REF Main Panel D: Meeting 2

27 January 2014

HEFCE Offices, Furnival Street, London

Minutes

Present:

Dinah Birch (Deputy Chair)
Alexander Bird (Sub Panel Chair – SP32)
Jane Boggan (Panel adviser)
Bruce Brown (Chair)
Maria Delgado (Sub Panel Chair – SP35)
David Docherty (User Member)
Kirsten Drotner (International Member)
Peter Gatrell (Sub Panel Chair – SP27)
Peter Golding (Sub Panel Chair – SP36)
Paul Greenhalgh (Sub Panel Chair – SP34)
Rebecca Lambert (Panel Adviser)
Mark Llewellyn (Observer)
James Moy (International Member)
Robin Osbourne (Sub Panel Chair – SP31)
Alice Prochaska (International Member)
Robert Ritchie (International Member)
Graeme Rosenberg (REF Team)
Anthonya Visser (International Member)
Elizabeth Westlake (Panel Adviser)
Chris Wickham (Sub Panel Chair – SP30)
Linda Woodhead (Sub Panel Chair – 33)

Apologies:

Chris Barron (User Member)
Francis Davis (User Member)
Matthew Taylor (User Member)

1.   Introduction and competence to do business

1.1.   The Chair welcomed panel members to the meeting, introduced the Agenda and
invited colleagues to introduce themselves.

1.2.   In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2.   Conflicts of interest (received paper 01)

2.1.   The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct and/or individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest after the meeting.

2.2.   The panel considered paper 01 and noted the general principles and procedures for managing conflicts of interest. In particular the panel confirmed the process for managing and recording minor conflicts of interest at sub-panel level, such that panellists will declare minor conflicts which will be recorded by the sub-panel secretary, along with the Chair's decision on how the minor conflict will be treated. The record will be used to ensure that minor conflicts are handled consistently across the sub-panel.

3.   Summary of Submissions Received (received paper 02)

3.1.   The panel noted the summary of submissions received to the sub-panels of Main Panel D.

4.   Roles and Responsibilities of the Main Panel and the Sub-panels during the assessment process (received paper 03)

4.1.   The panel received and noted paper 03 which included an extended extract from REF01.2012 Panel Criteria and Working Methods (Part 1, paragraphs 106-131) to remind members of the agreed and published role and working methods of the Main panel and its Sub-panels. In particular, panel members noted:

- Paragraph 107(b): the attendance of Main Panel members at Sub-panel meetings, and the role of international members and user members (*discussed further under agendum 5);*
- Paragraph 107(f) concerning the review by the Main Panel of emerging assessment outcomes, and in particular paragraph 107(g) with respect to the Main Panel role in determining outcomes;
- Sub-panel working methods outlined in paragraphs 109 onwards, in particular paragraphs 120-124 on assessing submissions and paragraph 126 which lists issues relating to output sub-profiles;
- Paragraph 130, which outlines Sub-panel responsibilities with respect to recommending final overall quality profiles to the Main Panel.

5.   Main Panel and Sub-panel working methods and on-going calibration (received paper 04)

5.1.   The panel received paper 04 which reiterated the key principles that the Main Panel D Sub-panels would observe in devising their own working methods. The

panel confirmed that in assessing submissions Sub-panels will observe the following principles:

- Individual elements within each submission will be assessed by a range of panel members identified for their expertise to undertake such assessment and to ensure that no one person has too great a degree of influence over the quality profiles for a particular institutional submission;
- Each, and all, of the individual elements within a submission will be scrutinised in sufficient detail so as to form robust quality judgements;
- There will be mechanisms to assure the robustness of judgements by identifying and addressing significant differences in grades and borderline cases;
- The responsibility for agreeing quality profiles, and for recommending these to the Main Panel, will be the responsibility of the Sub-panel as a whole.

5.2 The panel proposed a number of minor refinements to the Framework outlined in the paper. In particular, it was agreed that the paper would be amended to ensure greater flexibility for the Chair when allocating the roles of lead and reader and to manage the risk that no one individual would have an undue influence over a submission.

5.3 It was agreed that as the paper had already been circulated in the papers for those Sub panels meeting later that week, that an addendum would be prepared by the panel advisers and that the paper would be revised in time for the Sub-panels meeting the following week (as well as being re-circulated to the first panels).

5.4 The panel recognised the need to prepared for drafting feedback reports on each of the three elements of a submission to HEIs at the end of the exercise, and that the role of 'Lead' is designed to undertake that role. It was noted that the REF team are preparing some templates to be shared with Sub-panels early in the exercise to help with the preparation of the feedback reports.

5.5 In discussing the role of International Members there was a request for greater clarity in how they are expected to exercise their duties in terms of attending and contributing to meetings. It was agreed that the Chair would prepare a briefing paper for them.

5.6 The panel confirmed the plans for calibration of Outputs, Impact and Environment at Main Panel and Sub-panel levels, in particular to work in three clusters. It was agreed that each cluster would submit 6 case studies by 7th February, for circulation to the whole panel for consideration and discussion at the meeting on 4th March.

6. Sub panel membership

6.1. Sub-panel Chairs were invited to confirm that they have the appropriate expertise on their panels to conduct the assessment. It was noted that SP28 – Modern

Languages and Linguistics have not been able to appoint an additional impact assessor. The Chair is assessing whether the panel has the expertise and capacity to absorb the gap or whether to continue trying to identify another assessor.

7.   Project Plan (received paper 05)

7.1.   The panel noted the Project Plan for the assessment period outlining the key milestones and activities prior to and after each of the scheduled Main Panel meetings.

8.   Audit (received paper 06)

8.1.   The panel noted the plans for audit and data verification during the assessment phase and that the Panel Members' Website now has a detailed guidance document on audit procedures.

8.2.   A discussion was held regarding the audit criteria where there is reason to believe that an individual included in a submission on a 20% contract is also contracted to work full time in an HEI outside of the UK. It was agreed that as long as the individual is contractually eligible within the submitting UK HEI, and that the sum of his/her academic contracts within the UK do not sum to greater than one FTE, there are no further grounds for audit.

9.   Output Calibration (received paper 07 plus Annexes 1 &2)

9.1.   The panel considered paper 07 Annex 1, which detailed 2-3 outputs per Sub-panel taken from the set of outputs that they had selected for calibration purposes. Each Sub-panel Chair spoke to the outputs from their Sub-panel, identifying the issues raised.

9.2.   From the discussion the Main Panel identified the following themes:

- *Whether an item meets the REF definition of research* (the initial threshold decision about whether an item is eligible or not)
- *Boundary issues*: issues of fit with a SP's UOA descriptors
- *Authorial contribution*: eg co-authored or edited outputs; outputs where the SP are not confident that the author has appropriately identified his or her input to the work etc
- *Eligibility*: eg instances where it is unclear whether the output is eligible because it is unclear whether or to what extent it was published/produced during the REF period; or where it is unclear whether the item can justly claim to have been produced by the submitting author
- *Overlap*: with material published before the REF period, or during the REF period (which may or may not have been submitted to RAE/REF)

9.3   Agreed that the Sub panel chairs would bring back a report of the discussions in the Sub-panels regarding the outputs presented, responding as appropriate to the themes identified in 9.2, to include the scores confirmed by the sub-panel against

the criteria of Originality, Significance and Rigour and also to bring a hard copy sample of one of the outputs under discussion.

9.4   The panel considered paper 07 Annex 2, which included the double-weighting text from 2-3 outputs per sub-panel, taken from the selection chosen for calibration by the Sub-panels. Each Sub-panel Chair spoke to the double weighting requests and the panel agreed that each Sub panel Chair should bring back a particularly contentious request to the following meeting as well as report of the double weighting discussions at their Sub-panel meetings.

10.   Future meetings

10.1.   Noted the key agenda items for future meetings as follows:

- 4 March 2014: output calibration; impact calibration; assessment issues
- 24 April 2014: review sub-panel impact calibrations; consider output scores to date
- 12 June 2014: consider impact sub-profiles and data for 33% of outputs
- 21 July 2014: consider draft environment sub-profiles and data for 50% of outputs
- 23 September 2014: consider recommended profiles and sub-profiles and initial reports
- 30 October 2014: approve outcomes; approve feedback and reports

10.2.   The International Members had not been scheduled to attend the next meeting but where possible they will endeavour to attend.

11.   Any other business

11.1.   The meeting closed at 4pm.

REF Main Panel D: Meeting 3

4 March 2014

HEFCE Offices, Furnival Street, London

Minutes

Present:

Dinah Birch (Deputy Chair)
Alexander Bird (Sub Panel Chair – SP32)
Jane Boggan (panel adviser)
Kersti Bojars (Sub Panel Chair – SP28)
Bruce Brown (Chair)
Maria Delgado (Sub Panel Chair – SP35)
David Docherty (User Member)
Peter Gatrell (Sub Panel Chair – SP27)
Peter Golding (Sub Panel Chair – SP36)
Paul Greenhalgh (Sub Panel Chair – SP34)
Rebecca Lambert (Panel Adviser)
Mark Llewellyn (Observer)
James Moy (International Member)
Robin Osbourne (Sub Panel Chair – SP31)
Alice Prochaska (International Member)
Graeme Rosenberg (REF Team)
Matthew Taylor (User Member)
Anthonya Visser (International Member)
Elizabeth Westlake (Panel Adviser)
Chris Wickham (Sub Panel Chair – SP30)
Linda Woodhead (Sub Panel Chair – 33)

Apologies:

Chris Barron (User Member)
Francis Davis (User Member)
Kirsten Drotner (International Member)
Robert Ritchie (International Member)

1.   Introduction and competence to do business

1.1.   The Chair welcomed panel members to the meeting, introduced the Agenda and thanked members for their work in preparing for the business of the meeting. The Chair invited colleagues to introduce themselves.

1.2.   In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2.   Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1   The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record.

3.   Conflicts of interest (received paper 01)

3.1.   The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct and/or individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest after the meeting.

4.   Outputs Calibration (received paper 02)

4.1.   The Chair introduced the item, noting that the following the initial Main Panel D outputs' calibration exercise in January, the constituent Sub-panels had each undertaken output calibration and produced feedback on the exercise for consideration by the Main Panel. The panel reviewed paper 02, which summarised feedback from each sub-panel on the agreed quality assessments for the MPD calibration outputs, on assessment issues arising from the calibration discussions, and on double weighting.

4.2.   The Chair invited the panel to break out into sub-panel cluster groups to consider the feedback and identify any further key issues and or points of clarification that had arisen from the sub-panel calibration exercises.

4.3.   A plenary session was held following the break-out sessions at which a number of key points relating to output assessment were identified that should be fed back to sub-panels. It was agreed that the Panel Advisers would produce a briefing paper summarising the key issues for circulation to sub-panels during meeting round 3.

5.   Impact Calibration

5.1   The Chair introduced the impact calibration exercise and reminded members of the approach the panel had taken to calibration. Working in their sub-panel clusters, each sub-panel had identified 2 case studies that represented a range of assessment issues. Sub-panel chairs were asked to score the calibration material for their cluster (and skim read the material for the other two clusters) and provide scores and comment in advance of the meeting.

5.2 One of the Panel Advisers gave a presentation on the threshold criteria for assessing impact case studies. The key points from the presentation noted that:

(i) If a case study fails to meet one of the threshold criteria then it should be graded as Unclassified, noting that an audit query could be raised where there was significant doubt as to whether the evidence provided was sufficient to make the threshold judgement. Audit queries could not however be used to request additional information relating to the quality assessment of the case study.

(ii) The quality of the underpinning research is a threshold judgement and, once passed, should play no further part in the assessment of the quality of the submitted impact, it being noted that the assessment was of the quality of the impact, not the underpinning research.

(iii) The research making a distinct and material contribution to the impact is a key factor in making threshold judgements; panel members need to ascertain that the research cited in the case study made such a contribution.

(iv) Case studies must be assessed on the basis of the evidence provided in the document. Corroborating sources should be used to verify evidence cited in the case study and not to gather further information.

5.2 Following the presentation, the Chair invited the panel to break-out into cluster groups to consider the calibration materials. International and User members joined sub-panel chairs in their cluster groups for the discussion. Group discussion focussed on the application of the criteria of reach and significance within the context of grade boundaries, and on eligibility (in the context of the threshold judgement). Groups were also asked to identify any particular issues that arose during the cluster discussions. Cluster groups were provided with analyses of the scores and comments provided by sub-panel chairs. A plenary session was held for the cluster groups to feedback.

5.3 During the plenary session a set of issues were identified for sub-panel chairs to report to their sub-panels as part of their calibration discussions. It was agreed that the Panel Advisers would produce a briefing paper summarising the key issues for circulation to sub-panels during meeting round 3.

6. Sub-panel issues/Assessment Issues

6.1 The Chair invited members to raise any particular issues of concern, for discussion as a main panel.

6.2 The panel considered boundary issues, noting that in a number of cases sub-panels had received a significant amount of material that very clearly falls outside of individual panel's published remit of expertise. It was agreed that each sub-panel should assess the material submitted to it to the best of its ability. Where, after careful consideration, panels consider that it is outwith the competence of the panel to assess any material submitted to it, then the output(s) should be

cross-referred to the most appropriate sub-panel within or across Main Panels. It was agreed that where panels did not feel competent to make the primary assessment of whether an item is eligible, it would also be appropriate to seek cross-referral advice. Sub-panel chairs were reminded that the final assessment of submitted material remained with the sub-panel to which the material was submitted.

6.3   The panel raised concern that guidance was not yet available from the REF team on preparing institutional feedback statements. Members were keen that guidance should be made available as soon as possible to support sub-panel members in collating feedback during the assessment process. It was agreed that the Chair would raise with the REF team the issue of feedback guidance as part of the Progress update meeting, being held on 17th March, with a view to circulating initial guiding principles to sub-panel chairs shortly after.

7.   Future meetings

7.1.   The Chair noted the key agenda items for future meetings as follows:

- 24 April 2014: review sub-panel impact calibrations; consider output scores to date
- 12 June 2014: consider impact sub-profiles and data for 33% of outputs
- 21 July 2014: consider draft environment sub-profiles and data for 50% of outputs
- 23 September 2014: consider recommended profiles and sub-profiles and initial reports
- 30 October 2014: approve outcomes; approve feedback and reports

8.   Any other business

8.1.   The Chair thanked members for their participation and closed the meeting at 4.30pm.

REF Main Panel D: Meeting 4

24 April 2014

London Mathematical Society, De Morgan House, Russell Square,

London

Minutes

Present:
Dinah Birch (Deputy Chair)
Alexander Bird (Sub Panel Chair – SP32)
Jane Boggan (panel adviser)
Kersti Borjars (Sub-panel Chair – SP28)
Bruce Brown (Chair)
Maria Delgado (Sub Panel Chair – SP35)
David Docherty (User Member)
Peter Gatrell (Sub Panel Chair – SP27)
Peter Golding (Sub Panel Chair – SP36)
Paul Greenhalgh (Sub Panel Chair – SP34)
Rebecca Lambert (Panel Adviser)
James Moy (International Member)
Robin Osbourne (Sub Panel Chair – SP31)
Graeme Rosenberg (REF Team)
Elizabeth Westlake (Panel Adviser)
Chris Wickham (Sub Panel Chair – SP30)
Linda Woodhead (Sub Panel Chair – 33)

Apologies:
Chris Barron (User Member)
Kirsten Drotner (International Member)
Mark Llewellyn (Observer)
Alice Prochaska (International Member)
Robert Ritchie (International Member)
Anthonya Visser (International Member)
Matthew Taylor (User Member)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1. The Chair introduced the Agenda and welcomed panel members to the meeting confirming its competency to address the business identified.

2. Minutes of the last meeting (received paper 01)

2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true and accurate record**.**

3. Conflicts of interest (list tabled at the meeting)

3.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct and/or individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest on the Panel Members' Website after the meeting.

4. Analysis of the Sub-panel progress to date

4.1. The Chair presented a report detailing the progress of each of the Sub-panels in agreeing scores for each of the elements of assessment.

4.2. The panel discussed the matter of when the Sub-panels would see the sub-profiles and final overall profile for each HEI submitting to their panel. It was agreed that:

- The sub-profiles for Impact would be recommended to the Main Panel at the conclusion of the May meetings;
- The sub-profiles for Environment would be recommended to the Main Panel at the conclusion of the July meetings;
- The sub-profiles for Outputs would be recommended to the Main Panel at the conclusion of the September meetings. Outputs scores are being monitored at each meeting with a target of 33% being recommended at the May meetings and 50% at the July meetings; and that
- The overall profiles would be recommended to the Main Panel in October.

5. Impact Calibration (received papers 02 – extract from PCWM on Impact Template, 03 – Impact calibration: collated feedback from sub panels on the calibration of impact case studies and impact templates; and 04 – Collated scores from the sub-panel calibration of impact case studies and impact templates)

5.1. The Chair introduced the item, noting that following the Main Panel D Impact case study calibration at the previous meeting, the Sub-panels had undertaken a calibration of impact (of case studies and templates) and produced feedback on the exercise for consideration by the Main Panel. The panel reviewed papers 03 and 04, which summarised feedback from each sub-panel and the scores given to case studies and templates within each cluster. It was noted that there was a fair degree of consistency in the scoring, although in some cases, particularly in relation to Impact templates, panels provided a range of scores rather than a single score.

5.2. The Chair invited the panel to break out into sub-panel cluster groups to consider the feedback and identify any further key issues and/or points of clarification that had arisen from the Sub-panel calibration exercises.

5.3. A plenary session was held following the break-out sessions at which a number of additional points relating to impact assessment were identified to be fed back to the Sub-panels. It was agreed that the Panel Advisers would amend paper 2 accordingly for circulation to the Sub-panels for their meetings in May.

5.4. It was further noted that the issues identified in paper 2 could usefully contribute to the final feedback report from the Main Panel.

5.5. Given that the impact assessment needs to be completed by the end of Day two at the next round of meetings, the panel considered how best to structure the meetings to achieve that outcome.   It was agreed that the first part of Day one should be used to consider any unclassified scores, any unresolved scores, and any particular issues raised by panel members. The second part of Day one and all of Day two should be used to consider the contributing scores and consequent Impact sub-profiles for each submitting HEI, as well as agreeing the process for producing the feedback reports for HEIs.

6.   Environment Template Calibration (received paper 05 – Extract from PCWM on Environment Template; paper 06 – Standard Analysis 'crib sheet'; paper 07 – collated scores from sub-panel Environment calibration exercise; 08 – Environment calibration – collated feedback from Sub-panels)

6.1. The Chair introduced the item, noting the Sub-panels had undertaken a calibration of Environment templates and produced feedback on the exercise for consideration by the Main Panel as part of the Main Panel's calibration of Environment.   The panel reviewed papers 07 and 08, which summarised feedback from each sub-panel and the scores given to environment templates within each cluster.

6.2. The Chair invited the panel to break out into Sub-panel cluster groups to consider the feedback and identify any further key issues and/or points of clarification that had arisen from the Sub-panel calibration exercises.

6.3. A plenary session was held following the break-out sessions at which a number of additional points relating to Environment assessment were identified to be fed back to the Sub-panels. It was agreed that the Panel Advisers would amend paper 8 accordingly for circulation to the Sub-panels for their meetings in May.

6.4. The panel advisers presented two documents to the panel, inviting comment as to whether they should also be provided to the Sub Panels. Paper 06 was an annotated version of the Standard Analysis sheet, detailing key questions to ask of the data points presented and also clarifying the meaning of the different data

points.   The other document presented was a mock-up of the collated environment data banded by size of submission. Each band showed the median of number of degrees awarded (by number of staff submitted), and the median of research income (by number of staff submitted). This allows for a more sensitive reading of the data comparative to institutions (submissions) of similar size. The panel agreed that both documents should be prepared for their Sub-panels.

7.   Review of Output and Impact scores to date

7.1.   The Chair presented a report of the scoring profiles of the Sub-panels thus far along with the Main Panel profile. Relative scoring patterns were noted as was the fact that there is still a relatively small amount of data in the system and this could give the appearance of anomalies that may be resolved once a greater volume of the material had been assessed.

7.2.   It was agreed that Sub-panels would be given the emerging profile for the Main Panel as a whole (at relevant sub-profile and overall profile level) but not the profiles from the individual constituent Sub-panels.

7.3.   It was agreed that Panel Chairs should be regularly considering the SO1 report available to them to monitor scoring profiles of individual panel members for each element of the submission. This report can be provided for the panel members but it is recommended that it be anonymised unless the Sub-panel agrees otherwise.

8.   Preparation of feedback

8.1.   The panel advisers reported that guidance would follow shortly from the REF team detailing the requirements for feedback from Sub-panels to HEIs, from Sub-panels to their sector and from the Main Panel, and providing guidance and sample text. The purpose of the feedback to the HEIs is to provide a high level commentary to the profile therefore it will be important to use the language of the criteria and to highlight strengths. Where unclassified scores are a matter of clear technical ineligibility rather than judgement, then these too can be explained briefly.

8.2.   It was agreed that as each element of the assessment was completed, panels should be collating their draft feedback statements, rather than waiting until the end of the exercise.

9.   Future meetings

9.1.   Noted   the   key   agenda   items   for   future   meetings   as   follows:

- 12 June 2014: consider sub-panel recommendations for impact sub-profiles and data for 33% of outputs

- 21 July 2014: consider sub-panel recommendations for draft environment sub-profiles and data for 50% of outputs
- 23 September 2014: consider recommended profiles and sub-profiles and initial reports
- 30 October 2014: approve outcomes; approve feedback and reports

10.   Any other business

10.1.   The meeting closed at 4pm.

REF Main Panel D: Meeting 5

12 June 2014

Finlaison House, London

Minutes

Present:

Chris Barron (User member)

Dinah Birch (Deputy Chair)

Alexander Bird (Sub Panel Chair – SP32)

Jane Boggan (panel adviser)

Kersti Borjars (Sub-panel Chair – SP28)

Bruce Brown (Chair)

Maria Delgado (Sub Panel Chair – SP35)

Anna Dickenson (REF team)

David Docherty (User Member)

Peter Gatrell (Sub Panel Chair – SP27)

Peter Golding (Sub Panel Chair – SP36)

Paul Greenhalgh (Sub Panel Chair – SP34)

Gary Grubb (AHRC, observer)

Rebecca Lambert (Panel Adviser)

James Moy (International Member)

Alice Prochaska (International Member)

David Langslow (Sub Panel Deputy Chair – SP31)

Graeme Rosenberg (REF Team)

Matthew Taylor (User member)

Elizabeth Westlake (Panel Adviser)

Chris Wickham (Sub Panel Chair – SP30)

Linda Woodhead (Sub Panel Chair – SP33)

Apologies:

Kirsten Drotner (International Member)

Mark Llewellyn (Observer)

Robin Osborne (Sub Panel Chair – SP31)

Robert Ritchie (International Member)

Anthonya Visser (International Member)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1. The Chair introduced the Agenda and welcomed panel members to the meeting confirming its competency to address the business identified in the agenda.

2. Minutes of the last meeting (received paper 01)

2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the correction of the spelling of Professor Osborne's surname.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct and/or individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest on the Panel Members' Website after the meeting.

4. Impact sub-profiles

4.1. The Main Panel reviewed the recommended sub-profiles for Impact, noting the progress made by the other three main panels on Impact and observations made by the sub-panel chairs on the process of assessing impact, in particular the engagement of user members. It was agreed that:

- Sub-panel chairs had impressively demonstrated the internal integrity of the impact assessment process within each sub-panel, which had been confirmed by the user members of the sub-panels;
- As part of the ongoing process of calibration, given the newness of the impact review process, the need to ensure the delivery of fully robust and credible outcomes, and the fact there was sufficient time in the assessment timetable, the Main Panel user members requested that sub-panels be invited to review their recommended sub-profiles against Main Panel D contextual data at their next meetings;
- The Main Panel would review the recommended sub-profiles again at its July meeting in the light of sub-panel discussions.

4.2. The Main Panel chair thanked the user members for their valuable contribution to the discussion.

5. Review of Environment sub-profiles to date

5.1. The Chair introduced the item, noting that Sub-panels would be considering environment scores at their next round of meetings at the beginning of July.

5.2. Data on Sub-panel progress with respect to the allocation of templates and scoring so far was reviewed and it was noted that good progress was being made.

6. Review of Output sub-profiles to date

6.1. The Chair introduced the item. The panel reviewed emerging output sub-profiles and data on progress with respect to meeting the 50% target for the next round of meetings. Good progress was being made by individual panellists, and it was noted that for some sub-panels to achieve the 50% target, work now needed to be done between panellists to agree scores. Calibration was ongoing to ensure the appropriate application of criteria by all panellists.

7. Preparation of Feedback

7.1. The Chair noted the need to ensure that feedback was prepared – albeit in draft form – as the assessment process progressed, rather than at the end of the process.

7.2. Sub-panels chairs noted some of the challenges of the process, including ensuring feedback was robust, informative and referenced the criteria without being directive, and confirmed processes were in place to collect drafts as stages of the process were completed.

8. Audit

8.1. The Chair reported that a particular issue had arisen in one sub-panel with respect to the application of the criteria for independent researchers (paragraphs 80 and 81 of REF02.2011 Guidance on Submission).

8.2. The REF Manager invited comments from members of the panel on disciplinary differences with respect to the application of the criteria, to assist him in ensuring the criteria were applied fairly.

9. Future meetings

9.1. Noted the key agenda items for future meetings as follows:
   - 21 July 2014: consider sub-panel recommendations for draft impact and environment sub-profiles and data for 50% of outputs
   - 23 September 2014: consider recommended profiles and sub-profiles and initial reports
   - 30 October 2014: approve outcomes; approve feedback and reports

10. Any other business

10.1. The meeting closed at 3pm.

REF Main Panel D: Meeting 6

21 July 2014

Finlaison House, London

Minutes

Present:

Dinah Birch (Deputy Chair, Sub-Panel Chair – SP29)
Alexander Bird (Sub Panel Chair – SP32)
Jane Boggan (panel adviser)
Kersti Borjars (Sub-panel Chair – SP28)
Bruce Brown (Chair)
Maria Delgado (Sub Panel Chair – SP35)
David Docherty (User Member)
Peter Gatrell (Sub Panel Chair – SP27)
Peter Golding (Sub Panel Chair – SP36)
Paul Greenhalgh (Sub Panel Chair – SP34)
Vicky Jones (REF)
Rebecca Lambert (Panel Adviser)
James Moy (International Member)
Robin Osborne (Sub Panel Chair – SP31)
Alice Prochaska (International Member)
Mark Llewellyn (AHRC, Observer)
Robert Ritchie (International Member)
Matthew Taylor (User member)
Anthonya Visser (International Member)
Elizabeth Westlake (Panel Adviser)
Chris Wickham (Sub Panel Chair – SP30)
Linda Woodhead (Sub Panel Chair – SP33)

Apologies:

Chris Barron (User member)
Kirsten Drotner (International Member)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1. The Chair introduced the Agenda and welcomed panel members to the meeting confirming its competency to address the business identified in the agenda.

1.2. The Chair reported that one of the Main Panel's user members had resigned from the REF due to personal reasons.

2. Minutes of the last meeting (received paper 01)

2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the addition of Professor Borjars to the attendance list.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct and/or individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest on the Panel Members' Website after the meeting.

4. Review of overall profiles so far

4.1. The Chair introduced the item. The panel reviewed the emerging overall sub-profiles for each sub-panel, noting that the sub-profiles reflected only c. 50% of assessment of outputs and therefore should be understood as an early indicator that may be subject to change over the coming weeks as the proportion of outputs scored increases across all sub-panels and subsequently fed into the overall profiles.

4.2. The panel considered a number of datasets relating to the emerging sub-profiles, which included a comparison of emerging scores against the RAE2008 assessment.

4.3. The Chair outlined to the Panel that the current sub-profiles are calculated using a weighted methodology, which takes account of the size of submitting institutions across the UoA, such that big submissions will have a greater effect on the resultant sub-profiles. The panel therefore reviewed both weighted and un-weighted overall sub-profiles, the latter enabling a clearer understanding of the consistency of each panel in the application of the criteria.

4.4. The panel received paper 2 (Main Panel Working methods, re-circulated from the January meeting of the Main Panel).

5. Review of output scores to date

5.1. The Chair introduced the item. The panel reviewed emerging output sub-profiles and data on progress, noting that good progress had been made since the last meeting with the majority of panels comfortably passed the July target of 50% assessment completed. It was noted that for some sub-panels, whilst individual panellists have completed well in excess of 50%, further work was now needed to agree scores between panellists so they can be entered on the database and so included in the emerging sub-profile.

5.2. The panel noted that there had been variable practice on the part of submitting institutions across the Main Panel with respect to requests for double weighting

for outputs, noting that this variance was seen at both discipline and institutional level. Some sub-panels expressed their surprise at the (small) volume of double weighting requests received, particularly in the light of the criteria permitting a reserve item and the numbers of outputs that would likely have met the criteria for double weighting.

5.3. The Chair invited sub-panel chairs, in turn, to raise any issues pertaining to the assessment of outputs in a round table discussion. It was noted that calibration was ongoing across all sub-panels to ensure the appropriate application of criteria by all panellists. During this discussion, all sub-panel chairs confirmed their panels were undertaking their assessments of outputs in accordance with the Main Panel Working Methods, as outlined in paper 2.

6. Environment Sub-Profiles

6.1. The Main Panel reviewed the recommended sub-profiles for Environment. Prior to this, sub-panel chairs were invited to outline their sub-panel's approach to the assessment of environment; in doing so chairs confirmed that their sub-panel had undertaken its work in accordance with the Main Panel Working Methods and that criteria for each quality level had been consistently applied. Sub-panel chairs were also invited to comment on any observations on the process for assessing environment.

6.2. During the round table discussion a number of sub-panel chairs indicated that further work was necessary within their panels before assessment could finally be signed-off.

6.3. The Main Panel approved in principle 6 environment sub-profiles, as recommended to the Main Panel by sub-panels; in four cases the Main Panel permitted sub-panels to review their initial sub-profiles at their next meeting, noting that a finalised sub-profile for environment would be expected to be recommended to the Main Panel at its meeting in September.

7. Impact Sub-profiles

7.1. At the last meeting of the Main Panel, user members had requested that sub-panels review their recommended sub-profiles against Main Panel D contextual data as a means to support the delivery of robust profiles.

7.2. The Main Panel reviewed the recommended sub-profiles for Impact and noted that in some cases sub-profiles had been revised following further sub-panel consideration. Sub-panel chairs were invited to outline their sub-panel's approach to the assessment of Impact (including an explanation of any changes in the sub-profile since the last meeting), and in doing so confirmed that their sub-panel had undertaken its work in accordance with the Main Panel Working Methods and that criteria for each quality level had been consistently applied. Chairs confirmed that where revisions to the Impact assessment had been made, these changes had been confirmed by user members of the sub-panels

7.3. During the round table discussion, three sub-panels noted that the cross-panel calibration had led to further work being undertaken on impact which had not

been completed during the last meeting. Those sub-panels had therefore been unable to sign off the final Impact sub-profile for recommendation to the Main Panel. It was agreed that for these three sub-panels final consideration of Impact sub-profiles could be undertaken at the next round of sub-panel meetings. It was further agreed that whilst the remaining six sub-profiles were approved in principle (for one panel the revised profile is still subject to the approval of the user members), the Main Panel would not formally approve Impact sub-profiles until all sub-panels had completed the assessment process and formally recommended the sub-profiles to the Main Panel.

8.   Preparation of Feedback

8.1.   The Main Panel considered some anonymised examples of draft feedback for Impact and Environment to facilitate a discussion on the general principles for institutional feedback. It was agreed that:
- Where material had been unclassified, further elaboration in the feedback would be valuable to institutions;
- Feedback should seek to explain the assessment outcome and not offer advice to the institution on how its submission might have been improved, noting that phrases such as 'there was a lack of evidence of..' or 'the sub-panel expected to see more evidence of' might usefully be used.

8.2.   The Main Panel agreed a timetable for the production of Main and Sub-Panel overview reports, noting that (as near as) complete drafts of sub-profile overview reports would be considered at the next meeting of the Main Panel (on 23 September) after initial consideration by sub-panels during meeting round 6. The Main Panel overview report would be drafted in the light of the sub-panel reports (and sub-panel reports amended to remove material duplicated in the Main Panel report) and provided to Chairs in advance of meeting round 7 for final sub-panel consideration.

9.   Audit

9.1.   No issues were raised for discussion under this item.

10.   Future meetings

10.1.   The Chair noted the key agenda items for future meetings as follows:

- 23 September 2014: consider recommended profiles and sub-profiles and initial reports
- 30 October 2014: approve outcomes; approve feedback and reports

11.   Any other business

11.1.   The meeting closed at 3.30pm.

REF Main Panel D: Meeting 7

23rd September 2014

Finlaison House, London

Minutes

Present:

Dinah Birch (Deputy Chair, Sub-Panel Chair – SP29)
Alexander Bird (Sub Panel Chair – SP32)
Jane Boggan (panel adviser)
Kersti Borjars (Sub-panel Chair – SP28)
Bruce Brown (Chair)
Maria Delgado (Sub Panel Chair – SP35)
David Docherty (User Member)
Kirsten Drotner (International Member)
Peter Gatrell (Sub Panel Chair – SP27)
Peter Golding (Sub Panel Chair – SP36)
Paul Greenhalgh (Sub Panel Chair – SP34)
Rebecca Lambert (Panel Adviser)
James Moy (International Member)
Robin Osborne (Sub Panel Chair – SP31)
Alice Prochaska (International Member)
Robert Ritchie (International Member)
Graeme Rosenburg (REF Team)
Duncan Shermer (REF Team)
Anthonya Visser (International Member)
Elizabeth Westlake (Panel Adviser)
Chris Wickham (Sub Panel Chair – SP30)
Linda Woodhead (Sub Panel Chair – SP33)

Apologies:

Chris Barron (User member)
Mark Llewellyn (AHRC, Observer)
Matthew Taylor (User member)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1. The Chair introduced the Agenda and welcomed panel members to the meeting confirming its competency to address the business identified in the agenda.

2.   Minutes of the last meeting (received paper 01) and Matters Arising

2.1.   The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true and accurate record.

2.2.   The Main Panel had permitted a number of sub-panels to return and review their initial sub-profiles for impact and environment at their subsequent meeting following the last Main Panel meeting. These sub panel chairs confirmed that they could now recommend finalised sub-profiles for Impact and Environment to the Main Panel and these were received by the Main Panel subject to final confirmation of all profiles at the Main Panel meeting on 30th October.

3.   Conflicts of interest

3.1.   The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct and/or individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest on the Panel Members' Website after the meeting.

4.   Outputs

4.1.   The Main Panel reviewed the recommended sub-profiles for Outputs. Prior to this, sub-panel chairs were invited to outline his/her sub-panel's approach to the assessment of outputs; in doing so chairs confirmed that his/her sub-panel had undertaken its work in accordance with the Main Panel Working Methods and that criteria for each quality level had been consistently applied. Sub-panel chairs were also invited to comment on any observations on the process for assessing outputs.

4.2.   During the round table discussion four sub-panel chairs indicated that a small amount of further work was necessary within their panels before output assessment could finally be signed-off.

4.3.   The Main Panel received six output sub-profiles, as recommended to the Main Panel by sub-panels; in four cases the Main Panel permitted sub-panels to review their initial sub-profiles at their next meeting, noting that a finalised sub-profile for outputs would be required to be recommended to the Main Panel at its meeting on 30th October when all profiles for all elements would be confirmed.

5.   Consideration of summative profiles for each UoA

5.1.   The Main Panel received and considered the recommended summative profiles for each Unit of Assessment (subject to the outstanding four outputs sub profiles in 4.3 above) along with a quartile analysis of the data and a consideration of the weighted and unweighted profiles for Impact and Environment.

5.2.   Sub-panel chairs each presented their observations on the final profiles for their Unit of Assessment, identifying where a given profile might require a particular explanation.

5.3.   The recommended profiles for each element of each submission in each UoA were presented to the Main Panel. These were received and considered subject to minute 4.3 above.

6.   Draft Sub-panel Overview reports

6.1.   The sub-panel chairs each outlined the key messages for their sub-panel reports, with the discussion also identifying those issues common to a number of sub-panels that are more appropriately located in the Main Panel report, or that need amplification in the sub-panel reports.

7.   Main Panel Overview report

7.1.   The discussion of the draft Main Panel report identified the following actions and issues:
- (1) The need to work to a common dataset;
- (2) The need to explain the use of half grades for Impact and Environment;
- (3) The text to address key common issues including:
  - Double weighting
  - Equality and Diversity
  - Interdisciplinarity
  - Quality of portfolios
- (4) Recommendations for future exercises

7.2.   The Chair invited David Docherty to co-ordinate feedback from Main Panel user members and James Moy to co-ordinate feedback from Main Panel International members for inclusion in the Main Panel report.

8.   Plans for the final sub-panel meetings

8.1.   It was agreed that the next draft of the Main Panel report should go to the final meetings of the sub-panels so that they could see their draft report in the context of the Main Panel report and provide feedback where relevant.

8.2.   It was also agreed that the final profiles for each submission in the sub-panel should be presented at the end of the meeting, using the SO5 report, should panel members wish to see the whole set of results.

8.3.   The meeting should also include signing off the sub panel feedback to HEIs, if that had not been completed at the previous meeting, and subject to final copy editing.

9. Any other business

9.1. The meeting closed at 3.30pm.

REF Main Panel D: Meeting 8

30th October 2014

Finlaison House, London

Minutes

Present:

Dinah Birch (Deputy Chair, Sub-Panel Chair – SP29)
Alexander Bird (Sub Panel Chair – SP32)
Jane Boggan (panel adviser)
Kersti Borjars (Sub-panel Chair – SP28)
Bruce Brown (Chair)
Maria Delgado (Sub Panel Chair – SP35)
David Docherty (User Member)
Kirsten Drotner (International Member)
Peter Gatrell (Sub Panel Chair – SP27)
Peter Golding (Sub Panel Chair – SP36)
Paul Greenhalgh (Sub Panel Chair – SP34)
Vicky Jones (REF team)
Rebecca Lambert (Panel Adviser)
Mark Llewellyn (AHRC, Observer)
James Moy (International Member)
Robin Osborne (Sub Panel Chair – SP31)
Alice Prochaska (International Member)
Robert Ritchie (International Member)
Graeme Rosenburg (REF Team)
Matthew Taylor (User member)
Anthonya Visser (International Member)
Elizabeth Westlake (Panel Adviser)
Chris Wickham (Sub Panel Chair – SP30)
Linda Woodhead (Sub Panel Chair – SP33)

Apologies:

Chris Barron (User member)

1.   Introduction and competence to do business

1.1.   The Chair introduced the Agenda and welcomed panel members to the last meeting of the Main Panel. The Chair confirmed the Main Panel's competency to address the business identified in the agenda.

2. Conflicts of interest

2.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct and/or individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest on the Panel Members' Website after the meeting.

3. Minutes of the last meeting (received paper 01) and Matters Arising

3.1. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true and accurate record.

4. Minor Adjustments

4.1. Each Sub-panel Chair was asked in turn to confirm whether any minor adjustments had been made to the institutional profiles as recommended to the Main Panel at its last meeting, noting in particular that four sub-panels had been permitted at the last Main Panel meeting to review their recommended output sub-profiles ahead of final recommendation to the Main Panel

4.2. Two sub-panels reported very minor changes to output assessments. The four sub-panel Chairs permitted to review their output sub-profiles confirmed that all assessment work in relation to outputs was now complete and that final sub-profiles had been considered and approved for recommendation to the Main Panel by the Sub-panels.

5. Outcomes

5.1. The Main Panel received and considered the recommended institutional quality profiles, and constituent sub-profiles, for each Unit of Assessment.

5.2. The Main Panel approved all profiles as recommended by the 10 Sub-panels of Main Panel D.

6. Feedback to Institutions

6.1. The sub-panel chairs each outlined the approach taken for their sub-panels in drafting feedback to institutions. It was agreed that sub-panel Chairs would undertake a final review of draft feedback and confirm to the Main Panel chair that feedback was appropriate and reflective of the awarded sub-profile, prior to submission to the REF team.

7. Publication of results

7.1. The REF Manager outlined the timetable for the publication of results and provided an overview of the key messages, summary data and analyses that will be published.

8.   Main Panel and Sub-panel Overview reports

8.1.   The Main Panel considered the current draft Main and Sub-panel reports. The Chair led a discussion to identify common principles with regard to the drafting of reports. The discussion noted the following actions and issues:

- The Main Panel report should cover the working methods and Sub-panel reports should avoid duplicating Working Methods detail in the individual reports;
- The Sub-panel chairs should ensure that Sub-panel reports include some detail on the range, quality, scope and type of impacts submitted to their UOA;
- That Sub-panel reports should include comment on the distribution of submissions across the four UK regions;
- The Sub-panel reports should include some detail on the expertise of the User members.

8.2.   It was agreed that the Advisers would work with Sub-panel Chairs to revise sub-panel reports in light of the established drafting principles.

9.   Survey of Panel Members

9.1.   The REF Manager presented the initial results of the survey of panel members, and noted the positive comments received.

10.   Open Access

10.1.   The Main Panel received a paper (paper 04) on Open Access. The Main Panel noted its support for the substantive points in the paper.

11.   Final Remarks

11.1.   The Chair expressed his thanks and gratitude to the Sub-panel Chairs for their dedication, hard work and support, and to the User and International members of the Main Panel for their invaluable contributions throughout the process.

11.2.   The Chair thanked the REF Manager, the REF team and the Main Panel Advisers and Secretaries for their support throughout the process.

11.3.   The Deputy Chair expressed thanks on behalf of the Main Panel to the Chair for his leadership and guidance of the Main Panel.

12.   Any other business

12.1.   The meeting closed at 4.00pm.