



REF Sub-panel 2: Meeting 1 (Part b)

12 December 2013

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Dr Bev Abram (secretary)	Professor Sally Macintyre
Professor David Armstrong	Professor James Newell
Ms Angela Barnard	Professor Jon Nicholl (chair)
Ms Katherine Branch (panel adviser)	Professor Tim Peters
Professor Chris Butler	Professor Rosalind Raine
Professor Karl Claxton	Professor Peter Sasieni
Professor Jenny Donovan	Dr Sophie Staniszewski
Professor Robert Elliott	Dr Frans Van Der Ouderra (main panel A member)
Professor Caroline Fall	Professor Tom Walley
Professor Phil Hannaford (deputy chair)	Professor Kieran Walshe
Professor Elaine Hay	Professor Nick Wareham
Professor Frank Kee	
Professor David Leon	
Professor Paul Little	

Apologies: Professor Ian Harvey and Professor Edwin van Teijlingen

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. Sub-panel members introduced themselves and the chair welcomed new and international members.
- 1.2. The chair gave a brief introduction to the meeting agenda.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct and agreed to notify the secretariat with their minor conflicts of interest after the meeting.

3. Communication

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed a spreadsheet of their preferred contact details and confirmed that they were correct.

4. IT Systems briefing Output allocation arrangements

- 4.1. An overview of REF IT systems, which included information on output spreadsheet management, reading lists, cross referral and use of REF webmail was presented to the sub-panel by the secretariat.

5. Output calibration

- 5.1. The chair reported on the calibration exercise by the main panel, which had met on 11th December 2013, and covered the following issues:

- Characteristics of outputs that were on the borderline between star levels.
- Comparison of scores by main panel and sub-panel for outputs that had been in the main panel calibration sample.
- Discussion on how the sub-panels could continue to calibrate their assessments beyond this initial exercise.
- Dealing with audit queries.
- Avoiding the influence of journals and impact factors.
- Resolving discrepant scores between review pairs.

- 5.2. The chair outlined the aims of this calibration exercise, highlighting that the main aim was to develop a common understanding of the star levels; not to agree specific scores for the outputs in the calibration sample.

- 5.3. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair had selected and circulated a sample of 20 outputs to the sub-panel members and output assessors, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. These were international outputs from the RAE period, chosen to ensure that sub-panel members did not have any conflicts of interest with them. Outputs were selected to represent a spread of research areas and research quality. The sub-panel scored them from 0 to 4*, using the criteria provided (REF Assessment framework and guidance on submissions page 43, Annex A, Table A1, Overall quality profile: Definitions of starred levels).

- 5.4. Sub-panel members had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The secretary displayed the scores and the sub-panel considered how far members had reached a consensus on each output. The sub-panel discussed

the particular outputs where scores diverged or where sub-panel members considered the output was on the border of two star levels. Through this discussion the panel agreed on the score for each output and highlighted the reasons for those scores.

6. Output allocation

- 6.1. The chair explained that allocations would be made using a restricted randomisation taking individual major conflicts of interest in to consideration. Sub-panel members and output assessors agreed to review their output allocation and identify any issues to the secretary and chair by REF email.
- 6.2. It was agreed that 67% of outputs would be assessed before 2nd April 2014 for review at the next sub-panel meeting. The remainder should be assessed before meeting 4 on 13th May 2014.
- 6.3. The panel agreed that e-mail/ phone discussion should be used to resolve discrepancies in scoring. In cases where agreement cannot be reached, sub-panel members should bring the outputs to the secretary/ chair/ deputy-chair who will identify a third reader.

7. Impact case study calibration

- 7.1. The chair explained that main panel A have agreed to provide sub-panel 2 with a selection of impact case studies for a calibration exercise. The case studies will be provided from submissions to other sub-panels within main panel A, and will be case studies that have been submitted by institutions that have not submitted to sub-panel 2.
- 7.2. The secretary will circulate case studies for calibration and all sub-panel members agreed to review each case study before the meeting on 2nd April 2014.
- 7.3. The chair explained that impact assessors will be supplied with guidelines and examples of impact assessment from the pilot impact exercise (REF Research Impact Pilot Exercise Lessons-Learned Project Feedback on Pilot Submissions, November 2011) and will lead discussions on case calibration at the 2nd April 2014 meeting.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. A timetable, containing targets for assessment for sub-panel 2 was discussed by the panel.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. None reported.

10. Date of next meeting

10.1. The next meeting will take place on 2-3 April (outputs) 2014 in London.

REF Sub-panel 2: Meeting 3 (Part 1)

2 April 2014

CCT Venues- Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Professor David Armstrong	Professor James Newell
Ms Angela Barnard	Professor Jon Nicholl (chair)
Ms Katherine Branch (panel adviser)	Professor Tim Peters
Professor Chris Butler	Professor Rosalind Raine
Professor Karl Claxton	Professor Peter Sasieni
Professor Jenny Donovan	Dr Sophie Staniszewska
Professor Robert Elliott	Professor Edwin van Teijlingen
Professor Caroline Fall	Professor Erika von Mutius (main panel member)
Professor Ian Harvey	Professor Tom Walley
Professor Elaine Hay	Professor Kieran Walshe
Professor Frank Kee	Professor Nick Wareham
Professor David Leon	
Professor Paul Little	
Professor Sally Macintyre	

Apologies:

Dr Bev Abram (secretary)
Professor Phil Hannaford (deputy chair)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel members and introduced Professor von Mutius from main panel A.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes, subject to correction of the meeting attendance to show that Professor van Teijlingen was present at the last meeting and that Professor Wareham had sent apologies.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub- panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.
- 3.2. The sub-panel were reminded they should leave the room when they had a major conflict of interest with any element of an item under discussion and should sign the sheet provided by the secretariat to indicate they had done so.

4. Output scoring to date

- 4.1. The sub-panel reviewed progress with assessment of outputs to date. The chair introduced the emerging quality profile, individual scoring and individual mean scores. The sub-panel noted the feedback from main panel A on scoring.
- 4.2. The sub-panel noted the outputs that had been cross referred into and out of the sub-panel. The chair encouraged the sub-panel to identify any further material to be cross referred by the end of April, providing a reminder of the process once both assessors agreed.

5. Audit

- 5.1. The sub-panel discussed issues that had arisen during output assessment where an audit is required, particularly issues of multi-authored papers and assessment of review papers and protocols. The chair emphasised the criteria for output assessment: significance, originality and rigour.
- 5.2. The sub-panel were reminded that where supporting statements have been provided by the submitting unit they should be accepted at face value, unless the assessors had a reason to doubt them.
- 5.3. The sub-panel agreed that review papers, document reviews and protocols should provide an original contribution or approach.

[One sub-panel member left the room during discussion]

6. Agreeing process for output 'speed dating'

- 6.1. The sub-panel agreed the process for reaching agreed scores on the first allocation of outputs.

7. Output ‘speed dating’

- 7.1. The sub-panel reached agreed scores on the first allocation of outputs and were reminded to ensure these were entered in their personal spreadsheets.

8. Future meeting schedule

- 8.1. The sub-panel noted the future meeting schedule, in particular that the reserve day for 15th May is cancelled and the reserve day on 11th July is confirmed.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. None.

10. Date of next meeting

- 10.1. The next meeting is 13 May (outputs) and 14 May (impact) 2014, in Birmingham.

REF Sub-panel 2: Meeting 3 (Part 2)

3 April 2014

CCT Venues- Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Professor David Armstrong	Mr Paul Lincoln
Ms Angela Barnard	Professor Paul Little
Ms Katherine Branch (panel adviser)	Professor Sally Macintyre
Professor Chris Butler	Dr Anne Mackie
Professor Karl Claxton	Professor Jon Nicholl (chair)
Professor Jenny Donovan	Professor Tim Peters
Professor Robert Elliott	Professor Rosalind Raine
Professor Trish Greenhalgh (main panel deputy chair)	Dr Malcolm Skingle (main panel member)
Professor Phil Hannaford (deputy chair-joined by skype)	Dr Sophie Staniszewska
Professor Ian Harvey	Professor Edwin van Teijlingen
Professor Elaine Hay	Professor Frans van der Ouderaa (main panel member)
Professor Stephen Holgate (main panel chair)	Professor Erika von Mutius (main panel member)
Professor Frank Kee	Professor Tom Walley
Professor Mike Kelly	Professor Kieran Walshe
Professor David Leon	Professor Nick Wareham

Apologies:

Dr Bev Abram (Secretary)

10. Introduction and competence to do business

10.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel members and introduced the main panel members.

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

11. Conflicts of interest

- 11.1. The sub-panel were reminded they should leave the room when they had a major conflict of interest with any element of an item under discussion and should sign the sheet provided by the secretariat to indicate they had done so.

12. Impact allocation and audit

- 12.1. The secretariat provided a reminder of the guidance for assessment of impact, with a particular focus on threshold criteria and judgments.
- 12.2. Discussion followed on the definition of 2* research for underpinning research. It was agreed that the sub-panel will seek to establish that the research was of at least 2* quality ("internationally recognised") at the time it was published. A broad view will be taken of the evidence of the underpinning research. When there is doubt that the research meets the threshold criteria, the sub-panel will consider instead if there is insufficient indication that the research is *not* of 2* quality before making a judgment.
- 12.3. The sub-panel accepted the principle that there can be more than one set of underpinning research that contributes to an impact. It was agreed that each case study would be treated on its individual merit and the sub-panel will not look for connections between case studies in similar areas.
- 12.4. It was agreed that long term and sustained impact case studies would be considered, although only the impact occurring within the REF period would be assessed.
- 12.5. The sub-panel noted that 0.5 scores are available to use for impact. However it was agreed that 0.5 scores would be used only for borderline cases.
- 12.6. The chair outlined how the impact case studies and impact templates had been allocated for assessment in sub-panel 2. Initial assessment will be carried out by one impact assessor (lead assessor) and two sub-panel members. All impact case studies and templates will be discussed in the sub-panel meetings to determine a panel agreed score.
- 12.7. The sub-panel noted the requirement to skim read all of their impact case studies by the end of April in order to identify cases to be audited.
- 12.8. The sub-panel agreed to score the first 50% of impact case studies by 6 May 2014, for discussion in the May meeting. It was requested that the secretariat provide a brief outline of the next steps and timetable for impact assessment.

13. Impact calibration exercise

13.1. The sub-panel members and impact assessors had scored 12 impact case studies and 4 templates and submitted their scores to the secretariat in advance. The sub-panel were reminded that the cases and templates used for calibration have been submitted to other sub-panels and were to be treated in confidence.

13.2. Each case study and template was discussed to gain a common understanding of the definition of the quality levels and application of the guidance.

14. Future meeting schedule

14.1. The sub-panel noted the future meeting schedule, in particular that the reserve day for 15th May is cancelled and the reserve day on 11th July is confirmed.

15. Any other business

15.1. None.

16. Date of next meeting

16.1. The next meeting is 13 May (outputs) and 14 May (impact) 2014, in Birmingham.

REF Sub-panel 2: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

13 May 2014

AUMS, Aston University, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Dr Bev Abram (panel secretary)	Professor David Leon
Professor David Armstrong	Professor Paul Little
Ms Angela Barnard	Professor Sally Macintyre
Ms Katherine Branch (panel adviser)	Professor James Newell
Professor Chris Butler	Professor Jon Nicholl (chair)
Professor Karl Claxton	Professor Tim Peters
Professor Jenny Donovan	Professor Rosalind Raine
Professor Robert Elliott	Professor Peter Sasieni
Professor Caroline Fall	Dr Sophie Staniszewska
Dr Russell Hamilton (main panel member)	Professor Edwin van Teijlingen
Professor Phil Hannaford (deputy chair)	Professor Tom Walley
Professor Ian Harvey	Professor Kieran Walshe
Professor Elaine Hay	Professor Nick Wareham
Professor Frank Kee	

Apologies: None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel members to the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes as a true representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.
- 3.2. The sub-panel were reminded they should leave the room when they had a major conflict of interest with any element of an item under discussion and should sign the sheet provided by the secretariat to indicate they had done so.

4. Audit

- 4.1. The sub-panel discussed issues that had arisen during output assessment where an audit is required, particularly issues of multi-authored papers and outputs given an unclassified score as a result of audit. The panel were encouraged not to raise audit queries on outputs more than once and were reminded to raise final audit queries as soon as possible for resolution before the July meeting.
- 4.2. The chair reminded the sub-panel to seek clarification from the secretariat and chair in any instances where the two assessors are unsure that an output meets the REF definition of research, before agreeing a score.

5. Output scoring to date

- 5.1. The sub-panel reviewed progress with assessment of outputs to date and noted that 79% of scores had been agreed. The chair reported on the output quality profile for UOA 2 and fed back from the main panel A meeting on 9 May 2014.
- 5.2. The chair presented an analysis of output scoring which demonstrated that scoring was consistent across batch allocations of outputs.
- 5.3. The sub-panel discussed outputs that had been submitted multiple times to UOA 2 and noted that this was likely to be due to the highly collaborative nature of the research area.
- 5.4. The sub-panel noted an update on the outputs that had been cross referred into and out of the sub-panel. The chair encouraged the sub-panel to identify any final material for cross referral as soon as possible, providing a reminder of the process for cross referral once both assessors agreed.

6. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 6.1. The chair explained the purpose of overview reports and feedback statements and outlined the process for contributing to the overview report from main panel A

and preparing feedback statements for institutions which have submitted to UOA 2.

- 6.2. The sub-panel agreed plans for producing feedback statements which will be approved in the October meeting. It was agreed that sub-panel members will help draft these statements, focusing on the strengths of each submission.

7. Environment

- 7.1 The chair confirmed that allocations for environment assessment will be made after the meeting by the secretariat.

8. Output speed dating

- 8.1. The sub-panel were reminded of the process for reaching agreed scores on outputs and reached agreed scores on the second allocation of outputs. The sub-panel were reminded to ensure that individual scores were entered into their personal spreadsheets.
- 8.2. The chair thanked the output assessors for their contribution to the assessment.

9. Future meeting schedule

- 9.1. The sub-panel noted the future meeting schedule, in particular that the reserve day for 11 July is confirmed.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. None.

11. Date of next meeting

- 11.1. The next meeting is 8-11 July 2014 (inclusive), with discussions on outputs on 8 July (0.5 days) and impact on 8-11 July, in Stratford.

REF Sub-panel 2: Meeting 4 (Part 2)

14 May 2014

AUMS, Aston University, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Dr Bev Abram (secretary)	Professor Mike Kelly
Professor David Armstrong	Professor David Leon
Ms Angela Barnard	Mr Paul Lincoln
Ms Katherine Branch (panel adviser)	Professor Paul Little
Professor Chris Butler	Professor Sally Macintyre
Professor Karl Claxton	Dr Anne Mackie
Professor Jenny Donovan	Professor Jon Nicholl (chair)
Professor Robert Elliott	Professor Tim Peters
Dr Russell Hamilton (main panel member)	Professor Rosalind Raine
Professor Phil Hannaford	Dr Sophie Staniszewska
Professor Ian Harvey	Professor Edwin van Teijlingen
Professor Elaine Hay	Professor Frans van der Ouderra (main panel member)
Professor Stephen Holgate (main panel chair)	Professor Tom Walley
Professor Frank Kee	Professor Kieran Walshe
	Professor Nick Wareham

Apologies:

None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel members and impact assessors and introduced the main panel members.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. The sub-panel were reminded they should leave the room when they had a major conflict of interest with any element of an item under discussion and should sign the sheet provided by the secretariat to indicate they had done so.

3. Impact audit

- 3.1. The secretariat provided a reminder of the guidance for assessment of impact, with a particular focus on threshold criteria and judgements on when an audit query should be raised on a case study.
- 3.2. The sub-panel were reminded that between 5-10% of case studies will be audited which for UOA 2 is 8-16 cases.
- 3.3. The sub-panel members and impact assessors were requested to skim read their allocated impact case studies and to identify potential cases for audit prior to the meeting. A tabled list was distributed and it was agreed that further cases for audit would be identified as the sub-panel discussed individual cases during the meeting.
- 3.4. The chair reminded the sub-panel that there can be more than one set of underpinning research that contributes to an impact and that each case study would be treated on its individual merit. The sub-panel noted they will not look for connections between case studies in similar areas.

4. Impact case study discussion

- 4.1. The chair outlined the process for discussion of impact case studies and explained the randomisation process used to compile the running order of impact cases for discussion. The chair reminded the sub-panel that 0.5 scores were available for use in scoring impact. It was however agreed that 0.5 scores would be used only when there is considerable uncertainty about the score.
- 4.2. Case studies were discussed and the secretariat recorded the agreed score.
- 4.3. Due to time constraints the sub-panel agreed to complete discussion of the first 50% of case studies at the next meeting in July.
- 4.4. The sub-panel agreed to score the remaining 50% of impact case studies by 30th June 2014, for discussion at the July meeting.

[Six panel members left the room during this discussion]

5. Future meeting schedule

- 5.1. The sub-panel noted the future meeting schedule, in particular that the reserve day for 11 July is confirmed.

6. Any other business

6.1. None.

7. Date of next meeting

7.1. The next meeting is 8 July (outputs) and 8-11 July (impact) 2014, in Stratford.



REF Sub-panel 2: Meeting 5 (Part 1)

8 July 2014

The Stratford Hotel, Stratford

Minutes

Present:

Dr Bev Abram (panel secretary)	Professor Jon Nicholl (chair)
Professor David Armstrong	Professor Tim Peters
Ms Katherine Branch (panel adviser)	Professor Rosalind Raine
Professor Chris Butler	Dr Sophie Staniszewska
Professor Karl Claxton	Professor Edwin van Teijlingen
Professor Jenny Donovan	Professor Erika von Mutius (main panel member)
Professor Robert Elliott	Professor Tom Walley
Professor Phil Hannaford (deputy chair)	Professor Kieran Walshe
Professor Ian Harvey	Professor Nick Wareham
Professor Elaine Hay	
Professor Frank Kee	
Professor Sally Macintyre	

Apologies: None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel members and main panel member, Professor Erika Von Mutius to this part of the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub- panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes as a true representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub- panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.
- 3.2. The sub-panel were reminded they should leave the room when they had a major conflict of interest with any element of an item under discussion and should sign the sheet provided by the secretariat to indicate they had done so.

4. Individual staff circumstances

- 4.1. **Clearly defined circumstances:** The chair outlined the process for reviewing individual staff circumstances and reminded the sub-panel of their collective responsibility to make decisions on clearly-defined circumstances, based on the recommendations of the panel secretariat. The chair reported that all clearly defined staff circumstances (including ECR cases) have been reviewed by the secretariat. Audit queries have been raised where insufficient information was provided to confirm that the criteria had been met. The sub panel agreed the recommendation of the secretariat.
- 4.2. **Complex circumstances:** The chair reported that complex circumstances have been reviewed by EDAP and recommendations have been provided to the main panel chairs. For UOA2 there are is 1 case pending.

5. Developing and recommending quality profiles

- 5.1. The chair informed the sub-panel of their role in recommending output and impact sub profiles to the main panel, and in signing off institutional profiles for each element (outputs, impact and environment). He reminded the sub-panel that sub profiles will be used to inform compilation of feedback statements to institutions.

6. Output assessment

- 6.1. The sub-panel noted an update on outputs that had been cross referred into and out of the sub-panel and that there was a decision on one cross referred output outstanding.
- 6.2. The sub-panel noted the reasons for awarding any outputs with “unclassified” scores.
- 6.3. It was agreed that the secretariat would draft and present output profiles on the final day of the meeting.

7. Environment assessment

- 7.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the allocation process for environment whereby each assessment will be carried out by three sub-panel members.
- 7.2. The secretariat provided a reminder of the guidance for assessment of environment, explaining that assessors should take a holistic view on sustainability and vitality of the environment and should then proceed to score the 4 equally weighted components of the template (overview and strategy, people, income, and collaboration), taking account of the quantitative data provided in the REF4 submissions.
- 7.3. The sub-panel noted the guidance from main panel A to score the 4 elements across the entire template rather than focusing on the information contained within each section of the document.
- 7.4. Discussion followed on how to interpret the quantitative data provided in REF4a/b/c submissions. The sub-panel accepted the principle that trends and trajectories within submissions can be noted. However, comparisons between submissions were unreliable and should not be made.
- 7.5. The sub-panel noted that 0.5 scores are available to use for environment and that positive scoring was encouraged.
- 7.6. The chair reminded the panel of the process for agreeing scores. All environment templates will be discussed in the September sub-panel meetings to determine a panel agreed score.

8. Environment calibration exercise

- 8.1. The sub-panel members had scored a small sample of environment templates in advance. The sub-panel were reminded that the templates used for calibration have been submitted to other sub-panels and were to be treated in confidence.
- 8.2. The templates were discussed to gain a common understanding of the definition of the quality levels and application of the guidance on environment assessment.

9. Close

- 9.1. The chair closed the meeting, noting that the impact assessors would now join the sub-panel for assessment of impact.



REF Sub-panel 2: Meeting 5 (Part 2)

8-11 July 2014

The Stratford Hotel, Stratford

Minutes

Present:

Dr Bev Abram (panel secretary)	Professor Paul Little
Professor David Armstrong	Dr Anne Mackie (10 and 11 July only)
Ms Angela Barnard	Professor Sally Macintyre
Ms Katherine Branch (panel adviser)	Professor Jon Nicholl (chair)
Professor Chris Butler	Professor Tim Peters
Professor Karl Claxton	Professor Rosalind Raine
Professor Jenny Donovan	Mr Graeme Rosenberg (REF manager)
Professor Robert Elliott	(10 July)
Professor Phil Hannaford (deputy chair)	Dr Sophie Staniszewska
Professor Ian Harvey	Professor Edwin van Teijlingen
Professor Elaine Hay	Professor Erika von Mutius (main panel
Professor Stephen Holgate (main panel	member) (8 and 9 July)
chair) (9 and 10 July)	Professor Tom Walley
Professor Frank Kee	Professor Kieran Walshe (8 and 11 July
Professor Mike Kelly	only)
Professor David Leon	Professor Nick Wareham
Mr Paul Lincoln	

Apologies: None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel members, impact assessors, main panel member, Professor Erika Von Mutius and main panel chair, Stephen Holgate to the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub- panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1 The sub-panel were reminded they should leave the room when they had a major conflict of interest with any element of an item under discussion and should sign the sheet provided by the secretariat to indicate they had done so.

3. Impact assessment

- 3.1. The sub-panel noted progress with assessment of impact to date. The chair reported on the emerging impact quality profiles for UOA2 and fed back from the main panel A meeting on 4 July 2014.
- 3.2. The panel noted a summary of impact audit queries raised.
- 3.3. The sub-panel confirmed that in each case the information supplied as a result of audit was sufficient to make a judgement.

4. Impact case assessment

- 4.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the process for discussion of impact case studies.
- 4.2. The chair reminded the sub-panel that 0.5 scores could be used where there is considerable uncertainty about the score.
- 4.3. Case studies were discussed and the secretariat recorded the agreed scores for each one.
- 4.4. Following advice from the main panel A chair, the sub-panel agreed to cross refer one case study to sub-panel 6 for assessment.

(Twenty two sub-panel members left the room during this discussion)

5. Impact template assessment

- 5.1. The chair explained the rationale behind impact template assessment and reminded the sub-panel that the impact template contributes 4% to the overall profile score.
- 5.2. The chair informed the sub-panel that use of the future tense in the impact template is acceptable and noted that many institutions may not have had an impact strategy in place at the beginning of the REF2014 period.

- 5.3. Impact templates were discussed and the secretariat recorded the agreed scores.

(Twenty one sub-panel members left the room during this discussion)

6. Sub profiles for outputs and impact

- 6.1. The secretariat presented impact sub-profiles for each submission to the sub-panel.
- 6.2. The sub-panel agreed to recommend the impact sub-profiles for approval by main panel A.
- 6.3. The chair thanked impact assessors for their services on the panel and for their invaluable contribution to the assessment process and invited them to leave the meeting.
- 6.4. The secretariat presented output sub-profiles for each submission to the sub-panel.
- 6.5. The sub-panel agreed to recommend the output sub-profiles for approval by main panel A.

(Twenty sub-panel members left the room during this discussion)

7. Feedback statements

- 7.1. The chair explained the purpose of the overview report and feedback statements and the process by which these would be prepared by the sub-panel, highlighting the importance of giving informative feedback.
- 7.2. The sub-panel agreed plans for producing feedback statements and discussed the template provided. It was requested that the chair and secretariat refine the template for use in preparing feedback.

8. Future meeting schedule

- 8.1. The sub-panel noted the future meeting schedule.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The sub-panel requested that a summary of feedback on the assessment process from the sub-panel discussions should be sent to HEFCE.

10. Date of next meeting

- 10.1. The next meeting is 16 -17 September 2014, with discussions on environment on 16-17 September (1.5 days) and feedback on 17 September (0.5 days), in Birmingham.



REF Sub-panel 2: Meeting 6
16-17 September 2014
The Radisson Blu Hotel, Birmingham
Minutes

Present:

Dr Bev Abram (panel secretary)	Professor Bruce Murphy (main panel member)
Professor David Armstrong	Professor Jon Nicholl (chair)
Ms Angela Barnard	Professor Tim Peters
Ms Katherine Branch (panel adviser)	Professor Rosalind Raine
Professor Chris Butler	Mr Duncan Shermer (17 September only)
Professor Karl Claxton	Dr Sophie Staniszewska
Professor Jenny Donovan	Professor Frans van der Ouderra (main panel member)
Mrs Geri Echue (REF team member)	Professor Edwin van Teijlingen
Professor Robert Elliott	Professor Tom Walley
Professor Phil Hannaford (deputy chair)	Professor Kieran Walshe
Professor Elaine Hay	Professor Nick Wareham
Professor Frank Kee	
Professor David Leon	
Professor Paul Little	
Professor Sally Macintyre	

Apologies: Professor Ian Harvey

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel members and main panel representative to the meeting and outlined the agenda for the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes as a true representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub- panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.
- 3.2. The sub-panel were reminded they should leave the room when they had a major conflict of interest with any element of an item under discussion.

4. Environment assessment

- 4.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the process for discussion of environment statements.
- 4.2. The chair reminded the sub-panel that 0.5 scores could be used where there is uncertainty about the score.
- 4.3. The sub-panel noted progress with assessment of environment to date. The chair reported on the emerging environment quality profiles for UOA2.
- 4.4. Environment statements were discussed and the secretariat recorded the agreed scores for each one.

(Twenty one sub-panel members left the room during this discussion)

5. Environment sub-profiles and overall quality profiles

- 5.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of their role in recommending environment sub-profiles to the main panel, and in recommending institutional profiles for each element (outputs, impact and environment) to the main panel.
- 5.2. The secretariat presented environment sub-profiles and overall institutional quality profiles for each submission to the sub-panel.
- 5.3. The sub-panel agreed to recommend the environment and overall institutional quality profiles to the main panel.

(Twenty one sub-panel members left the room during this discussion)

6. Feedback statements

- 6.1. The sub-panel discussed drafts of feedback statements to accompany quality profiles for each institution and agreed the process to finalise statements before the next meeting.

(Twenty one sub-panel members left the room during this discussion)

7. Overview reports

- 7.1. The chair outlined the requirements for drafting the sub-panel sections of the UOA2 overview report and reported that he would draft the report for discussion at the next meeting.
- 7.2. Sub-panel members agreed to provide feedback/comments on the REF process to the chair by email.

8. Future meeting schedule

- 8.1. The sub-panel noted the future meeting schedule.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. None.

10. Date of next meeting

- 10.1. The next meeting is 8 October 2014, with discussions on feedback statements and overview reports, in London.

REF Sub-panel 2: Meeting 7
8 October 2014
CCT Venues-Barbican, London
Minutes

Present:

Dr Bev Abram (panel secretary)	Professor Frank Kee
Professor David Armstrong	Professor David Leon
Ms Angela Barnard	Professor Paul Little
Ms Katherine Branch (panel adviser)	Professor Sally Macintyre
Professor Chris Butler	Professor Jon Nicholl (chair)
Professor Karl Claxton	Professor Tim Peters
Professor Jenny Donovan	Professor Rosalind Raine
Professor Robert Elliott	Dr Sophie Staniszewska
Professor Phil Hannaford (deputy chair)	Professor Edwin van Teijlingen
Professor Ian Harvey	Professor Tom Walley
Professor Elaine Hay	Professor Kieran Walshe
Professor Stephen Holgate (main panel chair)	Professor Nick Wareham

Apologies: None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel and main panel A chair, Professor Stephen Holgate, to the meeting and outlined the agenda for the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub- panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes as a true representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub- panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.
- 3.2. The sub-panel were reminded they should leave the room when they had a major conflict of interest with any element of an item under discussion.

4. Quality profiles

- 4.1. The chair explained the overall UOA2 quality profile to the sub-panel and reported that main panel A had endorsed the profile at the MPA meeting on 30 September.
- 4.2. The sub-panel discussed quality profiles for outputs, impact, environment and the resultant overall profiles for UOA2 compared with the average quality profiles for main panel A.
- 4.3. The secretariat presented profile quartile data for UOA2 compared to profile quartile data for main panel A. A discussion on the quartile data followed and the sub-panel noted the spread of profiles within the sub-panel and in comparison with the average for main panel A.

5. Feedback statements

- 5.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the agreed process for drafting feedback statements.
- 5.2. The secretariat presented drafts of feedback statements to accompany quality profiles for each institution.
- 5.3. The sub-panel discussed drafts of feedback statements and the secretariat recorded the agreed changes for each statement.
- 5.4. The sub-panel agreed to recommend the feedback statements to the main panel for approval.

(Twenty one sub-panel members left the room during this discussion)

6. Overview report

- 6.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the requirements for drafting the sub-panel sections of the overview report and commented that the format of the report was

the same for all MPA sub-panels and will include un-weighted profiles for each UOA.

- 6.2. The sub-panel discussed and agreed key messages and reflections on process for inclusion in the sub-panel section of the UOA2 overview report.
- 6.3. The chair agreed to produce a final draft of the overview report for presentation at the main panel meeting on 4 November 2014.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. None.

8. Final comments

- 8.1. The secretariat reminded the sub-panel that the REF results would be publicly available on 18 December 2014 and provided advice on responding to questions prior to the results release date.
- 8.2. The secretariat reminded the panel that, in line with the REF confidentiality agreement, all assessment materials should be destroyed or returned to the REF team by 30 November 2014.
- 8.3. The chair thanked the sub-panel members and the secretariat for their commitment and continued hard work throughout the REF assessment phase.
- 8.4. The main panel chair thanked the sub-panel chair for his excellent chairing skills in guiding and leading the sub-panel throughout the REF assessment phase.