

REF Sub-panel 4: Meeting 1b

13 December 2013

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams	Michael Lamb
Richard Bentall	Matthew Lambon Ralph
Andrew Blamire	Paul Matthews
Gavin Bremner	Andrew McIntosh
Verity Brown	Bruce Murphy (Main Panel
Mike Burton	Representative)
Arthur Butt	David Nutt
Angela Clow	Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)
Susan Condor	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Bruno Frenguelli	Emily Simonoff
Susan Gathercole	Trevor Smart
Kim Graham	Irene Tracey
Jeremy Hall	Joanna Wardlaw
Marion Hetherington	Andrew Whitelaw
Glyn Humphreys (Chair)	Paul Whiting
Jane Ireland	Til Wykes
David Jones (Secretary)	

Apologies:

Peter Kirkpatrick
Peter Rothwell

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 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 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. Key principles of output assessment

- 3.1. The secretariat delivered a briefing on the key principles of output assessment, which covered the output star criteria and definitions; output types; the guidance on co-authorship; double-weighting and the use of citation data.

4. Output calibration exercise

- 4.1. Prior to the meeting, the chair had selected and circulated a sample of 17 outputs to the panellists to be used for the sub-panel's initial 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 research areas and research quality. Panellists did not hold any conflicts of interest with the outputs discussed.
- 4.2. 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 outputs of different types and from diverse research areas may be assessed equitably.
- 4.3. The chair recognised that asking panellists to consider all of the calibration sample sometimes took them outside of their immediate areas of expertise.
- 4.4. Panellists had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The chair displayed these and panellists considered how far they had reached a consensus on each output. The sub-panel discussed each output in turn and considered the characteristics of the quality levels provided in the panel criteria and how these might be applied to provide differentiation for outputs where scores diverged or panellists considered the output was borderline between star 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.

- 4.5. 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.

5. Output allocation arrangements

- 5.1. The chair presented his plans for output allocation, highlighting that:
- a) Each output will be reviewed by at least two panellists.
 - b) Panellists will be paired with at least two others to ensure that no pair is responsible for reviewing all the outputs from one submission.
- 5.2. It is planned that the output allocation will be completed as soon as possible before the sub-panel's next meeting on 27 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.
- 5.3. The sub-panel discussed the arrangements that will be used 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 the secretariat would assign each output a random number and that they would be assessed in that order.

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. The panel considered the meeting schedule previously circulated.
- 6.2. The chair outlined the proposed target dates for panellists to have uploaded 40%, 75% and 100% of their output scores.

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 4: Meeting 2

27 January 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams	Jane Ireland
Richard Bentall	Dave Jones (Secretary)
Andrew Blamire	Michael Lamb
Gavin Bremner	Matthew Lambon Ralph
Verity Brown	Paul Matthews
Mike Burton	Andrew McIntosh
Arthur Butt	David Nutt
Angela Clow	Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)
Susan Condor	Helen Reddy (Advisor)
Bruno Frenguelli	Neil Scolding
Susan Gathercole	Emily Simonoff
Kim Graham	Trevor Smart
Jeremy Hall	Irene Tracey
Marion Hetherington	Andrew Whitelaw
Stephen Holgate (MPA Chair)	Paul Whiting
Glyn Humphreys (Chair)	Til Wykes

Apologies:

Peter Kirkpatrick
Joanna Wardlaw

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Professor Stephen Holgate, main panel chair.
- 1.2. The chair reported that one panel member had resigned from the sub-panel due to the demands of other duties and welcomed Professor Neil Scolding in replacement.
- 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 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 sub-panel 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.

4. Cross-referral and specialist advice

- 4.1. 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.
- 4.2. 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.
- 4.3. The sub-panel agreed a number of papers that were outside of their collective expertise and should therefore be cross-referred.
- 4.4. The sub-panel confirmed that they did not have the language skills to review the single output received in Italian and that appropriate specialist advice should be sought.

5. Audit and data verification

- 5.1. 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.
- 5.2. 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.

- 5.3. 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.

6. Outputs allocation

- 6.1. The chair reported that the initial allocation of outputs to individual panellists was complete and outlined the methodology used. The 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. Each output has been allocated to two panellists, with outputs submitted multiple times allocated to the same panellists.
- 6.2. The chair explained that allocating by expertise had resulted in panellists in some areas being more heavily loaded than those in other areas. The sub-panel agreed that additional outputs assessors should be recruited to provide extra capacity in those areas.
- 6.3. 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 to another individual.
- 6.4. The sub-panel reconfirmed the arrangements agreed at the previous meeting that outputs should be assessed using the random number assigned by the secretariat. 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.
- 6.5. The sub-panel noted the target to have 40% of outputs scored and uploaded to the PMW by 18 March 2014.
- 6.6. 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.

7. Citation data

- 7.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the main points of Paper 4: "Citation data: guidance for panels", circulated prior to the meeting.

- 7.2. 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.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the main points of Paper 5: "Proposed work plan", circulated prior to the meeting.
- 8.2. Panellists noted the timescales for the assessment of outputs, impact and environment, and upon reflection agreed that the dates were achievable.
- 8.3. The sub-panel noted that a full briefing on impact assessment will be provided at the next meeting on 27 March 2014.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. There was no further business.

REF Sub-panel 4: Meeting 3 Part 1

27 March 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams	Mi Ja Kim (Main Panel Representative)
Richard Bentall	Michael Lamb
Andrew Blamire	Matthew Lambon Ralph
Gavin Bremner	Paul Matthews
Verity Brown	David Nutt
Mike Burton	Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)
Arthur Butt	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Angela Clow	Neil Scolding
Susan Condor	Emily Simonoff
Bruno Frenguelli	Trevor Smart
Susan Gathercole	Irene Tracey
Trevor Harley	Joanna Wardlaw
Marion Hetherington	Andrew Whitelaw
Glyn Humphreys (Chair)	Paul Whiting
Jane Ireland	Til Wykes
Dave Jones (Secretary)	

Apologies:

Kim Graham	Peter Kirkpatrick
Patrick Haggard	Andrew McIntosh
Jeremy Hall	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Professor Mi Ja Kim from the main panel.
- 1.2. The chair introduced Professor Trevor Harley, who has been recruited as an additional outputs assessor to provide further capacity in cognitive psychology.
- 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 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. Output assessment progress

- 4.1. 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.
- 4.2. The sub-panel discussed a number of specific outputs where the individual scores assigned by the allocated assessors were some distant 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.
- 4.3. 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.
- 4.4. The sub-panel reaffirmed that where the same output is present in different submissions then it should be awarded the same score in each instance. The secretariat will undertake checks to ensure consistency once all outputs have been scored.
- 4.5. 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.

5. Audit and data verification

- 5.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the level of audit activity to date and provided some examples of the types of queries raised.
- 5.2. 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 were told to expect audits where there were 15 or more authors.
- 5.3. 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.

6. Future meetings

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

7. Any other business

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

REF Sub-panel 4: Meeting 3 Part 2

27 March 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams
Richard Bentall
Verity Brown
Mike Burton
Angela Clow
Susan Condor
Bruno Frenguelli
Susan Gathercole
James Goodwin
Glyn Humphreys (Chair)
Jane Ireland
Dave Jones (Secretary)
Michael Lamb
Matthew Lambon Ralph

Paul Matthews
Jane Melton
Bruce Murphy (Main Panel
Representative)
David Nutt
Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)
Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Neil Scolding
Emily Simonoff
Trevor Smart
Irene Tracey
Andrew Whitelaw
Paul Whiting
Til Wykes

Apologies:

Mike Cooke
Lee Davis
Jeremy Hall

Peter Kirkpatrick
John Seton

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the impact assessors and Bruce Murphy 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. 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. Key principles of impact assessment

- 3.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the threshold criterion for impact case studies and the guidance for the assessment of impact.
- 3.2. The sub-panel discussed each threshold criteria 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.
- 3.3. The sub-panel agreed that the current REF definition of 2* research should be applied, but that underpinning outputs should be placed in their historical context for originality, significance and rigour.
- 3.4. 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.

4. Impact allocation and audit

- 4.1. 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 chair and deputy chair. The methodology for the allocation of impact items was explained. Each case study has been allocated to one impact assessor and two academic panel members. Impact templates have been allocated to one impact assessor and three academic panel members.
- 4.2. 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.
- 4.3. 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.

5. Impact calibration exercise

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

6. Future meetings

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

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 4: Meeting 4 Part 1

19 May 2014

AUMS, Aston University

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams
Richard Bentall
Andrew Blamire
Gavin Bremner
Verity Brown
Mike Burton
Arthur Butt
Angela Clow
Susan Condor
Bruno Frenguelli
Trevor Harley
Glyn Humphreys (Chair)
Jane Ireland
Dave Jones (Secretary)
Peter Kirkpatrick
Michael Lamb

Matthew Lambon Ralph
Paul Matthews
Andrew McIntosh
Bruce Murphy (Main Panel
Representative)
Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)
Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Neil Scolding
Emily Simonoff
Trevor Smart
Irene Tracey
Joanna Wardlaw
Andrew Whitelaw
Paul Whiting
Til Wykes

Apologies:

Susan Gathercole
Kim Graham
Patrick Haggard

Jeremy Hall
Marion Hetherington
David Nutt

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Bruce Murphy 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 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. The sub-panel were reminded of the need to leave the room during discussions for which they were conflicted.

4. Output assessment progress

- 4.1. 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.
- 4.2. The introduction was followed by a period of dedicated time for panellists to discuss and agree output scores in their scoring pairs.
- 4.3. The sub-panel was reconvened and discussed a number of outputs that had been scored as unclassified. The sub-panel was satisfied that panellists were correctly applying the published guidance and criteria.
- 4.4. 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.
- 4.5. 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.
- 4.6. 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.
- 4.7. 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.

5. Audit and data verification

- 5.1. The sub-panel noted the audit queries that had been raised to date.
- 5.2. 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.

6. Future meetings

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

7. Staff circumstances

- 7.1. This item was deferred until the next meeting.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 4: Meeting 4 Part 2

20-21 May 2014

AUMS, Aston University

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams

Richard Bentall

Verity Brown

Mike Burton

Angela Clow

Susan Condor

Mike Cooke

Lee Davies

Bruno Frenguelli

Susan Gathercole

James Goodwin

Stephen Holgate (MPA Chair)

Glyn Humphreys (Chair)

Jane Ireland

Dave Jones (Secretary)

Peter Kirkpatrick*

Michael Lamb

Matthew Lambon Ralph

Paul Matthews*

Bruce Murphy (Main Panel
Representative)

Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)

Helen Reddy (Adviser)

Neil Scolding

John Seton

Emily Simonoff

Trevor Smart*

Irene Tracey

Andrew Whitelaw

Paul Whiting

Til Wykes

* Present on 20 May only (agenda items 1-4)

Apologies:

Jeremy Hall

Jane Melton

David Nutt

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. Impact calibration – case studies

- 4.1. 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.
- 4.2. 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.
- 4.3. The sub-panel broke into three 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 panel criteria 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.
- 4.4. 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.
- 4.5. 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.

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

5. Impact calibration – templates

- 5.1. 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.
- 5.2. 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.
- 5.3. The sub-panel broke into three 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.
- 5.4. 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.
- 5.5. 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.
- 5.6. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, one panellist left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

6. Impact audit

- 6.1. 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).
- 6.2. The sub-panel noted the required procedures and timescales for raising audit queries.
- 6.3. 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.

7. Future meetings

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

8. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 8.1. This item was deferred until the next meeting.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 4: Meeting 5 Part 1

7-8 July 2014

Stratford Manor, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams	Dave Jones (Secretary)
Richard Bentall	Peter Kirkpatrick
Andrew Blamire	Michael Lamb
Gavin Bremner	Matthew Lambon Ralph
Verity Brown	Paul Matthews
Mike Burton	Andrew McIntosh
Arthur Butt*	Bruce Murphy (Main Panel Representative)
Angela Clow	Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)
Susan Condor	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Bruno Frenguelli	Neil Scolding**
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel Representative)**	Emily Simonoff
Kim Graham	Trevor Smart**
Jeremy Hall	Irene Tracey
Trevor Harley	Joanna Wardlaw
Marion Hetherington	Andrew Whitelaw
Stephen Holgate (MPA Chair)**	Paul Whiting**
Glyn Humphreys (Chair)	Til Wykes
Jane Ireland	

* Present on 7 July only (agenda items 1-4)

** Present on 8 July only (agenda items 4-10)

Apologies:

Susan Gathercole	David Nutt
Patrick Haggard	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Bruce Murphy and Jack Gauldie 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 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. Output assessment progress

- 4.1. 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.
- 4.2. The sub-panel discussed the importance of consistency of scoring where the same output had been submitted to the UOA more than once.
- 4.3. The secretary 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.
- 4.4. The remainder of the session was dedicated time for panellists to discuss and agree output scores in their scoring pairs

5. Unclassified outputs

- 5.1. The sub-panel discussed a representative sample of outputs that had been scored as unclassified to ensure that the published guidance and criteria had been correctly and consistently applied.
- 5.2. In addition, the sub-panel agreed that the chair and deputy chair will review all outputs that had been scored as unclassified, except for those that have been unclassified due to failing to meet a threshold criteria following audit (such as being published outside of the publication period).

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

6. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 6.1. 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.
- 6.2. 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.
- 6.3. 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/scores for their designated HEIs.
- 6.4. In addition, the chair reminded panellists that the sub-panel will have an opportunity to input into the Main Panel A overview report which will be published early in 2015.

7. Output sub-profiles

- 7.1. 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.
- 7.2. Through discussion, panellists debated the reasoning behind the quality profiles and identified particular areas of strength within the submission to inform the feedback statement.
- 7.3. The sub-panel agreed that the draft output sub-profiles be recommended to the main panel.
- 7.4. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, 34 panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

8. Audit

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

9. Future meetings

- 9.1. 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).

10. Any other business

- 10.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 4: Meeting 5 Part 2

9-10 July 2014

Stratford Manor, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams	Paul Matthews
Richard Bentall	Jane Melton
Verity Brown	Bruce Murphy (Main Panel Representative)
Mike Burton*	Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)
Angela Clow	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Susan Condor	Neil Scolding
Lee Davies	John Seton
Bruno Frenguelli	Emily Simonoff
James Goodwin	Malcolm Skingle (Main Panel Representative)*
Jeremy Hall	Trevor Smart
Stephen Holgate (MPA Chair)	Irene Tracey
Glyn Humphreys (Chair)	Andrew Whitelaw
Jane Ireland	Paul Whiting
Dave Jones (Secretary)	Til Wykes
Peter Kirkpatrick	
Michael Lamb	
Matthew Lambon Ralph	

* Present on 10 July only (agenda items 6-10)

Apologies:

Mike Cooke	David Nutt
Susan Gathercole	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Stephen Holgate, main panel chair, and also Bruce Murphy and Malcolm Skingle from the main panel.
- 1.2. The chair reported that Mike Cooke had resigned from the sub-panel on 7 July.

- 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 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. Impact assessment progress

- 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.
- 4.2. 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.

5. Agreement of scores – impact case studies

- 5.1. For the purpose of on-going calibration, panellists broke into two sub-groups to discuss 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.
- 5.2. The sub-panel broke to allow panellists to discuss and agree the scores for their remaining allocated impact case studies.
- 5.3. 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.

6. Agreement of scores – impact templates

- 6.1. Prior to the meeting, the secretariat had selected and circulated a sample of six impact templates to be used in a refresher calibration exercise. Templates were selected to represent a spread of submission sizes and individual scores. The chair facilitated a discussion on each template in turn, through which the sub-panel reached a consensus score with reference to the level descriptors.
- 6.2. The sub-panel broke to allow panellists to discuss and agree the scores for their remaining allocated impact templates.

7. Staff circumstances

- 7.1. The impact assessors were not present for this agenda item.
- 7.2. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the main points of Paper 3: “Individual staff circumstances”, circulated prior to the meeting.
- 7.3. 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 29 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.
- 7.4. The sub-panel approved the recommendation of the secretariat that for 803 staff with clearly defined circumstances an appropriate number of outputs have been submitted and no missing outputs are recorded.
- 7.5. There were no cases where the criteria for output reductions had not been met.

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 4, 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 5, 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 templates of differing sizes may be assessed equitably.
- 8.6. The chair facilitated a further discussion on 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 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. Over the course of the discussion of this agenda item, 30 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 4: Meeting 6

10-12 September 2014

Radisson Blu, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams	Peter Kirkpatrick
Richard Bentall	Michael Lamb
Verity Brown	Matthew Lambon Ralph
Mike Burton	David Nutt
Angela Clow	Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)
Bruno Frenguelli	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Susan Gathercole	Emily Simonoff
Trisha Greenhalgh (MPA Deputy Chair)*	Trevor Smart
Jeremy Hall	Irene Tracey
Glyn Humphreys (Chair)	Andrew Whitelaw
Jane Ireland	Til Wykes
Dave Jones (Secretary)	

* Present on 11 September only (agenda items 8-11)

Apologies:

Susan Condor	Neil Scolding
Paul Matthews	Paul Whiting

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 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. Environment: key assessment principles

- 4.1. The chair 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 relates to the whole submitted unit and are not linked only to the submitted staff.
- 4.2. 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.

5. Environment calibration exercise

- 5.1. 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.
- 5.2. 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 two 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.
- 5.3. 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.

6. Sub-panel agreement of scores for environment

- 6.1. 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. Feedback statements

- 7.1. The secretariat reminded panellists that statements are intended to provide informative feedback to assist a HEI in understanding the reasons for the profiles it has been awarded. To this end the feedback statements should comment on each of the three sub-profiles.
- 7.2. 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.
- 7.3. In advance of the meeting, the chair and deputy chair had drafted feedback statements for four submissions. Using these exemplars, 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.
- 7.4. Panellists agreed to share their draft feedback statements within their pre-determined small groups for peer review, and then to send these to the executive team within one week.

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, 23 panellists left the room while submissions with which they had a conflict of interest were discussed.

9. Consideration of draft overview report

- 9.1. 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 process of assessment.
- 9.2. The secretariat presented the draft overview report. The chair facilitated a discussion to identify what points and issues should be included in the main panel and sub-panel sections.

- 9.3. The sub-panel agreed that the executive team will present a draft to the final meeting in October.

10. Future meetings

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

11. Any other business

- 11.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 4: Meeting 7

9 October 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Dominic Abrams	Michael Lamb
Richard Bentall	Matthew Lambon Ralph
Verity Brown	Paul Matthews
Mike Burton	David Nutt
Angela Clow	Michael Owen (Deputy Chair)
Susan Condor	Helen Reddy (Adviser)
Bruno Frenguelli	Neil Scolding
Susan Gathercole	Emily Simonoff
Glyn Humphreys (Chair)	Trevor Smart
Jane Ireland	Andrew Whitelaw
Dave Jones (Secretary)	Paul Whiting
Vicky Jones (REF Team, present for items 1-4)	Til Wykes

Apologies:

Jeremy Hall
Peter Kirkpatrick
Irene Tracey

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. Draft feedback statements

- 4.1. The secretariat briefed the sub-panel on the edits that had been made to the draft feedback statements since the prior meeting to ensure accuracy and consistency.
- 4.2. The sub-panel reviewed the draft feedback statements for a sample of submissions. Panellists discussed the suitability of the statements; requested a number of edits; and suggested additional information to be included.
- 4.3. The sub-panel noted the timetable and process for finalising the feedback statements.

5. Draft overview report

- 5.1. 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. The secretariat then provided a brief summary of the size and shape of the final overall and sub-profiles.
- 5.2. 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.
- 5.3. The sub-panel noted the timetable for finalisation of the report and agreed to send the executive team any further comments within one week.

6. Publication of the results

- 6.1. 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.
- 6.2. 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.

- 6.3. 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.

7. Reflections on the REF process

- 7.1. 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.
- 7.2. The chair invited panellists to reflect on the assessment process. A number of suggestions for improvements or changes were agreed, and the nominated panellists to raise these at the feedback events.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. The chair reiterated his thanks to 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.