



REF Sub-panel 5: Meeting 1b

13 December 2013

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Richard Apps
Alan Barrett (Main Panel Member)
Kate Bishop (Secretary)
Mike Boots
Leo Brady
Sue Brain
Juliet Brodie
Nigel Brown
Adrian Clark
Alan Clarke
Richard Cogdell
Chris Cooper
Stuart Cull-Candy
Julian Dow
David Eisner
Gerard Evan
Maria Fitzgerald
Kevin Fox
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel Member)
Martin Glennie
Neil Gow
John Heslop-Harrison
Chris Marshall
Barbara McDermott
Tracy Palmer
Nancy Papalopulu
David Paterson
Ole Petersen (Chair)
John Pickett
Malcolm Press (Deputy Chair)
Stefan Przyborski
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)

Anne Ridley
Claudio Stern

Apologies:

Paul Brakefield
Chris Reilly

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the agenda, describing that the majority of the meeting would be devoted to discussing the output calibration exercise.
- 1.2. All panellists were asked to introduce themselves and to provide a brief summary of their area of expertise. The detail was recorded by the secretariat for future use in the output allocation exercise.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and members were requested, where required, to update their details via the Panel Members' Website (PMW) after the meeting.
- 2.2. It was requested that all panellists check the dates relating to their conflicts of interest as only conflicts after 1 January 2008 are relevant.

3. Output Calibration Exercise

- 3.1. The sub-panel chair introduced the output calibration exercise and talked through a series of summary slides (available via the PMW). The sub-panel chair provided a summary of the output calibration exercise conducted by Main Panel A.
- 3.2. The methodology for the allocation of REF outputs was discussed briefly, in the context of whether individuals will be required to review material which is outside of their area of expertise. The sub-panel chair confirmed that the REF outputs will be allocated on the basis of subject area, however panellists may be required to review some material which is outside of their area.
- 3.3. The secretariat had produced a series of graphs from the calibration exercise which were shown to the panellists and were also made available via the PMW.

- 3.4. It was noted that there is a tendency for panellists to shy away from using the top score. It was suggested that panellists may find it useful to remember that 4* is a range, and that within the submissions there will be spectrum of 4* papers.
- 3.5. The scenario of differences of opinion between reviewer pairs was discussed. It was agreed that the first step in this situation should be for the two reviewers to discuss their reasons behind their decisions and to explore whether a consensus can be reached. In cases where a consensus can't be reached, it was agreed that the outputs would be referred to a 3rd party (possibly one of the international members). Where no agreement was possible, the output should be flagged to the sub-panel chair/deputy chair.
- 3.6. The sub-panel discussed consistent scoring for the same output which has been returned multiple times by different institutions. The secretariat agreed that these outputs would be identified and allocated to the same review pair.
- 3.7. It was noted that, since author contribution is a threshold, assessors need to raise any valid concerns via the secretariat, but that once substantial contribution had been agreed the paper should be assessed and scored on its originality, significance and rigour.
- 3.8. The panel reaffirmed that outputs must be reviewed in isolation of environmental contextual information.
- 3.9. The use of citation data was discussed as this will be made available to panellists. It was reaffirmed that citation data should be used as a positive indicator, and that it must be used with caution as citation count is not always a reliable indicator.
- 3.10. Where panellists have queries over initial publication of research prior to the assessment period, or work that may have subsequently been retracted, they should refer these to the secretariat.

4. Output Allocation Arrangements

- 4.1. The sub-panel chair delivered a brief presentation on the number and size of the submission to Sub-Panel 5 (SP5), the plans for output allocation and the timing of the output assessment exercise. Indicative targets for output review were presented.
- 4.2. It was thought that the increase in the numbers of early career researchers to REF 2014 had resulted in a decrease in the number of papers per full-time equivalent.
- 4.3. It is planned that the output allocation will be completed by mid-January so that individual allocations and any issues can be discussed and resolved at the next meeting on 24 January. Panellists were reminded that they would be required to

review their allocations in advance of the meeting. Potential tension between allocating outputs on an equal basis and ensuring subject coverage was discussed.

- 4.4. It was agreed that, where there are questions arising from a conflict between the statement provided by the submitting institution and the detail within the output, this should be raised with the secretariat so that an audit query can be raised, if appropriate.
- 4.5. The frequency of audit queries was raised. Panellists were advised that they will be required to raise audit queries to the secretariat and that the executive will maintain oversight of the number of queries arising and will advise panellists accordingly.
- 4.6. Panellists were advised that, where outputs have been submitted which are outwith of the scope of the sub-panel, these may be cross-referred to another more relevant panel. SP5 will retain responsibility for recommending the outputs sub-profile, however.
- 4.7. The sub-panel chair reminded panellists that they cannot seek advice from individuals outside of the REF process.
- 4.8. Panellists were reminded to review their outputs in the same order, i.e. alphabetically as advised by the executive, to ensure that, by the interim review meetings, the same outputs had been scored and so that useful conversations can start to happen between scoring pairs.
- 4.9. The plans for ongoing scoring calibration need to be defined. It was suggested that ongoing calibration could be on the agenda at the March meeting.

5. IT Systems

- 5.1. The sub-panel adviser provided a brief introduction to the IT system which will be used for the assessment. It was agreed that panellists would receive a more detailed presentation at the January meeting.
- 5.2. Several panel members detailed that they were experiencing issues with accessing the PMW. It was advised that these should be referred to the REF IT team.

6. Future meeting Schedule

- 6.1. The full meeting schedule for SP5 was presented.

- 6.2. The allocation of impact case studies and the conduct of the impact calibration exercise were discussed. The sub-panel chair confirmed that REF impact case studies would be used in the impact calibration exercise.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. All panellists were invited to provide additional contact details to the sub-panel secretary to assist with members making contact with each other during the assessment process. Several panellists expressed their interest in discussing outputs using Skype. All panellists were requested to confirm their consent for the distribution of their contact details within the sub-panel.



REF Sub-panel 5: Meeting 2

24 January 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Richard Apps
Kate Bishop (Secretary)
Mike Boots
Leo Brady
Sue Brain
Paul Brakefield
Juliet Brodie
Nigel Brown
Adrian Clark
Alan Clarke
Richard Cogdell
Chris Cooper
Stuart Cull-Candy
Julian Dow
David Eisner
Gerard Evan
Maria Fitzgerald
Kevin Fox
Martin Glennie
Neil Gow
John Heslop-Harrison
Chris Marshall
Tracy Palmer
Nancy Papalopulu
David Paterson
Ole Petersen (Chair)
John Pickett
Malcolm Press (Deputy Chair)
Stefan Przyborski
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Chris Reilly
Anne Ridley

Claudio Stern

Apologies:

Barbara McDermott

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panellists reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 13 December 2013, which were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. IT Presentation

- 4.1. The sub-panel secretariat delivered a presentation covering the REF IT system (available via the PMW).

5. Output allocation

- 5.1. The methodology for the allocation of outputs was discussed. The sub-panel executive had reviewed the research groups provided by submitting institutions. Outputs for which no research group had been provided were reviewed by the sub-panel executive and allocated to a research group. The research groups defined by the sub-panel executive were matched to panellist's expertise and the outputs were allocated accordingly.
- 5.2. The sub-panel chair confirmed that it had not been possible to allocate the outputs purely on the basis alignment of research group and panellists' expertise as this would have resulted in an unfair allocation of the outputs.

- 5.3. Panellists were invited to raise any general issues relating to output allocations and discuss their outputs with other members to negotiate a series of swaps to address the issues that some panellists had encountered with their allocations. Panellists were asked to provide details of their agreed swaps to the sub-panel secretariat.
- 5.4. The sub-panel chair requested that all panellists ensure that they have reviewed their allocations and refer any further issues/conflicts to the sub-panel secretariat by Monday 27 January.
- 5.5. Guidance (available via the PMW) was provided on cross-referral of outputs from Sub-panel 5 (SP5) to another sub-panel and for outputs from other sub-panels to SP5. The sub-panel secretariat confirmed that all cross-referral suggestions are required by 30 April and will be reviewed by the sub-panel executive. It was confirmed that the sub-panel requesting cross-referral retains the responsibility for the final scoring of any cross-referred output.
- 5.6. It was agreed that panellists should review their outputs in alphabetical order of submitting institution.
- 5.7. It was confirmed that duplicate outputs would not be reallocated to the same scoring pair and that the allocation of duplicate outputs to multiple pairs would be used by the sub-panel executive as part of an ongoing calibration exercise.
- 5.8. The sub-panel secretariat provided brief information regarding the process for panellists to access their scoring reports from the PMW.
- 5.9. The sub-panel secretariat delivered a brief presentation on citation and contextual data (available via the PMW) and the citation data spreadsheet provided by the REF team was shown to the sub-panel.

6. Project plan

- 6.1. The sub-panel secretariat delivered a presentation covering the project plan for SP5 (available via the PMW). The presentation covered the deadlines and targets for output review, process for impact allocation, impact calibration, deadlines and targets for impact review and environment review.

7. Audit

- 7.1. Further detail on individual staff circumstances and audit processes (available via the PMW) was presented, covering the sample based audit undertaken by the REF team and panel-instigated audit. The different types of audit queries were covered.

8. Next meeting

- 8.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed the date of the next meeting (27 March) and provided a brief summary of the proposed agenda.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. No further business was raised.



REF Sub-panel 5: Meeting 3

27 March 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Richard Apps
Kate Bishop (Secretary)
Mike Boots
Leo Brady
Sue Brain
Paul Brakefield
Juliet Brodie
Nigel Brown
Adrian Clark
Alan Clarke
Richard Cogdell
Chris Cooper
Stuart Cull-Candy
Julian Dow
David Eisner
Gerard Evan
Maria Fitzgerald
Simon Fleming
Kevin Fox
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel Member)
Martin Glennie
John Heslop-Harrison
Stephen Holgate (Main Panel Member)
Barbara McDermott
Tracy Palmer
Nancy Papalopulu
David Paterson
Ole Petersen (Chair)
John Pickett
Malcolm Press (Deputy Chair)
Stefan Przyborski
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)

Chris Reilly
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Anne Ridley
Claudio Stern

Apologies:

Neil Gow
Elena Lurie-Luke
Chris Marshall
Mark Prescott

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair introduced the Main Panel A members attending the meeting: Stephen Holgate (Main Panel A chair) and Jack Gauldie (international member).
- 1.2. The sub-panel chair advised sub-panel members that Kate Bishop will be going on maternity leave from 9 May and that Kerry Revel has started as her replacement.
- 1.3. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the agenda, describing that the morning part of the meeting would be dedicated to output assessment and the afternoon to impact assessment.
- 1.4. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panellists reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 24 January 2014, which were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

and leave the room. The secretariat will ensure panellists return to the room on conclusion of the discussion.

4. Output assessment

- 4.1. The secretariat had analysed the sub-panel output scoring data and prepared paper 1 and a slide pack (available via the PMW) covering scoring activity, the emerging outputs sub-profile and scoring by research area.
- 4.2. It was agreed that the progress with output assessment was good.
- 4.3. Panellists were requested to indicate whether they had had scoring pair discussions prior to 20 March. The response indicated that a high proportion of discussions between assessors had taken place.
- 4.4. The process to be used if assessors cannot reach a consensus on the score for an individual output was queried. The sub-panel chair advised that any such cases should be referred to the exec group for potential discussion at the next meeting.
- 4.5. The process for requesting to cross-refer an output was queried. The sub-panel chair confirmed that all cross-referral requests must be sent to the secretariat.
- 4.6. Access to citation data for cross-referred outputs was raised. The secretariat confirmed that, for outputs where the requesting sub-panel utilises citation data, it will be available to assessors on the advising sub-panel.
- 4.7. The submission of same output across multiple submissions was discussed. It was confirmed that Main Panel A will be reviewing the issue of duplicate submissions across the sub-panels within Main Panel A.
- 4.8. It was agreed that the secretariat will undertake to check the scores for duplicate outputs across submissions within the sub-panel.
- 4.9. The sub-panel reviewed a list of outputs identified by the sub-panel chair. Six sub-panel members left the room during the discussion due to conflicts of interest.
- 4.10. The issue of monographs, review articles and software was discussed. Panellists were reminded to refer to the panel criteria and also to consider the potential for cross-referral.

5. Audit queries and ineligible outputs

- 5.1. The secretariat presented some slides on co-authorship (available via the PMW) covering: the process for raising audit queries, the level of audit activity across the

sub-panel and some examples of the types of queries identified to date and the action taken.

- 5.2. The sub-panel chair confirmed the process for panellists to allocate an unclassified score, confirming that all outputs where assessors wish to give an unclassified score as a consequence of co-authorship issues must be referred to the secretariat.
- 5.3. Panellists were requested to provide specific information relating to their concerns when raising audit queries with the secretariat.
- 5.4. It was agreed that the secretariat will undertake to review all audit queries to identify whether any institutions are demonstrating a consistent approach to submitting outputs with common co-authorship issues.
- 5.5. The secretariat provided a brief summary of their review of clearly defined staff circumstances.

Stephen Holgate, Kevin Fox and Nancy Papalopulu left the meeting at 1pm and Simon Fleming joined the meeting at 2pm.

6. Impact assessment

- 6.1. The secretariat had prepared slides (available via the PMW) to cover impact assessment.
- 6.2. The adviser provided an overview of the impact calibration exercise (covered in paper 2), confirming that all impact calibration scores must be returned to the secretariat by REF webmail by 1 May.
- 6.3. The adviser provided an overview of the allocation of impact case studies and impact templates (covered in paper 3) and requested that all assessors skim-read their allocation and refer any conflicts of interest and audit queries to the secretariat by REF webmail by 1 May.
- 6.4. It was agreed that each assessor will review four impact templates.

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. A summary of future meetings was provided. The sub-panel chair confirmed the date of the next meeting (20-22 May) and provided a brief summary of the proposed agenda.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. The sub-panel chair thanked Kate Bishop for her outstanding work as secretary and the whole sub-panel wished her well for the happy period she is now entering.



REF Sub-panel 5: Meeting 4 Part 1

20 May 2014

Conference Aston, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Richard Apps
Mike Boots
Leo Brady
Sue Brain
Paul Brakefield
Nigel Brown
Adrian Clark
Alan Clarke
Richard Cogdell
Chris Cooper
Stuart Cull-Candy
Julian Dow
David Eisner
Gerard Evan
Maria Fitzgerald
Kevin Fox
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel Member)
Martin Glennie
Neil Gow
Iain Hagan
John Heslop-Harrison
Barbara McDermott
Tracy Palmer
Nancy Papalopulu
David Paterson
Ole Petersen (Chair)
John Pickett
Stefan Przyborski
Chris Reilly
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Anne Ridley

Claudio Stern

Apologies:

Juliet Brodie

Malcolm Press (Deputy Chair)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the agenda, describing that part one of the meeting would be devoted mainly to discussing output assessment.
- 1.2. The sub-panel chair informed the sub-panel that Professor Chris Marshall had unfortunately had to resign from the sub-panel and that Professor Iain Hagan had been appointed as a new member of the sub-panel. The sub-panel chair welcomed Professor Hagan to the sub-panel and all panellists were asked to introduce themselves.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panellists reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on the 27th March 2014, which were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Output assessment to date

- 4.1. The sub-panel chair thanked the sub-panel for its work to date, noting that overall progress was on target. The sub-panel reviewed the analysis provided by the secretariat in Paper 1 covering scoring activity, the emerging outputs sub-profile and scoring by research area.
- 4.2. It was agreed to undertake some further analysis to test that assessments in high scoring research areas were calibrated with those in other areas but it was reiterated that differences in the quality profile between disciplines were to be expected.

- 4.3. Panellists were reminded that the deadline for uploading agreed scores for outputs was 23 June 2014.
- 4.4. The adviser presented some slides providing an overview of the number of outputs submitted more than once to Sub-Panel 5 (whether by the same HEI or by different HEIs) and an overview of co-authored outputs where the submitting author is not the lead or corresponding author.

5. Problem outputs for discussion

- 5.1. The secretariat circulated a list of duplicate outputs for panellists to use when agreeing scores. Panellists were asked to liaise with one another regarding any duplicate outputs to ensure that the scores given to those outputs were consistent. It was agreed to revise and recirculate the list of duplicate outputs after 6 June 2014 and panellists were therefore asked to upload scores for duplicate outputs by 5 June 2014.
- 5.2. It was agreed that panellists should not assess any duplicate outputs where the output was also submitted by an institution with which they have a conflict of interest.
- 5.3. The sub-panel identified and discussed several duplicate outputs and examples of responses received to date to output audit requests.
- 5.4. The sub-panel discussed some general issues regarding output scoring including the scoring of research outputs involving very large study populations. For outputs to be eligible, it was noted that research need not be hypothesis-led.
- 5.5. Nine sub-panel members left the room during the discussion due to conflicts of interest.

6. Output audit and staff circumstances

- 6.1. The adviser presented a slide providing a summary of the level of audit activity across the sub-panel and the number of audit queries raised and responses received to date.
- 6.2. It was noted that output audit queries should be received by the secretariat by 30 May 2014 in order to allow time for audit responses to inform the July meeting.
- 6.3. The sub-panel noted Paper 2, providing an overview of the process and progress to date regarding individual staff circumstances, including an update on audit queries raised. The sub-panel agreed that responsibility for making decisions regarding appropriate output reductions for staff with clearly defined circumstances would be delegated to the exec group. On that basis, the sub-panel approved the recommendations made by the exec group to date.

7. Preparing sub-panel overview and HEI feedback reports

- 7.1. The sub-panel will be responsible for preparing confidential HEI feedback reports to each institution that made a submission in UOA5. This feedback will comprise a paragraph on each of the three assessment areas (outputs, impact and environment). The sub-panel will also prepare an overview report which will be published as part of the Main Panel A overview report and will comment on both the process and the findings from the assessment. Paper 3 gave further details about the structure of these reports.
- 7.2. To aid preparation of the HEI feedback reports, a 'lead' panellist will be nominated for each HEI whom, following panel discussion of each element of the submission, will be responsible for initial drafting of the feedback. The panellist chosen will be one of the assessors of the environment template for that HEI.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed the date of the next meeting (7-8 July for outputs, 9-10 July for impact) and provided a brief summary of the proposed agenda.

REF Sub-panel 5: Meeting 4 Part 2

21-22 May 2014

Conference Aston, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Richard Apps
Mike Boots
Leo Brady
Sue Brain
Paul Brakefield
Juliet Brodie
Nigel Brown
Adrian Clark
Alan Clarke
Richard Cogdell
Chris Cooper
Stuart Cull-Candy
Julian Dow
David Eisner
Gerard Evan
Maria Fitzgerald
Simon Fleming
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel Member)
Martin Glennie
Neil Gow
Tricia Greenhalgh (22 May only)
Iain Hagan
John Heslop-Harrison
Elena Lurie-Luke
Barbara McDermott
Tracy Palmer
David Paterson
Ole Petersen (Chair)
John Pickett
Mark Prescott
Stefan Przyborski
Chris Reilly
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Anne Ridley (21 May only)

Malcolm Skingle (Main Panel Member) (22 May only)
Claudio Stern

Apologies:

Malcolm Press (Deputy Chair)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Conflicts of interest

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

3. Impact calibration

- 3.1. The adviser presented a slide containing advice from Main Panel A following its own impact case study calibration exercise.
- 3.2. The panel members assessed a selection of impact cases from other Main Panel A sub-panels and from a range of submitting institutions in a calibration exercise. They submitted their scores in advance of the meeting. The case studies were discussed in turn to agree key principles for the assessment of impact. Panel members were invited to re-score each item and these scores were collected by the secretariat at the end of the exercise.
- 3.3. Twelve sub-panel members left the room during the discussion due to conflicts of interest.
- 3.4. A number of general principles were reiterated, which included the need to disentangle the impact achieved within the REF period and previous or potential impact; the use only of the information presented in the case study to judge the impact; the target audience of the described impact; the clarity of the link between the underpinning research and the impact; the individual contribution of the submitting HEI to the impact; and the influence of presentation. It was noted that the assessment involves scoring very different types of impact, and that direct comparisons in terms of the evidence one might hope to see were not possible.

- 3.5. The sub-panel chair reminded panellists that threshold judgements should be established before scoring the impact, and that academic assessors should take the lead on judging the quality of the underpinning research.

4. Environment allocation and assessment

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

5. Outcome of case study calibration exercise

- 5.1. A number of key points from the discussion the day before were summarised and the sub-panel reviewed the post-discussion scores and noted the convergence.

6. Impact template calibration

- 6.1. As with the case studies, each template included in the calibration exercise was discussed in turn, drawing out discussions on expectations at the different star levels. The sub-panel noted that there would not necessarily be any correlation between template and case study scores.
- 6.2. Four sub-panel members left the room during the discussion due to conflicts of interest.

7. Impact audit

- 7.1. The secretariat provided a review of the audit process, and noted that suggested impact audit queries should be received by the secretariat by 6 June 2014 in order to allow time for audit responses to inform the July meeting.

8. Impact assessment and preparation for July meeting

- 8.1. Panellists were reminded that the deadline for uploading agreed scores for impact was 23 June 2014. A target of 50% of scores uploaded was set for 15 June so that the emerging quality profile might inform the meeting of main panel chairs.
- 8.2. It was noted that, on the morning of 9 July, there would be a session to discuss and agree scores for difficult cases and templates in break-out groups. Given the limited time for this activity, however, scoring trios should endeavour to agree the vast majority of scores by the 23 June deadline.

9. Future meetings

- 9.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed the date of the next meeting (7-8 July for outputs, 9-10 July for impact) and provided a brief summary of the proposed agenda.

10. Any other business

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



REF Sub-panel 5: Meeting 5 Part 1

7-8 July 2014

Stratford Manor, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

Richard Apps
Mike Boots
Leo Brady
Sue Brain
Paul Brakefield (8 July only)
Juliet Brodie
Nigel Brown
Adrian Clark
Alan Clarke
Richard Cogdell (8 July only)
Chris Cooper
Stuart Cull-Candy
Julian Dow
David Eisner
Gerard Evan
Maria Fitzgerald
Kevin Fox
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel Member)
Martin Glennie
Neil Gow
Iain Hagan
John Heslop-Harrison
Stephen Holgate (Main Panel Member) (7 July only)
Barbara McDermott
Bruce Murphy (Main Panel Member) (7 July only)
Tracy Palmer
David Paterson
Ole Petersen (Chair)
Malcolm Press
Stefan Przyborski
Chris Reilly
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)

Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Anne Ridley

Apologies:

Nancy Papalopulu
John Pickett
Claudio Stern

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 20-22 May 2014. These were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Output assessment to date

- 4.1. The panel noted that, where an output has been submitted by more than one HEI, agreed scores must be consistent, even where scores have been awarded by different scoring pairs. An unclassified score would be appropriate, however, where reviewers agreed that the submitting author had failed to make a substantial research contribution to the output.
- 4.2. The sub-panel reviewed the analysis provided by the secretariat in Paper 1 covering scoring activity, the emerging outputs sub-profile and scoring by research area. Following work undertaken by sub-panel members and the exec group, the sub-panel chair reassured the sub-panel that, as far as possible, assessments in high scoring areas had been suitably calibrated with those in

other areas. The exec group had undertaken a cross-panel analysis of scores for a selected sub-set of outputs.

- 4.3. It was noted that the exec group was reviewing unclassified scores to ensure that these had been awarded fairly and consistently.
- 4.4. The sub-panel noted that a very small number of output scores were yet to be agreed and panellists undertook to agree any outstanding scores with their co-reviewers as soon as possible. Given that these outstanding scores would not make a significant difference to resulting sub-profiles, it was agreed that the sub-panel would agree output sub-profiles as they stood and that any final adjustments would be made following the meeting.

5. Preparation of institutional feedback statements

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

6. Output sub-profiles

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

- 6.3. For each submission, the sub-panel approved the outputs sub-profile and agreed to recommend it to Main Panel A.
- 6.4. Twenty six sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.

7. Sub-panel overview report for outputs

- 7.1. Sub-panellists discussed their observations and findings in relation to the overall outputs assessment process, noting comparisons with RAE2008. It was agreed that the exec group would take account of these observations when preparing a first draft of Sub-Panel 5's contribution to the Main Panel A overview report and that this first draft would be submitted to a future meeting of the sub-panel for further discussion.

8. Individual staff circumstances

- 8.1. The sub-panel noted Paper 3, providing an update on the recommendations and decisions made with regard to individual staff circumstances.
- 8.2. With regard to cases of clearly defined circumstances, it was noted that the vast majority of cases had been reviewed and recommendations made. In a small number of cases, audit responses were awaited from HEIs and the final results of the review process would be reported to the next meeting of the sub-panel.
- 8.3. With regard to cases of complex circumstances, it was noted that the Equality and Diversity Panel (EDAP) had completed its review of circumstances submitted within Main Panel A, excluding circumstances where further information had been requested from the HEI.

9. Environment calibration

- 9.1. The adviser reminded panellists of the key principles of environment assessment as set out in Paper 4 (including details of the relevant guidance and sub-panel criteria). The adviser also directed panellists to where they could access standard analyses and staff summary reports via their USB keys and the PMW.
- 9.2. Panel members undertook a calibration exercise based on selected examples of environment templates from other Main Panel A sub-panels. These examples had been circulated in advance of the meeting, together with accompanying standard analyses reports. Panellists had been asked to review and score each example in advance of the meeting.
- 9.3. A number of general principles regarding environment assessment were reiterated. Panellists were reminded that their assessment of environment must be based on the environment template itself and that the data in the standard

analyses and staff summary reports should inform that assessment. Panellists were also reminded that 'per FTE' data in the standard analyses reports was not comparable between HEIs. This was because the submitted data related to all researchers in a unit whereas the denominator used for the calculation was the subset of researchers returned to REF. It was noted that data indicating a trajectory could be used for context.

- 9.4. Panellists were advised to read the entire template first to get a holistic sense of the environment and then to go back and assess each element using the 0.5 point scale. There was no pre-formed view of the ideal size or organisational structure for research environment and each submission would be judged on its own merits.
- 9.5. Panellists were reminded that the deadline for uploading personal scores for environment was 2 September 2014.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. The sub-panel had a brief discussion regarding the scoring of impact items. Data had been circulated prior to the meeting, comprising tables of individual scoring profiles for impact case studies and impact templates (Paper 5). It was noted that 75% of the scores for impact items had now been agreed. The secretariat presented a slide showing case study scoring profiles for each panellist.
- 10.2. Now that the outputs component of the assessment was complete, the sub-panel Chair thanked output assessors Prof Kevin Fox and Prof Nancy Papalopulu for their service on the panel and for their invaluable contribution to the assessment process.

REF Sub-panel 5: Meeting 5 Part 2

9 July 2014

Stratford Manor, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

Richard Apps
Mike Boots
Leo Brady
Sue Brain
Paul Brakefield
Juliet Brodie
Nigel Brown
Adrian Clark
Alan Clarke
Richard Cogdell
Chris Cooper
Stuart Cull-Candy
Julian Dow
David Eisner
Gerard Evan
Maria Fitzgerald
Simon Fleming
Jack Gauldie (Main Panel Member)
Martin Glennie
Neil Gow
Iain Hagan
John Heslop-Harrison
Elena Lurie-Luke
Stephen Holgate (Main Panel Member)
Barbara McDermott
Tracy Palmer
David Paterson
Ole Petersen (Chair)
Mark Prescott
Malcolm Press
Stefan Przyborski
Chris Reilly
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Anne Ridley

Apologies:

John Pickett
Claudio Stern

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Conflicts of interest

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

3. Plenary to discuss impact assessment and issues to date

- 3.1. The Chair of Main Panel A provided an update on the Main Panel's experience and observations regarding impact assessment to date. He reminded the sub-panel that there are a large range of different types of impacts, all capable of being scored as 4* and that each case study should be judged on its own merits.
- 3.2. The secretariat presented an updated slide showing the case study scoring profiles for each panellist. A further slide was presented comprising data on the number and percentage of impact case studies and templates scored at each starred level.
- 3.3. For the purposes of calibrating and finalising agreed impact case study scores, the sub-panel discussed a number of case studies selected by the exec group and sub-panel members. In 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. The sub-panel then discussed the case study and agreed on what the appropriate score should be.
- 3.4. Six sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.

4. Break-out discussions and upload of agreed scores

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

5. Impact sub-profiles

- 5.1. Taking account of all updated scores, the secretariat projected a series of slides showing, for each submission, the impact sub-profile, the number of impact case studies submitted, the FTE of Category A staff submitted and the scores for the impact template and impact case studies. Submissions were presented in alphabetical order.
- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed the impact profile and associated data for each submission in turn and noted any key points to include in institutional feedback statements.
- 5.3. For each submission, the sub-panel approved the impact sub-profile and agreed to recommend it to Main Panel A.
- 5.4. Twenty five sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.

6. Sub-panel overview report for impact

- 6.1. Panellists discussed their observations and findings in relation to the overall impact assessment process. It was agreed that the exec group would take account of these observations when preparing the first draft of Sub-Panel 5's contribution to the Main Panel A overview report.

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed that the next meeting (16-17 September 2014) would focus on the assessment of environment.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. Now that the impact component of the assessment was complete, the sub-panel Chair thanked impact assessors Dr Simon Fleming, Professor Elena Lurie-Luke and Dr Mark Prescott for their service on the panel and for their invaluable contribution to the assessment process.



REF Sub-panel 5: Meeting 6
16-17 September 2014
Radisson Blu, Queensway, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Richard Apps
Mike Boots
Leo Brady
Sue Brain
Paul Brakefield
Juliet Brodie
Nigel Brown
Adrian Clark
Alan Clarke
Richard Cogdell
Chris Cooper
Stuart Cull-Candy
Julian Dow
David Eisner
Gerard Evan
Maria Fitzgerald
Martin Glennie
Neil Gow
Iain Hagan
John Heslop-Harrison
Barbara McDermott
Tracy Palmer
David Paterson
Ole Petersen (Chair)
John Pickett
Malcolm Press
Stefan Przyborski
Chris Reilly
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Anne Ridley
Claudio Stern

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He introduced the agenda, describing that the majority of the meeting would be devoted to agreeing the scores and profiles for environment submissions, for recommendation to Main Panel A. There would also be a discussion of the draft feedback statements and the Sub-Panel 5 overview report, each of which would be approved at the final meeting of the sub-panel on 15 October 2014.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel chair confirmed the sub-panel's competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 7-9 July 2014. These were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Assessment of environment templates – plenary discussion

- 4.1. The sub-panel chair delivered a brief presentation reminding panellists of some of the key principles of environment assessment.
- 4.2. Prior to the meeting, panellists had reviewed the environment templates assigned to them for assessment and had uploaded their personal scores for each of the four components of environment to the Panel Members' Website.
- 4.3. For the purposes of calibrating and finalising agreed environment scores, the sub-panel discussed a number of environment submissions, as selected by the exec group prior to the meeting.

5. Assessment of environment templates – small group discussion

- 5.1. The sub-panel moved into breakout groups, where panellists discussed and agreed the final scores for each component of the environment submissions they were tasked with assessing.

6. Assessment of environment templates – plenary discussion

- 6.1. The sub-panel reconvened to report and agree the final scores for each environment submission.
- 6.2. The sub-panel agreed to recommend the final environment sub-profiles to Main Panel A.
- 6.3. Twenty seven sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.

7. Feedback reports

- 7.1. The sub-panel chair thanked lead panellists for the draft outputs and impact feedback they had prepared for their respective institutions. It was agreed that these draft statements would be edited and finalised by the sub-panel chair and deputy chair.
- 7.2. Panellists were referred to Paper 1, comprising suggested text for use by lead panellists when drafting the environment components of institutional feedback statements. No amendments were suggested to the proposed text.
- 7.3. It was agreed that, following the meeting, the secretariat would contact lead panellists individually to provide them with a pack of guidance and data in respect of the environment profiles/scores for their designated HEIs. Panellists were advised that the deadline for providing their draft environment feedback was 26 September 2014.

8. Discussion of draft overview report

- 8.1. Panellists were referred to Paper 2, comprising the first draft of Sub-Panel 5's section of the Main Panel A Overview Report. The draft had been prepared in line with input from panellists at the previous meeting.
- 8.2. Panellists provided further comments and suggestions in relation to the draft report and it was agreed that the sub-panel chair and deputy chair would further revise the report in light of these. It was noted that the next version of the report would be approved at the final meeting of the sub-panel on 15 October.
- 8.3. Panellists were invited to contact the exec group by e-mail with any further comments or suggestions in relation to the draft overview report.

9. Individual staff circumstances

- 9.1. Panellists noted the contents of Paper 3, comprising a summary of the final recommendations and decisions made with regard to cases of individual staff circumstances.
- 9.2. It was noted that all 614 cases of clearly defined individual staff circumstances had now been reviewed by the secretariat on behalf of the exec group. Audit queries had been raised in cases where insufficient information had been provided by the HEI to allow the secretariat to replicate the reduction calculation or to judge whether the reduction sought was appropriate.
- 9.3. The sub-panel approved the exec group's recommendation that, in all 614 cases, no missing outputs should be recorded because the appropriate number of outputs had been submitted.
- 9.4. There were no cases where the criteria for output reductions had not been met.
- 9.5. With regard to cases of complex circumstances, it was noted that the Equality and Diversity Panel (EDAP) had completed its review of circumstances submitted within Main Panel A. The sub-panel noted the outcome of this review.

10. Review of all profiles

- 10.1. The secretariat projected a series of slides showing, for each submission, the overall quality profile and individual sub-profiles, the FTE of Category A staff submitted, the scores for each element of the environment sub-profile and average profile data for the sub-panel as a whole.
- 10.2. The sub-panel approved the overall quality profile and sub-profiles for each submission and agreed to recommend these to Main Panel A.
- 10.3. Twenty eight sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

11. Any other business

- 11.1. The adviser provided a brief update on the timetable and arrangements for the publication of the REF results in December 2014.
- 11.2. The sub-panel chair reminded panellists that the next and final sub-panel meeting would take place on 15 October 2014. The main purpose of the meeting would be to complete feedback on submissions and to complete sub-panel content for overview reports.



REF Sub-panel 5: Meeting 7

15 October 2014

CCT Venues – Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Richard Apps
Mike Boots
Leo Brady
Sue Brain
Paul Brakefield
Juliet Brodie
Nigel Brown
Adrian Clark
Alan Clarke
Richard Cogdell
Chris Cooper
Julian Dow
David Eisner
Maria Fitzgerald
Martin Glennie
Neil Gow
John Heslop-Harrison
Stephen Holgate (Main Panel Member)
Barbara McDermott
Tracy Palmer
David Paterson
Ole Petersen (Chair)
John Pickett
Malcolm Press
Stefan Przyborski
Chris Reilly
Gillian Rendle (Adviser)
Kerry Revel (Secretary)
Claudio Stern

Apologies:

Stuart Cull-Candy

Gerard Evan

Iain Hagan

Anne Ridley

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the minutes from the last meeting held on 16-17 September 2014. These were confirmed as an accurate representation of the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Reviewing and agreeing contents of HEI feedback reports

- 4.1. The sub-panel chair confirmed that the exec group had reviewed and edited the draft HEI feedback statements provided by panellists. This had been done in response to guidance from the REF team and to achieve consistency in the feedback provided as a whole. The sub-panel chair referred panellists to the revised versions of the feedback statements contained in Paper 1 and thanked them for their input to the drafting process.
- 4.2. The sub-panel reviewed and discussed a selection of draft HEI feedback statements. The sub-panel agreed on what the content of each feedback statement should be and agreed on a number of general principles, to be followed by the secretariat when finalising the text of each statement. It was agreed that the secretariat would proceed to make further revisions to the feedback statements accordingly. Lead panellists were also asked to e-mail the secretariat

following the meeting with any final suggested changes to the text for their designated HEIs.

- 4.3. Seven sub-panel members left the room during the discussions due to conflicts of interest.

5. Agreeing contents of overview report

- 5.1. The sub-panel discussed Paper 2, comprising the latest draft of Sub-Panel 5's section of the Main Panel A Overview Report. This draft took account of the input from panellists at the previous meeting.
- 5.2. The sub-panel approved the text for the overview report, subject to some final amendments.

6. REF results and publication

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

7. Any other business

- 7.1. The sub-panel chair noted that this was the final meeting of the sub-panel. He thanked all panellists for their invaluable input and hard work throughout the assessment process,
- 7.2. The sub-panel chair expressed his thanks to the deputy chair, the panel adviser and the panel secretary for their support throughout the exercise.
- 7.3. Panellists asked the secretariat to pass on their thanks to the international MPA members for their contributions throughout the exercise.