



**Code of Practice for the fair and transparent selection  
of staff for inclusion in the University's submission to  
the Research Excellence Framework 2014**

# **University of the Arts London Research Excellence Framework 2014 Equalities Code of Practice Policy Statement**

## **Introduction**

1. It is a requirement of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) that each submitting institution establishes a code of practice. Institutional decisions on which members of staff to submit are at the discretion of HEIs but they need to be justifiable. The funding bodies require the head of each HEI making a REF submission to confirm that the HEI has – in preparing its submissions and selecting staff for inclusion – developed, adopted and documented an appropriate internal code of practice which attends to all relevant equal opportunities legislation in force on the submission date. HEIs are required to submit their code of practice for verification by the REF Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP).

## **Policy statement**

2. University of the Arts London has a well established Equality and Diversity Framework 2010-2015 that responds to the legal requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and supports best practice across the Colleges. A copy of the framework is available on the University's website<sup>1</sup>.
3. UAL aims to submit to the REF 2014 all eligible staff who are conducting excellent research, including those whose ability to produce four outputs or work productively throughout the assessment period has been constrained for reasons covered by equality legislation. The selection of staff will be consistent with the research quality criteria laid down by HEFCE for REF 2014 and the provisions made with respect to staff individual circumstances.
4. The purpose of the code of practice is to make sure that all the processes concerned with selection of staff for inclusion in REF 2014 submissions are transparent, consistent, accountable and inclusive. The code sets out the principles to be applied to all aspects and stages of the process to ensure that submissions will be consistent throughout the University. Responsibilities are clearly defined and the operating criteria and terms of reference for individuals, committees, advisory groups and any other bodies concerned with the REF will be made readily available to all individuals and groups concerned. The existence of the code will be publicised throughout the University and is available on its intranet site. Alternative formats are available on request from the University's Research Management and Administration department (rma-pa@arts.ac.uk).
5. The University of the Arts will:
  - a) Implement open and transparent selection criteria based on the HEFCE REF criteria for use by the University's selection panels, committees and boards (Appendix 1).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.arts.ac.uk/about-ual/diversity/equality-and-diversity-framework/>

- b) Detail the communication channels to be used to convey the relevant information to all involved in the selection process and all those eligible for submission.
- c) Take account of staff individual circumstances in accordance with the guidance set out in REF 02.2011. It will publish a statement drawing staff attention to the guidance on how REF panels will consider individual circumstances. It will publish a list of the circumstances that will be taken into account and details of the mechanisms through which they will be considered by the REF panels and the University. Staff will be provided with a centralised procedure to enable confidential disclosure of their individual circumstances.
- d) Ensure that selection for REF submissions eliminates discrimination, promotes equality of opportunity and fosters good relations in relation to the legally protected characteristics of Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Sex (Gender), Race, Religion or Belief or Sexual Orientation as outlined in the University's Equality and Diversity Framework 2010-2015 as well as fixed-term or part-time status. See further information in paragraphs 29-44 of this code.
- e) Detail an appeals process that can be used by all eligible staff in order to seek appropriate and timely feedback for those that are not selected with provision for appeals to be considered before the final selection is made. See paragraph 48 of this code.
- f) Conduct equality impact assessments (EIA) to inform the code of practice and the REF selection process in order to identify, monitor and respond to any adverse impact on the inclusion and exclusion rates of staff with protected characteristics.

## **Legislative context**

- 6. The University has responsibilities as an employer and as a public sector organisation under the Equality Act 2010. As an employer, the University must ensure that its policies do not directly or indirectly discriminate against its employees on the grounds of their Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Sex (Gender), Race, Religion or Belief, Sexual Orientation. These obligations apply to all REF selection procedures.
- 7. This Code of Practice applies to all members of staff involved in REF processes as well as any REF external advisers engaged by the University. This Code of Practice affirms our commitment to equality and the REF selection process by cross-referencing to the University's Equality and Diversity Framework 2010-2015.

## **Code of Practice for the fair and transparent selection of staff for inclusion in the University's submission to the Research Excellence Framework 2014**

### **Staff**

8. The selection of staff for submission to the REF will need to balance both University and individual needs. In April 2011 all returnable staff were invited to submit information on their research outputs in preparation for the University's submission to the Research Excellence Framework. Staff proposed for inclusion by College REF Working Groups will be required to draft supporting statements for each output. Exceptions in terms of fewer research outputs published during the period will be considered where the justification falls within paragraphs 29-44 of this code of practice. Staff will be invited to identify any confidential matters relating to their ability to produce the research outputs which relate to clearly defined circumstances or complex circumstances (see paragraphs 30-44 of this code).

### **Output selection**

9. Outputs will be selected with reference to the University's research strategy and based on a judgement of quality. The University's criteria for the judgement of quality will relate to REF criteria, such as originality, significance and rigour (REF 02.201, pp87-88).
10. In being selective about its submission, the University is seeking to demonstrate both its excellence in art, design and communication as well as a strong academic coherence to these activities. The final responsibility for deciding who and what is entered in to the REF 2014 rests with the Academic Board and the Executive Board.

### **Committees**

11. The University's Research Standards Development Committee (RSDC) has the major responsibility for overseeing and directing the University's preparation for the REF submission.
12. The RSDC will delegate matters to the College REF Working Groups (CRWGs), and the Research Management Group (RMG). The Research Strategy Group (RSG) will comment and advise Executive Board on the REF proposals made by RSDC. A non-academic REF team based within Research Management and Administration (RMA) will provide administrative processes and a secretariat for the REF submission. See Appendix 2 for a diagram of the reporting structure.
13. The RSDC will approve an internal expert REF Review Panel to test the emerging submission at key points before the submission deadline.

### **Training**

15. RMA will provide training on equality and diversity supported by the University's Equality and Diversity Team. Training will be tailored to the REF processes and will include worked examples that explore issues concerning individual circumstances. The following individuals will be required to undertake the training:

- Staff selected to decide appeals (see paragraph XX of this code)
- Members of the RMG who are responsible of recommending staff.
- The Director and Deputy Director of Human Resources.
- College Associate Deans of Research who chair the College REF Working Groups.
- RMA staff supporting the REF submission.

The training will be based upon the guidance issued by the Equality Challenge Unit.

## Communication

- 16 The University is committed to communicating and disseminating the code to all active research staff and explaining the processes for the selection of staff for submission. It will:
- Make the code widely available throughout the University by publishing it, and other relevant documents, on its Research website and on the Staff Intranet site;
  - Circulate an email from the Vice Chancellor to all staff in May 2012 to disseminate the Code of Practice;
  - Present the Code of Practice at the four College REF Days in May 2012 at which examples of the definitions of clearly defined and complex circumstances and early career researchers will be discussed;
  - Encourage staff to discuss questions they may have on the University's preparation for REF with their College ADR, the Dean of Research or the Director of RMA. Staff will also be able to email questions or suggestions related to REF to a University email address ([refenquiries@arts.ac.uk](mailto:refenquiries@arts.ac.uk));
  - Ensure that RMA contact those staff who are unable to access the University's email facility or are absent from work due to sabbatical leave, maternity and sick leave to draw their attention to the REF Code of Practice and guidance available on the University's website;
  - Ensure that members of staff are notified in writing about University decisions with regard to exclusion or inclusion in the REF submission and provide appropriate and timely feedback for those that are not selected with provision for appeals to be considered before the final selection is made.

**Tasks of the Key Committees** (See UAL REF 2014 Committee and Research Groups Reporting Structure: Appendix 2)

17. **The Academic Board** will:

- a) Approve all aspects of the REF submission for sign-off by the Vice Chancellor.

18. **The University's Research Standards Development Committee** will:

- a) Identify which REF Units of Assessment (UoA) the University will submit to;
- b) Define the overall quality level to be expected from submissions;
- c) Identify how the University will carry out its selection and submission process;
- d) Approve detailed criteria that reflect the quality level expected by the University within each UoA to be submitted, based on the REF criteria specific to each UoA set out in REF 02/2012 - Panel Criteria and Working Methods;

- e) Approve all aspects of the University's REF submission (Ref 1a, 1c, 2, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b, 4c & 5);
- f) Ensure that members of staff are notified in writing about University decisions with regard to exclusion or inclusion in the REF submission and provide appropriate and timely feedback for those that are not selected with provision for appeals to be considered before the final selection is made;
- g) Receive reports from RMG on the emerging character of the University's REF submission;
- h) Delegate actions to the CRWGs, RMG, the Dean of Research and the Director of RMA to ensure that the selection of staff accords with the Code of Practice and that the University's preparation for the REF submission is communicated to UAL staff;
- i) Receive Equality Impact Assessments and feedback to CRWGs and RMG on outcomes and any actions to be taken;
- j) Update Academic Board on the progress of the REF submission;
- k) Recommend to the Academic Board the final REF 2014 submission.

19. **The Research Strategy Group will:**

- a) Comment and advise Executive Board on the REF submission proposals of the RSDC.

20. **The Research Management Group will:**

- a) Recommend to RSDC the appropriate metrics to maximise UAL's REF submission for use by CRWGs with reference to Outputs, Impact and Environment;
- b) Propose assessment criteria for REF research outputs to be approved by RSDC;
- c) Ensure that the UAL REF selection criteria are communicated to all eligible members of staff;
- d) Ensure that all eligible staff are notified concerning methods of appeal;
- e) Ensure that relevant staff are notified of all critical deadlines;
- f) Ensure the accuracy of the staff details data (REF1a, 1c);
- g) Receive, assess and report on the proposals of the individual CRWGs for inclusion and exclusion of members of staff in the REF submission to the RSDC;
- h) Oversee the development of the Impact Template and Research Impact Case Studies (REF 3a & 3b);
- i) Receive and take into account documentation relating to clearly defined individual circumstances prepared by RMA in consultation with the University's HR department, and report this to the CRWGs.
- j) Ensure the accuracy of Research Environment data (REF 4a, 4b, 4c) and oversee the development of Research Environment narrative REF 5);

- k) Receive and comment on Equality Impact Assessments on the policies and procedures for selecting staff;
- l) Provide Stage 1 of the appeals process as detailed at paragraph 39;
- m) Report to RSDC on the progress of all areas of the University's REF submission.

21. **The College REF Working Groups will:**

- a) Operate the criteria approved by the RSDC for REF research outputs;
- b) Evaluate the submissions of individual members of staff against the specified UAL REF criteria and make proposals for inclusion and exclusion of members of staff to RMG;
- c) Receive and take into account documentation relating to clearly defined individual circumstances prepared by RMA in consultation with the University's HR department;
- d) Ensure that records of the evaluations are kept;
- e) Report to RMG and College Research Committee on the progress of REF preparation.

22. **The UAL REF Expert Review Panel will:**

- a) Review a sample of research outputs against College RWG evaluation to ensure the benchmarking of evaluation across the University;
- b) Report to RMG and RSG.

## **Research Management and Administration**

- 23 Research Management and Administration (RMA) staff act as the secretariat for all research committees and groups involved in the REF. The role of RMA staff ensures consistency of support regarding: terms of reference, agendas, minutes and reports, which ensures that the University's guidelines are followed.

RMA staff support College REF Working Groups by providing:

- Consistent guidance for Chairs of College RWGs.
- Preparation of consistent paperwork and procedures for the four College RWGs.
- Liaison with staff and internal peer reviewers

## **Selection Process**

24. **Stage 1:** All eligible staff will be invited to submit research outputs for inclusion in the REF to be submitted to RMA. RMA will pass the data to the CRWGs.
25. College REF Working Groups are the appropriate bodies to evaluate research outputs as well as represent each subject field and to make the preliminary proposals for inclusion, conditional inclusion or exclusion. They will be convened by each College Associate Dean Research (ADRs).

26. **Stage 2:** The RMG will review and test the proposals of the CRWGs and report to RSDC. RSDC will be responsible for formulation of the University's final REF submission including the confirmed recommendations for inclusion or exclusion of members of staff to the Academic Board. It will ensure compliance with this code of practice by integrating the priorities of Equality Impact Assessments (see paragraph 47 of this code) and the application of this code of practice to the REF submission.

### **Feedback to staff**

27. As instructed by RSDC, RMA will be responsible for informing all staff individually whether or not it is proposed that they should be included in the submission. Timely feedback will be offered to all staff as to how their submission might be further developed or strengthened. In some cases, inclusion in the submission may be contingent on following the advice given. Where improvements in an individual's submission are required ADRs will provide the appropriate guidance.
28. Those individuals not recommended for inclusion in the submission will be provided with the opportunity to bring forward any further evidence of individual circumstances that may have constrained their performance. Any new evidence will be re-examined by the appropriate CRWG and RMG. Staff will also be able to appeal against exclusion (see paragraph 48 of this code).

### **Individual Circumstances**

29. HEFCE REF main panels and sub-panels have produced guidance on how they will deal with circumstances that might have constrained an individual's ability to produce four outputs or work productively throughout the assessment period. There are two types of individual circumstances: clearly defined circumstances and complex circumstances.

#### **Clearly defined circumstances**

30. All members of eligible staff will be invited to disclose individual circumstances defined by HEFCE REF as 'clearly defined' (see paragraphs 33-34 below) that have had a material impact on the individual's ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs in the assessment period.
31. Any member of staff wishing to bring a clearly defined circumstance forward for consideration should identify these on the REF individual circumstances form available on the Human Resources Employee Self Service system (iTrent). The Director of RMA will confirm the details of the disclosed circumstances with the Director of Human Resources, or their nominee. The confirmed details will then be considered by the Dean of Research, the Director of RMA & the Chair of the member of staff's College REF Working Group to decide the appropriate reduction of outputs according to HEFCE REF guidance (REF 01.2012 paragraphs 70-85).
32. The Director of RMA will inform the member of staff of the outcome of their disclosure of clearly defined circumstances. Confidentiality will be maintained regarding the details of the circumstances disclosed. The Director of RMA will inform the College REF Working Group, RMG, and RSDC of the agreed reduction in outputs but not disclose the nature of the individual circumstances. The Dean of



Research and Director of RMA will draft the statement on Individual staff circumstances to be submitted on Form REF1b to REF2014.

33. Circumstances with a clearly defined reduction in outputs are the following:
- Qualifying as an Early Career Researcher.
  - Absence from work due to working part-time, secondments or career breaks.
  - Qualifying periods of maternity, paternity or adoption leave.
34. Early career researchers are defined as members of staff who meet the criteria to be selected as Category A or Category C staff on the census date, **and** who started their careers as independent researchers on or after 1 August 2009. For the purposes of the REF, an individual is deemed to have started their career as an independent researcher from the point at which:
- 1) They held a contract of employment of 0.2 FTE or greater, which included a primary employment function of undertaking 'research' or 'teaching and research', with any HEI or other organisation, whether in the UK or overseas, **and**
  - 2) They undertook independent research, leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on a research grant or significant piece of research work. (A member of staff is not deemed to have undertaken independent research purely on the basis that they are named on one or more research outputs.)

The following do **not** meet the definition of an ECR (this list is not exhaustive):

- 1) Staff who first acted as an independent researcher while at a previous employer – whether another HEI, business or other organisation in the UK or elsewhere – before 1 August 2009, with a contract of 0.2 FTE or greater.
- 2) Staff who first acted as an independent researcher before 1 August 2009 and have since had a career outside of research or an extended break from their research career, before returning to research work. Such staff may reduce the number of outputs submitted according to paragraph 92a.iv. (career breaks).
- 3) Research assistants who are ineligible to be returned to the REF.

### **Complex circumstances**

35. All members of eligible staff will be invited to disclose individual circumstances defined by HEFCE REF as 'complex' (see paragraphs 42-43 below) that have had a material impact on the individual's ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs in the assessment period.
36. Any member of staff wishing to bring a complex circumstance forward for consideration should identify these on the REF individual circumstances form available on the Human Resources Employee Self Service system (iTrent). Information on the form will detail:
- The nature and timing of the circumstances;
  - An explanation of the effects on the individual's contracted working hours or ability to fulfil their contracted working hours;

- c) An explanation of any other effects on the individual's ability to work productively;
  - d) A calculation for the reduction in outputs and the number of outputs returned.
37. In all cases, the Director of Human Resources will treat a complex circumstances disclosure statement confidentially. If further information is required the Deputy Director of Human Resources will follow up on the form by speaking with the eligible member of staff to record details of the case.
38. The complex circumstances statement will then be considered by the Director of Human Resources, the Dean of Research & the Director of RMA to decide if a case for the reduction of outputs can be made and what this reduction will be. They will use the examples of complex circumstances provided by the Equality Challenge Unit (ECU), which indicate the appropriate reduction in outputs for a range of particular circumstances.
39. The Director of RMA will inform the member of staff of the outcome of their disclosure of complex circumstances. Confidentiality will be maintained regarding the details of the circumstances disclosed. Any such statements are captured for REF purposes only. The Director of RMA will inform the College REF Working Group, RMG, and RSDC of the agreed reduction in outputs but not disclose the nature of the individual circumstances.
40. The member of staff can appeal against the outcome of their disclosure of complex circumstances by submitting a completed form AP2 'Request for Appeals panel to review case' to the Director of RMA. The appeal will follow Stage 2 of the Appeals process indicated in paragraph 48 of this document.
41. The Dean of Research and Director of RMA will draft the statement on individual staff circumstances to be submitted on Form REF1b to REF2014. Confidential records will kept to verify decisions on complex issues.
42. Complex circumstances are likely to require a judgement about the appropriate number of outputs that can be reduced without penalty. These circumstances are:
- i. Disability. This is defined in REF 02.2011, Part 4, Table 2 under 'Disability'.
  - ii. Ill health or injury.
  - iii. Mental health conditions.
  - iv. Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, paternity, adoption or childcare that fall outside of – or justify the reduction of further outputs in addition to – the allowances made according to clearly defined circumstances.
  - v. Other caring responsibilities (such as caring for an elderly or disabled family member).
  - vi. Gender reassignment.
  - vii. Other circumstances relating to the protected characteristics covered by the Equality Act 2010. The Act covers the protected characteristics of:

- 1) age
- 2) disability
- 3) gender reassignment
- 4) marriage and civil partnership
- 5) pregnancy and maternity
- 6) race
- 7) religion or belief
- 8) sex
- 9) sexual orientation.

43. Other circumstances comparable with the examples above will be considered, as long as an explanation is provided as to the way in which they are said to have impacted on the individual's ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs.
44. Where a submission includes a combination of clearly defined and more complex circumstances relating to an individual, the University will return these as 'complex' so that a single judgement can be made about the appropriate reduction in outputs, taking into account all the circumstances.

### **Fixed-term and part-time staff**

45. The University will ensure that fixed term staff including contract research staff, are treated no less favourably than similar permanent employees. In addition the University has a security of Employment Agreement with University and College Union covering its hourly paid Associate Lecturers. There is also a clear procedure for the fair termination of fixed term contracts, including the right of appeal. The University encourages flexible working amongst its staff and is keen to ensure that part-time workers are treated no less favourably than their full-time counterparts and can achieve a good work-life balance.
46. In the light of the Fixed-term and Part-time Regulations, consideration will be given by the University to individual circumstances affecting part-time and fixed-term staff in relation to Equality and Diversity. It will seek to demonstrate how equality is achieved for those on fixed-term (relative to open) and part-time (relative to full-time) contracts. Such circumstances might for example include pro rata consideration of:
  - a) the application criteria for submission in the case of part-time staff
  - b) breaks in the continuity of employment of fixed-term staff and where relevant, contract research staff.

### **Equality Impact Assessment**

47. The University will conduct equality impact assessments (EIAs) on the composition of committees and working groups, policies and procedures for selecting staff for the REF. This will include a comparative equality profile report on the diversity characteristics of those submitted for the REF against the profile of the University's academic staff. EIAs will be reviewed by RMG, which will report to RSDC.

Equality Impact Assessments will be completed according to the following timetable:

EIA 1: Committees and Working Groups - May 2012  
EIA 2: Final Selection - September 2013

The University will seek to achieve best practice in the area of equality and diversity by involving, where possible, staff with protected characteristics in the EIAs in (see HEFCE REF 02.2011). All EIAs will be made public after the REF 2014 submission has been finalised.

## Appeals

48. An appeals procedure forms an integral part of our code of practice and seeks to address any perceived unfair discrimination, concerns about process (including if it is felt that procedure has not been followed) or circumstances where previously unavailable evidence has come to light. The REF is a qualitative process in which judgements are made about the quality of research of individual members of staff. The judgements result from expert professional knowledge and factual information. Hence, disagreement with the decision alone would not be appropriate grounds for an appeal. Appeals will result from procedural concerns or the availability of factual information not considered by HR, CRWG, RMG or RSDC (the decision making groups). If an individual has appropriate grounds for a complaint, then they should take the following action(s):
- a) Stage 1. An individual who wishes to have their recommendation for selection for the REF reviewed must complete form AP1 – Request for review of REF Exclusion and submit it to the Dean of Research. Form AP1 can be downloaded from the University's intranet site. RMG will consider the request resulting in a decision to be reached within four weeks of receiving the form.
  - b) Stage 2. Where resolution has not been possible at RMG level, an individual may then submit formal written notification to the Director of Research Management and Administration stating what action has been taken to date and the reasons why resolution has not been possible. This request should be submitted on form AP2 - 'Request for Appeals panel to review case' which is available on the University's intranet site. An Appeals Panel will meet to consider the case, normally within six weeks of receiving the form AP2. Should the University Appeals Panel need to meet an individual, a work colleague or trade union representative may accompany the individual. The Appeals Panel will comprise:
    - i. A Deputy Vice Chancellor (Chair).
    - ii. A Dean (who is not connected to the College concerned or the Research Standards Development Committee).
    - iii. A Trade Union representative or work colleague.
    - iv. A member from Human Resources will assist.

The decision of the Stage 2 Appeals panel will be final.

## Abbreviations

ADRs	Associate Dean of Research (UAL)
CRWGs	College REF Working Groups (UAL)

REF	Research Excellence Framework (HEFCE)
ECR	Early Career Researcher (HEFCE)
EDAP	Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (HEFCE)
EIA	Equality Impact Assessment (UAL/HEFCE)
ECU	Equality Challenge Unit (HEFCE)
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HR	Human Resources (UAL)
REF	Research Excellence Framework (HEFCE)
RMA	Research Management and Administration (UAL)
RMG	Research Management Group (UAL)
RSDC	Research Standards Development Committee (UAL)
RSG	Research Strategy Group (UAL)
UoA	Units of Assessment (HEFCE)

## **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 Assessment Criteria for Working Groups, panels, committees and boards
- Appendix 2 UAL REF 2014 Committee and Research Groups Reporting Structure

## Appendix 1

### Assessment Criteria for Working Groups, panels, committees and boards.

#### 1. Background

**University Working Groups, panels, committees and boards** will deploy their professional judgement to propose and approve potential REF submissions in the context and procedures of the UAL Code of Practice on the fair and transparent selection of staff.

#### 2. Eligible Outputs

**The University** will accept any output first published in its final form during the REF publication period (1 January 2008 to 31 December 2013) that was 'pre-published' during calendar year 2007 – whether in full in a different form (for example, an 'online first' article or preprint), or as a preliminary version or working paper – as eligible for submission to the REF, provided that the 'pre-published' output was not submitted to the 2008 RAE.

Other than the above exception, an output published during the REF publication period (1 January 2008 to 31 December 2013) that includes significant material in common with an output published prior to 1 January 2008 is eligible only if it incorporates significant new material. In these cases:

- a. The **University's REF Working Groups and Committees** should form a view as to whether or not all of the work reported in the listed output should be considered as having been issued within the publication period; and, if the previously published output was submitted to the 2008 RAE, REF Working Groups and Committees should assess only the distinct content of the output submitted to the REF.
- b. Researchers will need to explain, where necessary, how far any work published earlier was revised to incorporate new material.

(See REF 02. 2011, paragraphs 105 -139, Pages 21-25 & REF 01. 2012, Part 1, paragraphs 42-44).

#### 3 Co-authored/co-produced outputs.

**The University** should ensure that active researchers have recorded co-authored or co-produced outputs only against the individuals that made a substantial research contribution to the output. The Main Panel D statements of criteria in Part 2 of the Panel Criteria and Working Methods provide details of the information that REF panels may require in submissions to establish that an individual made a substantial contribution to any co-authored outputs listed against them.

**The University's REF Working Groups and Committees** should assess the quality of the whole output as well as the specific contribution of the individual. Panel D's criteria statements provide guidance about the extent to which a co-authored output may be listed against more than one member of staff returned within the same submission.

(See REF 01.2012, paragraphs 45-47 Page 7; & paragraphs 56-62 Section 2D; pp 85-86)

#### 4 Double-weighted outputs.

**The University's Working Groups and Committees** should identify which outputs of extended scale and scope should be proposed as double-weighted (count as two outputs) in the UAL REF submission.

(See REF 02.2011, paragraphs 123-126, Page 24). In all UOAs, a 'reserve' output should be included with each output proposed for double-weighting.

Panel Criteria and Working Methods (REF 0.121012), Panel D provides further guidance on how outputs of extended scale and scope are characterised in their disciplines, and on the process for requesting an output to be double-weighted.

(See REF 01.2012 paragraphs 48-49, Page 7; and Section 2D, paragraphs 63-70, Page 86)

#### 5 UAL REF 2014 assessment criteria

The UAL assessment process is based on internal peer and expert review. REF Working Groups and Committees will examine the evidence of research outputs presented by active researchers. They will use their professional judgement to evaluate each output and form an overall view about the output profile of each researcher.

The Unit/s of Assessment applicable to UAL research will be related to (a) sub panel/s of Main Panel D. In line with the published HEFCE REF assessment criteria the UAL REF Working Groups and Committees will assess outputs against the following criteria:

**5.1 UAL REF Working Groups, panels, committees and boards** will assess the quality of outputs in terms of their 'originality, significance and rigour', with reference to international research quality standards.

#### Assessment Criteria

- a. **Originality:** a creative/intellectual advance that makes an important and innovative contribution to understanding and knowledge. This may include substantive empirical findings, new arguments, interpretations or insights, imaginative scope, assembling of information in an innovative way, development of new theoretical frameworks and conceptual models, innovative methodologies and/or new forms of expression.
- b. **Significance:** the enhancement or deserved enhancement of knowledge, thinking, understanding and/or practice.
- c. **Rigour:** intellectual coherence, methodological precision and analytical power; accuracy and depth of scholarship; awareness of and appropriate engagement with other relevant work.

#### 5.2 Definitions of starred levels

In assessing outputs, **UAL REF Working Groups, panels, committees and boards** will look for evidence of originality, significance and rigour and apply the generic definitions of the starred quality levels as listed below.

The terms 'world-leading', 'international' and 'national' are taken as quality benchmarks within the generic definitions of the quality levels. They will relate to the actual, likely or deserved influence of the work. There will be no assumption of any necessary international exposure in terms of publication or reception, or any necessary research content in terms of topic or approach. Nor will there be an assumption that work published in a language other than English or Welsh is necessarily of a quality that is internationally benchmarked.

<b>Four star</b>	<p><b>Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</b></p> <p>In assessing work as being four star (quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour), <b>UAL REF Working Groups, panels, committees and boards</b> will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics across and possibly beyond its area/field:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a primary or essential point of reference</li> <li>• of profound influence</li> <li>• instrumental in developing new thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences</li> <li>• a major expansion of the range and the depth of research and its application</li> <li>• outstandingly novel, innovative and/or creative.</li> </ul>
<b>Three star</b>	<p><b>Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.</b></p> <p><b>UAL REF Working Groups, panels, committees and boards</b> will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics across and possibly beyond its area/field:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an important point of reference</li> <li>• of lasting influence</li> <li>• a catalyst for, or important contribution to, new thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences</li> <li>• a significant expansion of the range and the depth of research and its application</li> <li>• significantly novel or innovative or creative.</li> </ul>
<b>Two star</b>	<p><b>Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</b></p> <p><b>UAL REF Working Groups, panels, committees and boards</b> will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics across and possibly beyond its area/field:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a recognised point of reference</li> <li>• of some influence</li> <li>• an incremental and cumulative advance on thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences</li> <li>• a useful contribution to the range or depth of research and its application.</li> </ul>

<b>One star</b>	<b>Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</b> <b>UAL REF Working Groups , panels, committees and boards</b> will expect to see evidence of the following characteristics within its area/field: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• based on existing traditions of thinking, methodology and/or creative practice</li> <li>• a useful contribution of minor influence.</li> </ul>
<b>Unclassified</b>	<b>Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work.</b> Or work which does not meet the published definition of research for the purposes of this assessment.

(See REF 01.2012 Section 2D, paragraphs 77-79, Pages 87-88)

All UAL REF Working **Groups, panels, committees and boards** will apply the assessment described here (Appendix 1) and will use the UAL REF Submission Peer Review Form to record this assessment. They will follow a common set of procedures in undertaking aspects of their work.



## Appendix 2: UAL REF 2014 Research Groups, Panel and Committees Reporting Structure

Submission of the REF by the Vice Chancellor

Approval of the REF Submission by Academic Board (paragraph 17 of the CoP)

Scrutiny of the REF submission by RSG and Executive Board (paragraph 19 of the CoP)

RSDC oversee the University's REF Preparation and recommends the submission to Academic Board (paragraph 18 of the CoP)

RMG reviews proposals from Colleges and oversee the management of the impact and environment sections of REF submission (paragraph 20 of the CoP)

College REF Working Groups propose the Selection of outputs for the REF submission (paragraph 21 of the CoP)

College Research Committees oversee the work of the College RWGs (paragraph 21e of the CoP)

UAL REF Expert Review Panel will review a sample of research outputs against CRWG evaluation (paragraph 22 of the CoP)

RMA provides secretariat support for all

Research Committees and Groups (paragraph 23 of the CoP)

