

# UCML Executive Committee



Friday 2 November 2018 12.30 – 16.00

Monnet Room, Europe House

32 Smith Square, London SW1P 3EU

## Report from the Vice-Chair (Research)

### **Open Access for Monographs**

On 11 September at the British Academy there was a well-attended and smoothly organised symposium on the state of play in the world of academic open-access publishing, with presentations from academics, including Dr Caroline Warman, tutor in French at Jesus, Oxford, and publishers, including UCL Press and Open Books. It is the intention of Research England, which is the successor organisation to HEFCE for matters to do with research, that for the next REF (in 2027 or thereabouts) only monographs published in open access mode (ie available at a few clicks of a mouse to anyone anywhere in the world with a device and an internet connection) will be eligible for submission. The minutes of the event will be available shortly. In the meantime, this is the programme:

<https://www.eventbrite.co.uk/e/open-access-monographs-an-event-for-learned-societies-and-subject-associations-tickets-47516020697#>

At present the principle objection to the policy and obstacle in the way of its implementation is that someone has to pay for the publication, including organising peer review, editing, copy-editing and type-setting. At UCL Press, UCL picks up the tab for its own academics and charges most others £5000. UCL Press also sends out print copies for review and sale, thus making the best of both worlds. Academics who have published in open access tend to be converts and boast much greater interaction with readers.

UCML's concern has been that our members are more likely to publish in other countries and in languages other than English and that foreign publishers would not be bound by any deal Research England and its equivalent agencies in the devolved regions may make with publishers in the UK. This fear seems unfounded to me for two reasons: academics in other countries are also moving towards open access and Continental academic publishers are already often charging as much in subsidies as any book processing fee. Helen Snaith, senior policy adviser at Research England who is driving the initiative forward and (full disclosure) coincidentally my PhD student, also insists there will be exceptions to the rule when it is brought in. By the end of the day, however, I was no wiser with respect to how open access would be funded.

### **REF Consultation**

We agreed to submit the following four points:

1. Neither UOA 26 (Modern Languages and Linguistics) nor 25 (Area Studies) mention Japanese, Chinese or Arabic. Indeed East Asian and Middle Eastern Languages seem to be excluded from UOA 26 which highlights 'Celtic, Germanic, Romance or Slavonic languages or other languages of Europe and

Latin America'. I know that there is cross-referral and that both panels expect to receive work which could have been submitted elsewhere and they promise to deal with it appropriately, as I am sure that they will. But inclusion of East Asian and Middle Eastern languages in that list would reflect how many schools and departments of Modern Languages are now configured and how organisations such as UCML itself work. We have noted with respect to A-level entries that there is growth in Chinese which is now commonly taught alongside the traditional European languages. European languages are invited to submit to UOA 25; the same should apply to East Asian and Middle Eastern with respect to UOA 26.

2. UCML welcomes the inclusion of translation as practice under the category of research output [and informally records its gratitude to Naomi Segal] and recommends that the descriptor for UOA 26 draw attention to this change which is defined in paragraph 212 currently hidden in a sub-annex. It is a major and welcome reform and it is important that the sector makes note of it and institutional managers understand what it is.

3. Mention should be made too, certainly in the UOA 26 descriptor and possibly in UOA 25 too, of historical periods, such as the Middle Ages and the Early Modern, as Modern Languages and Linguistics and also Area Studies work across time (History) as well as space (Geography).

4. In paragraph 205 on impact, we recommend the inclusion of an extra sub-clause on the international dimension of impact [suggested addition in square brackets]: 'They will relate to the actual, likely or deserved influence of the work [whether in the UK, a particular country or region outside the UK, or on international audiences more broadly].

### **Post-OWRI (informal) Consultation**

I submitted to Michael Worton who chairs the AHRC Modern Languages Advisory Group the suggestions, albeit re-phrased, which we discussed at the last plenary, the first under the heading 'Beyond the Monolingual Paradigm in the Arts and Humanities' and the second 'Follow-On Funding for Impact and Public Engagement'. Michael seemed very pleased but repeated that no commitment by the AHRC had been made. Our input would strengthen his hand, however, in negotiations.

### **AHRC Consultation**

I also responded formally on our behalf to this, discussing a draft with Claire in mid-July. The main points were that the leadership fellow had made a very positive impact and that OWRI was working well and was worth following up, for instance, with our 'Beyond the Monolingual Paradigm in the Arts and Humanities' plan.

### **January Plenary**

Susan Hodgett, chair of UOA 25 Area Studies, and Charles Forsdick, chair of UOA 26 Modern Languages and Linguistics, have both agreed to address the plenary and take part in discussion on 18 January. This will fill one half of the afternoon. The other half will be devoted to policy, see item 4 of the SG minutes.

Julian Preece

22 October, Swansea