan S article and/or book mandates will, when that research is funded by a Plan S signatory, apply.

Wider UK institutional context:

Historical research and publication in the UK is further supported by two national research institutions that receive both UK government and charitable funding. The Institute of Historical Research (IHR), part of the University of London's School of Advanced Study (SAS) is the sole UK discipline-specific government funded scholarly national organisation for the support of historical research.⁵⁰ It has an especially significant role in ECR training. Its journal, *Historical Research*, was established (as the *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*) in 1923 and is currently published by Wiley-Blackwell.⁵¹

The UK government funded interdisciplinary scholarly society for Humanities and Social Science research is the British Academy (BA), which includes many historians among its Fellows. The BA sponsors books with Oxford University Press in its *Proceedings of the British Academy* series.⁵² Further, the BA funds the British Institute in East Africa (based in Nairobi), which sponsors a journal published by Routledge that includes historical research, the *Journal of Eastern Africa Studies*.

Historical research in the UK is further enriched by organisations such as the Learned Society of Wales, the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and the London-based German Historical Institute (part of the Max Weber Foundation).⁵³

Wider international Context:

Although this report focuses on History in the UK, it is vital to recognise that—as the British Academy's funding of a research institute in Africa, for example, makes clear—H&SS scholarship is an international science. Historians are active members of wider international scholarly networks in which OA publication is neither advocated nor financially supported. Many UK-based

⁵⁰ <https://www.history.ac.uk/> .

⁵¹ <https://www.history.ac.uk/publications/historical-research/about-historical-research> .

⁵² <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/proceedings-british-academy> .

⁵³ See <https://www.learnedsociety.wales/> , <https://www.rse.org.uk/funding-awards/> , and <https://www.ghil.ac.uk/home.html> .

historians, indeed, are members of discipline-based and interdisciplinary learned societies and subject associations based outside the UK: the incoming President Elect of the US-based Sixteenth Century Studies Society, for example, is a UK historian based at Oxford Brookes University.

Like British subject associations, many non-UK scholarly organisations publish journals and or book series. To cite US-based learned societies alone, these societies include, for example, the African Studies Association (publisher of both *African Studies Review* and *History in Africa*), the American Historical Association (publisher of the *American Historical Review*), the Associations for Asian Studies (publisher of the *Journal of Asian Studies* as well as the ‘Key Issues in Asian Studies’ book series), the North American Conference on British Studies (publisher of the *Journal of British Studies*) and the Renaissance Society of America (publisher of the *Renaissance Quarterly*). There is an obvious tension between Plan S’s entirely laudable goal of enhancing global access to UK and European scholarship and the fact that neither funders nor universities in substantial portions of the globe—most notably, North America and much of the Global South—understand or support the technical requirements and financial costs entailed by Plan S compliance.

(ii) Learned Societies’ Structures & Functions:

Societies for the study of historical topics date from the eighteenth century in the UK: the oldest UK History societies are antiquarian associations established in England and Scotland in the eighteenth century. The nineteenth century saw History emerge from this antiquarian base, whilst still retaining links to non-academic research that have been significantly enhanced in the past decade or so by the tremendous upsurge in popular participation in local and family history and (within the university sector) by the REF Impact agenda. The twentieth century saw a significant increase in the establishment of national History learned societies and subject associations in the UK, with the period after WWII experiencing an acceleration of this trend. Unsurprisingly given this extended genealogy, twenty-first-century History learned societies and their memberships vary substantially, and the survey below cannot do justice to this vibrant landscape of voluntary research endeavour.

History Learned Society Organisation/Structure/Finance:

As the membership figures cited above demonstrate, there is substantial variation in the size of different UK History learned societies. No single model of governance, staffing or finance prevails among these varied organisations.⁵⁴ However, a few generic features provide contextual information for analysis of the potential impact of Plan S. The **governance** of History learned societies is typically undertaken by unpaid elected officers, most of whom are academic employees of UK HEIs and conduct their learned society duties in addition to their normal full-time academic employment. This governance structure, like learned society staffing levels, places significant limits on societies’ ability to respond effectively to Plan S proposals within the timescales currently mooted for consultation and implementation. Participation in preliminary pilot studies would have afforded them sufficiently more scope for meaningful engagement. Funded pilot studies early in the UK implementation process would be very welcome.

Paid staff members are relatively few in number in learned societies and often work part-time. In January 2019, for example, RHS staffing comprised 1 full-time permanent member of staff, one 0.6 FTE permanent member of staff, one 0.6 FTE fixed-term member of staff and occasional

⁵⁴ Evidence for this paragraph has been derived from society websites and the author’s personal communications with society officers.

hourly paid staff. Smaller learned societies rely either on more modest staffing or on volunteer officers' unpaid labour alone. In January 2019, for example, the Society for the Study of French History's activities were supported entirely by unpaid officers' labour; the website of the Society for Social History of Medicine makes no reference to salaried staff members.

The **finances** of History UK learned societies likewise vary widely, both in scale and revenue sources. Annual membership fees are typically bundled with societies' individual journal subscriptions, complicating assessments of their respective costs. In responding to the author's interim report, several societies noted that they derive more than half of their income from their journal subscriptions. It is important to underline at the outset that learned societies are not profit-making business organisations. The revenues they derive from publication are **both** significantly more modest than those of the commercially-published STEMM journals whose profits have hitherto driven and dominated debates on OA journal publication **and** are used to promote their wide-ranging charitable aims, including significant support for History in schools, PhD students and ECRs, scholarly conferences, policy engagement and public History. The cost (January 2019) of individual membership of the Economic History Society, including a subscription to its *Economic History Review*, is £21/\$39, with a discounted cost of £10.50 for UK and EU students.⁵⁵ Nor are institutional subscriptions for History journals as a whole or for History learned society journals as a subset priced at excessive levels. The institutional cost of bundled on-line and print subscriptions for sampled UK History learned society journals in March 2018 ranged from £100 to £491 per annum. In contrast, bundled institutional subscriptions to STEMM journals, for example *Epidemiology* (£852) and the *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* (£4,372), were substantially higher.⁵⁶

Donations from individuals and from other charities (including other UK History societies) provide another income stream, as do royalties and other payments associated with societies' publication activities and (for larger societies) income from investment portfolios.⁵⁷ It is not possible at this time to estimate what proportion of learned societies' annual revenues typically derive from their publications. Anecdotal evidence—which may be inaccurate and should be treated with healthy scepticism at this time—suggests that this proportion varies widely, but is typically higher for smaller and more recently established societies.

Research Activities of History Learned Societies, exclusive of publication:

History learned societies engage in 'cradle to publication' research support, but typically focus their financial investment on History PhD students and ECRs, the career stage in the discipline in which self-funding and partial research funding as well as periods of non-academic employment tend to be especially acute. Many societies support doctoral and ECR postdoctoral researchers financially. Many also organise conferences, workshops, symposiums and/or training sessions. Most offer prizes or awards that recognise excellence in research and/or wider contributions to the discipline of History. Some host libraries, archives and collections. Several engage in policy work, for

⁵⁵ <http://www.ehs.org.uk/membership/join-the-society.html>.

⁵⁶ See the Appendix (page 16) of Finn and Fisher's 2018 RHS paper on the UK Scholarly Communications Licence for these and other subscription costs: <https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/publication-open-access/>. Given that research articles in History and other H&SS journals are commonly used as teaching resources at both undergraduate and MA level in the UK, any assessment of their value for money would need to take account of their role in supporting the research-based pedagogy that HEIs feature so prominently in their Teaching Exercise Framework (TEF) and other documentation.

⁵⁷ The financial accounts of the RHS for the year ending 2018 can be accessed from: <https://5hm1h4aktue2uejbs1hsqt31-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Royal-Historical-Society-2017-2018-Signed-Accounts.pdf>.

example contributing to consultations on education in schools, higher education issues, research funding and heritage. A synoptic overview with a small number of illustrative examples is offered below. Abundant additional information can be accessed from the websites of the organisations listed in Appendix I and Appendix II.

Activities related to postgraduate and ECR researchers: Funding to support UK postgraduate students and/or ECR researchers is offered by many History learned societies. The most common forms of bursaries are provided to allow these individuals to conduct archival or library research and/or to deliver research findings at conferences nationally or internationally and/or to organise research events such as conferences and workshops. An indicative list of societies that offer such bursaries includes the African Studies Association of the UK (ASAUUK, supporting travel to its annual conference for African PhD students and ECRs), British American Nineteenth Century Historians (BrANCH), the British Society for the History of Science, the Design History Society, the Economic History Society, the German History Society, the RHS, the Society for the History of Alchemy and Chemistry, the Society for the Study of French History, the Society for the Study of Labour History and the Social History Society. In the financial year ending 20 June 2017, the RHS, for example, disbursed £41,848 to 162 individuals through such schemes; in the year ending 30 June 2018 it disbursed £47,809 to 145 History PhD students and ECR researchers.⁵⁸ The History of Education Society annually provides financial support for the European Educational Research Association's History of Education Doctoral Summer School. The Selden Society currently funds one 3-year PhD studentship (the Milsom studentship for English Legal History) every three years.

Training events for PhD students and ECRs are orchestrated and subsidised by several History learned societies, and society websites also host online training resources designed to provide PhD students and ECRs with open access to discipline-based or interdisciplinary expertise. Topics include guidance on conducting research in archives and libraries (for example, 'Using Archives and Resources in the Former Soviet Union', British Society for Slavonic & East European Studies),⁵⁹ as well as advice on publishing in peer-reviewed journals, publishing first books, open access publication policies, and job applications/ interviews.⁶⁰ The British Society for the History of Science offers training in public engagement by funding month-long placements for postgraduate students in heritage organisations and museums.⁶¹ The annual training events organised by the Women's Committee of the Economic History Society include many PhD students and ECRs. The Social History Society's three online 'Exchange' forums (Community, Teaching and Research), although not restricted to PhD students and ECRs, feature their contributions prominently, as recent Research Exchange content demonstrates.⁶²

Many History learned societies offer prizes that recognise excellence in PhD student and/or ECR publications. Peer-reviewed article and/or book prizes are for example offered by the British

⁵⁸ Annual Accounts for year ending 30 June 2018, page 5: <https://5hm1h4aktue2uejbs1hsqt31-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Royal-Historical-Society-2017-2018-Signed-Accounts.pdf>.

⁵⁹ <http://basees.org/resources/>.

⁶⁰ See for example the Ecclesiastical History Society's resources:

<https://www.history.ac.uk/ehsoc/content/postgrads-and-early-career-scholars> and the RHS ECR resources:

<https://royalhistsoc.org/early-career-historians/>. RHS training events are typically organised and supported jointly with the IHR.

⁶¹ <http://www.bshs.org.uk/grants/engagement-fellowships>.

⁶² https://socialhistory.org.uk/shs_exchangearea/research-exchange/.

Society for the History of Science, the Ecclesiastical History Society, the Economic History Society, the German History Society, RHS, and the Society for the Social History of Medicine.

Funding for extended postdoctoral research fellowships is typically beyond the financial means of History learned societies. However, such research fellowships are supported by a small number of History learned societies, often under the administrative aegis of the IHR. Examples include postgraduate fellowships funded by the Economic History Society, the Past & Present Society and the RHS.⁶³ The Past & Present Society's commitment of c. £44,034 over two years (c. £22,017 per year) for up to 4 such fellowships for 2019-21, like its funding for a 2-year RHS Race, Ethnicity & Equality in History Postdoctoral Fellow (funding of over £80,000 during 2019-2021), represents a very substantial investment in the next generation of historical scholarship at an especially precarious career stage.

Annual conferences and conference organisation: Annual conferences are sponsored by a substantial portion of History learned societies. These events provide opportunities for researchers at all career stages to present and hone their research, to make contact with potential research collaborators and to discuss their publication plans with journal and book editors. Encouraging international engagement within their research constituencies is a prominent feature of many of these learned society conferences, some of which are held outside the UK and many of which attract speakers and panel members from a global scholarly community. Footnote references in articles published in journals sponsored by learned societies attest to the importance of these subsidised conferences in enhancing interpretation of research findings prior to publication.⁶⁴ UK History learned societies with annual conferences include for example the British Agricultural History Society, the British Society for the History of Science, the Ecclesiastical History Society, the Economic History Society, the German History Society, the Society for Social History of Medicine, the Society for the Study of French History, and the Social History Society.

Several History learned societies offer funds for historians beyond the ECR stage to organise historical symposia, workshops or public lectures. Some focus on developing specific areas of historical research; others allow academic research to be disseminated to public audiences. Developing and encouraging research articles appropriate for submission to the journals they sponsor is another key function of learned society sponsored events. The British Society for Agricultural History's 'Conferences and Initiatives Fund' is thus 'especially keen to encourage one-day workshops that might generate articles for the *Agricultural History Review*.'⁶⁵ Other examples of societies that fund such activities include the British Society for the History of Science, the Design History Society, the RHS and the Social History Society.

Awards for Research Achievement: A range of awards for research achievement are offered by UK History learned societies. Book and/or article prizes for non-ECR researchers (or not restricted to first books or articles) are for example awarded by the British Association for Slavonic & East European Studies, the British Society for the History of Science, the Design History Society, the Economic History Society, the History of Education Society and the Selden Society. Awards for achievements in public history are made (for example) by the British Society for the History of Science, the Historical Association and the RHS.

⁶³ See <https://www.history.ac.uk/fellowships/current/junior-fellows> , and

⁶⁴ Abundant examples can be found in the acknowledgements in articles published in, for example, the *Economic History Review* and *French History*.

⁶⁵ http://www.bahs.org.uk/conference_fund.html .

Policy Work and Public Engagement: Many UK History learned societies engage in policy work, advising members of the public, members of their discipline or subject group, heritage bodies, funding bodies and government on policy matters. The Oral History Society's advice for community based and institutional practitioners of oral history illustrates one type of public engagement.⁶⁶ Many other examples could be culled from the websites listed in Appendix I and Appendix II.

Most History learned societies publish newsletters or website content designed to communicate essential developments in the policy landscape relevant for their members, providing vital information to highly dispersed communities of researchers, many of whom lack permanent affiliations with universities. Nominations to REF panels and sub-panels are also undertaken by several History learned societies, as are responses to a wide range of research council and government consultations.⁶⁷

Equalities work has emerged in the past several years as an increasingly salient aspect of UK History learned societies' activities. Established in 1987, the Women's Committee of the Economic History Society laid pioneering groundwork in this context. Its annual programme now includes a workshop, a training day, a networking event and a dedicated session at the Economic History Society's annual conference.⁶⁸ The Women's Forum of the British Association of Slavonic & East European Studies sponsors three annual prizes 'for scholarly work of high quality either produced by a woman or which furthers knowledge about gender and diversity relevant to the East European, Russian and Eurasian region.'⁶⁹ The RHS issued its first report on gender equality in UK History in higher education in 2015 and a second report in 2018, the year that saw publication of its *Race, Ethnicity & Equality in UK History: A Report and Resource for Change*. All three RHS reports have been available without charge from the RHS website since their date of publication.⁷⁰ 2018 also saw the Social History Society launch a network for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) historians, designed to combat persistent, pervasive practices of exclusion that impede diversity and inclusion in the discipline.⁷¹

Assessing the value, much less the value for money, of UK History learned societies lies beyond the scope of this report. The longevity of the oldest of these societies—the Society of Antiquaries dates from 1707 and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland from 1770, for example—and the continued vitality of more recently established societies, however, suggest that the History research community values their contributions to the discipline.⁷² The dual facts that these societies rely overwhelmingly on unpaid voluntary labour from their officers and that members repeatedly pay to belong to them also provide obvious evidence that thousands of UK historians consider that learned societies enhance universities' and funding bodies' support for and investment in historical research. Societies established in the nineteenth and early twentieth century continue to flourish, to maintain and often expand their publishing activities and to attract new members, even as new

⁶⁶ <http://www.ohs.org.uk/advice/> .

⁶⁷ For examples of RHS contributions in this sphere, see <https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/> .

⁶⁸ <http://www.ehs.org.uk/the-society/womens-committee/> .

⁶⁹ <http://basees.org/basees-womens-forum-prizes/> .

⁷⁰ For the gender reports, see <https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/gender-equality/> ; for the race report, see <https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/race/> .

⁷¹ <https://socialhistory.org.uk/2018/08/03/network-for-bme-historians/> .

⁷² The RHS was established 1868; the Historical Association in 1906; and the Economic History Society in 1926; the British Society for the History of Science in 1947; the British Agricultural History Society in 1953; the Ecclesiastical History Society in 1961; the Furniture History Society in 1964; the Society for Social History of Medicine in 1970; the Social History Society in 1976; the Design History Society in 1977; the Society for the Study of French History in 1986.

History learned societies are established to represent emerging sub-fields of research. Current membership of the RHS, which completed its 150th year in 2018, is at an historical highpoint.

4: History Learned Societies and Journal Publication:

This section sketches the place of journal publication in History research and then focuses on journals sponsored/published by History learned societies and on the research articles published within them. The discussion includes limited references to interdisciplinary journals that publish History research articles—a highly important subject which demands additional research—only two, the *American Historical Review*, published by Oxford University Press and the *Indian Social & Economic History Review*, published in Delhi by Sage, have been sampled for this interim report.

(i) The History Journal Ecosystem:

Any comprehensive analysis of the potential impact of Plan S in History or H&SS would need to take into account the wider ecology of H&SS journals. A multiplicity of organisational and financial models coexist in this complex ecosystem. History journals sponsored by collectives, rather than learned societies, include *History Workshop Journal* (published by Oxford University Press) and *Gender & History* (sponsored by a collective based jointly in the UK and North America and published by Wiley). Many journals derive support in kind and/or financial support from the HEIs in which their editorial offices are based. Others are sponsored by HEI research centres rather than by learned societies: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* is sponsored by the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies of the University of Birmingham and *Cold War History* is sponsored by the Cold War History Project at LSE IDEAS and published by Taylor & Francis. This is an illustrative list, not a comprehensive sample, of History journal publishing models. Many historians, moreover, serve on the editorial boards of and/or publish in international journals, which contribute additional, vital dimensions to the publishing environment in which UK historians disseminate their research.

Public History:

As has already been noted in the context of local history societies, a further level of complexity is added by the interface in History between ‘academic scholarship’ and ‘citizen science’. Precisely because many types of historical research do not require substantial physical infrastructure or large, externally funded research teams, many journals include research articles published by ‘lay’ historians, and many learned societies welcome these researchers’ membership and participation. The journals published by these societies play an important part in linking academic scholarship to wider public audiences and to non-academic practitioners. Journals of this type (for example, *Furniture History*, *Garden History*, *Genealogists’ Magazine*, *The Local Historian*, and *Southern History*) typically lack an affiliation with a university or commercial publisher. OA in theory is intended to enhance the ability of these broad public constituencies to access research publications; in practice, Plan S presents substantial challenges to the societies of which they are members.

Article publication within History academic scholarship:

Free-standing articles, separate from larger monograph and book projects, are published by many historians. For historians who operate toward the social science end of the methodological spectrum—many business and economic historians, for example—this is a very significant mode of publication. However, and especially within the more Humanities-centred core of the discipline, a substantial proportion of journal articles are published as intermediate stages within the process of researching and writing a monograph. Monographs play key roles nationally and internationally in academic career progression in History. They are, for example, often required or preferred

markers in tenure and/or promotion exercises. Journal articles in History thus typically have two simultaneous functions for the researcher: 1) they provide free-standing summations of research findings on a closely defined topic, and 2) they lay preliminary groundwork for chapters or portions of chapters that will subsequently appear in major monographs—typically sole-authored books of 90,000-150,000 words which will be published within 2-10 years of the journal article's publication. In REF2014, monographs (together with scholarly editions and websites) were the form of History output that received the highest scores for research quality.⁷³ Journal articles thus play an essential, and complex, role in the enhancing the quality of UK research in History.

(ii) *UK Learned Society History Journals:*

The journals published by 38 identified UK History learned societies are listed below. To gauge the minimal level of their contribution to research, the **total number of pages** and **number of research articles** each published in a single year, **2017** (the most recent year for which data are complete) is noted where known. Cumulatively, these 38 journals **in 2017** published **over 15,000 pages** of historical content (including book reviews, debates etc.), including **over 550 research articles**:

- 1) *Agricultural History Review*: published by the British Agricultural History Society twice yearly; 2017: 350 pages, 8 research articles
- 2) *Ambix*: published by Taylor & Francis for the Society for the History of Alchemy and Chemistry; 2017: 391 pages, 16 research articles
- 3) *American Nineteenth Century History*: published by Taylor & Francis for British American Nineteenth Century Historians (BrANCH); 2017: 319 pages, 12 research articles
- 4) *Antiquaries Journal*: published by Cambridge University Press for the Society of Antiquaries of London, 2017: 331 pages, 11 research articles
- 5) *Architectural History*: published by Cambridge University Press for the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain; 2017: 371 pages, 10 research articles
- 6) *Archives*: published by Liverpool University Press for the British Records Association, 2017: 144 pages, 10 research articles)
- 7) *BJHS Themes*: published open access (thanks to a bequest) by Cambridge University Press for the British Society for the History of Science; 2017: 263 pages, 11 research articles
- 8) *British Journal for the History of Science*: published by Cambridge University Press for the British Society for the History of Science, 2017: 746 pages, 23 research articles)
- 9) *The Court Historian - The International Journal of Court Studies*: published for the Society for Court Studies by Routledge, 2017: 253 pages, 8 research articles
- 10) *Cultural and Social History*: published for the Social History Society by Taylor & Francis, 2017: 742 pages, 37 research articles
- 11) *Economic History Review*: published by Wiley-Blackwell for the Economic History Society, 2017: 1,474 pages; 44 research articles
- 12) *Family and Community History*: published for the Family and Community Historical Research Society Ltd by Routledge, 2017: 234 pages, 10 research articles
- 13) *Foundations*: published by and for the Foundation for Medieval Genealogy, Hereford; 2017: 91 pages, 5 research articles

⁷³ Panel D Overview Report, page 52, point 10:

<https://www.ref.ac.uk/2014/media/ref/content/expanel/member/Main%20Panel%20D%20overview%20report.pdf>.

- 14) *French History*: published by Oxford University Press for the Society for the Study of French History, 2017: ; 554 pages, 19 research articles
- 15) *Furniture History*: published by the Furniture History Society; 2017, 11 research articles
- 16) *Garden History*: published by and for the Gardens Trust (previously the Garden History Society, established in 1965); 2017: 270 pages, 13 research articles
- 17) *Genealogists' Magazine*: published by and for the Society of Genealogists, established in 1911; 2017: 336 pages
- 18) *German History*: published by Oxford University Press for the German History Society; 4 issues per year; 2017 is 690 pages: 16 research articles
- 19) *History*: published by Wiley for the Historical Association (published since 1912), 2017: 932 pages, 29 research articles
- 20) *History of Education*: published by Taylor & Francis for the History of Education Society (UK); 2017: 709 pages, 38 research articles
- 21) *History of Education Researcher*: published by and for the History of Education Society (UK); 2017
- 22) *Huguenot Society Journal* (formerly *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society*): published by the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland: 2017: 144 pages, 8 research articles
- 23) *Innes Review*: published by Edinburgh University Press for the Scottish Catholic Historical Association; 2017: 316 pages, 10 research articles
- 24) *International Journal for the History of Engineering and Technology*: published by Taylor & Francis for the Newcomen Society for the History of Engineering and Technology; 2017: 152 pages, 6 research articles
- 25) *Journal for the Society of Army Historical Research*: published for the Society for Army Historical Research, 2017: 381 pages, 13 research articles
- 26) *Journal of Design History*: published by Oxford University Press for the four times per annum for the Design History Society, 2017: 433 pages: 22 research articles)
- 27) *Labour History Review*: published by Liverpool University Press for the Society for the Study of Labour History, 2017: 291 pages, 6 research articles
- 28) *The Local Historian*: published by and for the British Association for Local History; 2017: 352 pages, 21 research articles
- 29) *Local Population Studies*: published online by Ingenta and printed by Argent Litho for the Local Population Studies Society; 2017: 222 pages, 13 research articles
- 30) *Mariner's Mirror*: published by Taylor & Francis for the Society for Nautical Research; 2017: 509 pages, 18 research articles
- 31) *Oral History*: published by and for the Oral History Society; 2017: 248 pages, 16 research articles
- 32) *Parliamentary History*: published by Wiley-Blackwell for the Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust, 2017: 413 pages, 19 research articles
- 33) *Past & Present*: published by Oxford University Press four times a year (excluding supplements) for the Past & Present Society; 2017: 1,099 pages, 28 research articles
- 34) *Scottish Historical Review*: published by Edinburgh University Press for the Scottish Historical Review Trust; 2017: 251 pages, 7 research articles
- 35) *Southern History*: published by the Southern History Society; 2016 [2017 at binders] 229 pages, 8 research articles
- 36) *Studies in Church History*: published by Cambridge University Press for the Ecclesiastical History Society; 2017, 375 pages, 19 research articles

- 37) *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire & Cheshire*: published by Liverpool University Press for the Historic Society of Lancashire & Cheshire;
- 38) *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*: published by Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society, 2017: 269 pages, 11 research articles.

Publishing Arrangements:

The publishing arrangements of these learned society journals are characterised by considerable diversity. Of the 38 journals, 11 (29%) appear from their websites to be self-published, 15 (39%) are published by university presses (2 by Edinburgh, 3 by Liverpool, 4 by Oxford and 6 by Cambridge) and 12 (32%) by commercial publishers (1 by Ingenta, 2 by Routledge, 3 by Wiley-Blackwell and 6 by Taylor & Francis).

Most learned societies bundle membership fees with journal subscriptions. Publishing arrangements with university and commercial presses, in turn, increase the likelihood that these journals will garner institutional subscriptions by inclusion in these presses bundled offered to university and other libraries. Subscription income plays a vital role in many societies' finances, enabling them (for example) both to publish their journals and to provide bursaries for ECRs.

Where contractual agreements have been made with university or commercial presses, ownership of the journals rests with the relevant society, not with the publishing press. In the past decade, arrangements such as these have often allowed the digitisation of back issues, enhancing researchers' access to decades of past scholarship.

UK Interdisciplinary journals and historical research:

To date, the following 12 interdisciplinary journals publishing historical research have been identified. It is highly likely that this list substantially underrepresents the UK learned society journals in which History research articles are published:

- 1) *African Affairs*: established in 1944 and published by Oxford University Press for the Royal African Society it is the top-ranked journal in African Studies. Its 2017 volume totalled 728 pages, including 24 research articles;
- 2) *British Catholic History* (formerly *Recusant History*): published by Cambridge University Press for the Catholic Record Society; 2017 [NB only the 2017 portion of volume 33 has been included in this calculation]: 348 pages, 11 research articles
- 3) *British Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*: published by Wiley-Blackwell for the British Association for Eighteenth Century Studies; 2017: 648 pages, 20 research articles;
- 4) *British Journal of Canadian Studies*: published by Liverpool University Press for the British Association for Canadian Studies; 2017: 281 pages, 10 research articles
- 5) *Bulletin of Latin American Research*: published four times by Wiley-Blackwell for the Society for Latin American Studies; 2017: 575 pages, 26 research articles;
- 6) *European Journal of Korean Studies*: 2017: published online by the British Association for Korean Studies; 2017: 215 pages, 9 research articles
- 7) *Italian Studies*: Society for Italian Studies, published by Taylor & Francis; 2017: 478 pages, 31 research articles
- 8) *Journal of American Studies*: published by Cambridge University Press for the British Association of American Studies; 2017: 1,303 pages, 42 research articles;

- 9) *Journal of the British Association for Chinese Studies*: Established in 2011, this online, OA journal typically publishes 1-2 issues per year. The volume/issue for 2017 contained 126 pages of content and 3 research articles:
- 10) *Reformation*: published by Taylor & Francis for the Tyndale Society (established 1995); 2017: 151 pages, 6 research articles
- 11) *Reformation and Renaissance Review*: published by Taylor & Francis for the Society for Reformation Studies; 2017: 169 pages, 13 research articles
- 12) *Slavonic & East European Review*: published by Modern Humanities Research Association and SEES UCL for British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies (BASEES); 2017: 799 pages, 19 research articles.

The publishing arrangements of these 12 journals are arguably more varied than those of discipline-based journals: one, for example, is published in conjunction with both the Modern Humanities Research Association and UCL's School of Slavonic & East European Studies, while one is self-published Gold OA. The presence of a self-published OA journal in this sample, *Journal of the British Association for Chinese Studies*, is notable, and provides an obvious opportunity to test the viability of extending Plan S protocols to journals published by H&SS learned societies. Concerns have been raised by some commentators on this front: Cochran draws especial attention to the technical and financial challenges for learned societies and other stakeholders given that Plan S compliance will require them to set full-text XML of all research article content in the JATS DTD. A concrete opportunity to explore the extent to which these concerns are valid for OA Humanities journals is very welcome.⁷⁴

(iii) Article Publication Costs:

Regardless of whether they publish their research in journals published by learned societies or by outlets that operate outside the learned society matrix, historians incur research and publication costs. Beyond the cost of research itself—travel to archives, research assistance and conference costs, for example—many historians incur costs at the point of publication. The use of 3rd party images can add substantially to the cost of article publication. The author for example recently (July 2018) paid £280 (including VAT) to reproduce a single black and white image from a UK national museum in a Green OA article in the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*.

The APC model currently dominates Gold OA for H&SS research articles in the UK, and thus represents the model currently in use that best approximates Plan S compliance at scale. Principle 4 of Plan S clearly indicates that Plan S Funders expect that many journals will continue to charge APCs after Plan S implementation. It remains to be seen whether zero embargo Green OA across journals' entire research article offer will prove a functional alternative to APCs.

APCs for Gold OA are substantial. These charges are subject to VAT in the UK. Table 1 provides an indicative list of the charges for Gold OA publication in History learned society journals published by either commercial or university presses. Non-learned society journals, of course, also charge APCs for Gold OA. Their charges are broadly comparable to those of learned societies.

⁷⁴ See especially Michael Clarke, 'Plan S: Impact on Society Publishers': <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2018/12/05/plan-s-impact-on-society-publishers/>, and Angela Cochran, 'Plan S: A Mandate for Gold OA with Lots of Strings Attached': <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2018/12/07/plan-s-a-mandate-for-gold-oa-with-lots-of-strings-attached/>.

Table 1: Gold OA APCs for UK Learned Society Journals

Journal	Press	APC
<i>British Journal for the History of Science</i>	CUP	£1780
<i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>	CUP	£1870
<i>Studies in Church History</i>	CUP	£1870
<i>Past & Present</i>	OUP	£2079
<i>German History</i>	OUP	£2150
<i>French History</i>	OUP	£1943
<i>Cultural & Social History</i>	T&F	£1895
<i>American Nineteenth Century History</i>	T&F	£1895
<i>Economic History Review</i>	Wiley	£2000
<i>Parliamentary History</i>	Wiley	£1650
<i>History</i>	Wiley	£1650

Given that the cost of an APC significantly exceeds the annual value of QR funding typically allocated to individual university-based History researchers in the UK—much less the funding for publication costs available to H&SS researchers in the Global South—the establishment of wider research council and institutional mechanisms for subsidising these costs will become a matter of urgent importance if a substantial proportion of UK History journals ‘flip’ to Gold OA in response to Plan S. More the great majority of History journals, the appeal and viability of converting to Gold OA will be limited.

External Funding for Research Published in History Journals:

Table 2 uses data from the 2015-2017 volumes (inclusive) of a small sample of UK learned society journals to explore the extent to which History article publication derives from research funded by bodies that are Plan S signatories. The sample of journals is very small indeed, and the restriction to a 3-year period (research articles published in 2015, 2016 and 2017) will inevitably distort the broader profiles of individual journals. A preliminary analysis of a single year (2017) of articles published in a broader sample of 12 UK History journals—some sponsored by learned societies, others independent—yielded very similar figures overall, but appeared to distort the funding profiles of individual journals unduly and thus was replaced by extended sample periods of a smaller number of journals.⁷⁵ Journal editors and learned society officers will wish to examine longer periods of time as well as other types of data when assessing the likely impact of Plan S on their journals and the desirability (or not) of ‘flipping’ to Gold OA and Plan S compliance.

Data are derived from authors’ acknowledgements in the published articles—either from a specific ‘acknowledgement’ or funder section of the article or the article’s first or second footnote/endnote—and/or from journals’ ‘notes on contributors’. They have not been cross-checked against authors’ websites or reports to funding bodies. Likely errors include the under-counting of smaller charitable funding (by the author of this report) and under-reporting by article

⁷⁵ This pilot sample included *Culture & Social History*, the *Economic History Review*, the *English Historical Review*, *French History*, *Gender and History*, the *Historical Journal*, *Historical Research*, *Past & Present*, *Social History of Medicine*, *Studies in Church History* and the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. The proportion of Plan S signatory-funded research articles in this sample ranged from 0% to 24.3% overall; among UK-based authors, it ranged from 0% to 21.6%. The highest value in this pilot sample was for *C&SH*; it deflated from just under 25% to 17% with the extended, 3-year sample.

authors of their sources of funding. Some articles derived from research council funded PhD dissertations may fail to register that source of original funding.

The available data **do not** allow precise calculations of ‘funded’ versus ‘unfunded’ research in History. Many footnotes mention the role played by funded attendance at workshops and conferences (including those subsidised by learned societies) in honing research articles, but this funding has not been counted here. Nor has **internal** institutional funding (that is, funding from the author’s own institution) been logged. Authors mention institutional support only in part and episodically: no UK author, for example, mentions QR. Only external funding of authors’ research is reflected in these figures, which in consequence significantly under-report the individual and institutional cost of History research. With these caveats in mind, the data nonetheless provide new evidence for discussion by stakeholders in the Plan S consultation period.

Key to Table 2:

RA: number of research articles, *excluding* historiographical reviews, debates, introductions to special issues and very short reflective pieces. The focus here has been on substantive pieces of original research. ‘Supplementary Issues’ have been excluded for simplicity, a decision that journal editors may legitimately contest;

NEF: ‘Not Externally Funded’ (includes all articles **not evidently funded** by ERC, UK research councils, Wellcome, Leverhulme, BA, Mellon, Australian Research Council and other named funders excluding own university/institutional and learned society funding;

All Funded: articles that designate funding from Plan S and non-Plan S funders, excluding own university and learned society funding, as above. See Appendix III for named funders;

cOAI-F: per cent and number of research articles research funded by Plan S signatories. This figure is intended as a proxy for articles that will be subject to Plan S from 1 January 2020;

Table 2: Funding for History Journal Articles

Journal	RA	NEF	All Funded	cOAI-F
<i>C&SH</i>	88	71.6% [63]	28.4% [25]	17.0% [15]
<i>P&P</i>	76	51.3% [39]	48.7% [37]	9.2% [7]
<i>History</i>	89	80.9% [72]	19.1% [17]	4.9% [3]
<i>French H.</i>	61	80.3% [49]	19.7% [12]	4.9% [3]
<i>ANCH</i>	36	88.9% [32]	11.1% [4]	0% [0] ⁷⁶
TOTAL	350	72.9% [255]	27.1% [95]	8% [28]

⁷⁶ One article’s author had received funding from the Irish Research Council. This does not appear to be the same organisation as Science Foundation Ireland (a Plan S sponsor), but if this author were counted as Plan S funded in the ANCH figure would rise from 0% to 2.7% and the total cOAI-funded figure would rise from 8% to 8.3% 2.7%. The transparent alphabetical list of Plan S funders (rather than the current page of logos) would enhance the quality of feedback and planning for implementation.

Taken as a whole, the UK learned society journals selected here publish over an extended chronological period (*Past & Present's* purview extends from the ancient world to contemporary issues), cover the globe in terms of their substantive reach and include an international community of authors. UK and international authors reflect the full career cycle in academic History, including for example PhD students, postdoctoral teaching fellows and researchers, staff on permanent contracts and emeritus researchers. Several non-affiliated researchers are also present in the sample. *Cultural & Social History* (Social History Society) and *History* (Historical Association) are sponsored by larger associations and less specialised societies than *American Nineteenth Century History* (BrANCH) and *French History* (Society for the Study of French History). Appendix III lists all of the external funders named in the acknowledgements of these journals. Few of these 42 funders are Plan S signatories; charities are more numerous than government bodies in this list.

Scrutiny of the 82 research articles published in 2015-2017 (inclusive) by the *American Historical Review*, the journal of the largest US History learned society, provides an interesting comparison. The authors of these articles were predominantly based in the US, but included as well historians based in (for example) Finland, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Singapore, Switzerland and the UK. Here a much higher proportion of research articles acknowledge external funding: 33 articles (40%) acknowledged funding and 49 (60%) did not. Scrutiny of the acknowledgements and the list of external funders (Appendix IV) however, reveals that a substantial proportion of this funding derives from residential fellowship schemes at research libraries and institutes such as the Huntington Library, the John Carter Brown Library, Princeton's Institute of Advanced Study and the Woodrow Wilson Center. Stipends at institutions such as these typically do not cover full salary costs, much less funding for APCs and BPCs.⁷⁷ Similarly, the maximum value of a 12-month individual fellowship supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities is US\$ 60,000. In all, 43 external funders were named in these 82 research articles. Coordinating and aligning their funding priorities to conform with Plan S mandates will likely prove challenging.

One journal (not affiliated with a learned society) published in the Global South, *Indian Social & Economic History Review* (IS&EHR) was also examined from 2015-2017 (inclusive). This sample yielded 53 research articles, of which 13.2% (7 articles) had attributed funding. Of these externally funded projects, 1 article (1.9% of the total) had been funded by a Plan S funder (the AHRC). Taking the perspectives of journals produced in the Global South into account must form an essential component of thinking-through the implications of Plan S. This example is offered simply to put down a preliminary marker to that end.

Research undertaken by the Local Population Studies Society in response to the Plan S consultation provides complementary evidence drawn from a much larger sample of 340 national and international History journals. Using the abstracting database Scopus, this study identified 20,370 History research articles published in these journals from 2014 to 2018. Of these articles, 2,887 (14%) acknowledged funding and 17,483 (86%) did not. The top five acknowledged funders were the AHRC (7.9% of all acknowledgements), the Australian Research Council (4.4% of all acknowledgements), the ESRC (3.5% of all acknowledgements), the Social Science & Humanities Research Council of Canada (3.3%) and the National Science Foundation (3.2%).⁷⁸

⁷⁷ Long-term (9-12 month) residential fellowships at the Huntington Library, for example, are capped at US\$ 50,000: <https://www.huntington.org/available-fellowships#long>.

⁷⁸ Many thanks to Dr William Farrell for generously sharing these data. The search was undertaken between 17 and 18 January 2019.

Preliminary analysis: The proportion of research articles in sampled UK learned society journals reported as being funded by current Plan S signatories ranged from 0% to 17%. If, as is intended by Plan S's advocates, additional government funders and other charities become signatories, a higher proportion of articles would be subject to these mandates. However, based on reported funding in authors' acknowledgements in the Scopus sample assessed by the Local Population Studies Society, a significant, often very high, proportion of History journal articles, lack external grant funding of any kind. Extending Gold OA mandates to all externally funded articles would, based on these very preliminary figures, still leave most History research outside the Plan S mandate. The business case for choosing to 'flip' UK History journals would, in this context, appear to be weak.

The relative paucity of funding received from Plan S signatories by History research authors has important implications not only for learned societies' and journals' consideration of Plan S implementation but also for individual researchers. Very few of the predominant funders of H&SS research currently subsidise either APCs or BPCs to enable Gold OA publication of articles and books, the predominant research outputs of historians. Nor do UK or international universities typically provide these funds in sufficient volume to support the bulk of H&SS research publications. Plan S sponsors note the need to develop alternative platforms to eliminate the APC/BPC model, a laudable aim. PAR may prove one route toward that goal, although it is a mechanism that is likely to exclude specific populations of History researchers, such as non-affiliated ECRs, emeritus staff, researchers based in heritage organisations and 'citizen scientists'. The costs of including all authors in the research community need to be specified and addressed by Plan S Funders.

As trustees of registered charities governed by the Charity Commission for England & Wales (and by devolved equivalent bodies in Northern Ireland and Scotland), learned society officers will be mindful of their fiscal duties. Their legal obligations differ from those of both UKRI and profit-making companies. In this context, learned society trustees will need to balance factors that include the financial viability of their organisations, the full range of their charitable aims (which typically include but also extend significantly beyond fostering scholarship, and supporting the next generation of practitioners in particular) and commitment to OA publication.

Future research questions: A wider dataset is clearly required to allow any conclusions to be drawn from these very preliminary data. In addition to expanding the chronological range and number of sampled UK History journals, research is urgently needed on interdisciplinary (for example, Area Studies) and international journals. The variety, range and scope of national and international funders of History research also deserves systematic analysis.

A vital component of this assessment must be an Equalities audit: are researchers in groups 'protected' by the UK Equality Act 2010 and its Northern Irish counterparts (for example) equally, less or more likely than researchers not in protected categories to have external funding for their articles from Plan S signatories? In a discipline in which—as the RHS's 2018 *Race, Ethnicity & Equality* and *Promoting Gender Equality in UK History* reports make emphatically clear—Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and female researchers experience significant levels of discrimination, the potential implications of Plan S for equal opportunities to publish are of vital importance.

Much greater attention is urgently needed to the ways in which implementation of Plan S will affect the career trajectories and mobility of ECRs. In History, extended periods of self-funding and partial employment are characteristic of this career phase. Learned societies are able to provide some 'gap' funding to help ECRs bridge this challenging phase of the research life cycle in History.

But the costs entailed by APCs—much less by BPCs—significantly exceed what the learned society matrix would be able to support and subsidise, even in the unlikely event that they chose to disengage from their existing programmes of activities and invest wholesale in Gold OA (or experiment with zero Embargo Green OA) instead. Accommodating Plan S goals to the day-to-day realities of ECR life will demand a much more granular and comprehensive understanding of career development in both national and international contexts than at present appears to inform Plan S’s highly ambitious goals.

5: History Learned Societies and Book Publication:

Publication of books—including scholarly editions of primary sources, edited volumes of essays and monographs—has been a key function of UK History learned societies since the nineteenth century. It remains a major scholarly activity of many learned societies. Although a small number of learned societies have withdrawn from this activity in recent years,⁷⁹ others have increased their investment in sponsorship of book publication.

Because implementation of Plan S for monographs is not yet under active development, this section merely records the known UK History learned society book publishers.

Canterbury and York Society: <http://www.canterburyandyork.org/> : ‘The Canterbury and York Society has been pre-eminent in the publication of scholarly editions of the records of the English church in the middle ages for more than a century. The majority of its publications are editions of episcopal and archiepiscopal registers, which document the administration of dioceses and constitute a major source for ecclesiastical, political, social, legal, economic, local and family history. Recent publications have also made records relating to cases before the Papal Penitentiary and the Archbishop of Canterbury’s medieval court of appeal, episcopal wills, and letters appointing clerical proctors for parliament accessible. Since its foundation in 1904, the Society has published one-hundred and eight volumes and worked with other learned and local record societies to produce and support volumes which are lasting works of scholarship. Works which are used and enjoyed across a range of disciplines and communities and by those with interests beyond the academy, on a local, regional and international level.’

Economic History Society: <http://www.ehs.org.uk/the-society/publications.html> : ‘In addition [to publishing the *Economic History Review*], the Society is involved in a number of publishing ventures through its Publications Committee (Chair: Professor Marguerite Dupree): ‘The Publications Committee has inaugurated a new series in partnership with publishers Boydell & Brewer entitled *People, Markets, Goods: Economies and Societies in History*.... The editorial committee of Professors Nigel Goose, Steve Hindle, Jane Humphries and Catherine Schenk welcome submissions on all aspects of economic social history....In 2009 the Committee established a very successful successor to the *New Studies in Economic and Social History*....*New Approaches to Economic and Social History* [Cambridge University Press].’

German History Society: <http://www.germanhistorysociety.org/sighs/> : ‘The German History Society is pleased to announce the establishment of its new book series, *Studies in German History*, in collaboration with its long-standing publishing partner Oxford University Press. The series reflects the German History Society’s long-standing mission to promote the best scholarship in the broad field of German history, and seeks to build on the innovative directions established by the Society’s journal in recent years. Taking an open, expansive view of what German History is and where that history has been played out, it envisions a broad chronological and geographic scope that encompasses topics from the medieval period to the present day; it seeks to go beyond the traditional confines of German history by adopting a comparative approach or exploring themes that entwine the history of the German-speaking lands with that of other parts of the world; it aims to solicit titles that are intellectually ambitious, whether in their engagement with novel paradigms or their use of concepts and methods from other disciplines; and it seeks to publish work that reaches a readership beyond immediate specialists in a particular field. Above

⁷⁹ The British Society for the History of Science published 14 volumes in its book series, the last in 2011. The interdisciplinary Society for Latin American Studies published its last book in 2012.

all, it seeks to publish work that engages with historical questions of wider relevance across German and other histories.’

Harleian Society: <http://harleian.org.uk/> : ‘The Harleian Society is a registered charity (no. 253659), established in 1869 and incorporated in 1902. Its official objects are "the transcribing, printing and publishing of the heraldic visitations of counties, parish registers or any manuscripts relating to genealogy, family history and heraldry". The Society is known for the quality and scholarship of its publications, particularly its editions of the Heralds' Visitations in the possession of the College of Arms.’

Past & Present Society: http://www.oxfordjournals.org/our_journals/past/supplement : ‘Past and Present has a long history of publishing books and collections of essays reflective of the broad themes and ethos of the journal itself. Encompassing a range of scholarly and original works primarily concerned with social, economic and cultural changes, their causes and consequences, these volumes endeavour to communicate the results of innovative historical and allied research in readable and lively form to a wide audience. The Past and Present Publications series was established in 1976 and comprises more than 70 books by both established and early career scholars. In 2009, the monograph series was re-launched with Oxford University Press as the Past and Present Book Series. Transcending chronological and geographical boundaries, the purpose of the series is to publish high-quality, cutting-edge work that has an appeal outside the specialist area of the author. Collections of essays are now primarily published via the Past and Present Supplement series.’ The Past & Present Society has published 19 books since 2009. <https://global.oup.com/academic/content/series/p/the-past-and-present-book-series-ppbs/?cc=gb&lang=en&>

Royal Historical Society: <https://royalhistsoc.org/publications/>: The Society sponsors the Camden series of annotated scholarly editions of primary sources, having absorbed the Camden Society (established in 1838) in 1897. It publishes 2 Camden volumes per year with Cambridge University Press. Its Studies in History series (established 1975 and re-launched in 1995), which will complete in 2019 having enabled the publication of 103 first monographs by ECRs, is published by Boydell. Studies in History will, from 2019, be replaced by New Historical Perspectives, a Gold OA book series published with New Humanities Library (School of Advanced Studies, University of London) in conjunction with the IHR. New Historical Perspectives is exceptional in charging its authors/editors (who are UK-based ECRs within 10 years of receiving their doctorates) no BPCs. It is expected to produce 4 volumes per annum.

Scottish History Society: <https://scottishhistorysociety.wordpress.com/> : ‘The Scottish History Society is the leading publisher of original sources relating to the history of Scotland. Founded in 1886, the Society has published over 170 volumes; taken together, these form a collection of great richness and variety illustrating the history of the nation as recorded by contemporaries. Scottish History Society volumes cover all periods from the twelfth to the twentieth centuries and a very wide range of topics – social, economic, legal, political, constitutional, diplomatic, military and religious history, as well as farming, gardening and the joys of good housekeeping! In addition to making available sources vital to the study and writing of Scottish history, most volumes have substantial introductions by the editors. The volumes are thus not only of value to professional historians and teachers of history, but to all who take an interest in Scotland’s past.’ The 6th series has published 9 volumes since 2007, the most recent (with Woodbridge Press) in 2014.

Selden Society: <https://www.seldensociety.ac.uk/> : ‘The Selden Society is the only learned society and publisher devoted entirely to English legal history. This includes the history of the law, the

development of legal ideas, the legal profession, the courts and legal institutions, individual judges and lawyers, legal literature and records, the languages of the law, legal portraiture and costume; in short, researching the history of everything which is characteristic of our unique English common law and legal system. And because for most of the nation's history, the only continuous records have been legal records, there is in them a wealth of incidental information on every aspect of contemporary life and conditions to be found in no other source.' The Society published Annual Volumes, a Supplementary Series and Selden Society Lectures. The Annual Volumes now include 130 titles. The most recent Annual Volume was published in 2015; the most recent title in the Supplementary Series was published in 2017; the most recent title in the Lecture series was published in 2013.

Social History Society: <http://socialhistory.org.uk/publications/book-series/>: 'New Directions in Social and Cultural History is the Social History Society's new book series, published in collaboration with Bloomsbury. The series was launched in spring 2018, with an edited volume of the same name.... The series editors welcome expressions of interest for monographs and edited volumes that present new research and suggest new directions for our social and cultural understanding of the past. There are no limits on chronological or geographical focus.'

Society for the Social History of Medicine:

<http://www.manchesteruniversitypress.co.uk/series/social-histories-of-medicine/>: 'Social Histories of Medicine is concerned with all aspects of health, illness and medicine, from prehistory to the present, in every part of the world. The series covers the circumstances that promote health or illness, the ways in which people experience and explain such conditions, and what, practically, they do about them. Practitioners of all approaches to health and healing come within its scope, as do their ideas, beliefs, and practices, and the social, economic and cultural contexts in which they operate. Methodologically, the series welcomes relevant studies in social, economic, cultural, and intellectual history, as well as approaches derived from other disciplines in the arts, sciences, social sciences and humanities. The series is a collaboration between Manchester University Press and the Society for the Social History of Medicine.' 15 titles have been published or in press since the series began in 2017.

Society for the Study of French History:

<http://www.manchesteruniversitypress.co.uk/series/studies-in-modern-french-history/> : 'The Society for the Study of French History monograph series, in collaboration with Manchester University Press, aims to publish the very best short monographs relating to the history of the French post 1750, in France and in the World. The objective is to publish a selection of the most innovative UK and North American recent dissertation work in revised form, intermixed with mature reflective works by established scholars. The Series publishes up to two hardback monographs of 80-100,000 words in length each year.' The series has published 12 titles since 2011, of which 11 have been published 2015 onward.

Society for the Study of Labour History:

<https://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk/series/series-12366/> Studies in Labour History is published by Liverpool University Press. 'Studies in Labour History provides reassessments of broad themes along with more detailed studies arising from the latest research in the field of labour and working-class history, both in Britain and throughout the world. Most books are single-authored but there are also volumes of essays focussed on key themes and issues, usually emerging from major conferences organized by the British Society for the Study of Labour History. The

series includes studies of labour organizations, including international ones, where there is a need for new research or modern reassessment. It is also its objective to extend the breadth of labour history's gaze beyond conventionally organized workers, sometimes to workplace experiences in general, sometimes to industrial relations, but also to working-class lives beyond the immediate realm of work in households and communities.'

Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain: <https://www.sahgb.org.uk/symposium-papers.html#>. The Society periodically publishes volumes of its annual *Symposium Papers*. Presses in the past decade have included, for example, Routledge, Spire and Ashgate.

Interdisciplinary societies that publish History books: BASEES (British Assn of Slavonic & East European Studies) monograph series published by Routledge. To date, the series has published 108 books. More information is available from <http://basees.org/baseesroutledge-series-on-russian-and-east-european-studies/> and <https://www.routledge.com/BASEES-Routledge-Series-on-Russian-and-East-European-Studies/book-series/BASEES>.

6: Potential Impact of Plan S & Issues for Clarification:

Plan S documentation is highly schematic, and is dominated by ideological statements rather than evidence and argumentation. UKRI is now in the early stages of considering how best to implement Plan S mandates. In doing so, it may wish to bear in mind the following areas of concern and/or ambiguity.

(i) Potential impacts:

- **Equalities:** Is there potential for negative impacts on women, racial and ethnic minorities and other ‘protected’ groups under the 2010 UK Equality Act? Major RHS reports have drawn attention to the salience of inequality in our discipline. Socio-economic (class) issues, although not ‘protected’ in the same way, are also of great importance to historians, especially given the extent of self-funding in History. Access to publishing opportunities for emeritus staff need to be considered. Global South issues need to be addressed as well. The Ford and Carnegie Foundations and other major philanthropic funders have for many years subsidised African university journal subscriptions, for example. Will APCs and BPCs and PAR agreements be subsidised by them as well, or will the government-funded bodies supporting Plan S instead commit to using UK and European tax revenue to do so?
- **ECRs:** Is there a significant likelihood, given History career structure, for ECRs to be disadvantaged by this system? Will ‘flipped’ journals offer author subventions for APCs or will exemptions instead be instituted for self-funding ECRs? (This latter provision would be equitable but also counterintuitive—it is ECR careers more than senior careers that arguably benefit most from Gold OA). What requirements will current Plan S signatory funded ECRs be held to for articles published after their grants have completed? It is unknown whether funders such as the AHRC and the Wellcome Trust plan to institute new Plan S-related funding streams for precarious ECRs;
- **Licences:** Problems associated with CC BY as opposed to CC BY ND for H&SS researchers need to be resolved and clearly accommodated within Plan S’s protocols. The briefing documentation refers to the issues outlined above in Part 2 only very schematically;
- **Bifurcation:** There is potential for Plan S implementation to lead to a bifurcation between journals that publish research council funded authors (which in History will mean predominantly UK and European researchers) and those that publish articles by other researchers (this latter group of journals will, based on the available evidence, include most authors from the Global South);
- **Non-affiliated researchers:** Efforts need to be made to explore and (if needed) mitigate the potential impact of Plan S on non-affiliated researchers, including museum curators and local and family historians. Will local history journals that are not published by university or commercial presses (for example) and the charitable societies that sponsor them be advantaged or disadvantaged by Plan S? Will the ‘Impact’ terrain of historical scholarship be enhanced or compromised by Plan S implementation?;
- **Learned societies:** These organisations will need to consider carefully what activities they will no longer be able to support if they ‘flip’ their journals and/or divert funds from supporting (for example) research trips and conferences to supporting APCs and BPCs and the costs of JATS DTD formats. Alternatively, they will need to weigh very

carefully the risks of experimenting with zero embargo Green OA, or retaining their current models of operation;

- **International:** The short- and medium-term impact of Plan S on the international profile of UK History research (and the mobility of UK researchers) merits serious attention, especially for subject areas that enjoy substantial links with non-UK and non-European researchers (including those in the Global South) who lack access to funding for Gold OA;
- **Timeline(s) for implementation:** Which UK and international funding bodies will opt to apply Plan S requirements to current grants and which only to future grants or future calls? The impact on individual and institutional research planning of ambiguity in this respect—and the likelihood that different funders will make different decisions and announce them at different times—is cause for considerable concern;
- **Publication planning:** There are obvious potential short-term implications for journals given the very abrupt transition period, due to long lead-times between acceptance and publication for many journals, and (for researchers) the lack of available alternative Plan S compliant platforms. These potential impacts may differ across different sub-fields of History.

(ii) Known Unknowns: Queries/Ambiguities:

- 1) **Which portions of journal content other than ‘straight’ research articles fall within Plan S’s purview?** An especially urgent question is whether (as in REF) **book chapters** will be considered as portions of books and **not** as research articles. The substantial proportion of pages (sometimes the numerical majority of content) in journals that is content other than research articles also poses significant definitional problems. What is the status, with regard to Plan S OA mandates, of ‘debates’, historiographical reviews, and roundtables? (This is an indicative, not comprehensive list). Are there implications for researchers’ and journals’ web-based content such as blogs (for example, the RHS’s *Historical Transactions* (<https://blog.royalhistsoc.org/>)). Do Plan S funders consider this content to constitute ‘research articles’ subject to Plan S mandates including the requirement to set full-text XML of all research article content in the JATS DTD? Would a short synopsis (or an extended exposition) of a Plan S signatory-funded research project in a learned society newsletter sent to society subscribers, for example, need to be compliant? What falls within the remit of ‘scientific publications on the results from research’ funded by Plan S signatories? Many ‘Impact’ projects produce research outputs that may fall into this grey area;
- 2) **List of funders:** The list of logos of Plan S signatories lacks transparency in terms of the actual funding bodies and grant schemes that are covered by Plan S stipulation. Is **all** UKRI funded research (including QR) at issue? If not, what specific portions of it are within the Plan S envelope? An alphabetical list of funders and funding schemes within these bodies that fall within Plan S mandates (in place of the current webpage with signatories’ logos) would also significantly ease and enhance consultation on implementation;
- 3) **Monitoring:** What types of monitoring on impact are funders undertaking, and (given the very short time for implementation) do they have data on the ‘now’ situation? Data of this kind will be vital for effective equalities monitoring of Plan S impacts. Who will monitor Plan S Funders themselves?;

- 4) **Conflicts among UK government agendas:** There is an obvious disconnect between UKRI and DCMS agendas with significant implications for Plan S implementation for H&SS (especially Humanities) researchers. These anomalies need to be acknowledged and rectified in the UKRI and Plan S consultations. DCMS institutions are permitted and in some cases encouraged to treat their (our?) cultural property as financial assets, charging for not only their commercial but also their academic use. Many offer term-limited OA permission only. These 3rd party restrictions run counter to UKRI goals and expectations; they render Gold OA costly and/or prohibitive, and they complicate or prohibit use of CC BY. There is also potentially a conflict between UKRI policy via Plan S and the goals of the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)/the REF Impact agenda. Research that lies at the interface between academic History and citizen science (for example, research that is co-produced) is not recognised in the proposals. Are the implications for these stakeholders negligible? The example of History societies would suggest that this is a potential problem area. A clear articulation of which government agendas will dominate policy decisions dominate would be welcome.
- 5) **Will all Plan S signatories be required to allow all researchers full open access to all Gold OA publications?:** Some national governments restrict the access of their researchers to academic articles they consider politically subversive. For example, in 2017, the Chinese government asked Cambridge University Press to prohibit Chinese scholars' access to CUP's *China Quarterly*, threatening to ban other CUP publications unless this request was implemented. Will Plan S signatory policy allow (or instead explicitly prohibit) such restrictions by national governments, which would appear to run entirely counter to the scheme's laudable aspirations to make access to research open to all?

Acknowledgements:

Many thanks to the following individuals for information, commentary, criticism and corrections to the Interim Report: Maxine Berg, Georgina Brewis, Anthony Cond (Liverpool University Press), Rosemary Cresswell (Society for the Social History of Medicine), Simon Dixon, Martin Eve, William Farrell (for the Local Population Studies Society), Richard Fisher, Charles Fonge (Canterbury and York Society), Aileen Fyfe, James Grossman, Julian Hoppit, Frank James (Society for the History of Alchemy and Chemistry), Michael Lobban, Helen Lovatt, Peter Mandler, Rana Mitter, Barbara Penner, Giorgio Riello, John Robertson, John Sabapathy, Robert Shoemaker, the Social History Society, Stephanie Spencer (for the History of Education Society, UK), Andrew Spicer, Rebecca Sullivan, Richard Toyne, Megan Vaughan, Alex Walsham, Simon Werrett, Gerda Wielander, David Wood (Society for Latin American Studies), and Abigail Woods. Christopher Kissane provided APC data, comments and technical support with his characteristic skill and celerity. The views expressed in this report are the author's own, as are all errors of fact and interpretation.

Appendix I: List of Publishing UK History Learned Societies:

British Agricultural History Society: <http://www.bahs.org.uk/>

British American Nineteenth Century Historians: <https://branchuk.wordpress.com/>

British Association for Local History: <https://www.balh.org.uk/>

British Records Association: <https://www.britishrecordsassociation.org.uk/>

British Record Society: <https://www.britishrecordsociety.org/>

British Society for the History of Science: <http://www.bsbs.org.uk/>

Canterbury and York Society: <http://www.canterburyandyork.org/>

Design History Society: <https://www.designhistorysociety.org/publications/journal>

Ecclesiastical History Society: <https://www.history.ac.uk/ehsoc/content/home>

Economic History Society: <http://www.ehs.org.uk/>

Family and Community Historical Research Society: <http://www.fachrs.com/>

Foundation for Medieval Genealogy: <https://fmg.ac/>

Furniture History Society: <https://www.furniturehistorysociety.org/>

Gardens Trust: <http://thegardenstrust.org/>

German History Society: (<http://www.germanhistorysociety.org/>

Hakluyt Society: <https://www.hakluyt.com/>

Harleian Society: <http://harleian.org.uk/>

Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire: <https://www.hslc.org.uk/>

Historical Association: <https://www.history.org.uk/>

History of Education Society (UK): <http://historyofeducation.org.uk/>

Huguenot Society: <https://www.huguenotsociety.org.uk/>

Local Population Studies Society: <http://www.localpopulationstudies.org.uk/>

Newcomen Society for the History of Engineering and Technology:
<https://www.newcomen.com/>

Oral History Society: <http://www.ohs.org.uk/>

Parliamentary History Yearbook Trust: <http://beta.charitycommission.gov.uk/charity-details/?regid=513120&subid=0>

Past & Present Society: <http://pastandpresent.org.uk/>

Royal Historical Society: <https://royalhistsoc.org/>

Scottish Catholic Historical Association: <http://www.scha.scot/>

Scottish Historical Review Trust: <https://www.history.ac.uk/history-online/grants/research-grants/scottish-historical-review-trust-bursary-scheme>

Scottish History Society: <https://scottishhistorysociety.com/the-society/>

Selden Society: <https://www.seldensociety.ac.uk/>

Social History Society: <http://socialhistory.org.uk/>

Society for Army Historical Research: <https://www.sahr.org.uk/>

Society for Court Studies: <http://www.courtstudies.org/about-us.htm>

Society for the History of Alchemy and Chemistry: <https://www.ambix.org/>

Society for the Social History of Medicine: <https://sshm.org/>

Society for the Study of French History: <http://frenchhistorysociety.co.uk/about.htm>

Society for the Study of Labour History: <http://www.sslh.org.uk/>

Society of Antiquaries of London: <https://www.sal.org.uk/>

Society of Antiquaries of Scotland: <https://www.socantscot.org/>

Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain: <https://www.sahgb.org.uk/>

Society of Genealogists: <http://www.sog.org.uk/>

Appendix II: Publishing Interdisciplinary Societies with Substantial Historians:

British Association for American Studies: <https://www.baas.ac.uk/>

British Association for Canadian Studies: <https://britishassociationforcanadianstudies.org/>

British Association for Chinese Studies: <http://bacsuk.org.uk/>

British Association for Eighteenth Century Studies: <https://www.bsecs.org.uk/>

British Association for Korean Studies: <http://www.baks.org.uk/wptest/about/>

British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies: <http://basees.org/>

Catholic Record Society: <http://catholicrecordsociety.co.uk/>

Royal African Society: <http://www.royalafricansociety.org/publications>

Society for Italian Studies: <http://italianstudies.org.uk/>

Society for Latin American Studies: <http://www.slas.org.uk/>

Society for Reformation Studies: <https://www.reformationstudies.org/>

Tyndale Society: <http://www.tyndale.org/>

Appendix III: External funders of History named in research articles published 2015-2017 by *American Nineteenth Century History*, *Cultural & Social History*, *French History*, *History and Past & Present*:

Andrew Mellon Foundation, NY

Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Germany

Australian Research Council

British Academy

Council for European Studies, NY

Edinburgh Humanities Institute

European Research Council (including Marie Curie scheme)

European University Institute, Florence

Filson Historical Society of Kentucky

Fonds Westenschappelijk Onderzoek Vlaadered, Belgium

Fondation Napoléon, France

Fullbright Commission, US

Gilder Lehrman Institute, NY

Government of Alberta, Canada

Hamburg Institute of Social Research, Germany

Huntington Library, California

Icelandic Research Fund

Institute for Research in the Humanities, Wisconsin

Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London

Institute of Historical Research, London

Irish Research Council

Isaac Newton Trust, Cambridge

Kulturwissenschaftliches Kolleg, Konstanz

Leverhulme Trust, UK

Library of Congress, US

National Endowment for the Humanities (US)

Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NOW)

New England Regional Fellowship Consortium, US

New York Public Library

Peter Paris Memorial Fund

Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies, Harvard

Scouloudi Foundation, UK

Social Science & Humanities Research Council, Canada

St Andrews Institute for Medieval Studies, UK

Swedish ÖstersjöstiftelsenSwiss Natural Sciences Foundation

US Department of Education

US Naval Postgraduate School

Velux Foundation

Villa I Tatti, Italy

Wellcome Trust, UK

Weslyan Center, Point Loma Nazarene University, California

Wolfson Trust, UK

Appendix IV: External funders acknowledged in *American Historical Review* research articles, 2015-2018:

Academia Sinica in Taiwan

AHRC

Alexander von Humboldt Foundation

American Academy of Arts and Sciences

American Antiquarian Society

American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS)

American Philosophical Society

American University of Paris

Andrew Mellon Foundation

Australian Research Council

Bourse Chateaubriand from the French Embassy in the United States

British Academy

Center for Chinese Studies, Taiwan

Charlotte W. Newcombe Foundation

China Scholarship Council Exchange Program

Council of American Overseas Research Centers

Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD)

Fulbright Foundation in Germany

Fung Global Fellows Program, Princeton University

Gerda Henkel Stiftung

Huntington Library, US

Indiana University Maurer School of Law (Jerome Hall Fellowship)

Institute for New Economic Thinking (INET)

Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton

John Carter Brown Library

John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation

Leverhulme Trust

McNeil Center for Early American Studies/Barra Foundation

National Endowment for the Humanities

New England Regional Fellowship Consortium

New York Public Library

Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study

Research Council of Norway

Research Foundation of the City University of New York

School of Historical Studies at Tel Aviv University

Shelby Cullom Davis Center for Historical Studies, Princeton University

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, Canada

Social Science Research Council, U.S

Swiss National Science Foundation

University of California, Berkeley History Department

U.S. Department of Education

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, US

Zentrum Moderner Orient (ZMO), Berlin