



REF Sub-panel 1: Meeting 1b

12 December 2013

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Alan Barrett (Main Panel Member)

Kate Bishop (Secretary)

Iain Cameron

Mark Caulfield

Edwin Chilvers

Jonathan Cohen

Mary Collins

Cyrus Cooper

David Cox

David Crossman

Christopher Day (Chair)

Christopher Griffiths

Ian Hall

Simon Herrington

John Iredale (Deputy Chair)

Kay-Tee Khaw

Nicholas Lemoine

Peter Morris

Paul Moss

Jeremy Pearson

Liz Philpots

Charles Pusey

Phil Quirke

Gillian Rendle (Adviser)

Alastair Riddell

Aziz Sheikh

Rosalind Smyth

Paul Stewart

Rajesh Thakker

Josef Vormoor

Joanna Wardlaw

Jonathan Weber

Peter Winstanley

Apologies:

Tim Aitman
Usha Chakravarthy
Anna Dominiczak
Renny Leach
Robert Mansel

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the agenda, describing that the majority of the meeting would be devoted to discussing the output calibration exercise.
- 1.2. The following new members were introduced: Professors Paul Moss and Joanna Wardlaw.
- 1.3. The sub-panel chair advised that Professors Patrick Johnston and Alastair Thompson have secured new appointments and would be resigning from Sub-panel 1 (SP1). Professor Josef Vormoor (present) had been invited to replace Patrick Johnson and Professor Dion Morton (appointment to be confirmed by the chair of Main Panel A) to replace Alastair Thompson.
- 1.4. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. The panellists reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and were requested, where required, to update their details via the panel members' website (PMW) after the meeting.

3. Output Calibration Exercise

- 3.1. The sub-panel chair delivered some background slides to panellists, which covered the REF scoring criteria, co-authorship and the use of citation data (available via the PMW). It was noted that once an author's contribution to an output is agreed as substantial, the sub-panel will assess the quality of the output, taking no further regard of the submitted member of staff's individual contribution. Panellists should raise any queries about co-authorship with the panel secretariat. The panel reaffirmed that where the output is published is not a factor in the assessment.

- 3.2. The sub-panel chair introduced the output calibration exercise and talked through a series of summary slides (available via the PMW) and provided a summary of the output calibration exercise conducted by Main Panel A.
- 3.3. The panel secretariat had produced a series of graphs from the calibration exercise which were shown to the panellists and were also made available via the PMW. The panel discussed the calibration outputs and issues arising.
- 3.4. Where differences of opinion arise between reviewer pairs, it was agreed that the first step should be for the two reviewers to discuss their reasons behind their decision and to explore whether a consensus can be reached. In cases where a consensus can't be reached, it was agreed that the output would be referred to a 3rd party, possibly the sub-panel chair or deputy chair.
- 3.5. It was agreed that where a panellist has a concern that the research has been previously reported, the output should be referred to the panel secretariat.
- 3.6. There was discussion around the assessment of review articles and it was noted that reviews could meet the definition of original research and that each would be assessed on a case-by-case basis to ensure this.
- 3.7. The panel secretariat will identify outputs that have been returned multiple times by different institutions and flag these so that they might be allocated to the same reviewer pair.

4. Output Allocation Arrangements

- 4.1. The sub-panel chair delivered a brief presentation on the submission to SP1, the plans for output allocation and the timescale for output assessment, including the provision of indicative review targets (available via the PMW).
- 4.2. The information on the submission to SP1 showed that the numbers of outputs returned was similar to the RAE, however the number of papers per full-time equivalent was less. It was thought that this is as a result of an increase in the numbers of early career researchers being returned to the REF.
- 4.3. The sub-panel chair confirmed that, on average, each sub-panel member will be required to review 800 outputs.
- 4.4. The sub-panel chair confirmed that the REF outputs will be allocated based on subject area and that two panellists with related expertise will be allocated to review each subject area.
- 4.5. It is planned that the output allocation will be completed by mid-January so that individual allocations and any issues can be discussed and resolved at the

meeting on 23 January. Panellists were reminded that they would be required to review their allocations in advance of the meeting.

- 4.6. The raising of audit queries was questioned. The sub-panel chair confirmed that the guidance states that, where there are 15 or more authors, the contribution of the submitting author would more likely be the subject of an audit query, which would be referred to the panel secretariat and an e-mail requesting the necessary information would be sent to the submitting HEI.
- 4.7. Panellists were reminded to review their outputs in the same order (alphabetically by author) to ensure that, by the interim review meetings, the same outputs had been scored and so that useful conversations can start to happen between scoring pairs.
- 4.8. The timing of the allocation of impact material was questioned. It was agreed that this would be completed following the allocation of the outputs and that selected impact case studies would be used for the impact calibration exercise.

5. IT Systems

- 5.1. The secretariat provided a brief introduction to the REF IT system which will be used for the assessment (available via the PMW).
- 5.2. The mechanism for cross-referral to another sub-panel was raised. The secretariat confirmed that this is done via e-mail and all requests are reviewed by the panel executive.
- 5.3. The viewing of information via iPads was queried. It was confirmed that papers can be viewed on an iPad, however it is not possible for the spreadsheets to be viewed via this means. The panel adviser confirmed that all IT access issues should be referred to the REF IT team.
- 5.4. The sub-panel chair confirmed that a more detailed session on the IT system will be provided at the meeting on 23 January.
- 5.5. Accessing the papers without an internet connection was queried. The panel secretariat confirmed that all outputs are available via the USB pens which operate independently from an internet connection.

6. Future meeting Schedule

- 6.1. The full meeting schedule for SP1 was presented and the sub-panel chair confirmed that the full project plan would be on the agenda for the next meeting on 23 January.

7. Any other business

7.1. No further business was raised.



REF Sub-panel 1: Meeting 2

23 January 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Tim Aitman
Kate Bishop (Secretary)
Iain Cameron
Mark Caulfield
Chris Chamberlain
Edwin Chilvers
Jonathan Cohen
Mary Collins
Cyrus Cooper
David Cox
Christopher Day (Chair)
Anna Dominiczak
Christopher Griffiths
Ian Hall
Simon Herrington
John Iredale (Deputy Chair)
Kay-Tee Khaw
Nicholas Lemoine
Robert Mansel
Peter Morris
Dion Morton
Paul Moss
Jeremy Pearson
Liz Philpots
Charles Pusey
Phil Quirke
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Alastair Riddell
Rosalind Smyth
Paul Stewart
Rajesh Thakker
Josef Vormoor

Joanna Wardlaw
Jonathan Weber
Peter Winstanley

Apologies:

Usha Chakravarthy
David Crossman
Aziz Sheikh

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the agenda, describing that the majority of the meeting would be devoted to discussing output allocation.
- 1.2. The following new members were introduced: Professors Dion Morton and Josef Vormoor.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panellists reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 12 December 2013. A number of minor edits were noted by the sub-panel secretariat.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel secretariat had circulated the current register of major conflicts of interest and panellists were requested, where required, to update their details via the panel members' website (PMW). The sub-panel chair requested that details of any minor conflicts of interest were sent to the sub-panel chair and secretariat via REF webmail.

4. IT Presentation

- 4.1. The sub-panel secretariat delivered a presentation covering the REF IT system (available via the PMW). Members of the sub-panel suggested that the sub-panel secretariat circulate a list of dos and don'ts, to include key points from the IT presentation.

5. Citation data

- 5.1. The sub-panel secretariat delivered a brief presentation on citation and contextual data (available via the PMW) and the citation data spreadsheet provided by the REF team was shown to the sub-panel.
- 5.2. The sub-panel chair advised panellists on the use of citation data during the course of their review.

6. Output allocation

- 6.1. The methodology for the allocation of outputs was explained. The sub-panel executive had reviewed the research groups provided by submitting institutions and the outputs for which no research group had been provided; the latter were allocated to a research group. The research groups defined by the sub-panel executive were matched to panellists' expertise and the outputs were allocated accordingly.
- 6.2. The sub-panel chair confirmed that it had not been possible to allocate the outputs purely on the basis of alignment of research group and panellists' expertise as this would have resulted in an unfair allocation of the outputs. The sub-panel chair confirmed that the aim was for all panellists to receive fewer than 1000 outputs.
- 6.3. Panellists were invited to raise any general issues relating to output allocation and asked that any specific issues were raised with the sub-panel executive directly, or sent to the sub-panel secretariat by REF webmail. All panellists should ensure that they have reviewed their allocations and referred any issues to the sub-panel secretariat by Monday 27 January.
- 6.4. Guidance (available via the PMW) was provided on cross-referral of outputs from Sub-panel 1 (SP1) to another sub-panel and for outputs from other sub-panels to SP1. The sub-panel chair confirmed that all cross-referral suggestions are required by 30 April and will be reviewed by the sub-panel executive. It was confirmed that the sub-panel requesting cross-referral retains the responsibility for the final scoring of any cross-referred output. It was agreed to circulate details of the panellists' areas of expertise and contact details amongst the sub-panel.
- 6.5. It was confirmed that panellists should review their outputs in alphabetical order of unique output identifier (column B of the panellists' personal spreadsheet) and that duplicate outputs would be allocated to the same scoring pair.
- 6.6. Author contribution was discussed in relation to the individual editing rules associated with some journals e.g. alphabetical ordering of authors. The sub-panel chair confirmed that panellists should review the information provided by

the submitting institution and should raise an audit query when they have concerns regarding the information provided.

- 6.7. The sub-panel secretariat provided brief information regarding the process for panellists to access their scoring reports from the PMW.

7. Project plan

- 7.1. The sub-panel chair delivered a presentation covering the project plan for SP1 (available via the PMW). The presentation covered the deadlines and targets for output review, process for impact allocation, impact calibration, deadlines and targets for impact review and environment review.

8. Audit

- 8.1. The sub-panel secretariat presented slides on individual staff circumstances and audit processes (available via the PMW), covering the sample based audit undertaken by the REF team and panel-instigated audit. The audit processes and types of audit queries were covered.

9. Next meeting

- 9.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed the date of the next meeting (2 April) and provided a brief summary of the proposed agenda.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. No further business was raised.



REF Sub-panel 1: Meeting 3

2 April 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Tim Aitman
Alan Barrett (Main Panel Member)
Kate Bishop (Secretary)
Iain Cameron
Mark Caulfield
Edwin Chilvers
Jonathan Cohen
Mary Collins
David Cox
David Crossman
Christopher Day (Chair)
Anna Dominiczak
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel Member)
Christopher Griffiths
Ian Hall
Simon Herrington
Stephen Holgate (Main Panel Member)
Martin Hunt
John Iredale (Deputy Chair)
Kay-Tee Khaw
Renny Leach
Nicholas Lemoine
Robert Mansel
Peter Morris
Dion Morton
Paul Moss
Jackie Parkin
Jeremy Pearson
Liz Philpots
Charles Pusey
Phil Quirke
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)

Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Alastair Riddell
Rosalind Smyth
Paul Stewart
Josef Vormoor
Joanna Wardlaw
Jonathan Weber
Peter Winstanley

Apologies:

Martin Birchall
Chris Chamberlain
Cyrus Cooper
John Forrester
Aziz Sheikh
Rajesh Thakker

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the agenda, describing that the morning part of the meeting would be dedicated to output assessment and the afternoon to impact assessment.
- 1.2. The sub-panel chair informed the sub-panel that, following the resignation of Usha Chakravarthy, two new output assessors had been appointed: Martin Birchall and John Forrester.
- 1.3. The sub-panel chair introduced the Main Panel A members attending the meeting: Stephen Holgate (Main Panel A chair), Jack Gauldie and Alan Barrett (international members).
- 1.4. The sub-panel chair advised sub-panel members that Kate Bishop will be going on maternity leave from 9 May and that Kerry Revel has started as her replacement.
- 1.5. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panellists reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 23 January, which were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel secretariat had circulated the current register of major conflicts of interest and panellists were requested, where required, to update their details via the panel members' website (PMW). The sub-panel chair requested that details of any minor conflicts of interest were sent to the sub-panel chair and secretariat via the REF webmail.
- 3.2. Panellists were advised of the process to manage conflicts of interest arising during the course of future meetings. Where panellists have a major conflict with a particular discussion, they were requested to indicate their conflict to the secretariat, sign their name on the conflict of interest sheet located by the door and leave the room. The secretariat will ensure panellists return to the room on conclusion of the discussion.

4. Output assessment

- 4.1. The secretariat had analysed the sub-panel output scoring data and prepared paper 1 and a slide pack (available via the PMW) covering scoring activity, the emerging outputs sub-profile and scoring by research area.
- 4.2. The sub-panel chair confirmed that the deadline for panellists to complete their output assessment was 30 June.
- 4.3. The range of individual scoring profiles and variation in scoring profiles across the different disciplines was discussed.
- 4.4. The sub-panel chair confirmed that he and the deputy chair would undertake to review a sample of outputs across the different disciplines.
- 4.5. The use of citation data was discussed. The general consensus was that the data was being used where assessors were undecided about a final score for an output.
- 4.6. Panellists were requested to indicate whether they had had scoring pair discussions prior to 26 March. The response indicated that a low proportion of discussions between assessors had taken place prior to the meeting.
- 4.7. The sub-panel chair confirmed that no outputs had been cross-referred out of the sub-panel and that those being referred to the sub-panel for advice were being reviewed carefully, with a number being returned with an alternative sub-panel being identified as being better equipped to review the outputs.
- 4.8. Panellists were reminded that, should they wish to cross-refer any outputs to another sub-panel, they should send the details to the secretariat. On receipt of

the advice from the advising panellist, it remained their responsibility to allocate a final score.

4.9. The issue of the same output being returned multiple times was discussed.

4.10. The review and scoring of review articles and trial protocols was discussed.

5. Audit queries and ineligible outputs

5.1. The secretariat presented some slides on co-authorship (available via the PMW) covering: the process for raising audit queries, the level of audit activity across the sub-panel and some examples of the types of queries identified to date and the action taken.

5.2. Panellists were reminded to send their queries to the secretariat on an ongoing basis.

5.3. The secretariat confirmed that feedback will be provided to panellists on the audit queries raised to date.

5.4. The issue of submitting authors only being attributed to contributing reagents, samples or patients to a study was raised. The sub-panel chair confirmed that it had been agreed at Main Panel A that this did not constitute a substantial contribution.

5.5. The sub-panel chair confirmed the process for panellists to allocate an unclassified score, confirming that all outputs where assessors wish to give an unclassified score as a consequence of co-authorship issues must be referred to the secretariat.

5.6. Panellists were requested to provide specific information relating to their concerns when raising audit queries with the secretariat.

5.7. It was agreed that the secretariat will undertake to review all audit queries to identify whether any institutions are demonstrating a consistent approach to submitting outputs with common co-authorship issues.

5.8. The secretariat provided a brief summary of their review of clearly defined staff circumstances.

5.9. The raising of audit queries that relate to staff eligibility (both for minimal 0.2FTE contracts and independence) was discussed. The secretariat confirmed that this would be progressed through the existing process for staff-related audits.

Paul Moss and Joanna Wardlaw left the meeting at 1pm and Martin Hunt joined the meeting at 2pm.

6. Impact assessment, calibration and audit

- 6.1. The secretariat had prepared slides (available via the PMW) to cover impact assessment.
- 6.2. The adviser provided an overview of the impact calibration exercise (covered in paper 2), confirming that all impact calibration scores must be returned to the secretariat by REF webmail by 1 May.
- 6.3. The adviser provided an overview of the allocation of impact case studies and impact templates (covered in paper 3) and requested that all assessors skim-read their allocation and refer any conflicts of interest and audit queries to the secretariat by REF webmail by 1 May.
- 6.4. It was agreed that each assessor will review four impact templates.
- 6.5. The relationship between an institution's case studies and impact statement was discussed. Panellists were reminded that they can access all of the impact material via the PMW and their USB pens.
- 6.6. The sub-panel chair advised panellists that one of the impact assessors, Rita Ranmal, had resigned from the sub-panel and that her impact case studies would be reallocated.

7. Next meeting

- 7.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed the date of the next meeting (13-14 May) and provided a brief summary of the proposed agenda.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. The sub-panel chair thanked Kate Bishop for her excellent work as secretary and the whole sub-panel wished her well for her forthcoming period of maternity leave.



REF Sub-panel 1: Meeting 4 Part 1

13 May 2014

Conference Aston, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Tim Aitman
Alan Barrett (Main Panel Member)
Iain Cameron
Mark Caulfield
Chris Chamberlain
Edwin Chilvers
Jonathan Cohen
Mary Collins
Cyrus Cooper
David Crossman
Christopher Day (Chair)
Anna Dominiczak
Christopher Griffiths
Ian Hall
Russell Hamilton (Main Panel Member)
Simon Herrington
John Iredale (Deputy Chair)
Kay-Tee Khaw
Nicholas Lemoine
Robert Mansel
Peter Morris
Dion Morton
Paul Moss
Jeremy Pearson
Liz Philpots
Charles Pusey
Phil Quirke
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Alastair Riddell
Aziz Sheikh
Rosalind Smyth

Paul Michael Stewart
Rajesh Thakker
Josef Vormoor
Jonathan Weber
Peter Weissberg (Main Panel Member)
Peter Winstanley

Apologies:

Martin Birchall
John Forrester
Joanna Wardlaw

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the agenda, describing that part one of the meeting would be devoted mainly to discussing output assessment.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panellists reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 2 April 2014, which were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel secretariat had circulated the current register of major conflicts of interest and panellists were requested, where required, to update their details via the panel members' website (PMW). Panellists were reminded of the need to leave the room during discussions for which they were conflicted.

4. Output assessment to date

- 4.1. The sub-panel chair thanked the sub-panel for its work to date, noting that overall progress was on target. The sub-panel reviewed the analysis provided by the secretariat in Paper 1 covering scoring activity, the emerging outputs sub-profile and scoring by research area.
- 4.2. It was agreed that the sub-panel chair would contact two newly appointed assessors who were unable to attend the day's meeting in order to discuss output calibration. It was agreed to undertake some further analysis to test that assessments in high scoring research areas were calibrated with those in other

areas but it was reiterated that differences in the quality profile between disciplines were to be expected.

- 4.3. Panellists were reminded that the deadline for uploading agreed scores for outputs was 30 June 2014.
- 4.4. The adviser presented some slides providing an overview of the number of outputs submitted more than once to Sub-Panel 1 (whether by the same HEI or by different HEIs) and an overview of co-authored outputs where the submitting author was not the lead or corresponding author.
- 4.5. The secretariat circulated a list of duplicate outputs for panellists to use when agreeing scores. Panellists were asked to liaise with one another regarding any duplicate outputs to ensure that the scores given to those outputs were consistent.

5. Output audit and staff circumstances

- 5.1. The secretariat presented a slide providing a summary of the level of audit activity across the sub-panel and the number of audit queries raised and responses received to date. The sub-panel had a general discussion regarding challenges and key issues arising from the output audit process.
- 5.2. It was noted that output audit queries should be received by the secretariat by 2 June 2014 in order to allow time for audit responses to inform the July meeting.
- 5.3. The sub-panel discussed some examples of responses received to date to output audit requests. Three sub-panel members left the room during the discussion due to conflicts of interest.
- 5.4. The sub-panel noted Paper 2, providing an overview of the process and progress to date regarding individual staff circumstances, including an update on audit queries raised. The sub-panel agreed that responsibility for making decisions regarding appropriate output reductions for staff with clearly defined circumstances would be delegated to the exec group. On that basis, the sub-panel approved the recommendations made by the exec group to date.
- 5.5. It was agreed that the secretariat would provide panellists with information regarding the number of Category C staff and the number of Junior Clinical Academics submitted in UOA1.

6. Preparing sub-panel overview and HEI feedback reports

- 6.1. The sub-panel will be responsible for preparing confidential HEI feedback reports to each institution that made a submission in UOA1. This feedback will comprise a paragraph on each of the three assessment areas (outputs, impact and

environment). The sub-panel will also prepare an overview report which will be published as part of the Main Panel A overview report and will comment on both the process and the findings from the assessment. Paper 3 gave further details about the structure of these reports.

- 6.2. To aid preparation of the HEI feedback reports, it was agreed that a 'lead' panellist will be nominated for each HEI whom, following panel discussion of each element of the submission, will be responsible for initial drafting of the feedback. The panellist chosen will be one of the assessors of the environment template for that HEI. It was agreed that substantial time would need to be devoted to the overview and feedback reports in order to make them as valuable as possible for the sector.

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed the date of the next meeting (15-16 July for outputs, 16-18 July for impact) and provided a brief summary of the proposed agenda.

REF Sub-panel 1: Meeting 4 Part 2

13-14 May 2014

Conference Aston, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Tim Aitman (13 May only)
Alan Barrett (Main Panel Member)
Iain Cameron
Mark Caulfield (13 May only)
Chris Chamberlain
Edwin Chilvers
Jonathan Cohen
Mary Collins
Cyrus Cooper
David Cox
David Crossman
Christopher Day (Chair)
Anna Dominiczak
Christopher Griffiths
Ian Hall
Simon Herrington
Martin Hunt
John Iredale (Deputy Chair)
Kay-Tee Khaw (13 May only)
Renny Leach
Nicholas Lemoine
Robert Mansel
Peter Morris
Dion Morton (13 May only)
Jacqueline Parkin
Jeremy Pearson
Liz Philpots
Charles Pusey
Phil Quirke
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Alastair Riddell
Aziz Sheikh (13 May only)
Rosalind Smyth (13 May only)
Paul Michael Stewart

Rajesh Thakker
Josef Vormoor
Jonathan Weber
Peter Weissberg (Main Panel Member)
Peter Winstanley

Apologies:

None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed impact assessors to the meeting and introduced the agenda, describing that part two of the meeting would be devoted mainly to impact calibration.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. The sub-panel secretariat had circulated the current register of major conflicts of interest and panellists were requested, where required, to update their details via the panel members' website (PMW). Panellists were reminded of the need to leave the room during discussions for which they were conflicted.

3. Impact case study calibration

- 3.1. The adviser presented a slide containing advice from Main Panel A following its own impact case study calibration exercise.
- 3.2. The panel members assessed a selection of impact cases from other Main Panel A sub-panels and from a range of submitting institutions in a calibration exercise. They submitted their scores in advance of the meeting. The case studies were discussed in turn to agree key principles for the assessment of impact. Panel members were invited to re-score each item and these scores were collected by the secretariat at the end of the exercise.
- 3.3. Eleven sub-panel members left the room during the discussion due to conflicts of interest.
- 3.4. A number of general principles were reiterated, which included the need to disentangle the impact achieved within the REF period and previous or potential impact; the use only of the information presented in the case study to judge the impact; the target audience of the described impact; the clarity of the link between the underpinning research and the impact; the individual contribution of the

submitting HEI to the impact; and the influence of presentation. It was noted that there would be a large range of impacts all capable of being scored as 4*.

- 3.5. It was agreed that half marks would be particularly useful during the assessment process but not necessarily required for final scoring.

4. Impact template calibration

- 4.1. As with the case studies, each template included in the calibration exercise was discussed in turn, drawing out discussions on expectations at the different star levels.
- 4.2. Two sub-panel members left the room during the discussion due to conflicts of interest.

5. Impact audit

- 5.1. The secretariat provided a review of the audit process, and noted that suggested impact audit queries should be received by the secretariat by 13 June 2014 in order to allow time for audit responses to inform the July meeting.

6. Impact assessment and preparation for July meeting

- 6.1. Panellists were reminded that the deadline for uploading agreed scores for impact was 30 June 2014. A target of 50% of scores uploaded was set for 15 June so that the emerging quality profile might inform the meeting of main panel chairs.
- 6.2. It was noted that, on the morning of 16 July, there would be a session to discuss and agree scores for difficult cases and templates in break-out groups. Given the limited time for this activity, however, scoring trios should endeavour to agree the vast majority of scores by the 30 June deadline.

7. Environment assessment

- 7.1. Panellists were invited to review their environment allocation via a regenerated personal spreadsheet and to raise any conflicts with the secretariat immediately after the meeting.
- 7.2. It was noted that the 'per FTE' data provided for the environment data was not comparable between HEIs as data was submitted from all researchers in a unit, but the denominator used for the calculation was the subset of researchers returned to REF.
- 7.3. Further discussion on environment assessment would take place at the July meeting.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed the date of the next meeting (15-16 July for outputs, 16-18 July for impact) and provided a brief summary of the proposed agenda.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. It was agreed that the secretariat would circulate a list of contact details for each panellist to assist co-reviewers to organise discussions in order to agree their scores.



REF Sub-panel 1: Meeting 5 Part 1

15-16 July 2014

Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

Tim Aitman
Alan Barrett (Main Panel Member) (15 July only)
Martin Birchall
Iain Cameron
Mark Caulfield
Chris Chamberlain (16 July only)
Edwin Chilvers
Jonathan Cohen
Mary Collins
Cyrus Cooper
David Crossman
Christopher Day (Chair)
Anna Dominiczak
John Forrester
Christopher Griffiths
Ian Hall
Stephen Holgate (Main Panel Member)
Simon Herrington
John Iredale (Deputy Chair)
Kay-Tee Khaw
Nicholas Lemoine
Robert Mansel (15 July only)
Peter Morris
Dion Morton
Paul Moss
Jeremy Pearson
Charles Pusey
Phil Quirke
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Aziz Sheikh
Rosalind Smyth

Paul Michael Stewart
Rajesh Thakker
Josef Vormoor
Joanna Wardlaw (15 July only)
Jonathan Weber
Peter Weissberg (Main Panel Member) (16 July only)
Peter Winstanley

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He introduced the agenda, describing that part one of the meeting would be devoted mainly to agreeing the final outputs profiles for each submission and discussing content for the HEI feedback statements and the sub-panel section of the Main Panel A overview report.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panellists reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 13-14 May 2014. These were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel secretariat had circulated the current register of major conflicts of interest and panellists were requested, where required, to update their details via the panel members' website (PMW). Panellists were reminded of the need to leave the room during discussions for which they were conflicted.

4. Output assessment to date

- 4.1. The sub-panel reviewed the analysis provided by the secretariat in Paper 1 covering scoring activity, the emerging outputs sub-profile and scoring by research area.
- 4.2. The sub-panel noted that, where an output has been submitted by more than one HEI, agreed scores must be consistent, even where scores have been awarded by different scoring pairs. An unclassified score would be appropriate, however, where reviewers agreed that the submitting author had failed to make a substantial research contribution to the output.
- 4.3. It was noted that the sub-panel chair and deputy chair had reviewed all instances of outputs listed against two members of staff in the same submission. Where the institution had failed to provide a satisfactory explanation for listing the same

output against two members of staff, one occurrence of the output had been given an unclassified score.

- 4.4. It was noted that the sub-panel chair and deputy chair were reviewing unclassified scores to ensure that these had been awarded fairly and consistently.

5. Preparation of institutional feedback statements

- 5.1. Prior to the meeting, panellists had been notified of submissions for which they had been appointed “lead panellist”, with responsibility for preparing the initial draft of the confidential institutional feedback statement.
- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed Paper 2, consisting of a draft template developed by Main Panel A to support lead reviewers in drafting institutional feedback statements. Panellists provided their comments on the draft template and it was agreed that a final version would be circulated as soon as possible following the meeting.
- 5.3. It was noted that the deadline for lead panellists providing the exec group with their draft feedback statements on outputs and impact was 26 August 2014. To support the preparation of feedback, lead panellists would be provided with a pack of guidance and data in respect of the output and impact profiles/scores for their designated HEIs.
- 5.4. Given changes to the unit of assessment structure and assessment arrangements generally, it was noted that there is a limit to which disciplinary comparisons can be drawn between research performance in RAE2008 and REF2014.

6. Breakout discussions

- 6.1. The sub-panel moved into breakout groups and agreed and uploaded some outstanding output scores.

7. Output sub-profiles

- 7.1. The secretariat projected a series of slides showing, for each submission, the outputs sub-profile, the number of outputs submitted and the FTE of Category A staff submitted. Where HEIs had chosen to structure their submissions using research groups, the slide also provided data on outputs profiles broken down by research group. Submissions were presented in alphabetical order.
- 7.2. The sub-panel discussed the outputs sub-profile and associated data for each submission in turn and noted key points to include in institutional feedback statements. Where HEIs had chosen not to structure their submissions using research groups, panellists who had assessed their outputs were asked to comment on any particular research areas of note.

7.3. For each submission, the sub-panel approved the outputs sub-profile and agreed to recommend it to Main Panel A.

7.4. Thirty three sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.

8. Sub-panel overview report for outputs

8.1. Panellists discussed their observations and findings in relation to the overall outputs assessment process and the performance of individual disciplinary areas. It was agreed that the exec group would take account of these observations when preparing a first draft of Sub-Panel 1's contribution to the Main Panel A overview report and that this first draft would be submitted to a future meeting of the sub-panel for further discussion. In compiling this first draft, it was agreed that the exec group would seek advice from some individual panel members regarding how best to analyse the research performance of particular disciplinary areas, where this is not immediately apparent from the output disciplinary categorisations used by the panel to date.

9. Environment calibration

9.1. The adviser reminded panellists of the key principles of environment assessment as set out in Paper 5 (including details of the relevant guidance and panel criteria) and explained the data contained in each section of the standard analyses and staff summary reports. The adviser also directed panellists to where they could access environment material for assessment via their USB keys and the PMW.

9.2. Panel members undertook a calibration exercise based on selected examples of environment templates from other Main Panel A sub-panels. These examples had been circulated in advance of the meeting, together with accompanying standard analyses and staff summary reports. Panellists had been asked to review and score each example in advance of the meeting.

9.3. A number of general principles regarding environment assessment were reiterated. Panellists were reminded that their assessment of environment must be based on the environment template itself and that the data in the standard analyses and staff summary reports should inform that assessment. Panellists noted again that 'per FTE' data in the standard analyses reports was not comparable between HEIs. This was because the submitted data related to all researchers in a unit whereas the denominator used for the calculation was the subset of researchers returned to REF. It was noted that data indicating a trajectory could be used for context, however, and that panellists could look at trends, total amounts and sources of research income.

9.4. Panellists were advised to read the entire template first to get a holistic sense of the environment and then to go back and assess each element using the 0.5 point scale. There was no pre-formed view of the ideal size or organisational structure for research environment and each submission would be judged on its own merits.

9.5. Panellists were reminded that the deadline for uploading personal scores for environment was 2 September 2014.

10. Any other business

10.1. Now that the outputs component of the assessment was complete, the sub-panel Chair thanked output assessors Prof Martin Birchall, Prof John Forrester, Prof Paul Moss and Prof Joanna Wardlaw for their service on the panel and for their invaluable contribution to the assessment process.

REF Sub-panel 1: Meeting 5 Part 2

16-17 July 2014

Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

Tim Aitman
Alan Barrett (Main Panel Member) (16 July only)
Iain Cameron
Mark Caulfield
Chris Chamberlain (17 July only)
Edwin Chilvers
Jonathan Cohen
Mary Collins
Cyrus Cooper
David Cox
David Crossman
Christopher Day (Chair)
Anna Dominiczak
Christopher Griffiths
Ian Hall
Stephen Holgate (16 July only)
Simon Herrington
Martin Hunt
John Iredale (Deputy Chair)
Kay-Tee Khaw
Renny Leach
Nicholas Lemoine
Peter Morris
Dion Morton
Jacqueline Parkin
Jeremy Pearson
Liz Philpots
Charles Pusey
Phil Quirke
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Alastair Riddell
Aziz Sheikh
Rosalind Smyth
Paul Michael Stewart

Rajesh Thakker
Josef Vormoor
Jonathan Weber
Peter Weissberg (Main Panel Member) (16 July only)
Peter Winstanley (16 July only)

Apologies:

Robert Mansel

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed impact assessors to the meeting and introduced the agenda, describing that part two of the meeting would be devoted mainly to agreeing the final impact profiles for each submission and discussing matters to include in HEI feedback statements and the sub-panel section of the Main Panel A overview report.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. The sub-panel secretariat circulated the current register of major conflicts of interest and panellists were requested, where required, to update their details via the panel members' website (PMW). Panellists were reminded of the need to leave the room during discussions for which they were conflicted.

3. Plenary to discuss impact assessment and issues to date

- 3.1. The Chair of Main Panel A provided an update on the Main Panel's experience and observations regarding impact assessment to date. He reminded the sub-panel that there are a large range of different types of impacts, at various stages along the impact pathway, all capable of being scored as 4* and each case study should be judged on its own merits.
- 3.2. Data had been circulated prior to the meeting, comprising tables of individual scoring profiles for impact case studies and impact templates (Paper 3). The secretariat presented a slide showing the case study scoring profiles for the various groups of reviewers scoring case studies. A further slide was presented comprising data on the number and percentage of impact case studies and templates scored at each starred level.
- 3.3. For the purposes of calibrating and finalising agreed impact case study scores, the sub-panel discussed a number of case studies and impact templates selected by the exec group and sub-panel members. For each item, those tasked with

scoring the case study/template provided a brief summary of the research and the impact claimed and described any challenges encountered in agreeing the final score. The sub-panel then discussed the case study/template and agreed on what the appropriate score should be.

- 3.4. The sub-panel noted that the Funding Councils' decision to allow impact to travel between institutions when a unit has been taken over by another HEI resulted in an anomalous situation where the same impact was submitted twice in UoA1. The sub-panel agreed that this was not the best way of finding and rewarding the strongest impacts in the UK and firmly recommended that this situation not be allowed to occur in any future assessment exercise.

- 3.5. Twenty four sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.

4. Breakout discussions and upload of agreed scores

- 4.1. The sub-panel moved into breakout groups and agreed and uploaded their final scores for all impact items.

5. Impact sub-profiles

- 5.1. Taking account of all updated scores, the secretariat projected a series of slides showing, for each submission, the impact sub-profile, the number of impact case studies submitted, the FTE of Category A staff submitted and the scores for the impact template and impact case studies. Submissions were presented in alphabetical order.

- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed the impact profile and associated data for each submission in turn and noted any key points to include in institutional feedback statements.

- 5.3. For each submission, the sub-panel approved the impact sub-profile and agreed to recommend it to Main Panel A.

- 5.4. Twenty eight sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.

6. Sub-panel overview report for impact

- 6.1. Panellists discussed their observations and findings in relation to the overall impact assessment process. It was agreed that the exec group would take account of these observations when preparing the first draft of Sub-Panel 1's contribution to the Main Panel A overview report.

7. Individual staff circumstances

- 7.1. The sub-panel noted Paper 4, providing an update on the recommendations and decisions made with regard to individual staff circumstances.
- 7.2. With regard to cases of clearly defined circumstances, it was noted that the vast majority of cases had been reviewed and recommendations made. In a small number of cases, audit responses were awaited from HEIs and the final results of the review process would be reported to the next meeting of the sub-panel.
- 7.3. With regard to cases of complex circumstances, it was noted that the Equality and Diversity Panel (EDAP) had completed its review of circumstances submitted within Main Panel A, excluding circumstances where further information had been requested from the HEI.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed that the next meeting (10 September 2014) would focus on the assessment of environment.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. Now that the impact component of the assessment was complete, the sub-panel Chair thanked impact assessors Professor Chris Chamberlain, Dr David Cox, Mr Martin Hunt, Dr Renny Leach, Dr Liz Philpots, Dr Jacqueline Parkin and Dr Alastair Riddell for their invaluable contribution to the assessment process.



REF Sub-panel 1: Meeting 6
10 September 2014
Radisson Blu, Queensway, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Tim Aitman
Alan Barrett (Main Panel Member)
Iain Cameron
Mark Caulfield
Edwin Chilvers
Mary Collins
Cyrus Cooper
David Crossman
Christopher Day (Chair)
Tricia Greenhalgh (Main Panel Member)
Christopher Griffiths
Ian Hall
Simon Herrington
John Iredale (Deputy Chair)
Nicholas Lemoine
Robert Mansel
Peter Morris
Dion Morton
Jeremy Pearson
Liz Philpots
Charles Pusey
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Aziz Sheikh
Rosalind Smyth
Paul Michael Stewart
Rajesh Thakker
Josef Vormoor
Jonathan Weber
Peter Weissberg (Main Panel Member)
Peter Winstanley

Apologies:

Jonathan Cohen
David Cox
Anna Dominiczak
Kay-Tee Khaw
Renny Leach
Phil Quirke
Alastair Riddell

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He introduced the agenda, describing that the majority of the meeting would be devoted to agreeing the scores and profiles for environment submissions, for recommendation to Main Panel A. There would also be a discussion of the draft feedback statements and the Sub-Panel 1 overview report, each of which would be approved at the final meeting of the sub-panel on 16 October 2014.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 15-17 July 2014. These were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The secretariat circulated the current register of major conflicts of interest and panellists were requested, where required, to update their details via the panel members' website (PMW). Panellists were reminded of the need to leave the room during discussions for which they were conflicted.

4. Assessment of environment templates and feedback (environment)

- 4.1. The sub-panel chair delivered a brief presentation reminding panellists of some of the key principles of environment assessment. The adviser noted an issue with the numbers of junior clinical academics recorded for each submission and supplied an updated list.
- 4.2. Prior to the meeting, panellists had reviewed the environment templates assigned to them for assessment and had uploaded their personal scores for each of the four components of environment to the Panel Members' Website.

- 4.3. For each submission, those tasked with assessing the environment template were asked to comment on the rationale for their personal scores. The sub-panel then discussed and agreed panel scores.
- 4.4. During the discussions, the “lead panellist” for each submission noted the key points to include in the institutional feedback statement in respect of environment.
- 4.5. Twenty nine sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.
- 4.6. The sub-panel agreed to recommend the final environment sub-profiles to Main Panel A.
- 4.7. The sub-panel chair advised panellists of the overall quality profile and sub-profiles for Sub-Panel 1 as a whole.

5. Feedback reports

- 5.1. The sub-panel chair thanked lead panellists for the draft outputs and impact feedback they had prepared for their respective institutions. It was agreed that these draft statements would be edited and finalised by the sub-panel chair and deputy chair.
- 5.2. Panellists were referred to Paper 1, comprising suggested text for use by lead panellists when drafting the environment components of institutional feedback statements. No amendments were suggested to the proposed text.
- 5.3. It was agreed that, following the meeting, the secretariat would contact lead panellists individually to provide them with a pack of guidance and data in respect of the environment profiles/scores for their designated HEIs. At the same time, panellists would be advised of the deadline for providing their draft environment feedback.

6. Discussion of draft overview report

- 6.1. Panellists were referred to Paper 2, comprising the first draft of Sub-Panel 1’s section of the Main Panel A Overview Report. The draft had been prepared in line with input from panellists at the previous meeting.
- 6.2. Panellists provided further comments and suggestions in relation to the draft report and it was agreed that the sub-panel chair and deputy chair would further revise the report in light of these. It was noted that the next version of the report would be approved at the final meeting of the sub-panel on 16 October 2014.

7. Individual staff circumstances

- 7.1. The sub-panel noted Paper 3, providing an update on recommendations and decisions made with regard to individual staff circumstances.
- 7.2. With regard to cases of clearly defined circumstances, it was noted that all but two cases had been reviewed and recommendations made. In three cases, the full reduction in outputs sought had not been approved, leading to the award of at least one unclassified grade. The sub-panel chair provided a summary of the reasons for awarding unclassified scores in each case.
- 7.3. With regard to cases of complex circumstances, it was noted that the Equality and Diversity Panel (EDAP) had completed its review of circumstances submitted within Main Panel A. The sub-panel noted the outcome of this review.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. The sub-panel chair reminded panellists that the next and final sub-panel meeting would take place on 16 October 2014. The main purpose of the meeting would be to view overall profiles, to complete feedback on submissions and to complete sub-panel content for overview reports.



REF Sub-panel 1: Meeting 7

16 October 2014

CCT Venues - Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Tim Aitman
Iain Cameron
Mark Caulfield
Edwin Chilvers
Jonathan Cohen
Mary Collins
Cyrus Cooper
David Cox
Christopher Day (Chair)
Anna Dominiczak
Christopher Griffiths
Ian Hall
Simon Herrington
Stephen Holgate (Main Panel Member)
Kay-Tee Khaw
Renny Leach
Nicholas Lemoine
Robert Mansel
Peter Morris
Dion Morton
Jeremy Pearson
Charles Pusey
Phil Quirke
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Aziz Sheikh
Rosalind Smyth
Paul Michael Stewart
Rajesh Thakker
Josef Vormoor
Jonathan Weber
Peter Winstanley

Apologies:

David Crossman
John Iredale (Deputy Chair)
Liz Philpots
Alastair Riddell

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He introduced the agenda, describing that the majority of the meeting would be devoted to reviewing and agreeing the contents of the feedback reports to be provided to each HEI and to agreeing the contents of the overview report. There would also be a discussion regarding panellists' final observations on the overall assessment process and the arrangements for the publication of the results of REF2014 in December 2014.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 10 September 2014. These were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The secretariat circulated the current register of major conflicts of interest and panellists confirmed these were correct. Panellists were reminded of the need to leave the room during discussions for which they were conflicted.

4. Reviewing and agreeing contents of HEI feedback reports

- 4.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed that the exec group had reviewed and edited the draft HEI feedback statements provided by panellists. This had been done in response to guidance from the REF team and to achieve consistency in the feedback provided as a whole. The sub-panel chair referred panellists to the revised versions of the feedback statements contained in Paper 1 and thanked them for their input to the drafting process.
- 4.2. The sub-panel discussed and agreed the contents of the confidential feedback to be provided to each HEI.
- 4.3. Twenty eight sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.

5. Agreeing contents of overview report

5.1. The sub-panel discussed Paper 2, comprising the latest draft of Sub-Panel 1's section of the Main Panel A Overview Report. This draft took account of the input from panellists at the previous meeting.

5.2. The sub-panel approved the text for the overview report, subject to some final amendments.

6. Feedback to REF team

6.1. Panellists provided their final comments regarding their experience of the assessment process as a whole. Several members of SP1 will attend feedback events run by the Funding Councils and the sub-panel's views will inform their contribution to those.

7. Individual staff circumstances

7.1. The sub-panel noted Paper 3, providing an update on recommendations and decisions made with regard to clearly defined individual staff circumstances.

7.2. It was noted that all 1044 cases of individual staff circumstances had now been reviewed by the secretariat on behalf of the exec group. Audit queries had been raised in cases where insufficient information had been provided by the HEI to allow the secretariat to replicate the reduction calculation or to judge whether the reduction sought was appropriate.

7.3. The sub-panel approved the exec group's recommendation that, in 1041 cases, no missing outputs should be recorded because the appropriate number of outputs had been submitted.

7.4. The sub-panel noted that, in three cases, the exec group had judged that the criteria for output reductions had not been met. Of these staff, two had one missing output and one had two missing outputs. The sub-panel approved the exec group's recommendations regarding these missing outputs.

8. REF results and publication

8.1. The adviser delivered a presentation providing an overview of the timetable and arrangements for the publication of the REF results, advice on responding to questions from the press or the academic community and arrangements for ensuring the confidentiality of assessment material.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The sub-panel chair noted that this was the final meeting of the sub-panel. He thanked all panellists for their invaluable input and hard work throughout the assessment process.
- 9.2. Panellists asked the secretariat to pass on their thanks to the REF team for the excellent support provided throughout the exercise.