REF2014
Research Excellence Framework

REF Sub-panel 6: Meeting 1 (Part b)

13th December 2013

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:
Dr Bev Abram (Secretary)
Professor Mark Bailey
Dr Tina Barsby
Ms Katherine Branch (Panel adviser)
Professor Donald Broom
Professor David Church
Professor Peter Clegg
Professor Ian Connerton
Professor Eric Dickinson
Professor Stephen Downes
Professor Christopher Elliott
Professor Julie Fitzpatrick
Mr Mark Fowler
Professor Jack Gauldie (Main panel A member)
Professor Keith Goulding
Professor Laura Green
Professor Lance Lanyon
Professor Duncan Maskell
Dr David Mela
Professor Anne Marie Minihane
Professor Donald Mottram
Professor Bruce Murphy (Main panel A member)
Professor Massimo Palmarini
Professor Euan Phimister
Professor Guy Poppy
Mr Mike Roper
Professor Nigel Scollan
Professor Geoff Simm (Deputy chair)
Professor Alison Smith
Professor Philip John White
Professor Christine Williams (Chair)

Apologies: None received

1.   Introduction and competence to do business

1.1.   Sub-panel members introduced themselves and the Chair welcomed new and international members.

1.2.   The Chair gave a brief introduction to the meeting agenda and presented a comparison of REF/RAE2008 submission statistics for the Agriculture, Veterinary and Food Science sub-panels.

1.3.   In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

1.4.   The Chair discussed concerns regarding the breadth of expertise on the sub-panel and reported that the sub-panel seeks to appoint a replacement member with expertise in veterinary science and an additional member with expertise in plant science. Individuals agreed to contact the secretariat with suggestions for new members. It was also agreed to approach impact assessors for assistance with assessing a small number of outputs.

2.   Conflicts of interest

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

3.   Output calibration

3.1.   The chair reported on the calibration exercise by the main panel, which had met on 11th December 2013, and covered the following issues:
*   Characteristics of outputs that were on the borderline between star levels
*   Comparison of scores by main panel and sub-panel for outputs that had been in the main panel calibration sample
*   Discussion on how the sub-panels could continue to calibrate their assessments beyond this initial exercise.
*   Dealing with audit queries
*   Avoiding the influence of journals and impact factors
*   Resolving discrepant scores between review pairs

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

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

3.4. Sub-panel members had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The secretary displayed the scores and the sub-panel considered how far members had reached a consensus on each output. The sub-panel discussed the particular outputs where scores diverged or where sub-panel members considered the output was on the border of two star levels. Through this discussion the panel agreed on the score for each output and highlighted the reasons for those scores.

4. Output allocation arrangements

4.1. The Chair explained that for the purpose of allocations, sub-panel members would be grouped in to five broad subject areas. Based on this grouping, individual sub-panel members would then be mapped to individual outputs.

4.2. The Chair highlighted that approximately 50% of outputs would be allocated to panel members and output assessors by mid-January 2014. Sub-panel members and output assessors agreed to review their output allocation, identify any issues and bring any queries for discussion to sub-panel meeting 2 on 28th January 2014.

4.3. It was agreed that 50% of outputs would be assessed by 20th March 2014 for review by the secretariat before the next sub-panel meeting on 27th March 2014. The remainder should be assessed by the end of June.

4.4. E-mail/ phone discussion should be used to resolve disputes in scoring. In cases where agreement cannot be reached, sub-panel members should bring the outputs to the secretary/ chair/ deputy-chair who will identify a third reader.

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

5. Future meetings

5.1. A timetable, containing targets for assessment for sub-panel 6 was discussed by the panel.

6.   Any other business

6.1.   Sub-panel members requested that they should whenever possible be booked into the same accommodation on the evening before future meetings. The secretariat encouraged them to indicate their need for accommodation via the Panel Members Website as early as possible.

REF Sub-panel 6: Meeting 2

28th January 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:
Dr Bev Abram (Secretary)
Professor Mark Bailey
Dr Tina Barsby
Ms Katherine Branch (Panel adviser)
Professor Donald Broom
Professor David Church
Professor Peter Clegg
Professor Ian Connerton
Professor Eric Dickinson
Professor Stephen Downes
Professor Christopher Elliott
Professor Julie Fitzpatrick
Mr Mark Fowler
Professor Keith Goulding
Professor Laura Green
Professor Stephen Holgate
Professor Lance Lanyon
Professor Duncan Maskell
Dr David Mela
Professor Anne Marie Minihane
Professor Massimo Palmarini
Professor Euan Phimister
Professor Guy Poppy
Mr Mike Roper
Professor Nigel Scollan
Professor Geoff Simm (Deputy chair)
Professor Alison Smith
Professor Philip White
Professor Christine Williams (Chair)

Apologies: Professor Donald Mottram

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1 The Chair opened the meeting, welcomed members and introduced the Chair of main panel A and a member of the REF team to the meeting.

1.2 The Chair gave a brief introduction to the meeting agenda.

1.3 In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

1.4 The Chair reported that the sub-panel is awaiting the outcome of an offer to recruit an additional member with expertise in veterinary science and that an expert in plant pathology/ecology will be approached in the near future.

2. Conflicts of interest

2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.

2.2. The sub-panel discussed the difference between major and minor conflicts of interest. The Chair encouraged sub-panel members to use a degree of flexibility when making judgements on minor conflicts of interest with allocated outputs. The sub-panel agreed to use a template provided by the secretariat to record both minor conflicts with specific outputs, and outputs outside their area of expertise.

2.3. The sub-panel agreed to send summaries of rejected outputs to the secretary in a timely manner to enable the Chair to make decisions on reallocation or cross referral as soon as possible.

3. IT briefing

3.1. The secretariat presented a brief overview of IT systems to remind the sub-panel about output spreadsheet management, reading lists and user support.

3.2. Attention was drawn to a report on the panel member website designed to facilitate output scoring. It was agreed that the Secretary would circulate instructions on how to use the report to sub-panel members.

4. Output allocations

4.1. The Chair reported that approximately 50% of outputs have been allocated to sub-panel members based on broad subject area followed by mapping to individual areas of expertise.

4.2. Following a discussion on output scoring, it was agreed that panellists will score their outputs before conferring and will resolve any disputes by email/phone

discussion. Where agreement cannot be reached, a third reader will be identified by the secretariat.

4.3. It was agreed to bring the deadline for scoring 50% of outputs forward to 12th March 2014, to allow sufficient time for the secretariat to analyse the data prior to the main panel meeting on 26th March and the sub-panel meeting on 27th March 2014.

5. Citations and contextual data

5.1. The Chair outlined the use of citation data, emphasising that it should be used with caution and only as a positive indicator.

5.2. Attention was drawn to the availability of normalised citations data on the Panel Members Website to assist panellists when scoring outputs.

6. Cross referral

6.1. The Chair outlined the process of cross referral, highlighting that once advice on cross referred outputs is received, it is the responsibility of the requesting panel to enter the final scores on that output.

6.2. The Chair emphasised that cross referrals should be minimal and wherever possible outputs will be assessed within the panel.

6.3. It was agreed that if both panellists are unable to assess an output, the output will be cross referred to another panel.

6.4. The Chair advised panel members to inform the secretary if, when reviewing their output allocation, they consider an area of expertise is missing within the panel.

6.5. The Chair requested that panel members be flexible in agreeing to review outputs cross referred from other panels.

7. Panel instigated audit

7.1. The Chair reported that sample-based audits within institutions are already taking place.

7.2. The Chair highlighted that the REF team will limit impact case audit queries to approximately 5-10% of impact case studies. The sub-panel agreed that once case study allocations are received, members will review their cases and identify any obvious candidates for audit.

7.3. A discussion on multiple-authored outputs included the following issues;

- Outputs should be scored based on the quality of the paper.
- It is the responsibility of the author HEI to provide a statement that is sufficiently robust to justify a substantial contribution of the author on that paper.
- It was agreed that the panel will rely on trust of the HEI statements, however if in doubt, or if the statement is missing, contact the secretary to raise an audit query to request more information.
- Following audit query, if the author contribution is not considered significant, a score of unclassified will be given to the output.

7.4   The secretariat agreed to provide examples of multi-authored outputs for discussion at the next meeting

8.   Project plan and future meetings

8.1   A timetable containing target dates for assessment for sub-panel 6 was discussed and agreed by the panel.

8.2   The chair outlined items for discussion at the next meeting

9.   Any other business
None reported.

REF Sub-panel 6: Meeting 3

27th March 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Dr Bev Abram (Secretary)

Professor Mark Bailey

Dr Tina Barsby

Ms Katherine Branch (Panel adviser)

Professor Donald Broom

Professor David Church

Professor Peter Clegg

Professor Ian Connerton

Dr Nick Coulson

Professor Eric Dickinson

Professor Stephen Downes

Professor Christopher Elliott

Dr Helen Ferrier

Professor Julie Fitzpatrick

Mr Mark Fowler

Professor Keith Goulding

Professor Laura Green

Mr Brian Harris (Main panel A observer)

Professor Lance Lanyon

Professor Duncan Maskell

Dr David Mela

Professor Anne Marie Minihane

Professor Donald Mottram

Professor Bruce Murphy (Main panel A member)

Professor Massimo Palmarini

Professor Euan Phimister

Professor Guy Poppy

Mr Mike Roper

Professor Nigel Scollan

Professor Geoff Simm (Deputy chair)

Professor Alison Smith

Professor Frans Van der Ouderra (Main panel A member)

Professor Philip White

Professor Tim Wheeler
Professor Christine Williams (Chair)

Apologies: Dr Jonathon Brooks, Professor Peter Mills, Professor Steven Walker, Mr Alisdair Wotherspoon.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1. Sub-panel members introduced themselves and the Chair welcomed new sub-panel members, impact assessors and representatives from main panel A.

1.2. The Chair gave a brief introduction to the agenda and outlined the key aims of the meeting.

1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

2.1. The minutes were accepted as a true representation of the previous meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest, and confirmed they were correct. The Chair requested that panellists update any new major conflicts of interest via the panel member website.

3.2. The Chair outlined the difference between major and minor conflicts of interest and reminded members to absent themselves from the room when discussing assessment of an item with which they have a major conflict of interest unless the discussion is not directly related to scoring, whereby sub-panel members can remain in the room but should refrain from contributing to the discussion of that item.

4. Audit

4.1. The Chair outlined the output audit process and encouraged members to raise concerns on outputs with the secretary who will make a recommendation on whether to proceed with an audit query. The Chair reminded the sub-panel to raise precise questions for audit.

4.2. The Chair reported that information missing from the outputs spreadsheet due to technical errors in the submission upload process had been resolved and the information would be available to panellists in due course. (One sub-panel member left the room for this item).

4.3. Examples of recent audit queries were presented and a general discussion on output audit followed covering issues of co-authorship, incorrect papers provided, missing or incomplete author contribution statements and eligibility.
(Two sub-panel members left the room for this item).

4.4. The Chair reported that 30% of staff submitted to the REF had claimed a reduction in the number of outputs. The Chair encouraged the sub-panel to raise concerns about staff eligibility/defined circumstances with the panel secretary who will make a recommendation on whether an audit is required.

5. Output scoring and reminder of the timetable for output assessment

5.1. The Chair thanked the panel for their work on scoring outputs to date and reported that over 50% of outputs have been scored by 2 panellists, of which 45% had agreement on score.

5.2. The Chair reminded the panel about the REF criteria for assessing the quality of outputs. The secretary displayed the overall sub-panel scoring profile to date, comparative data with the other sub-panels within main panel A and analysis by research groupings within the sub-panel.

5.3. A summary of individual scoring distributions was circulated and discussed by the sub-panel. It was agreed that it was helpful to compare individual scoring profiles and requested that the secretary provide an update on individual scoring distributions and scoring data to panellists every two weeks until the output assessment is completed.

5.4. The sub-panel discussed quality control with respect to output scoring.

5.5. The Chair reminded panellists to score cross referred items within the time scale requested by the referring sub-panel.

5.6. The Chair reminded the sub- panel that 75% of outputs should be scored by the May meeting and 100% by the July meeting.

6. Assessment of impact

6.1. The Chair explained the process for allocation of impact case studies and impact templates to the sub-panel and reminded members that impact accounts for 20 % of the overall REF score. The sub-panel were advised to read the relevant sections of the REF 'guidance on submissions' and 'panel criteria' for assessing impact and were reminded that impact case studies are confidential documents and should not be discussed outside the sub-panel.

6.2. The Chair advised that impact case studies should be self-contained and to ensure fairness, judgements should be based on what has been provided in the

submission. Panellists should score impact items on the (0-4*) scale but may use 'half marks' for borderline cases.

6.3. The secretariat provided a briefing on the threshold criteria for impact, including a checklist to help panellists work through the required elements..

6.4. The panel adviser outlined the impact audit query process and confirmed that further information about impact itself cannot be requested however audit queries can be raised:
- To request further information if a panellist suspects the threshold criteria have not been met or there is insufficient information to make a judgement on threshold criteria
- To request corroboration of a claim made about impact, where a panellist doubts the veracity of a key claim.
- Access to the underpinning outputs where a panellist doubts that the quality is predominantly of 2* quality.

6.5. The sub-panel noted that the REF team will audit 5-10% case studies submitted to each sub-panel and have asked the sub-panels to distinguish between 'high priority 'and 'low priority' cases for audit. The Chair requested that members skim read, but not score, their allocated case studies and impact templates and notify the secretary of any specific items identified for audit or any minor conflicts of interest by the 1st May 2014.

6.6. The Chair advised that when evaluating impact templates, the sub-panel should assess the unit's approach to enabling impact during the REF period and its strategy and plans for the future in terms of the extent to which they are conducive to achieving impact. The Chair confirmed that impact templates will be discussed at the July meetings and should be scored on the same scale as case studies (0-4 with 'half marks'). The panel were encouraged to read templates associated with their case studies even if the template has not been allocated to their reading list.

6.7. The Chair outlined the plan for the sub-panel impact calibration exercise. The Chair reported that impact calibration paperwork will be emailed to panellists following the meeting and requested that they read the required items and send scores to the panel secretary by 1st May 2014, adding that half marks can be used to score impact.

7.   Allocation of environment statements

7.1   The Chair reminded the sub-panel that environment statements contribute 15% of the overall REF score and outlined the allocation process for environment templates. The Chair advised that environment statements will be allocated as soon as possible for discussion at the September meeting. The Chair encouraged

the sub-panel to read environment statements in addition to those allocated to them in order to familiarise themselves with environment assessment.

8.   Any other business

None reported.

9.   Date of next meeting and reminder of future meetings

9.1.   The Chair drew attention to the meeting schedule and informed the panel that the next meeting will take place from 19th -21st May 2014 at AUMS, Aston University and will comprise 2 days of discussion on outputs and 1 day for discussion of impact and the impact calibration exercise.

9.2.   The Chair thanked the panel for all of their work to date.

REF Sub-panel 6: Meeting 4 Part 1

19-20 May 2014

Conference Aston Meeting Suites, Aston University, Aston Street,

Birmingham, B4 7ET

Minutes

Present:

Professor Mark Bailey
Dr Tina Barsby
Ms Katherine Branch (Panel adviser)
Professor Donald Broom
Professor David Church (20 May only)
Professor Peter Clegg
Professor Ian Connerton
Dr Nick Coulson
Professor Eric Dickinson
Professor Stephen Downes
Professor Christopher Elliott
Dr Helen Ferrier (20 May only)
Professor Julie Fitzpatrick
Mr Mark Fowler
Professor Keith Goulding
Professor Laura Green
Dr Jane Hallett (Secretary)
Professor Stephen Holgate (Main panel A chair) (19 May only)
Dr Vicky Jones (Deputy REF Manager) (19 May only)
Professor Lance Lanyon
Professor Duncan Maskell
Dr David Mela
Professor Peter Mills
Professor Anne Marie Minihane
Professor Donald Mottram
Professor Bruce Murphy (Main panel A member)
Professor Massimo Palmarini
Professor Euan Phimister
Professor Guy Poppy
Mr Mike Roper
Professor Nigel Scollan

Professor Geoff Simm (Deputy chair)
Professor Alison Smith
Professor Philip John White
Professor Christine Williams (Chair)
Mr Alisdair Wotherspoon (20 May only)

Apologies:

None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1. The Chair opened the meeting, welcomed members and introduced the two members of Main Panel A, the new sub-panel member and the new sub-panel secretary to the meeting.

1.2. The Chair gave a brief introduction to the meeting agenda.

1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1. The minutes were accepted as a true representation of the previous meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest, and confirmed they were correct. The Chair requested that members update any new major conflicts of interest via the Panel Members' Website.

3.2. The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room when discussing assessment of an item with which they have a major conflict of interest unless the discussion is not directly related to scoring, whereby sub-panel members can remain in the room but should refrain from contributing to the discussion of that item.

4. Audit

4.1. The Chair updated members on the number of audits that had been raised, how many had been completed and how many were still outstanding.

4.2. The sub-panel agreed that the Executive Group should review all audit responses, to ensure consistency across the sub-panel.

5. Output assessment to date

5.1. The Chair updated members on the percentage of outputs that had been scored by at least one member, and the percentage of outputs that had agreed scores. The aim by the end of Part 1 of the current meeting was for the sub-panel to have agreed scores on 75% of the outputs.

5.2. The Chair presented an analysis of the current output profile for the sub-panel, relative to Main Panel A, and broken down by research areas.

6. Output speed dating session 1

6.1. The Chair invited members to use the output speed dating session to agree scores for each output without a previously agreed score in scoring pairs, and to re-visit previously agreed scores as necessary.

6.2. The Chair reminded members to upload their personal spreadsheets to the Panel Members' Website, and to report any revised agreed scores to the Panel Secretariat.

7. Discussion on specific outputs

7.1. The Chair welcomed the two Impact Assessors who had joined the meeting, and gave a recap of the previous day's business, including an update on the percentage of outputs with agreed scores and the resulting output profile for the sub-panel, which had been updated by the Panel Secretariat since the close of the previous day's business.

7.2. The Chair invited discussion on common issues faced by members when scoring outputs, including raising audits, author attribution and review articles. The Chair reminded members to employ a consistent approach to these issues when scoring outputs.

7.3. The sub-panel reviewed the output audit responses received to date. Members with a major conflict of interest absented themselves from the room for the discussion of outputs on which they were conflicted. Eleven sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

7.4. The sub-panel agreed that the Executive Group should review all decisions to award an unclassified rating to outputs.

8. Output speed dating session 2

8.1. The Chair invited members to use the second output speed dating session to agree scores for each output without a previously agreed score in scoring pairs, and to re-visit previously agreed scores as necessary.

8.2.   The Chair reminded members that scores should be agreed for 100% of the outputs before the next meeting of the sub-panel in July 2014.

9.   Overview reports and feedback statements

9.1.   The Chair outlined the overview reports and feedback statements that the sub-panel is expected to produce. Overview reports will be made public, and are intended to provide feedback both to the sector and to the funding bodies. Main Panel A will collate information from across the sub-panels and provide a description of process in the overview reports. Additionally, the sub-panel will need to provide confidential feedback statements to each HEI containing concise feedback statements on each individual submission. The Panel Secretariat will require input from members in order to compile the feedback statements.

9.2.   The Chair suggested that sub-panel will need to share collective intelligence on each institution.

9.3.   The Chair reminded members of the timetable for the sign-off of feedback statements.

10.   Future meeting schedule- outputs, impact and environment

10.1.   The sub-panel reviewed the future meeting schedule, and noted that 100% scoring of outputs, impact case studies and impact templates would need to be completed by the next meeting of the sub-panel in July 2014.

10.2.   Following discussion of the timetable for scoring of impact, the sub-panel agreed to amend the schedule for the July 2014 meeting to allow more time for discussion of impact and agreeing impact scores at the meeting.

11.   Any other business and close

11.1.   The Chair thanked the sub-panel, especially the Output Assessors who would not attend Part 2 of the meeting.

REF Sub-panel 6: Meeting 4 Part 2

21 May 2014

Conference Aston Meeting Suites, Aston University, Aston Street, Birmingham, B4 7ET

Minutes

Present:

Dr Tina Barsby
Ms Katherine Branch (Panel adviser)
Dr Jonathon Brooks
Professor David Church
Professor Peter Clegg
Professor Ian Connerton
Dr Nick Coulson
Professor Eric Dickinson
Professor Christopher Elliott
Dr Helen Ferrier
Professor Julie Fitzpatrick
Mr Mark Fowler
Professor Keith Goulding
Professor Laura Green
Dr Jane Hallett (Secretary)
Professor Lance Lanyon
Professor Duncan Maskell
Professor Anne Marie Minihane
Professor Donald Mottram
Professor Bruce Murphy (Main panel A member)
Professor Massimo Palmarini
Professor Euan Phimister
Professor Guy Poppy
Mr Mike Roper
Professor Geoff Simm (Deputy chair)
Professor Alison Smith
Professor Frans Van der Ouderra (Main panel A member)
Professor Tim Wheeler
Professor Christine Williams (Chair)
Mr Alisdair Wotherspoon

Apologies:

Professor Steven Walker

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1. The Chair opened the meeting, and introduced the Main Panel A members, and the two Impact Assessors who had joined Part 2 of the meeting.

1.2. The Chair gave a brief introduction to the meeting agenda.

1.3. The Chair provided a brief recap of the business covered in Part 1 of the meeting, and updated members on the percentage of outputs with agreed scores and the output sub-profile to date.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1. The minutes were accepted as a true representation of the previous meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest, and confirmed they were correct. The Chair requested that members update any new major conflicts of interest via the Panel Members' Website.

3.2. The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room when discussing assessment of an item with which they have a major conflict of interest unless the discussion is not directly related to scoring, whereby sub-panel members can remain in the room but should refrain from contributing to the discussion of that item.

4. Audit – Impact case studies

4.1. The Chair re-iterated the REF guidance that impact case studies should be self-contained and should include all the information needed to make judgements, without gathering additional material. The only additional information that should be used to inform the assessment of an impact case study is information obtained through an audit.

4.2. The Chair outlined the scope and procedures for auditing impact case studies and reminded the sub-panel of the expectation that between 5% and 10% of impact case studies should be audited.

4.3.   The Chair reminded members of the need to identify potential impact case studies for audit to the Panel Secretariat very soon.

5.   Impact calibration exercise

5.1.   The Deputy Chair introduced the impact calibration exercise and reminded members that they should absent themselves from the room in advance of discussion of any impact case studies on which they had a major conflict of interest.

5.2.   The sub-panel discussed each of the impact case studies included in the impact calibration exercise in turn. Members with a major conflict of interest absented themselves from the room for the discussion of impact case studies on which they were conflicted. Six sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

5.3.   The Chair invited members to highlight key lessons learned from the assessment of the impact calibration sample.

6.   Future meeting schedule - outputs, impact and environment

6.1.   The sub-panel discussed the logistics of finalising scores for impact case studies at the July 2014 meeting, and invited the Panel Secretariat to develop a process that embodies the spirit of involvement.

6.2.   The Chair confirmed that the split of the July 2014 meeting would be two days to finalise output scores, followed by three days to finalise impact scores, and that the Panel Secretariat would amend the meeting schedule accordingly.

7.   Any other business and close

7.1.   The Chair reminded members that the next meeting will take place on 14-18 July at Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon.

7.2.   The Chair thanked members for all of their work over the three days of the meeting.

REF Sub-panel 6: Meeting 5 Part 1

14-15 July 2014

Ettington Chase, Banbury Road, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon, CV37 7NZ

Minutes

Present:

Professor Mark Bailey (14 July only)
Professor Alan Barrett (Main panel A member) (14 July only)
Dr Tina Barsby
Ms Katherine Branch (Panel adviser)
Professor Donald Broom
Professor David Church
Professor Peter Clegg
Professor Ian Connerton
Dr Nick Coulson
Professor Eric Dickinson
Professor Stephen Downes
Professor Christopher Elliott
Dr Helen Ferrier (15 July only)
Professor Julie Fitzpatrick
Mr Mark Fowler
Professor Laura Green
Dr Jane Hallett (Secretary)
Professor Stephen Holgate (Main panel A chair)
Professor Lance Lanyon
Professor Duncan Maskell
Dr David Mela
Professor Peter Mills (14 July only)
Professor Anne Marie Minihane
Professor Donald Mottram
Professor Massimo Palmarini (15 July only)
Professor Euan Phimister
Professor Guy Poppy
Mr Mike Roper
Professor Nigel Scollan
Professor Geoff Simm (Deputy chair)
Professor Alison Smith

Professor Philip John White
Professor Christine Williams (Chair)
Mr Alisdair Wotherspoon (15 July only)

Apologies:

Professor Keith Goulding

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1.   The Chair opened the meeting, welcomed members and introduced the two members of Main Panel A.

1.2.   The Chair gave a brief introduction to the meeting agenda.

1.3.   In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1.   The minutes were accepted as a true representation of the previous meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1.   The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest, and confirmed they were correct. The Chair requested that members update any new major conflicts of interest via the Panel Members' Website.

3.2.   The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room, and sign the declaration of interest sheet when discussing assessment of an item with which they have a major conflict of interest unless the discussion is not directly related to scoring, whereby sub-panel members can remain in the room but should refrain from contributing to the discussion of that item.

4. Audit – individual staff circumstances

4.1.   The Chair reminded the panel that all individual staff circumstances were returned as either clearly defined or complex and that the sub-panel is responsible for decisions relating to clearly defined circumstances submitted, with the Equalities and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) reviewing complex circumstances.

4.2.   The sub-panel agreed that responsibility for making recommendations for staff with clearly defined circumstances was delegated to the Executive Group for SP6.

5.   Developing and recommending quality profiles

5.1.   The Chair provided a summary of the requirements of the sub-panel to develop and recommend a quality sub-profile for each of the three elements – outputs, impact and environment, and the timetable that will be followed.

6.   Environment assessment

6.1.   The Chair led a discussion of the issues arising during environment assessment and the factors affecting the quality judgement, and reminded the sub-panel that there is no expectation that the environment element will relate to a single department of an institution.

6.2.   The Chair explained in detail the format of the student and finance data provided by institutions, and reminded the sub-panel that this data underpins the environment statement.

6.3.   The Chair facilitated a plenary discussion on scoring each element of the two example environment templates that had been provided to sub-panel members in advance of the meeting.

6.4.   The Chair reminded sub-panel members of the requirement to score the environment statements allocated to them and to upload their personal spreadsheets to the Panel Members' Website by the end of August.

7.   Feedback statements

7.1.   The Chair provided an oral update on the discussion of feedback at Main Panel A, and invited to discuss their approach to providing feedback to institutions.

8.   Future meeting schedule

8.1.   The Chair outlined the future meeting schedule and confirmed that the next sub-panel meeting would focus on environment assessment and feedback statements.

9.   Output assessment

9.1.   The Chair welcomed the output assessors who had joined the meeting.

9.2.   The Chair updated members on the percentage of outputs that had agreed scores, and presented an analysis of the current output profile for the sub-panel.

10.   Output speed dating

10.1.   The Chair invited members to use the output speed dating session to agree scores for each output without a previously agreed score in scoring pairs, and to re-visit previously agreed scores as necessary.

10.2.   The Chair reminded members to upload their personal spreadsheets to the Panel Members' Website, and to report any revised agreed scores to the Panel Secretariat.

11.   Any other business and close

11.1.   The Chair thanked members, especially the output assessors for their final meeting.

REF Sub-panel 6: Meeting 5 Part 2

15-18 July 2014

Ettington Chase, Banbury Road, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon, CV37 7NZ

Minutes

Present:

Professor Alan Barrett (Main panel A member)
Dr Tina Barsby
Ms Katherine Branch (Panel adviser)
Dr Jonathon Brooks (17-18 July only)
Professor David Church (15, 17-18 July only)
Professor Peter Clegg
Professor Ian Connerton
Dr Nick Coulson
Professor Eric Dickinson
Professor Christopher Elliott
Dr Helen Ferrier
Professor Julie Fitzpatrick
Mr Mark Fowler
Professor Laura Green (15-17 July only)
Dr Jane Hallett (Secretary)
Professor Stephen Holgate (Main panel A chair) (15-16 July only)
Professor Lance Lanyon
Professor Duncan Maskell (15-17 July only)
Professor Anne Marie Minihane
Professor Donald Mottram
Professor Massimo Palmarini
Professor Euan Phimister
Professor Guy Poppy (15-17 July only)
Mr Mike Roper (15-17 July only)
Professor Geoff Simm (Deputy chair)
Professor Alison Smith
Professor Steven Walker
Professor Tim Wheeler (17 July only)
Professor Christine Williams (Chair)
Mr Alisdair Wotherspoon

Apologies:

Professor Keith Goulding

1.   Introduction and competence to do business

1.1.   The Chair opened Part 2 of the meeting, and gave a brief introduction to the meeting agenda.

1.2.   In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2.   Impact assessment

2.1.   The Chair presented an analysis of the current sub-panel profiles for impact case studies and impact templates, based on individual scores, and led a discussion on scoring.

3.   Impact templates discussion

3.1.   The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room when discussing assessment of impact templates with which they have a major conflict of interest and to sign the conflict of interest register outside the door.

3.2.   The Deputy Chair led full-panel discussion and scoring of the impact templates for each institution, in a randomised order. Twenty sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

4.   Impact case study discussions

4.1.   The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room when discussing assessment of impact case studies with which they have a major conflict of interest and to sign the conflict of interest register outside the door.

4.2.   The Chair and Deputy Chair led full-panel discussion and scoring the impact case studies in a randomised order. Twenty-one sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

5.   Produce draft output profiles

5.1.   The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room for the draft output profiles for which they have a major conflict of interest, and to sign the conflict of interest register outside the door.

5.2.   The Panel Advisor displayed the draft output profiles that would be recommended to Main Panel A for each institution. Sixteen sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

6.   Produce draft impact profiles

6.1.   The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room for the draft impact profiles for which they have a major conflict of interest, and to sign the conflict of interest register outside the door.

6.2.   The Panel Advisor displayed the draft impact profiles that would be recommended to Main Panel A for each institution. Sixteen sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

7.   Any other business and close

7.1.   The Chair thanked members for all of their work over the five days of the meeting, especially the impact assessors for their final meeting.

7.2.   The Chair reminded members that the next meeting will take place on 9-11 September in Birmingham.

7.3.   The Chair reminded sub-panel members of the requirement to score the environment statements allocated to them and to upload their personal spreadsheets to the Panel Members' Website by the end of August.

REF Sub-panel 6: Meeting 6

9-10 September 2014

The Studio, 7 Cannon Street, Birmingham, B2 5EP

Minutes

Present:

Professor Alan Barrett (Main panel A member)
Dr Tina Barsby
Ms Katherine Branch (Panel adviser)
Professor David Church
Professor Peter Clegg
Professor Ian Connerton
Dr Nick Coulson
Professor Eric Dickinson
Professor Christopher Elliott
Professor Julie Fitzpatrick
Professor Laura Green
Professor Trisha Greenhalgh (Main panel A member) (9 September only)
Dr Jane Hallett (Secretary)
Professor Lance Lanyon
Professor Duncan Maskell
Professor Anne Marie Minihane
Professor Massimo Palmarini
Professor Euan Phimister
Mr Mike Roper
Professor Geoff Simm (Deputy chair)
Professor Alison Smith
Professor Christine Williams (Chair)

Apologies:

Mr Mark Fowler
Professor Keith Goulding
Professor Donald Mottram
Professor Guy Poppy

1.   Introduction and competence to do business

1.1.   The Chair opened the meeting, welcomed members and introduced Professor Trisha Greenhalgh, Deputy Chair of Main Panel A.

1.2.   The Chair gave a brief introduction to the meeting agenda.

1.3.   In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2.   Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1.   The minutes were accepted as a true representation of the previous meeting.

3.   Conflicts of interest

3.1.   The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest, and confirmed they were correct. The Chair requested that members update any new major conflicts of interest via the Panel Members' Website.

3.2.   The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room, and sign the declaration of interest sheet during assessment of an item with which they have a major conflict of interest, unless the discussion is not directly related to scoring.

3.3.   In relation to the assessment of environment templates, the Chair advised that sub-panel members should refrain from contributing to the discussion if there is specific mention of their home institution, but that they can remain in the room.

4.   Environment assessment

4.1.   The Chair provided a summary of environment assessment to date for the sub-panel, and reminded the sub-panel of the criteria of vitality and sustainability.

4.2.   The Chair and Deputy Chair led full-panel discussion and scoring of the environment templates, in a randomised order. Eighteen sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

5.   Environment profiles

5.1.   The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room for the draft environment profiles, and later for the draft overall profiles, for which they have a major conflict of interest, and to sign the conflict of interest register.

5.2. The Panel Advisor displayed the draft environment profiles that would be recommended to Main Panel A for each institution. Sixteen sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

6. Feedback statements

6.1. The Chair reminded panel members that each institution will receive a feedback statement covering the three areas of the submission, outputs, impact and environment.

6.2. The Panel Advisor displayed the three draft sub-profiles for outputs, impact and environment, along with the draft overall profile for each institution. Sixteen sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

6.3. The Chair outlined the process for writing consistent feedback statements, and encouraged sub-panel members to forward their notes relating to feedback to the Panel Secretariat.

7. Future meeting schedule

7.1. The Chair outlined the future meeting schedule and confirmed that the next sub-panel meeting on 9 October 2014 would focus on feedback statements and the overview report.

8. Any other business and close

8.1. The Chair thanked sub-panel members for all of their work to date.

REF Sub-panel 6: Meeting 7

9 October 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, Aldersgate House, 135-137 Aldersgate Street, London EC1A 4JA

Minutes

Present:

Dr Tina Barsby
Ms Katherine Branch (Panel adviser)
Professor David Church
Professor Peter Clegg
Professor Ian Connerton
Dr Nick Coulson
Professor Eric Dickinson
Professor Christopher Elliott
Professor Julie Fitzpatrick
Professor Keith Goulding
Professor Laura Green
Dr Jane Hallett (Secretary)
Mr Brian Harris (Main panel A observer)
Professor Stephen Holgate (Main panel A chair)
Professor Lance Lanyon
Professor Anne Marie Minihane
Professor Donald Mottram
Professor Massimo Palmarini
Professor Euan Phimister
Professor Guy Poppy
Mr Mike Roper
Professor Geoff Simm (Deputy chair)
Professor Alison Smith
Professor Christine Williams (Chair)

Apologies:

Mr Mark Fowler
Professor Duncan Maskell

1.   Introduction and competence to do business

1.1.   The Chair opened the meeting, welcomed sub-panel members, Professor Stephen Holgate, Chair of Main Panel A and Mr Brian Harris, Main Panel A observer.

1.2.   The Chair gave a brief introduction to the meeting agenda.

1.3.   In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2.   Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1.   The minutes were accepted as a true representation of the previous meeting.

3.   Conflicts of interest

3.1.   The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest, and confirmed they were correct.

3.2.   The Chair reminded members to absent themselves from the room for the draft feedback statements for which they have a major conflict of interest, and to sign the conflict of interest register outside the door.

4.   Profiles

4.1.   The Chair provided a summary of the discussion of environment profiles from the last meeting of Main Panel A, including consistency between the three elements of submissions, and the level of granularity of scoring.

4.2.   The Chair outlined the review process that a representative, non-conflicted group of sub-panel members had undertaken since the last sub-panel meeting to ensure that there is sufficient granularity of scoring across the full range.

4.3.   The Panel Adviser presented a summary of the quality profiles for the sub-panel, alongside the summary profiles for Main Panel A as a whole.

5.   Feedback statements

5.1.   The Chair reminded panel members that feedback to institutions should be as consistent as possible.

5.2.   The Chair and Deputy Chair led a full-panel review of the draft feedback statements for each institution. Seventeen sub-panel members left the room during this part of the meeting due to conflicts of interest.

6. Overview report

6.1. The Chair invited sub-panel members to discuss the draft overview report, circulated previously by email.

6.2. General points of discussion included:
- The submission of world-leading outputs and impacts to the sub-panel;
- Investment by institutions despite a lack of external funding;
- Concern about the long-term sustainability of the sector in terms of people;
- Concern about the growing demands on the sector, but the diminishing resource.

6.3. The Chair requested further specific input from sub-panel members relating to the veterinary, agriculture and food sectors.

7. Release of results

7.1. The Panel Adviser outlined the timetable and process for the release of REF results and previewed a mock-up of the results website and comparative data that will be available.

7.2. The Panel Adviser reminded sub-panel members that the REF results are absolutely confidential until publication and that sub-panel members should not share any aspect of the results prior to publication. After the publication of results, sub-panel members may discuss information in the public domain which includes the results themselves and the overview reports, but not the feedback reports which are confidential to institutions.

7.3. The Panel Adviser clarified that if sub-panel members have any queries regarding responding to questions about the REF, they should contact the REF Team.

8. Any other business and close

8.1. The Chair reminded sub-panel members of her request for volunteers to participate in REF panel member feedback on panel process by attending two feedback meetings on 28 November 2014 and 23 January 2015.

8.2. The Chair reminded members to leave their encrypted USB pens with the secretariat at the end of the meeting.

8.3. The Chair thanked sub-panel members for conducting their work with rigour and good-humour, and the sub-panel secretariat for their support.

8.4. The Deputy Chair thanked the Chair, and this was echoed by Professor Stephen Holgate, Chair of Main Panel A, who also thanked sub-panel members.