

REF Sub-panel 8: Meeting 1b

8 January 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Michael Ashfold	Paul Madden
Kate Bishop (acting secretary)	Chris Moody
Richard Catlow (chair)	David O'Hagan
Peter Costigan	Annie Powell
Matthew Davidson	Emma Raven
Andrew deMello	Allyson Reed
Sabine Flitsch	David Rees
Andrew Harrison	Matt Rosseinsky
Christopher Hunter	Jeremy Sanders
Graham Hutchings (deputy chair)	Dominic Tildesley
Alastair Lewis	

Walter Henning (main panel international member) attended for item 4 onwards.

Apologies:

Phil Bartlett	Madeline McKerchar (secretary)
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, particularly the new members, and introduced the agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. The panel reviewed the register of its declared major conflicts of interest. The chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise through the panel members' website (PMW).

- 2.2. The panel discussed the circumstances that could constitute a minor conflict of interest. It was agreed that panellists should notify the chair and secretary of such interests, and that in each case the chair would decide what effect the minor interest should have on a panel member's participation in the assessment.

3. Output calibration

- 3.1. The chair reported that the sample of 20 outputs which had been circulated to panellists and output assessors in advance of the meeting for the calibration exercise had been selected so as to avoid major conflicts of interest for panellists. Ten of the outputs had also been used for the Main Panel B calibration exercise.
- 3.2. Panellists were advised that the aims of the calibration exercise were to: develop a common understanding of the star levels; agree specific scores for the outputs in the calibration sample; and to form a consensus on how outputs could be assessed equitably.
- 3.3. The scores for each output were reviewed and discussed with reference to the characteristics of the quality levels provided in the criteria document and how these might be applied to determine a final score for outputs where scores diverged or panellists considered that the output was on the borderline between star levels. Through this discussion the panel agreed a score for each output and highlighted the reasons for those scores, with reference to the level descriptors.
- 3.4. The panel reviewed the overall score profile of the calibration outputs and the chair asked panellists to reflect on their scores and how they aligned with those agreed by the panel.
- 3.5. The chair reported the key points from the Main Panel B output calibration exercise which had taken place on 7 January 2014. Panellists noted the relevant main panel agreed scores and the reasons for any differences with those agreed by the sub-panel.
- 3.6. Panellists were reminded that they should not make use of journal impact factors, rankings or lists, or the perceived standing of the publisher, in assessing the quality of research outputs ('*Panel criteria and working methods*', REF 01.2012, Part 1, paragraph 53).
- 3.7. The chair confirmed that panellists would be provided with citation data and suggested that any suspected issues with the data should be referred to him.
- 3.8. Panellists were instructed that the agreed scores must be discarded following the calibration exercise and the outputs assessed in the same way as all others.

4. Output allocation arrangements

- 4.1. The chair confirmed that instructions on how to access the outputs had been sent to all panellists. He reported that outputs with authors whose surnames begin with letters A-C had been allocated and that this equated to approximately 20 per cent of all outputs submitted to Unit of Assessment 8: Chemistry. Panellists noted that the rest of the outputs would be allocated by the end of the month.
- 4.2. The chair outlined the proposed methodology for dealing with discrepancies in scores between panellists.
- 4.3. Panellists were invited to review their outputs in alphabetical order by submitting author, and were asked not to assess outputs other than those from authors whose names begin with the letters A-C until after the next meeting.

5. IT systems briefing

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

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. The meeting schedule was received and noted.
- 6.2. The date of the next meeting was confirmed and panellists noted that they should have reviewed 20 per cent of their outputs by this stage.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 8: Meeting 2

Thursday 6 February 2014

Aston Business School Conference Centre, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Michael Ashfold
Phil Bartlett
Richard Catlow (Chair)
Matthew Davidson
Lesley Dinsdale (Adviser)
Sabine Flitsch
Andrew Harrison
Graham Hutchings (Deputy Chair)
Alastair Lewis

Madeline McKerchar (Secretary)
Chris Moody
David O'Hagan
Emma Raven
Allyson Reed
David Rees
Matt Rosseinsky
Jeremy Sanders
Dominic Tildesley

Apologies:

Andrew deMello
Christopher Hunter

Paul Madden
Annie Powell

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda, noting that the main item of business was to review the output assessment to date.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP8.2.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct (SP8.2.2).
- 3.2. The Chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.
- 3.3. Panellists noted that further guidance on major and minor conflicts was now available on the panel members' website and that they would be prompted to regenerate their spreadsheets should their allocation change due to minor conflicts of interest.

4. Update on cross-referrals

- 4.1. The Chair advised panellists that outputs would only be cross-referred in exceptional circumstances where the panel had determined that it did not have the appropriate expertise to reach a robust judgement. It was noted that one output had been cross-referred to SP7: Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences.
- 4.2. The panel noted that guidance on the cross-referral process was available on the panel members' website, but that in the first instance they should contact the Chair and Secretary to discuss any potential cross-referrals.
- 4.3. The Chair reported that requests for SP8 to provide advisory scores for several outputs had been received from SP9: Physics and SP7: Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences. The panel agreed to accept the incoming cross-referrals.

5. Review of output scores

- 5.1. The Chair reported that interim scores had been recorded for the first 20 per cent of outputs and thanked panellists for returning their scores by the deadline.
- 5.2. The panel reviewed profiles for each of the assessor's scores to date in comparison with the whole submission. The Secretary agreed to circulate the assessor analysis report for information
- 5.3. Panellists were advised that a new report had been issued which would enable them to see other panellists' scores for outputs that they had scored. It was agreed that panellists should review their scores where there was a significant divergence for a particular output. In such cases it was agreed that panellists should contact each other to agree a score.

6. Update on individual staff circumstances

- 6.1. Panellists noted that the Secretary would review the submitted information on clearly defined individual staff circumstances to check compliance with the criteria. They noted that she would bring proposed decisions to future meetings and that consequently panellists did not need to raise audit queries on staff circumstances.
- 6.2. It was noted that the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel would review all submitted information on complex staff circumstances in confidence and would report the decisions to the Chair in April.

7. Audit briefing

- 7.1. The Adviser presented a summary of the audits that the REF team and Secretariat would undertake and gave a brief introduction to panel-instigated audits.
- 7.2. Panellists were advised that all audit requests should be submitted via the Secretary and that further guidance on audit and data verification was now available on the panel members' website.
- 7.3. It was noted that the outcomes of audit requests would be a standing item on future agendas.

8. Preparation for impact assessment

- 8.1. The Chair briefed panellists on plans for the impact case study calibration exercise and the rationale for the allocation of impact case studies.
- 8.2. Panellists were advised that a briefing paper on assessing impact would be circulated shortly and that, while the impact assessment would not get fully underway until after Meeting 4, they would need to review the calibration sample in advance and look at their allocated case studies to identify any minor conflicts of interests, general issues for discussion at the meeting or audit queries.

9. Project plan and future meetings

- 9.1. A project plan that outlined the business for forthcoming meetings and what needed to be done between meetings was received and reviewed (SP8.2.3).

- 9.2. The panel approved the project plan and noted the deadlines for various tasks. In particular it was noted that they should have uploaded 50 per cent of their output scores by 19.03.14 and the remaining 50 per cent by 22.05.14.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 8: Meeting 3

Thursday 27 March 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Michael Ashfold	Paul Madden
Phil Bartlett	Madeline McKerchar (Secretary)
Richard Catlow (Chair)	David O'Hagan
Andrew deMello	Annie Powell
Lesley Dinsdale (Adviser)	Allyson Reed
Sabine Flitsch	Matt Rosseinsky
Christopher Hunter	Jeremy Sanders
Graham Hutchings (Deputy Chair)	Dominic Tildesley
Alastair Lewis	

Chris Moody, Emma Raven and David Rees attended for items 1-8.

Dave Allen, Colin Harrison and Pelham Hawker attended for items 9-10. Jim Al-Khalili attended an impact briefing with SP9 (Physics).

Apologies:

Matthew Davidson
Andrew Harrison

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda, noting that the main items of business were to review the output assessment to date and to receive a briefing on impact assessment.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP8.3.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. One addition was noted to the panel's register of its declared major conflicts of interest (SP8.3.2).
- 3.2. The Chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Update on cross-referrals

- 4.1. The Chair reported that, in addition to those noted at the last meeting, requests for SP8 to provide advisory scores for several outputs had been received from SP5 (Biological Sciences), SP13 (Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Metallurgy and Materials), SP22 (Social Work and Social Policy) and SP36 (Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management). The panel agreed to accept the incoming cross-referrals.
- 4.2. The panel noted that several outputs had been cross-referred for advisory scores to SP1 (Clinical Medicine), SP7 (Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences), and SP9 (Physics).

5. Audit

- 5.1. The Secretary reported that all the audit requests received to date had been resolved satisfactorily (SP8.3.3).
- 5.2. Panellists were reminded to submit any further audit requests via the Secretary.

6. Review of output scores

- 6.1. The Chair reported that interim scores had been recorded for the first 50 per cent of outputs and thanked panellists for their work.
- 6.2. The panel reviewed profiles for each of the reviewers' scores to date in comparison with the whole submission.
- 6.3. The panel agreed in principle a methodology for producing the final scores and noted the proposed final scores for the first 50 per cent of outputs.

- 6.4. It was agreed that scores on the grade boundaries would be reviewed prior to the next meeting and that the Panel Executive would undertake a series of checks to ensure that a consistent approach had been applied to the assessment of duplicate or proposed unclassified outputs.
- 6.5. An amended deadline for uploading the final 50 per cent of outputs was agreed and panellists were asked to raise any remaining audit queries as soon as possible.

7. Report on individual staff circumstances

- 7.1. Panellists noted that the secretariat had reviewed all cases for staff submitted with clearly-defined circumstances, with the exception of those where the HEIs were subject to full audits by the REF team (SP8.3.4).
- 7.2. The Secretary reported that the majority of cases were straightforward but that a number of audit queries had been raised where insufficient information had been provided to confirm that the criteria had been met.
- 7.3. The Secretary agreed to present recommendations for all clearly-defined staff circumstance cases at the next meeting.

8. Future meetings and updated project plan

- 8.1. An updated version of the project plan was received and approved (SP8.3.5).
- 8.2. The panel noted the work for completion by the next meeting, and in particular that the deadline for uploading the final 50 per cent of output scores had been brought forward to 15 May 2014.
- 8.3. It was noted that the next meeting would be held from 29-30 May 2014 in the Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon and that the meeting would be in two parts: 29 May for output assessors and 30 May for impact assessors.

9. Impact assessment briefing

- 9.1. The Chair welcomed the impact assessors to their first meeting of the panel.
- 9.2. The Adviser gave a detailed presentation on impact assessment to supplement the briefing paper, which contained full information on the assessment process and relevant extracts from other guidance documents (SP8.3.6).

- 9.3. The panel noted the timetable for impact assessment and the scoring scale to be used. Panellists also discussed various scenarios relating to the threshold judgements, assessment questions and audit process.
- 9.4. Panellists were advised that the impact allocation and materials for the calibration exercise would be circulated shortly. It was noted that the calibration sample would include ten case studies and two templates.
- 9.5. The Chair reminded panellists to raise any minor conflicts of interest or candidates for audit at the earliest opportunity. The deadline for assessing the calibration sample was also noted.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 8: Meeting 4 (Part 1: outputs)

Thursday 29 May 2014

Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon

Minutes

Present:

Michael Ashfold	Paul Madden
Phil Bartlett	Madeline McKerchar (secretary)
Richard Catlow (chair)	Chris Moody
Matthew Davidson	David O'Hagan
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)	Annie Powell
Sabine Flitsch	Emma Raven
Andrew Harrison	Allyson Reed
Christopher Hunter	David Rees
Graham Hutchings (deputy chair)	Matt Rosseinsky
Alastair Lewis	Dominic Tildesley

Walter Henning (main panel international member) attended for items 1-7.

Ann Dowling (main panel chair) attended as an observer for part of the meeting.

Apologies:

Andrew deMello
Jeremy Sanders

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Walter Henning, main panel international member, as this was his first SP8 meeting.
- 1.2. The panel noted that the main items of business were to agree scores for the final 50 per cent of outputs and to agree draft output sub-profiles.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP8.4.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct (SP8.4.2).
- 3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Cross-referrals

- 4.1. A full list of all incoming and outgoing cross-referral requests was received and noted (SP8.4.3).

5. Audit

- 5.1. A report was received and noted that summarised both the outcomes of the panel-instigated audits and data adjustments made by the REF team and those of the secretariat's in-depth review of clearly defined staff circumstances (SP8.4.4).
- 5.2. The panel agreed to approve the recommended decisions for the clearly defined staff circumstance cases submitted to Unit of Assessment 8 (UoA8), and noted the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel's decisions for the complex staff cases.

6. Review of output scores

- 6.1. The panel reviewed the interim scores for each output to arrive at agreed scores.
- 6.2. The chair described the checks that the executive group had carried out to ensure that a consistent approach had been applied to the assessment of duplicate and cross-referred outputs. The panel approved the approach used and agreed to accept the resulting final scores proposed by the chair.
- 6.3. The chair also reported that the executive group had carefully scrutinized the reviewers' profiles and the output allocation to ensure that no submission was subject to a marking bias. The panel reviewed these profiles and endorsed the executive group's conclusion.

- 6.4. Draft output sub-profiles for each submission, plus the overall draft output sub-profile, were projected for information.

7. Agreement of draft output sub-profiles

- 7.1. Twenty attendees left the room for the discussion of outputs and draft output sub-profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 7.2. The chair outlined the findings of the Main Panel's review of output sub-profiles at the 50 per cent mark.
- 7.3. The panel gave careful consideration to the grade boundaries and it was noted that the international member had reviewed a sample of outputs on the three to four star border and that he endorsed the panel's judgement that the grade boundaries were appropriate.
- 7.4. Draft sub-profiles were reviewed for each submission in turn, plus the Unit of Assessment as a whole, and panellists were invited to make any observations for note in the overview and feedback reports.
- 7.5. The reasons for any unclassified outputs in the profiles were noted.
- 7.6. The panel, for its part, approved all the draft sub-profiles and agreed to commend them to the Main Panel.

8. Overview and feedback reports

- 8.1. Guidance on the requirements for overview reports and feedback statements was received and noted (SP8.4.5).
- 8.2. The panel discussed the expectations and how responsibility for drafting the reports should be divided.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The chair thanked the panellists for their hard work throughout the output assessment process and, in particular, output assessors Chris Moody and Emma Raven for their contribution to the panel.

REF Sub-panel 8: Meeting 4 (Part 2: impact)

Friday 30 May 2014

Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon

Minutes

Present:

Dave Allen	Christopher Hunter
Michael Ashfold	Graham Hutchings (deputy chair)
Phil Bartlett	Alastair Lewis
Richard Catlow (chair)	Paul Madden
Peter Costigan (main panel user member)	Madeline McKerchar (secretary)
Matthew Davidson	David O'Hagan
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)	Annie Powell
Sabine Flitsch	Allyson Reed
Andrew Harrison	David Rees
Colin Harrison	Matt Rosseinsky
Pelham Hawker	Dominic Tildesley

Jim Al-Khalili attended for part of item 4.

Apologies:

Andrew deMello
Jeremy Sanders

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Peter Costigan, main panel user member, as this was his first SP8 meeting.
- 1.2. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main items of business were to carry out the impact calibration exercise, ensure that all reviewers were ready for the impact assessment process and to confirm the list of impact audit queries to be raised.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP8.4.1).

3. Conflicts of interests

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct (SP8.4.2).
- 3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Impact calibration

- 4.1. Two panellists left the room for discussion of case studies from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 4.2. The chair reported that the sample of ten case studies and two templates which had been circulated to panellists and impact assessors in advance of the meeting for the calibration exercise had been selected to represent a spread of the disciplines represented within the Unit of Assessment. Two of the case studies had also been used for the Main Panel calibration exercise.
- 4.3. Panellists were advised that the aims of the calibration exercise were to: develop a common understanding of the star levels and to form a consensus on how impact case studies and templates could be assessed equitably.
- 4.4. The scores for each case study and template were reviewed and discussed with reference to the characteristics of the quality levels provided in the criteria document and how these might be applied to determine a final score where scores diverged or panellists considered that the case study was on the borderline between star levels. Through this discussion the panel agreed a score for each case study and template.
- 4.5. Panellists noted the relevant Main Panel agreed scores and that they agreed with those recommended by the sub-panel.
- 4.6. Panellists were instructed that the calibration scores must be discarded following the exercise and the case studies and templates assessed afresh by the reviewers.

5. Impact allocation and assessment preparation

- 5.1. An earlier deadline for uploading impact scores was agreed to allow time for panellists to discuss the scores before the next meeting.
- 5.2. The panel noted the scoring scale to be used for the impact assessment process.

6. Cross-referrals

- 6.1. The chair reported that no case studies or templates had been cross-referred and that no cross-referral requests had been received from other sub-panels.

7. Audit

- 7.1. A list of queries raised by panellists before the meeting was received and noted (SP8.4.6).
- 7.2. The adviser reminded panellists of the threshold judgements and audit process and asked them to raise any further candidates for audit with the secretariat at the earliest opportunity.

8. Future meetings and updated project plan

- 8.1. An updated version of the project plan was received and approved (SP.4.7).
- 8.2. The panel noted the work for completion by the next meeting, and in particular the earlier deadline for uploading the impact scores.
- 8.3. It was noted that the next meeting would be held on 17 July 2014 at the Radisson Blu in Birmingham.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 8: Meeting 5

Thursday 17 July 2014

Radisson Blu, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Dave Allen	Christopher Hunter
Michael Ashfold	Graham Hutchings (deputy chair)
Phil Bartlett	Paul Madden
Richard Catlow (chair)	Madeline McKerchar (secretary)
Peter Costigan (main panel user member)	David O'Hagan
Matthew Davidson	Annie Powell
Andrew deMello	Allyson Reed
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)	David Rees
Sabine Flitsch	Matt Rosseinsky
Andrew Harrison	Jeremy Sanders
Colin Harrison	Dominic Tildesley
Pelham Hawker	Val Wooff (incoming panel secretary)

Jim Al-Khalili attended for item 6.

Apologies were received from Alastair Lewis.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Val Wooff who will act as panel secretary for the remaining meetings, and Peter Costigan, the main panel user member.
- 1.2. The panel congratulated Jeremy Sanders and Dominic Tildesley who had both been awarded CBEs in the Queen's Birthday Honours.
- 1.3. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main items of business were to complete the assessment of impact, produce draft impact sub-profiles, and prepare for the assessment of environment.
- 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 of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP8.5.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel received and noted the register of its declared major conflicts of interest (SP8.5.2).
- 3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Update on output profiles

- 4.1. One attendee left the room for discussion of a submission with which they had a major conflict of interest.
- 4.2. The chair reported that an adjustment had been made to one output sub-profile as a result of the REF audit team's data comparison exercise. The panel reviewed and approved the revised sub-profile.

5. Impact audit outcomes

- 5.1. A list of the queries raised by reviewers was received (SP8.5.3). It was noted that they had all been resolved satisfactorily.

6. Review of impact scores

- 6.1. The panel reviewed the interim scores for each case study and template to arrive at agreed scores.
- 6.2. The panel was satisfied that none of the case studies or templates should be unclassified.
- 6.3. The reviewer's profiles were projected for information and the chair reported that they and the impact allocation had been scrutinised by the executive group to ensure that no submission was subject to a marking bias.

- 6.4. The panel reviewed the overall profile for the Unit of Assessment and gave careful consideration to the emergent grade boundaries. The main panel user member confirmed that the panel's assessment process had been robust.

7. Production of impact sub-profiles

- 7.1. Twenty three attendees left the room for the discussion of draft impact sub-profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 7.2. Draft sub-profiles were reviewed for each submission in turn and panellists were invited to make any observations for note in the overview and feedback reports.
- 7.3. The panellists and impact assessors commented on the strength of the submissions and hoped that the case studies could provide useful, if partial, evidence to other bodies of the impact of chemistry on society and the economy.
- 7.4. The panel, for its part, approved all the draft sub-profiles and agreed to commend them to the Main Panel.

8. Overview and feedback reports

- 8.1. Guidance on the requirements for overview reports and feedback statements was received and noted (SP8.5.4).
- 8.2. The panel discussed the expectations and how responsibility for drafting the reports should be divided.

9. Environment allocation and assessment preparation

- 9.1. The adviser gave a presentation on environment assessment to supplement the briefing paper, which contained full information on the assessment process and relevant extracts from the published guidance (SP8.5.5).
- 9.2. The panel noted the timetable and criteria for environment assessment plus the scoring scale to be used.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. The chair thanked all the reviewers for their work on impact, and in particular the impact assessors as this was their last meeting. The panel also noted that this was the current secretary's last meeting.

- 10.2. Panellists noted the work for completion by the next meeting, which would be held from 11-12 September 2014 in the Scarman House Conference Centre, University of Warwick, Coventry.

11. Any other business

- 11.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 8: Meeting 6
Thursday 11th – Friday 12th September 2014
Scarman House, University of Warwick

Minutes

Present:

Michael Ashfold	David O'Hagan
Phil Bartlett	Annie Powell
Richard Catlow (chair)	Allyson Reed
Matthew Davidson	Matt Rosseinsky
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)	Jeremy Sanders
Sabine Flitsch	Dominic Tildesley
Andrew Harrison	Val Wooff (panel secretary)
Christopher Hunter	
Graham Hutchings (deputy chair)	
Paul Madden	

Apologies were received from Andrew de Mello.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main items of business were to complete the assessment of environment, review and recommend to the main panel draft environment and overall profiles and develop feedback for Main Panel B and individual submissions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP11.6.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel received and noted the register of its declared major conflicts of interest (SP8.6.2).
- 3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Audit Update

- 4.1 An oral report on audit activities was received:
 - The REF team had carried out a sample-based audit of outputs submitted as 'pending' and outputs with a 2014 date of publication across all submissions. No data adjustments had been required in SP11 as a result of this.
 - An audit of REF4a and 4b data against the relevant data submitted to HESA returns and also been carried out. An adjustment to the REF4b income in one submission was reported.

5. Update on impact profiles

- 5.1. The chair reported that an adjustment on one impact score had affected one submission and the overall sub-profile.
- 5.2. The panel reviewed the profile of the submission that had been affected by the change and overall sub-profile and agreed to commend the resulting profiles to the Main Panel.
- 5.3. The chair reported that, subject to a further check for consistency across the sub-panels by the main panel user members, the main panel had approved the draft impact profiles presented at its last meeting.

6. Review of environment scores

- 6.1. Panellists discussed environment templates where scores had not been agreed prior to the meeting.

7. Production of environment sub-profiles and feedback

- 7.1. Thirty one attendees left the room for the discussion of draft sub-profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 7.2. Draft sub-profiles were reviewed for each submission in turn and panellists were invited to make any observations for note in the feedback statements to HEIs.

- 7.3. The panel, for its part, approved all the draft sub-profiles and agreed to commend them to the Main Panel.
- 7.4. Guidance on the requirements for environment feedback statements was received and noted (SP8.6.3).
- 7.5. The panel discussed the expectations and how responsibility for drafting the statements should be divided.

8. Review of draft overall submission profiles

- 8.1. Thirty one attendees left the room for the discussion of draft overall profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 8.2. The sub-panel reviewed the draft overall profiles for each submission and agreed to recommend these to the main panel.

9. Overview report

- 9.1 The panel received guidance on the structure and content of the Main Panel B overview report (SP8.6.4).
- 9.2 Points made by panel members were recorded for inclusion in the main and sub-panel sections of the report.
- 9.3 Points from each of the sub-panels would be collated and considered at the next main panel meeting on 30th September.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. Panellists noted the work for completion by the next meeting, which would be held on 14th October 2014 at The Studio, Manchester.

11. Any other business

- 11.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 8: Meeting 7
Tuesday 14th October 2014
The Studio, Lever Street, Manchester

Minutes

Present:

Michael Ashfold	Graham Hutchings (deputy chair)
Phil Bartlett	Paul Madden
Richard Catlow (chair)	David O'Hagan
Matthew Davidson	Annie Powell
Andrew de Mello	Allyson Reed
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)	Matt Rosseinsky
Sabine Flitsch	Jeremy Sanders
Andrew Harrison	Val Wooff (panel secretary)
Christopher Hunter	

Not in attendance: Dominic Tildesley

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main item of business was to review feedback for Main Panel B and individual submissions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP8.7.1).

3. Conflicts of interests

- 3.1. The panel received and noted the register of its declared major conflicts of interest (SP8.7.2).

- 3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Report from Main Panel B

- 4.1 The chair gave an oral report on the recent meeting of Main Panel B.
- 4.2 It was noted that Main Panel B had accepted all recommendations from the sub-panel.

5. Review of Feedback to HEIs

- 5.1. Thirty attendees left the room for the discussion of feedback from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 5.2. Panellists discussed feedback to HEIs on outputs, impact and environment. Comments were noted.
- 5.3. It was agreed the panel executive would edit the statements and submit them to the REF team by the required deadline.

6. Overview report

- 6.1 The sub-panel reviewed the previously circulated draft of the sub-panel's contribution to the Main Panel B overview report. (SP8.7.3)
- 6.2 Points made by sub-panel members were recorded for inclusion in the main and sub-panel sections of the report.
- 6.3 It was agreed the sub-panel executive would edit the sub-panel section and provide an updated draft for consideration at the next Main Panel B meeting.

7. Reflections on the REF process

- 7.1. The sub-panel reviewed the previously circulated notes on the sub-panel's feedback on the REF process (SP8.7.4).
- 7.2. Points made by sub-panel members were recorded for inclusion.
- 7.3. It was agreed that the comments would be provided to the sub-panel representatives at the feedback meetings organised by HEFCE.

8. Results timetable

- 8.1. A brief presentation covering the timetable for the announcement of the REF2014 results and actions for panel members towards the end of the assessment period was given.
- 8.2. Sub-Panel members were reminded of the need to maintain confidentiality and advised on how to respond to any enquiries they may receive on the assessment process and results.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The chair thanked all members of the sub-panel for their contribution to the REF assessment and commended the secretariat for their support.
- 9.2. The deputy chair thanked the chair for his commitment to the panel.