

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 1b

12 December 2013

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Yvonne Barnett	Karen Luker
David Billington	Simon Mackay
Karen Bryan	Jill Macleod Clark
Charlotte Clarke	Luigi Martini
Jessica Corner	Ailbhe McDonald
Stephen Downes	Hugh McKenna (Chair)
Avril Drummond	Ann Moore
Dawn Freshwater	Joanna Neill
Martin Griffin	Jackie Oldham
Richard Guy	Nigel Pitts
Marion Hetherington	Richard Price
Susan Higham	Anne Marie Rafferty
Sara Howard	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Tracey Howe	Kevin Shakesheff
Billie Hunter	Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Martin Johnson	Stuart Smith
David Jones (Secretary)	Paul Speight
Mi Ja Kim (Main Panel Representative)	Julie Taylor
Ian Kitchen	Joanna Verran
William Lauder	Roger Watson

Apologies:

Aedin Cassidy	Maryrose Tarpey
Usha Chakravarthy	Angus Walls
James McElroy	David Whitaker
Marlene Sinclair	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and invited them to introduce themselves.

- 1.2. The chair reminded panellists to ensure that they negotiate sufficient free time with their institutions to enable them to undertake the assessment. The chair stated his willingness to speak with institutions if necessary.
- 1.3. The chair introduced the agenda and in the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest and confidentiality

- 2.1. 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). The sub-panel chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 2.2. The chair reminded the panellists of the importance of maintaining confidentiality at all times and in all aspects of the assessment process.

3. Output calibration exercise

- 3.1. Prior to the meeting, the chair had selected and circulated a sample of 20 outputs to panellists to be used for the sub-panel's initial output calibration exercise. These were outputs by non-UK authors and were not expected to be submitted in the REF. Outputs were selected to represent a spread of the disciplines represented within the UOA, and between qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods, as well as theoretical approaches. Panellists did not hold any conflicts of interest with the outputs discussed.
- 3.2. The chair outlined the aims of this calibration exercise, highlighting that these were to develop a common understanding of the star levels, rather than to agree specific scores for the outputs in the calibration sample, and to form a consensus on how papers of different methods and in differing disciplines may be assessed equitably.
- 3.3. The chair recognised that asking panellists to consider all of the calibration sample sometimes took them outside of their immediate areas of expertise.
- 3.4. Panellists had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The deputy chair displayed these and panellists considered how far they had reached a consensus on each output. The sub-panel discussed the particular outputs where scores diverged or panellists considered the output was borderline between star levels. To support that discussion, panellists considered the characteristics of the quality levels provided in the criteria document and how these might be applied to provide differentiation for outputs that are borderline between quality levels. Through this discussion the sub-panel reached an understanding on the score for each output and highlighted the reasons for those scores, with reference to the level descriptors.

- 3.5. The chair facilitated a further discussion on review outputs. Through this discussion the sub-panel reached a consensus on the various types of reviews that may be received and how these could be assessed, with reference to the level descriptors.
- 3.6. The chair reported on the calibration exercise by MPA, which met on 11 December 2013, and covered the following issues:
- The main issues involved in deciding on outputs that were on the borderline between star levels.
 - Feedback on the outputs that had been in the main panel calibration sample.

4. Output allocation arrangements

- 4.1. The chair and deputy chair presented their plans for output allocation, highlighting that:
- a) Each output will be reviewed by at least two panellists.
 - b) Panellists will be allocated outputs that are as close as possible to their immediate areas of expertise.
 - c) Each panellist will, as far as possible, be paired with no more than 6-8 other panellists.
 - d) To facilitate cross-discipline calibration, in c.10% of outputs one panellist will be from a cognate expertise area, e.g. a dentist paired with a pharmacist.
 - e) Where possible, panellists with prior RAE experience will be paired with panellists with no prior experience.
 - f) The allocation will be made jointly by the chair and deputy chair.
- 4.2. It is planned that the output allocation will be completed as soon as possible before the sub-panel's next meeting on 30 January 2014. The outputs will be made available to panellists via the PMW, at which point they will receive further written guidance from the secretary.
- 4.3. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel executive group had agreed that a 13-point scale (0-12) will be used when assessing outputs. The sub-panel chair presented this scoring scale and led a discussion in which the sub-panel reached a common understanding of how it is to be applied.
- 4.4. The sub-panel discussed the arrangements that will be used to ensure that outputs are assessed in the same order in advance of upcoming meetings. This is to ensure that scoring pairs are assessing outputs in the same order and can start to have useful conversations in advance of future meetings. It was agreed that outputs would be assessed alphabetically by the submitting author.

- 4.5. The chair proposed that each member will have oversight responsibility for one or more submissions and will act as a rapporteur for those submissions at future meetings. The sub-panel agreed to this approach.

5. Key principles of output assessment

- 5.1. The secretariat delivered a briefing on the key principles of output assessment, including: the output star criteria and definitions; output types; the guidance on co-authorship, double-weighting, use of citation data; output reductions; and the arrangements for clearly defined and complex circumstances.

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. The sub-panel considered the meeting schedule previously circulated.
- 6.2. The chair outlined the proposed deadline dates for panellists to have uploaded 40%, 75% and 100% of their output scores and upon reflection panel members agreed that the dates were achievable.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. The secretariat presented an overview of the IT systems provided to support the assessment processes, including arrangements for access to outputs, the use of spreadsheets, and mechanisms for recording and reviewing assessment scores. The sub-panel discussed the practical arrangements for the use of the IT systems.

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 2

30 January 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Yvonne Barnett	Simon Mackay
David Billington	Jill Macleod Clark
Karen Bryan	Luigi Martini
Aedin Cassidy	Ailbhe McDonald
Usha Chakravarthy	James McElnay
Charlotte Clarke	Hugh McKenna (Chair)
Jessica Corner	Ann Moore
Stephen Downes	Joanna Neill
Avril Drummond	Nigel Pitts
Dawn Freshwater	Anne Marie Rafferty
Trisha Greenhalgh (MPA Deputy Chair)	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Martin Griffin	Kevin Shakesheff
Richard Guy	Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Marion Hetherington	Marlene Sinclair
Susan Higham	Paul Speight
Sara Howard	Maryrose Tarpey
Tracey Howe	Julie Taylor
Billie Hunter	Joanna Verran
Martin Johnson	Angus Walls
David Jones (Secretary)	Caroline Watkins
Ian Kitchen	Roger Watson
William Lauder	David Whitaker
Karen Luker	

Apologies:

Richard Price
Stuart Smith

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Professor Trisha Greenhalgh, the main panel deputy chair.

- 1.2. The chair reported that Professor Jackie Oldham had resigned from the sub-panel due to personal reasons and welcomed Professor Caroline Watkins in replacement. The sub-panel thanked Professor Oldham for her contribution.
- 1.3. The chair reported that Professor John Hayes had been recruited as an additional outputs assessor to provide further capacity in biomedical science.
- 1.4. The chair introduced the agenda and 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 minutes of the previous meeting as an accurate record.

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). The chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 3.2. Panellists discussed circumstances that may constitute a minor conflict of interest and came to a common understanding. It was agreed that details of any minor conflicts of interest will be registered with the secretariat for consideration by the chair and deputy chair.

4. Chair's communication

- 4.1. The chair reminded the panellists of the importance of maintaining confidentiality at all times and in all aspects of the assessment process.
- 4.2. The chair recapped the outcome of the sub-panel calibration exercise and reiterated the key learning points.

5. Cross-referral and specialist advice

- 5.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the main points of Paper 2: "Cross-referral and specialist advice: Procedural guidance for panels", circulated prior to the meeting.
- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed the required procedures and timescales for the cross-referral of outputs and use of specialist advice. It was agreed that panellists should consult with each other before recommending that an output be cross-referred, and that such recommendations should only be made where the sub-panel as a whole does not contain appropriate expertise to assess the work.

- 5.3. The sub-panel confirmed that they did not have the language skills to review the single output received in Dutch and that appropriate specialist advice should be sought.

6. Audit and data verification

- 6.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the main points of Paper 3: “Audit and data verification: Procedural guidance for panels”, circulated prior to the meeting.
- 6.2. The sub-panel discussed the different circumstances in which an audit query may be raised in relation to an output and came to a common understanding. They also noted the required procedures and timescales for raising audit queries. It was agreed that both reviewers for an output should consult with each other before raising an audit query.
- 6.3. The sub-panel agreed that if there is any doubt over whether an audit query should be raised, they should discuss their concerns with the secretariat in the first instance.

7. Outputs allocation

- 7.1. The chair reported that the initial allocation of outputs to individual panellists was complete. The methodology for the allocation of outputs was explained. The chair and deputy chair had reviewed each output individually and matched them to panellist’s expertise, making use of the research groups provided by submitting institutions where available.
- 7.2. Each output has been allocated to two panellists, with outputs submitted multiple times allocated to the same panellists. Workload considerations and major conflicts of interest were taken into account, and where possible panellists new to research assessment were paired with panellists with prior RAE experience. Finally, to facilitate cross-discipline calibration, a random sample of outputs were allocated to a second panellist from a cognate expertise area, e.g. a dentist paired with a pharmacist.
- 7.3. Panellists were invited to review their allocated outputs as soon as possible and, in light of the prior discussion on minor conflicts of interest, to raise any such conflicts with the secretariat for consideration by the chair and deputy chair. Where it is determined that a panellist should not assess an assigned output, it will be re-allocated.
- 7.4. The deputy chair briefed the sub-panel on the use of the agreed 13-point scoring scale (0-12) for the assessment of outputs.

- 7.5. The sub-panel reconfirmed the arrangements agreed at the previous meeting that outputs should be assessed alphabetically by the submitting author. This is to ensure that scoring pairs are assessing outputs (but not HEIs) in the same order and can start to have useful conversations in advance of future meetings.
- 7.6. The sub-panel noted the target to have 40% of outputs scored and uploaded to the PMW by 20 March 2014.
- 7.7. The secretariat presented an overview of the IT systems provided to support the assessment process, including arrangements for access to outputs, the use of spreadsheets, and the mechanisms for recording and reviewing assessment scores. The sub-panel discussed the practical arrangements for the use of the IT systems and it was agreed that the secretariat will circulate clear step-by-step instructions.

8. Citation data

- 8.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the main points of Paper 4: "Citation data: guidance for panels", circulated prior to the meeting.
- 8.2. The sub-panel discussed and reached a common understanding on the circumstances in which citation data should be used and on how the contextual data provided by the REF Team should be applied.

9. Future meetings

- 9.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the main points of Paper 5: "Proposed work plan", circulated prior to the meeting.
- 9.2. Panellists noted the timescales for the assessment of outputs, impact and environment, and upon reflection agreed that the dates were achievable.
- 9.3. The sub-panel noted that a full briefing on impact assessment will be provided at the next meeting on 2 April 2014.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. There was no further business.

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 3 Part 1

2 April 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Yvonne Barnett
David Billington
Karen Bryan
Aedin Cassidy
Charlotte Clarke
Jessica Corner
Stephen Downes
Avril Drummond
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel
Representative)
John Greenman
Martin Griffin
Richard Guy
Bernadette Hannigan
Marion Hetherington
Susan Higham
Sara Howard
Tracey Howe
Billie Hunter
Martin Johnson
David Jones (Secretary)
Ian Kitchen
William Lauder
Karen Luker
Simon Mackay

Jill Macleod Clark
Luigi Martini
Ailbhe McDonald
James McElnay
Hugh McKenna (Chair)
Ann Moore
Joanna Neill
Nigel Pitts
Richard Price
Anne Marie Rafferty
Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Kevin Shakesheff
Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Marlene Sinclair
Stuart Smith
Maryrose Tarpey
Julie Taylor
Frans Van Der Ouderaa (Main Panel
Representative)
Joanna Verran
Angus Walls
Caroline Watkins
Roger Watson
David Whitaker

Apologies:

Iain Broom
Usha Chakravarthy

Dawn Freshwater
Paul Speight

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Jack Gauldie and Frans Van Der Ouderaa from the main panel.
- 1.2. The chair informed the sub-panel that the appointment of an additional output assessor as announced at the previous meeting had not come to fruition, and welcomed Professor John Greenman in replacement. The chair also reported that Professors Iain Broom and Bernadette Hannigan, who are impact assessors, have agreed to also become output assessors to provide extra capacity in biomedical science.
- 1.3. The chair introduced the agenda and 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 agreed a number of minor changes to the draft minutes and confirmed them as an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. 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). The sub-panel chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 3.2. Panellists were advised that they must leave the room during the assessment of an item with which they have a conflict of interest.

4. Chair's communication

- 4.1. The chair reminded panellists of the importance of maintaining confidentiality at all times and in all aspects of the assessment process.
- 4.2. The chair reported on the recent discussions at the main panel meeting.

5. Output assessment progress

- 5.1. The secretariat provided the sub-panel with a summary of output assessment to date, covering the progress made and the emerging quality profiles by assessor and expertise group. Panellists noted the progress made and that the sub-panel was on track in terms of workload. Issues that had arisen during assessment were discussed.

- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed a number of specific outputs where the individual scores assigned by the allocated assessors were some distance apart. These outputs tended to be similar, in that the assessors had uncertainty over their eligibility. The sub-panel agreed that where an output met the definition as described in '*Guidance on Submissions*', Annex C (REF 02.2011) as being "the product of research, briefly defined as a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared" then it should be assessed against the published criteria. It was noted that a number of submitted outputs do not contain new insights and therefore do not meet the REF definition of research.
- 5.3. A number of specific outputs were discussed where the assigned assessors had asked for the wider advice of the sub-panel to inform their assessment. It was agreed that advice should be sought from another sub-panel for some outputs.
- 5.4. The sub-panel noted that there were eight instances in which an output had been submitted twice by the same submission, and where the required justification statement had not been provided. In each instance an audit had been raised with the HEI to provide the required information.
- 5.5. The use of citation data was discussed, with panellists finding it to be helpful in informing assessments of some outputs.
- 5.6. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, five panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

6. Audit and data verification

- 6.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the level of audit activity to date and provided some examples of the types of queries raised.
- 6.2. The secretariat described the common guidance that has been developed across Main Panel A to ensure that queries on substantial contribution to co-authored outputs are being treated in a consistent manner. It was agreed that if any submissions had particularly high rates of co-authored outputs (where the submitting author was not lead or corresponding author, and the author was one of many), such outputs are more likely to be audited to check contribution. HEIs had been told to expect audits where there were 15 or more authors.
- 6.3. Panellists were reminded that if they had any doubt over whether an audit query should be raised, they should discuss their concerns with the secretariat in the first instance.

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. The sub-panel noted the timescales for the assessment of the outputs, impact and environment elements as detailed in Paper 3.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the use of the submission viewer functionality within the panel member's website.

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 3 Part 2

2 April 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

David Billington	Ailbhe McDonald
Jim Bonham	James McElnay
Aedin Cassidy	Hugh McKenna (Chair)
Charlotte Clarke	Ann Moore
Jessica Corner	Joanna Neill
Stephen Downes	Anne O'Reilly
Avril Drummond	Nigel Pitts
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel Representative)	Richard Price
Martin Griffin	Anne Marie Rafferty
Bernadette Hannigan	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Susan Higham	Kevin Shakesheff
Sara Howard	Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Tracey Howe	Marlene Sinclair
Billie Hunter	Stuart Smith
Martin Johnson	Maryrose Tarpey
David Jones (Secretary)	Julie Taylor
Ian Kitchen	Frans Van Der Ouderaa (Main Panel Representative)
William Lauder	Angus Walls
Karen Luker	Caroline Watkins
Simon Mackay	Roger Watson
Luigi Martini	David Whitaker

Apologies:

Sally Brearley	Siobhan McCelland
Iain Broom	Jane Melton
Ifan Evans	Paul Speight
Dawn Freshwater	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the impact assessors.

- 1.2. The chair introduced the agenda and in the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its 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). The sub-panel chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 2.2. Panellists were advised that they must leave the room during the assessment of an item with which they have a conflict of interest.

3. Chair's communication

- 3.1. The chair reminded panellists of the importance of maintaining confidentiality at all times and in all aspects of the assessment process.

4. Key principles of impact assessment

- 4.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the threshold criterion for impact case studies and the guidance for the assessment of impact.
- 4.2. The sub-panel discussed each threshold criterion in turn, and in particular reaffirmed that once it was established that the underpinning research made a distinct and material contribution to the impact, no further consideration would be given to the scale of that contribution, nor whether the HEI had been involved in the translation from research to impact.
- 4.3. Discussion followed on the definition of 2* research for underpinning research. It was agreed that the current REF definition of 2* research should be applied (internationally recognised), but that underpinning outputs should be placed in their historical context for originality, significance and rigour.
- 4.4. It was noted that whilst the assessment would only be based on impacts occurring between 1 January 2008 and 31 July 2013, this did not preclude examples where the impact had first arisen prior to that period but had been sustained.

5. Impact allocation and audit

- 5.1. The chair reported that the initial allocation of impact case studies and impact templates to individual panellists was complete and had been undertaken by the secretariat with oversight from the chair and deputy chair. The methodology for the allocation of impacts was explained. Each case study has been allocated to one impact assessor and two academic panel members (one of whom is an

'expert' in the research area, with the other being the co-ordinator for the particular submission). Impact templates have been allocated to one impact assessor and three academic panel members.

- 5.2. Panellists were invited to review their allocated impact items as soon as possible and, in light of the prior discussion on minor conflicts of interest, to raise any such conflicts with the secretariat for consideration by the chair and deputy chair. Where it is determined that a panellist should not assess an assigned impact item, it will be re-allocated.
- 5.3. Panellists noted the required timescales for identifying the sample of impact case studies to be audited (in advance of the May meeting) as detailed in Paper 1.

6. Impact calibration exercise

- 6.1. The chair outlined the aims of the calibration exercise. The sub-panel endorsed the sample of impact case studies and templates drawn from the other sub-panels within Main Panel A, as detailed in Paper 2. Case studies were selected to represent a spread of impact types, as well from a range of submissions.

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. The sub-panel noted the timescales for the assessment of the impact as detailed in Paper 3.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 4 Part 1

13 May 2014

AUMS, Aston University

Minutes

Present:

Yvonne Barnett	Karen Luker
David Billington	Simon Mackay
Iain Broom	Jill Macleod Clark
Karen Bryan	Luigi Martini
Aedin Cassidy	Ailbhe McDonald
Usha Chakravarthy	James McElnay
Charlotte Clarke	Hugh McKenna (Chair)
Jessica Corner	Ann Moore
Stephen Downes	Joanna Neill
Avril Drummond	Nigel Pitts
Dawn Freshwater	Richard Price
John Greenman	Anne Marie Rafferty
Martin Griffin	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Richard Guy	Kevin Shakesheff
Russell Hamilton (Main Panel Representative)	Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Bernadette Hannigan	Marlene Sinclair
Marion Hetherington	Stuart Smith
Susan Higham	Paul Speight
Stephen Holgate (MPA Chair)	Maryrose Tarpey
Sara Howard	Julie Taylor
Tracey Howe	Frans Van Der Ouderaa (Main Panel Representative)
Billie Hunter	Joanna Verran
Martin Johnson	Angus Walls
David Jones (Secretary)	Caroline Watkins
Mi Ja Kim (Main Panel Representative)	Roger Watson
Ian Kitchen	David Whitaker
William Lauder	

Apologies:

There were no apologies.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Mi Ja Kim and Frans Van Der Ouderaa from the main panel.
- 1.2. The chair introduced the agenda and 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 agreed a number of minor changes to the draft minutes and confirmed them as an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. 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). The sub-panel chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 3.2. The sub-panel were reminded of the need to leave the room during discussions for which they were conflicted.

4. Chair's communication

- 4.1. The chair reminded panellists of the importance of maintaining confidentiality at all times and in all aspects of the assessment process.
- 4.2. The chair reminded panellists of the importance of not bringing personal information to the decision-making process. Items should be assessed on their own merits, and audits raised where there are uncertainties
- 4.3. The chair reminded panellists of the arrangements for each sub-panel member to act as the co-ordinator for one or more submissions, whose responsibility it will be to collate information for the feedback statements.
- 4.4. The chair reported on the recent discussions at the main panel meeting.

5. Output assessment progress

- 5.1. The secretariat provided the sub-panel with a summary of output assessment to date (as detailed in Papers 2 and 3). Panellists noted the progress made and that the sub-panel was on track in terms of workload. Issues that had arisen during assessment were discussed.

- 5.2. The introduction was followed by a period of dedicated time for panellists to discuss and agree output scores in their scoring pairs.
- 5.3. The sub-panel was reconvened and was joined by Professor Stephen Holgate and Russell Hamilton from the main panel.
- 5.4. The sub-panel noted that advice had yet to be received on a number of outputs that had been cross-referred out of the sub-panel, and that the secretariat would follow this up with the other sub-panels. Likewise, panellists were reminded to provide advice to other sub-panels in a timely manner for outputs that have been cross-referred in.
- 5.5. The secretariat informed the sub-panel that a small number of HEIs had routinely failed to provide the required information on the number of additional co-authors, and in some cases the co-author contribution statements. The sub-panel agreed that these submissions should be audited to gather the missing information.
- 5.6. The sub-panel reiterated that where an output met the definition as described in '*Guidance on Submissions*', Annex C (REF 02.2011) as being "the product of research, briefly defined as a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared" then it should be assessed against the published criteria. It was noted that a number of submitted outputs do not contain new insights and therefore do not meet the REF definition of research.

6. Audit and data verification

- 6.1. The sub-panel noted the audit queries that had been raised to date.
- 6.2. Panellists were reminded that if they had any doubt over whether an audit query should be raised, they should discuss their concerns with the secretariat in the first instance.

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. The sub-panel noted the timescales for the assessment of the outputs, impact and environment elements (as detailed in Paper 4).

The output assessors departed.

8. Staff circumstances

- 8.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the main points of Paper 5: "Individual staff circumstances", circulated prior to the meeting.

- 8.2. The sub-panel agreed that the provisions made for individual staff circumstances in the REF have had a positive influence on the treatment of such individuals within HEIs.
- 8.3. The sub-panel noted that the secretary (or the adviser, where the secretary had a major conflict of interest) has reviewed all staff with clearly defined circumstances. Wherever the secretary considered that the criteria for clearly defined circumstances were not met (resulting in a 'missing' output), the case has also been reviewed by the adviser. The secretariat has raised audit queries to request further information for 34 cases, where insufficient information was provided to confirm that the criteria have been met, or where it has not been possible to replicate the reduction calculation. The sub-panel endorsed this working method.
- 8.4. The sub-panel approved the recommendation of the secretariat that for 816 staff with clearly defined circumstances an appropriate number of outputs have been submitted and no missing outputs are recorded.
- 8.5. The sub-panel discussed the six staff with clearly defined circumstances where the criteria for output reductions have not been met. Of these staff, four have one missing output and two have two missing outputs. The sub-panel approved these recommendations. During these discussions, nine panellists left the room due to conflicts of interest.
- 8.6. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, 10 panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 4 Part 2

14-15 May 2014

AUMS, Aston University

Minutes

Present:

David Billington	Luigi Martini
Jim Bonham	Ailbhe McDonald
Sally Brearley	James McElnay
Iain Broom	Hugh McKenna (Chair)
Aedin Cassidy	Jane Melton
Charlotte Clarke	Ann Moore
Jessica Corner	Joanna Neill
Stephen Downes	Anne O'Reilly
Avril Drummond	Nigel Pitts
Ifan Evans	Richard Price
Dawn Freshwater	Anne Marie Rafferty
Martin Griffin	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Bernadette Hannigan	Kevin Shakesheff
Susan Higham	Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Sara Howard	Marlene Sinclair
Tracey Howe	Stuart Smith
Billie Hunter	Paul Speight
Martin Johnson	Maryrose Tarpey
David Jones (Secretary)	Julie Taylor
Mi Ja Kim (Main Panel Representative)	Angus Walls
Ian Kitchen	Caroline Watkins
William Lauder	Roger Watson
Karen Luker	David Whitaker
Simon Mackay	

Apologies:

Siobhan McCelland

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the impact assessors.

- 1.2. The chair introduced the agenda and 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 minutes of the previous meeting as an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. 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). The sub-panel chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 3.2. Panellists were advised that they must leave the room during the assessment of an item with which they have a conflict of interest.

4. Chair's communication

- 4.1. The chair reminded panellists of the importance of maintaining confidentiality at all times and in all aspects of the assessment process.
- 4.2. The chair reported on the recent discussions at the main panel meeting.
- 4.3. The sub-panel discussed whether the full five days scheduled for the next meeting are required, and agreed to adhere to the original schedule.
- 4.4. The chair reminded panellists of the REF guidance that case studies should be self-contained – that is, they should include all the information required to make judgements, without the need to gather additional material, follow up references or rely on prior knowledge. The chair also advised panellists not to be influenced by writing style.

5. Impact calibration – case studies

- 5.1. Prior to the meeting, the secretariat had selected and circulated a sample of 10 impact case studies to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. These were selected from the other sub-panels within Main Panel A. Case studies were selected to represent a spread of impact types, as well from a range of submissions. Panellists had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting.
- 5.2. The chair outlined the aims of this calibration exercise, which were to develop a common understanding: of the star levels; of the threshold criteria; and of how case studies of different impact types may be assessed equitably.

- 5.3. The sub-panel broke into four sub-groups to discuss each case study in turn and consider how far panellists had reached a consensus. Panellists considered whether the threshold criteria had been satisfied; and how the characteristics of the quality levels provided in the criteria document might be applied to provide differentiation for case studies that are borderline between quality levels. Through this discussion the groups reached a broad consensus on the score for each case study and highlighted the reasons for those scores, with reference to the level descriptors.
- 5.4. The sub-panel reconvened and the chair facilitated a further discussion on each case study in turn. Through this discussion the sub-panel reached a consensus on the various types of impact that may be received and how these can be assessed, with reference to the level descriptors.
- 5.5. An additional calibration case study was circulated for panellists to consider overnight and was discussed the following morning. The case study was an example of impact being achieved through public engagement, an impact type not covered in the original calibration sample.
- 5.6. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, nine panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

6. Impact calibration – templates

- 6.1. Prior to the meeting, the secretariat had selected and circulated a sample of five impact templates to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. These were selected from the other sub-panels within Main Panel A. Templates were selected to represent a spread of submission sizes. Panellists had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting.
- 6.2. The chair outlined the aims of this calibration exercise, which were to develop a common understanding of the star levels, and of how templates from submissions of different sizes may be assessed equitably.
- 6.3. The sub-panel broke into four sub-groups to discuss each template in turn and consider how far panellists had reached a consensus. Through this discussion the groups reached a broad consensus on the score for each template and highlighted the reasons for those scores, with reference to the level descriptors.
- 6.4. The sub-panel reconvened and the chair facilitated a further discussion on each template in turn. Through this discussion the sub-panel reached a consensus on how impact templates should be assessed, with reference to the level descriptors.

6.5. The sub-panel agreed that the scale of submission should be taken into account, and that it is certainly feasible for small submissions to have an approach that is conducive to achieving impacts of outstanding reach and significance.

6.6. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, seven panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

7. Impact audit

7.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the circumstances in which an audit query may be raised in relation to an impact case study (as detailed in Paper 3).

7.2. The sub-panel noted the required procedures and timescales for raising audit queries.

7.3. The sub-panel agreed that if a panellist has any doubt over whether an audit query should be raised, they should discuss their concerns with the secretariat in the first instance.

8. Future meetings

8.1. The sub-panel noted the timescales for the assessment of the impact (as detailed in Paper 4).

9. Overview reports and feedback statements

9.1. This item was deferred until the next meeting.

10. Any other business

10.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 5 Part 1

14-15 July 2014

Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

Yvonne Barnett
David Billington
Iain Broom
Karen Bryan
Aedin Cassidy
Usha Chakravarthy
Charlotte Clarke
Jessica Corner
Stephen Downes
Avril Drummond
Dawn Freshwater
John Greenman
Martin Griffin
Richard Guy
Bernadette Hannigan
Marion Hetherington
Susan Higham
Stephen Holgate (MPA Chair)
Tracey Howe
Billie Hunter
Martin Johnson
David Jones (Secretary)
Ian Kitchen
William Lauder
Karen Luker*

Simon Mackay
Jill Macleod Clark
Luigi Martini
Ailbhe McDonald
James McElnay
Hugh McKenna (Chair)
Ann Moore
Joanna Neill
Nigel Pitts
Richard Price
Anne Marie Rafferty
Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Kevin Shakesheff
Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Marlene Sinclair
Stuart Smith
Paul Speight
Maryrose Tarpey
Julie Taylor
Joanna Verran
Angus Walls
Caroline Watkins
Roger Watson
David Whitaker

* Present on 14 July only (agenda items 1-5)

Apologies:

Sara Howard

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda. 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 agreed a number of minor changes to the draft minutes and confirmed them as an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. 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). The sub-panel chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 3.2. Panellists were advised that they must leave the room during the assessment of an item with which they have a conflict of interest.

4. Chair's communication

- 4.1. The chair reminded the panellists of their role as co-ordinator for one or more submissions, with responsibility for collating information for the feedback statements.
- 4.2. The chair reminded panellists that where they had been assigned an output that had been cross-referred into the sub-panel, to provide their advice to other sub-panels as soon as possible.

5. Output assessment progress

- 5.1. The secretariat provided the sub-panel with a summary of output assessment to date. The sub-panel noted that it had achieved its objective of all panellists having individually scored all of their assigned outputs by this point, although there remained a number of outputs for which the assigned panellists had yet to agree a score.
- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed the importance of consistency of scoring where the same output had been submitted to the UOA more than once.
- 5.3. The remainder of the session was dedicated time for panellists to discuss and agree output scores in their scoring pairs.

6. Unclassified outputs

- 6.1. The sub-panel discussed outputs that had been scored as unclassified to ensure that the published guidance and criteria had been correctly and consistently applied.
- 6.2. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, 10 panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

7. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 7.1. Prior to the meeting, panellists had been notified of submissions for which they had been appointed as “co-ordinator”, with responsibility for preparing the initial draft of the confidential institutional feedback statement.
- 7.2. The chair directed panellists to Paper 2 detailing the level of information that sub-panels are tasked with providing and including a draft template developed by the REF Team to support co-ordinators in drafting institutional feedback statements. Panellists provided their comments on the draft template and it was agreed that a final template would be circulated as soon as possible following the meeting.
- 7.3. To support the preparation of feedback, co-ordinators would be provided with a pack of guidance and data in respect of the output and impact profiles and scores for their designated HEIs.
- 7.4. In addition, the chair reminded panellists that the sub-panel will have an opportunity to provide input into the Main Panel A overview report, which will be published early in 2015.

8. Output sub-profiles

- 8.1. The sub-panel reviewed the draft output sub-profile for each submission in turn. They discussed the nature of the profile and examined output scores broken down by research group, where outputs had been assigned to such groups by the submitting HEI. 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. Submissions were presented in alphabetical order.
- 8.2. Through discussion, panellists debated the reasoning behind the quality profiles, and identified particular areas of strength within the submission to inform the feedback statement.
- 8.3. The sub-panel agreed that the draft output sub-profiles be recommended to the main panel.

- 8.4. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, 44 panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

9. Audit

- 9.1. The sub-panel noted the audit queries that had been raised to date.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. The sub-panel noted the timescales for the assessment of environment and the drafting of the overview report and feedback statement (as detailed in Paper 4).

11. Any other business

- 11.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 5 Part 2

16-17 July 2014

Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

David Billington	Luigi Martini
Jim Bonham	Ailbhe McDonald
Sally Brearley	James McElnay
Iain Broom	Hugh McKenna (Chair)
Aedin Cassidy	Jane Melton
Charlotte Clarke	Ann Moore
Jessica Corner	Joanna Neill
Stephen Downes	Anne O'Reilly
Avril Drummond	Nigel Pitts
Ifan Evans	Richard Price
Dawn Freshwater	Anne Marie Rafferty
Martin Griffin	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Bernadette Hannigan	Kevin Shakesheff
Susan Higham	Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Stephen Holgate (MPA Chair)	Marlene Sinclair
Sara Howard	Stuart Smith
Tracey Howe	Paul Speight
Billie Hunter	Maryrose Tarpey
Martin Johnson	Julie Taylor
David Jones (Secretary)	Angus Walls*
Ian Kitchen	Caroline Watkins
William Lauder	Roger Watson
Karen Luker	David Whitaker
Simon Mackay	

* Present on 16 July only (agenda items 1-6)

Apologies:

There were no apologies.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.
- 1.2. The chair reported that Siobhan McClland had resigned from the sub-panel and that her impact items had been reallocated to other panellists in advance of the meeting.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel agreed a number of minor changes to the draft minutes and confirmed them as an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. 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). The sub-panel chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 3.2. Panellists were advised that they must leave the room during the assessment of an item with which they have a conflict of interest.

4. Chair's communication

- 4.1. 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, all capable of being scored as 4*, and that each case study should be judged on its own merits.

5. Impact assessment progress

- 5.1. The secretariat provided the sub-panel with a summary of impact assessment to date. The sub-panel noted that it had achieved its objective of panellists having individually scored all of their assigned impact case studies and impact templates by this point.

6. Agreement of scores – impact case studies

- 6.1. For the purpose of on-going calibration, panellists broke into three sub-groups and discussed a range of impact case studies. For each case, those tasked with scoring the case study provided a brief summary of the research and the impact claimed and described any challenges encountered in agreeing the final score. They reached a consensus score with reference to the level descriptors.

- 6.2. The sub-panel broke up to allow panellists to discuss and agree the scores for their remaining allocated impact case studies.
- 6.3. The sub-panel discussed the impact case studies that had been scored as unclassified to ensure that the published guidance and criteria had been correctly and consistently applied.
- 6.4. During the process of agreement, a number of additional audit queries were identified. The sub-panel agreed that the secretariat will raise these immediately and that the case studies will be assigned a provisional agreed score pending the audit response.

7. Agreement of scores – impact templates

- 7.1. As with the case studies, the panellists broke into three sub-groups to discuss six impact templates for the purpose of on-going calibration. Templates were selected to represent a spread of submission sizes and individual scores. Panellists discussed each template in turn and reached a consensus score with reference to the level descriptors.
- 7.2. The sub-panel broke up to allow panellists to discuss and agree the scores for their remaining allocated impact templates.

8. Environment allocation, assessment and calibration

- 8.1. The impact assessors were not present for this agenda item.
- 8.2. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the key principles of environment assessment as set out in Paper 3, including the environment star criteria and definitions and the relative weighting of each section.
- 8.3. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the main points of Paper 4, explaining the data contained in each section of the standard analyses and staff summary reports. Through discussion, the sub-panel came to a common understanding of the data, and in particular noted the caution with which per-FTE figures should be used, as they are not comparable between HEIs.
- 8.4. Prior to the meeting, the secretariat had selected and circulated a sample of two environment templates to be used for an initial calibration exercise. These were selected from the other sub-panels within Main Panel A and chosen to represent a large and a small submission.
- 8.5. The chair outlined the aims of this calibration exercise, which were to develop a common understanding of the star levels and of how environment templates of differing sizes may be assessed equitably.

8.6. The chair facilitated a further discussion on each environment template in turn. Through this discussion the sub-panel reached a consensus on the how the level descriptors may be applied and on how assessment may be informed by the available data. The sub-panel reached a broad consensus on the score for each template and highlighted the reasons for those scores, with reference to the level descriptors.

8.7. Panellists were advised to read the entire environment 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. Impact sub-profiles

9.1. The sub-panel reviewed the draft impact sub-profile for each submission in turn. Panellists discussed the nature of the profile and examined in detail the agreed scores of each case study and template. Through discussion, panellists debated the reasoning behind the quality profiles and identified particular areas of strength within the submission to inform the feedback statement.

9.2. The sub-panel agreed that the draft impact sub-profiles be recommended to the main panel.

9.3. The chair facilitated a further discussion on feedback statements and the sub-panel agreed an appropriate level of information to be provided back to institutions on each of their submissions.

9.4. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, 44 panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

10. Any other business

10.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 6

16-18 September 2014

The Studio, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

David Billington	Ann Moore
Aedin Cassidy	Bruce Murphy (Main Panel Representative)**
Charlotte Clarke	Joanna Neill
Jessica Corner	Nigel Pitts
Avril Drummond	Richard Price
Dawn Freshwater	Anne Marie Rafferty
Martin Griffin	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Susan Higham	Kevin Shakesheff
Sara Howard	Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Tracey Howe	Marlene Sinclair
Billie Hunter	Stuart Smith
Martin Johnson	Paul Speight
David Jones (Secretary)	Maryrose Tarpey
Ian Kitchen	Julie Taylor
William Lauder*	Frans Van Der Ouderaa* (Main Panel Representative)
Karen Luker	Angus Walls
Simon Mackay	Caroline Watkins
Luigi Martini	Roger Watson
Ailbhe McDonald	David Whitaker
James McElroy	
Hugh McKenna (Chair)	

* Present for 16-17 September only (agenda items 1-8)

** Present for 16 September only (agenda items 1-7)

Apologies:

Julie Taylor

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Professors Bruce Murphy and Frans Van Der Ouderaa from the main panel.

- 1.2. The chair introduced the agenda and 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 agreed that the draft minutes were an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. 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). The sub-panel chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 3.2. Panellists were advised that they must leave the room during the assessment of an item with which they have a conflict of interest.

4. Chair's communication

- 4.1. The chair reminded panellists of the importance of maintaining confidentiality at all times and in all aspects of the assessment process.
- 4.2. The chair informed panellists that the results of the assessment will be published on 18 December.

5. Environment: key assessment principles

- 5.1. The secretariat delivered a brief presentation reminding panellists of some of the key principles of environment assessment, in particular on the application of the criteria with respect to 'vitality' and 'sustainability', and that the supporting data relate to the whole submitted unit and are not linked only to the submitted staff. Panellists agreed not to compare data at 'per research-active' or 'per FTE' level.
- 5.2. The sub-panel noted that some funding sources were not available in all parts of the United Kingdom during the REF assessment period, and agreed to take this into consideration with regards to the income, infrastructure and facilities section.
- 5.3. The chair reiterated the view of Main Panel A that excellent research can be undertaken in a wide variety of research structures and environments, and that there is no pre-formed view of the ideal size or organisational structure for a research environment. Panellists agreed to judge each submission on its merits.

6. Environment calibration exercise

- 6.1. The secretariat provided the sub-panel with a summary of environment assessment to date, noting that the objective of having all environment templates scored by panellists had been achieved.
- 6.2. For the purpose of on-going calibration, prior to the meeting the secretariat had circulated a sample of environment templates selected to represent a spread of submission sizes and individual scores. The sub-panel broke into four sub-groups to discuss the templates and to give panellists an opportunity to identify common issues that had been encountered during their personal scoring. Each group worked towards a common understanding of the assessment of templates, with reference to the level descriptors.
- 6.3. The sub-panel reconvened into plenary and the chair facilitated a discussion of the common issues that may be encountered when scoring the environment templates, with the panellists agreeing a shared approach.

7. Environment assessment

- 7.1. Panellists broke into their pre-assigned groups, where they discussed and agreed the final scores for each component of the environment templates that they had been allocated.
- 7.2. The sub-panel reconvened into plenary. The chair checked whether panellists were entirely satisfied with all of the agreed scores. It was decided that to ensure maximum consistency and fairness of scoring that the sub-panel would spend more time on ensuring that all panellists were in complete agreement on the final scores.
- 7.3. Panellists broke into their pre-assigned groups to re-evaluate the environment templates, particularly those where there had been less initial agreement.

8. Environment sub-profiles

- 8.1. The sub-panel reviewed the draft environment sub-profile and the overall sub-profile for each submission in turn. Through discussion, panellists debated the reasoning behind the quality profiles and identified particular areas of strength within the submission to inform the feedback statement.
- 8.2. The sub-panel agreed that the draft sub-profiles be recommended to the main panel.
- 8.3. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, 37 panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

9. Feedback statements

- 9.1. The secretariat reminded panellists that statements are intended to provide informative feedback to assist a HEI in understanding the reasons for the profiles the sub-panel has awarded. To this end the feedback statements should comment on each of the three sub-profiles.
- 9.2. Panellists noted the guidance from the main panel to highlight notable strengths that were evident within each aspect of the submission, and to comment on any notable shortcomings in the submission and/or provide a brief explanation of 'unclassified' grades.
- 9.3. In advance of the meeting, draft feedback statements for four submissions had been prepared. The sub-panel broke into four groups and used these exemplars to explore the wording used and to identify where improvements could be made.
- 9.4. The sub-panel reconvened into plenary and the chair facilitated a discussion during which the panellists reached consensus on the nature of feedback to be provided, and on the level of detail that is appropriate, with panellists keen to ensure that HEIs are provided with sufficient information for the feedback to be useful.
- 9.5. Panellists agreed to draft the feedback statements for the submissions for which they are responsible overnight, following which they broke into small groups to finalise and peer review the feedback statements.

10. Consideration of draft overview report

- 10.1. The secretariat reminded panellists of the nature and purpose of the overview report, which is to provide public feedback on the state of UK research, and general reflections on submissions received and the process of assessment.
- 10.2. The sub-panel broke into four discipline groups (dentistry, nursing and midwifery, pharmacy/biomedical, allied health professions) to identify points and issues to be considered for inclusion in the main panel and sub-panel sections.
- 10.3. The sub-panel agreed that the executive team will present a draft to the final meeting in October.

11. Future meetings

- 11.1. The sub-panel noted the timescales for the drafting of feedback statements and the overview report (as detailed in Paper 2).

12. Any other business

- 12.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 3: Meeting 7

8 October 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

David Billington
Charlotte Clarke
Jessica Corner
Avril Drummond
Martin Griffin
Susan Higham
Sara Howard
Tracey Howe
Billie Hunter
Martin Johnson
David Jones (Secretary)
Ian Kitchen
Karen Luker
Simon Mackay
Luigi Martini
Ailbhe McDonald
James McElroy
Hugh McKenna (Chair)

Ann Moore
Joanna Neill
Nigel Pitts
Richard Price
Anne Marie Rafferty
Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Kevin Shakesheff
Julius Sim (Deputy Chair)
Marlene Sinclair
Stuart Smith
Paul Speight
Maryrose Tarpey
Julie Taylor
Angus Walls
Caroline Watkins
Roger Watson
David Whitaker

Apologies:

Aedin Cassidy
Dawn Freshwater
William Lauder

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda. 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 minutes of the previous meeting as an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. 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). The sub-panel chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise.
- 3.2. Panellists were advised that they must leave the room during the assessment of an item with which they have a conflict of interest.

4. Chair's communication

- 4.1. The chair thanked panellists for their hard work over the past year.
- 4.2. The chair reminded panellists that all aspects of the assessment process, submissions, and scoring remain confidential.

5. Draft feedback statements

- 5.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the edits that had been made to the draft feedback statements since the last meeting to ensure accuracy and consistency.
- 5.2. The sub-panel reviewed the draft feedback statements for each submission in turn. Panellists discussed the suitability of the statements; requested a number of edits; and suggested additional information to be included.
- 5.3. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, 33 panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

6. Draft overview report

- 6.1. The chair reminded panellists of the nature and purpose of the overview report, noting that it consists of an overarching main panel report, and a more detailed sub-panel specific report.
- 6.2. The secretariat presented the draft sub-panel overview report. The chair facilitated a discussion on each section of the report, with panellists debating the content to be included, and in particular the relative strengths within each discipline area.

- 6.3. The sub-panel noted the timetable for finalisation of the report and agreed to send the executive team any further comments within one week.

7. Publication of the results

- 7.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the timetable for the publication of the results and on the format in which the results will be presented.
- 7.2. The chair advised panellists on how to respond to requests for comment. The sub-panel noted that no comment should be made before the results are published, and then panellists should only discuss information that is in the public domain.
- 7.3. The sub-panel noted that all assessment material should be destroyed or returned to the REF team by 30 November 2014, including submissions data, information generated by panels, and personal notes.

8. Reflections on the REF process

- 8.1. The chair advised panellists that the REF Team are conducting an evaluation of the assessment phase of the REF. A number of panellists have been nominated to attend feedback events in November.
- 8.2. The chair invited panellists to reflect on the assessment process. A number of suggestions for improvements or changes were agreed, and the nominated panellists agreed to raise these at the feedback events.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The chair thanked the panellists for their hard work over the past year. The panellists in turn thanked the chair and deputy chair for their leadership, and the secretariat for their ongoing support.