

Sub-panel 9: Meeting 1b

8 January 2014, 10:00 – 15:30

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

Minutes

Present:

Mrs Catherine Annabel (Secretary)	Professor Monica Grady
Professor Donal Bradley	Professor Tim Hollowood
Professor Martin Barstow	Professor Robert Kennicutt Jr.
Professor John Chalker	Professor Miles Padgett
Professor Richard Dendy	Professor John Peacock
Professor Laurence Eaves	Professor Ferruccio Renzoni
Professor Yvonne Elsworth	Professor Christopher Sachrajda
Professor Wendy Flavell (Deputy Chair)	Professor Roy Sambles
Professor Brian Foster (Chair)	Professor David Wark
Professor William Gelletly	

Apologies: Professor Mervyn Miles

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

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

2. Register of interests

2.1 The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest after the meeting. 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 may constitute a minor conflict of interest and the process that will be followed in notifying the chair and secretary of such

conflicts. In each case the chair will decide what effect the existence of a minor interest shall have on a panel member's participation in the assessment.

3. Output calibration

3.1 Prior to the meeting, the chair and deputy chair had selected and circulated a sample of outputs to members and output assessors, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. Ten of the submitted outputs were selected from HEIs that avoided major conflicts of interest for Main Panel B members. The others were selected so as to minimise major conflicts of interest for panellists. In addition, outputs were selected to represent a spread of the disciplines represented within the Unit of Assessment and to sit on the various star-level borderlines.

3.2 The chair outlined the aims of this calibration exercise, highlighting that these were to develop a common understanding of the star levels; to agree specific scores for the outputs in the calibration sample; and to form a consensus on how papers of different types and in differing disciplines may be assessed equitably.

3.3 The chair recognised that asking panellists to consider all of the calibration sample often took them outside of their immediate areas of expertise.

3.4 Panellists had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The secretary displayed the scores and the panel considered how far panellists had reached a consensus on each output. The panel discussed each output in turn and considered the characteristics of the quality levels provided in the criteria document and how these might be applied to provide differentiation for outputs where scores diverged or panellists considered the output was on the borderline between star levels. Through this discussion the sub-panel reached an understanding on the score for each output and highlighted the reasons for those scores, with reference to the level descriptors.

3.5 Main Panel B had met on 7 January 2014 to consider a sample of ten outputs from each sub-panel calibration exercise. The chair fed back the relevant scores agreed by the main panel and the panellists noted differences from those agreed by the sub-panel and discussed the reasons.

3.6 Panellists were instructed that the agreed scores must be discarded following the calibration and outputs used for calibration must be assessed in the actual evaluation in the same way as all other outputs.

4. Output allocation arrangements

4.1 The chair outlined the proposed deadline dates for having uploaded 15-20%, 50% and 100% of output scores in line with Main Panel B requirements and upon reflection panel members agreed that the dates should be achievable.

4.2 The chair outlined the approach that he and the deputy chair had taken to the allocation of outputs to panel members and output assessors for assessment, highlighting that:

- each output will be reviewed by two panellists, with a third to be appointed where agreement cannot be reached;
- the great majority of panellists' outputs were allocated to be as close as possible to their immediate areas of expertise.
- the deputy chair made the allocation of outputs for institutions with which the chair has a major conflict of interest.

4.3 The chair reported that an initial allocation of outputs had been made to enable panellists to begin scoring in advance of the sub-panel's next meeting on 6 February 2014. The "final" allocation would be made as soon as possible.

4.4 The panel discussed and agreed arrangements to ensure that panellists assess the same sub-set of outputs ahead of the sub-panel meeting in February. Arrangements for the later meetings will be discussed at the February 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 next meeting will take place on Thursday 6 February 2014, 10:00 - 16:30, at Aston Business School Conference Centre, Aston Street, B4 7ET, Birmingham.

7. Any other business

7.1 There was no further business.



Sub-panel 9: Meeting 2

6 February 2014, 10:00 – 15:30

Aston Conference Centre

Minutes

Present:

Mrs Catherine Annabel (Secretary)	Professor Tim Hollowood
Professor Donal Bradley	Professor Robert Kennicutt Jr.
Professor Martin Barstow	Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor John Chalker	Professor Miles Padgett
Professor Richard Dendy	Professor John Peacock
Professor Laurence Eaves	Professor Ferruccio Renzoni
Professor Yvonne Elsworth	Mr Peter Saraga
Professor Wendy Flavell (Deputy Chair)	Professor Christopher Sachrajda
Professor Brian Foster (Chair)	Professor Roy Sambles
Professor William Gelletly	Dr Frances Saunders
Professor Monica Grady	Professor David Wark

Apologies: There were no absentees.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1 The chair introduced Karen Ness, the adviser to the panel, who had been unable to attend the previous meeting due to the parallel scheduling of sub-panel meetings. It was noted that the secretary and adviser will both attend all future meetings. Mr Peter Saraga and Dr Frances Saunders (user members) were welcomed to the meeting.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest after the meeting. The chair

reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise through the Panel Members' Website (PMW).

3.2 It was noted that the Chair and Deputy Chair had examined all outputs for duplicate submissions and assigned one pair of assessors to review all examples of the repeated output. This necessitated a small number of reassignments when the initial marker had a conflict of interest with any of the institutions that had submitted a given output. These would be reflected in the next issue of the main spread-sheet subsequent to the meeting. The panel was reminded that minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Assessment of outputs

4.1 Prior to the meeting, panellists had been asked to assess allocated outputs from a 20% tranche, identified as a subset by taking the second output of each staff member who had submitted four outputs. Scores had been entered into personal spreadsheets and uploaded to the PMW, and in a proportion of cases where two readers had scored the output, and readers had had the opportunity to discuss scores ahead of the meeting, an agreed score had also been uploaded. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the panel adviser.

4.2 The chair outlined the aims of this exercise, highlighting that more than 20% of outputs had been assessed by at least one reviewer before this meeting, with 16% having pair-agreed scores.

4.3 The exercise raised a number of more general issues about output assessment.

4.3.1 It was noted that, as set out in published REF guidance, where review articles or lecture notes contain no original research content or new insight, they should be unclassified. However, where the output contains original research or new insight then this content should be assessed according to REF guidance and criteria. Submitting HEIs had the opportunity to identify the original research content in reviews and this is provided in the Additional Output Information field.

4.3.2 There was discussion about the additional output information provided by HEIs about co-author contribution where an output has ten or more co-authors. Panellists were reminded that unless there is a factual discrepancy in information provided (e.g. the author's name did not appear on the output) which would trigger an audit query, or other exceptional circumstances, the assessment should be based upon the information provided by the HEIs and no further information sought.

4.3.3 Panellists were reminded in reviewing the current distribution of scores that there is no quota of 4* outputs expected to be awarded and that all outputs should be assessed against the published criteria without regard to the overall distribution.

4.3.4 It was confirmed that where supplementary material is referenced within an output, panellists may, if it is appropriate, refer to that to inform their assessment.

4.3.5 It was noted that where double-weighted outputs have been submitted to the panel, panellists assigned to assess these outputs will consider the case made for double weighting and make recommendations for discussion by the panel.

4.4 For the next meeting, on 27 March, 50% of outputs will need to have been assessed and agreement was reached on how this will be achieved.

5. Audit briefing

5.1 The adviser presented a summary of the procedures relating to audit of outputs and staff members, covering data comparison and sample-based audits initiated by the REF team as well as panel-instigated audit. Panellists were reminded that guidance is available on the PMW, and that potential audit queries should be notified to the secretary for investigation and action where appropriate.

6. Cross-referrals and specialist advice

6.1 The secretary gave a verbal report on cross-referrals to and from SP9. The chair will consider which panellist would be most appropriate to review the referred output and advise the referring panel. The output will be added to the panellist's reading list once the referral was agreed. Currently no outputs had been identified as requiring specialist advice.

7. Preparations for impact assessment

7.1 It was noted that a sample of four impact case studies will be identified by the end of February for the main panel calibration exercise from which the Main Panel is expected to select two. For sub-panel calibration, a small number of further case studies will be selected. Further guidance on assessment and scoring will be provided.

7.2 It was agreed that each impact case study will be allocated to two impact assessors/user members and two academic panel members. Impact assessors will be fully briefed regarding the REF process.

7.3 Members were encouraged to scan case studies as soon as possible to allow early identification of audit issues and to assist in appropriate allocation to assessors/panel members.

8. Future meetings and work plan

8.1 Members received a plan of tasks and meetings over the REF period. This will be amended and additional detail provided regarding deadlines, and recirculated to members.

9. Any other business

9.1 There was no further business.



REF Sub-panel 9: Meeting 3

Thursday 27 March 2014, 10:00 – 16:30

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

Minutes

Present:

Professor Jim al-Khalili (from item 6, via Skype)	Professor Robert Kennicutt Jr.
Mrs Catherine Annabel (Secretary)	Professor Dewi Lewis (from item 6)
Professor Donal Bradley	Professor Mervyn Miles
Professor Martin Barstow	Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor John Chalker	Professor Miles Padgett
Professor Richard Dendy	Dr Becky Parker (from item 6)
Professor Laurence Eaves	Professor John Peacock
Professor Yvonne Elsworth	Professor Ferruccio Renzoni
Professor Wendy Flavell (Deputy Chair)	Professor Christopher Sachrajda
Professor Brian Foster (Chair)	Professor Roy Sambles
Professor William Gelletly	Mr Peter Saraga
Professor Monica Grady	Dr Frances Saunders
Professor Tim Hollowood	Professor David Wark

In attendance: Professor Dame Ann Dowling

Apologies:

Apologies for absence were received from Sir Martin Sweeting.

1. Introductions and competence to do business

- 1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2 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 of the meeting held on 6 February 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panellists of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited members to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Clearly defined staff circumstances

4.1 The secretary presented an interim report on clearly defined staff circumstances and outlined the proportion of reported circumstances associated with early career researcher status, part-time working and maternity/paternity leave, and other clearly defined circumstances. The numbers of audit queries raised to date were also reported.

5. Output assessment

5.1 Prior to the meeting, panellists had been asked to complete the assessment of 50% of allocated outputs. Scores had been entered into personal spreadsheets and uploaded to the PMW, and in a proportion of cases where two readers had scored the output and readers had had the opportunity to discuss scores ahead of the meeting, an agreed score had also been uploaded. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

5.2 The chair thanked members for their efforts and reported that the target of 50% had been achieved. Panellists were asked to complete the remaining assessment of outputs and to agree scores with co-readers, and to submit their scores by the evening of 19 May.

5.3 The panel noted that confidential reporting to HEIs will provide feedback on impact, outputs and environment and considered how that might be achieved.

5.4 The issue of duplicate outputs was discussed and it was noted that in the majority of cases pairs assessing one submission of an output will assess other submissions. Some reallocation of outputs had taken place to achieve this. The secretary confirmed that a report on duplicate outputs is available to the panel executive and that scores for these outputs are being monitored to ensure consistency.

5.5 It was noted that four proposed double-weighted outputs have been submitted to the sub-panel. Allocated readers will arrive at and record a decision initially as to whether the double-weighting is accepted so that reserve outputs can be assessed if required. Recommendations will be provided to the next meeting for the sub-panel's approval.

5.3 The secretary presented a report on the outputs cross-referred to and from the sub-panel and progress in assessing them. The secretary will log the receipt of advice on the spreadsheet. Panellists receiving advice from another panel on an output assigned to them were advised to record the advice and recommended score in Comment 2, and then to make a decision taking account of that advice if appropriate.

5.4 At the next meeting, on 28-30 May, all output scores will be finalised by the panel. It was agreed that panellists will now review all outputs where scores are still to be agreed, and upload as soon as possible, at the latest by the deadline of 19 May.

5.5 A report was provided on outputs referred to audit, the reasons for audit, and the outcomes. The secretary will continue to monitor responses from HEIs and advise panellists of outcomes. Members will review outputs currently flagged as having issues related to the provision of Additional Output Information (AOI), and remove the flags where the issues are resolved following discussions with co-readers. All outstanding AOI issues will then be referred for audit.

5.6 Members received an updated workplan identifying the tasks to be completed at forthcoming meetings. The document will be further revised to take account of decisions made and deadlines adjusted at this meeting, and will be reissued to all panellists.

6. Impact

6.1 The chair welcomed the impact assessors to the meeting.

6.2 The adviser presented a briefing on the assessment of impact case studies and templates, and the calibration exercise which had begun at Main Panel level.

6.3 It was agreed that following the meeting the calibration sample of eight case studies selected from the SP9 submissions and four templates selected by Main Panel B will be made available to panel members and impact assessors, who will be asked to score the sample using the agreed scale, recording the scores on the spreadsheet to be provided by the secretariat, and returning these by the deadline of 26 May.

6.4 In parallel with the calibration exercise, all case studies will be allocated to two user member/impact assessors and two academics (taking account of conflicts of interest). Impact templates will be allocated to one user member/impact assessor and two academic panellists. Panellists were asked initially to review their allocations without scoring them, in order to identify minor conflicts of interest and potential audit matters, pending the conclusion of the calibration process.

7. Audit matters relating to impact

7.1 The adviser briefed panellists on the approach to audit in relation to impact case studies and templates

8. Future meetings and workplan relating to impact

8.1 Panellists received a workplan showing the schedule for all tasks relating to the assessment of impact.

9. Any other business

9.1 There was no further business.



REF Sub-panel 9: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

28-29 May 2014

**Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead, South
Croydon, CR2 8YA
Surrey**

Minutes

Present:

Mrs Catherine Annabel (Secretary)	Professor Walter Henning
Professor Donal Bradley	Professor Tim Hollowood
Professor Martin Barstow	Professor Robert Kennicutt Jr.
Professor John Chalker	Professor Mervyn Miles
Professor Richard Dendy	Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor Laurence Eaves	Professor Miles Padgett
Professor Yvonne Elsworth	Professor John Peacock
Professor Wendy Flavell (Deputy Chair)	Professor Ferruccio Renzoni
Professor Brian Foster (Chair)	Professor Christopher Sachrajda
Professor William Gelletly	Professor Roy Sambles
Professor Monica Grady	Professor David Wark

Apologies: There were no apologies for absence.

1. Introductions and competence to do business

- 1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2 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 of the meeting held on 27 March 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1 The chair reminded panellists of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited panellists to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Clearly defined staff circumstances

4.1 Panellists received a report on clearly defined circumstances, recommended output reductions for approval, audit queries raised and outcomes. Output reductions were approved in 313 of the 322 cases submitted, and it was agreed that the outstanding 9 cases, which are awaiting audit outcomes, will be resolved by the Executive on behalf of the panel.

5. Output assessment

5.1 Prior to the meeting, panellists had been asked to complete the assessment of allocated outputs. Individual and agreed scores had been entered into personal spreadsheets and uploaded to the PMW. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

5.2 The chair thanked panellists for having completed the assessment of all outputs.. Members discussed outputs where an agreed score had not been provided and all cases where a score of unclassified was proposed.

5.3 The secretary presented a report on cross-referrals into and out of SP9, and it was noted that advice was awaited on a small number of outputs referred to other sub-panels. It was agreed that the secretary will remind those who had been allocated cross-referred outputs from SP9 and panellists will review their provisional scores once this advice was received, advising the secretariat of any change.

5.4 Members noted a summary of audit queries raised by panellists on outputs, and agreed that in 10 cases where the HEI response had not yet been received, panellists will be advised of the response when available and review their provisional scores, advising the secretariat of any change.

5.5 It was noted that four proposed double-weighted outputs were submitted to the sub-panel. Of these, two were rejected, and reserve outputs assessed in both cases.

5.6 The panel agreed scores for all outputs except those where there were outstanding audit queries and cross-referrals, where provisional scores were recorded. HEI output profiles were reviewed and approved. Panellists left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6. Overview and feedback reports

6.1 Panellists received the REF template and guidance on overview reports and feedback statements. Draft feedback statements on outputs were discussed for each submission

7. Future meetings and workplan

7.1 Panellists received a workplan showing the schedule for forthcoming meetings and the tasks to be completed prior to the next meeting.

8. Any other business

8.1 The chair noted that the work of the output assessor was now complete, and thanked him for his contribution.



REF Sub-panel 9: Meeting 4 (Part 2)

30 May 2014

**Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead, South
Croydon, CR2 8YA
Surrey**

Minutes

Present:

Professor Jim al-Khalili	Professor Mervyn Miles
Mrs Catherine Annabel (Secretary)	Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor Donal Bradley	Professor Miles Padgett
Professor Martin Barstow	Dr Becky Parker
Professor John Chalker	Professor John Peacock
Professor Richard Dendy	Professor Ferruccio Renzoni
Professor Laurence Eaves	Professor Christopher Sachrajda
Professor Yvonne Elsworth	Professor Roy Sambles
Professor Wendy Flavell (Deputy Chair)	Mr Peter Saraga
Professor Brian Foster (Chair)	Dr Frances Saunders
Professor William Gelletly	Dr Robert Sorrell
Professor Monica Grady	Professor Sir Martin Sweeting
Professor Robert Kennicutt Jr.	Professor David Wark
Professor Dewi Lewis	

There were no apologies for absence.

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

1.2 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 of the meeting held on 27 March 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panellists of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited panellists to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Impact assessment

4.1 The Chair reminded members of the definition of impact according to the REF guidelines, and the threshold judgements as to eligibility of case studies. The timescale for completing the impact assessment were discussed, and panellists were reminded of the deadlines, and the tasks that needed to be completed before the next meeting.

4.2 Members discussed the process of assessment of impact case studies and templates and agreed procedures for arriving at scores and corroborating claims made in the case studies. It was agreed that all panellists will read, score and agree with co-readers an initial sample (to be provided by the secretariat) by 16 June. While all assessors will review the totality of each case study allocated to them, academic readers will take the lead on assessing the underpinning research threshold judgements and user members and impact assessors will take the lead on assessing the impact itself, making the assumption that underpinning research thresholds have been reached. The first lead user member/impact assessor will initiate the discussions between the assessors, liaising with the lead academic assessor, and will coordinate the process of arriving at agreement.

5. Impact calibration

5.1 Panellists reviewed the calibration scores for the sample of case studies and templates, and agreed panel scores in each case. Panellists had found impact calibration to be a very useful exercise, enabling detailed exploration of the issues associated with the assessment of impact including the threshold conditions, the range of types of impact, and the application of the assessment criteria. Through these discussions, individual panellists had been able to calibrate their own scoring behaviours.

6. Audit matters relating to impact

6.1 Panellists received information on audit queries identified to date. It was agreed that where further information was required in order to enable panellists to assess whether a threshold had been reached, or where corroboration was required for claims made regarding impact, panellists will provide details for the secretariat as soon as

possible, so that queries could be raised with the HEIs or corroborating sources and responses received before the next meeting.

7. Future meetings and workplan relating to impact

7.1 Panellists received a workplan showing the schedule for all tasks relating to the assessment of impact.

8. Any other business

8.1 There was no further business.



REF Sub-panel 9: Meeting 5

16-17 July 2014

**Radisson Blu, 12 Holloway Circus Queensway, B1 1BT
Birmingham**

Minutes

Present:

Professor Jim al-Khalili	Professor Robert Kennicutt Jr.
Mrs Catherine Annabel (secretary)	Professor Dewi Lewis
Professor Donal Bradley	Professor Mervyn Miles
Professor Martin Barstow	Dr Karen Ness (adviser)
Professor John Chalker	Dr Becky Parker
Professor Richard Dendy	Professor John Peacock
Ms Anna Dickinson (REF Policy Team, part-time)	Professor Ferruccio Renzoni
Professor Laurence Eaves	Professor Christopher Sachrajda
Professor Yvonne Elsworth	Professor Roy Sambles
Professor Wendy Flavell (deputy chair)	Mr Peter Saraga
Professor Brian Foster (chair)	Dr Frances Saunders
Professor William Gelletly	Professor Sir Martin Sweeting
Professor Monica Grady	Professor David Wark

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 There were apologies for absence from Professor Miles Padgett. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

1.2 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 of the meetings held on 28-30 May 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panellists of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited panellists to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Output assessment

4.1 The adviser presented a report on scores amended after the last meeting due to technical issues. In addition a REF audit had resulted in one output being unclassified as it had been submitted to the RAE by the same HEI and staff member. All readers of affected outputs had been consulted and had approved the amendments. It was noted that the feedback statements drafted at the last meeting will be amended where necessary to reflect the change.

4.2 The secretary confirmed that all outstanding audits of outputs had been resolved, but 6 audit queries relating to staff circumstances were awaiting a response. As agreed at the previous meeting, the executive will take action on the audit responses when received before finalising all recommendations for reductions in outputs. All outgoing cross-referral activity had been completed. Panel members were asked to check that all incoming cross-referral requests had been dealt with.

5. Impact assessment

5.1 Prior to the meeting, panellists had been asked to complete the assessment of allocated impact case studies and templates. Individual scores had been entered into personal spreadsheets and uploaded to the PMW. Four-way agreements had also been recorded for most items. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

5.2 The secretary reported on audit queries raised by panel members. Further information had been provided by HEIs for all but 3 of the queries raised, and impact items had been scored taking account of the audit responses received. Provisional scores were recorded where audit information had not yet been received.

5.3 Panellists worked in pairs and small groups to confirm agreed scores for case studies and templates, and brought a number of items where this was not possible, or where agreement resulted in an unclassified item, to the full panel for consideration.

5.4 The panel reviewed and agreed panel scores for all impact items submitted to UOA9, subject to confirmation where an audit response was awaited. HEI impact

profiles were reviewed and approved. Panellists left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6. Overview reports and feedback statements

6.1 Panellists received the REF template and guidance on overview reports and feedback statements. Lead panellists were identified, and will draft feedback statements on impact for each submission. All panellists were asked to submit comments on working methods and on the submission as a whole to contribute to the main panel's overview report. Panel members were reminded to complete and submit all outstanding feedback statements relating to outputs.

7. Environment

7.1 Members received a briefing on the assessment of environment templates. The chair advised that each template had now been allocated to five panellists for assessment and scores will be agreed at sub-panel meeting 6. Members agreed an approach to the scoring of the various sections of the environment template, and discussed the way in which the standard analysis data may be used to inform the assessment.

8. Future meetings and workplan

8.1 Panel members received the latest version of the workplan and agreed deadlines for the next phase of sub-panel activity.

9. Any other business

9.1 The chair thanked the impact assessors for their contribution to the process.



REF Sub-panel 9: Meeting 6

17-18 September 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Mrs Catherine Annabel (secretary)
Professor Donal Bradley
Professor Martin Barstow
Professor John Chalker
Professor Richard Dendy
Professor Laurence Eaves
Professor Yvonne Elsworth
Professor Wendy Flavell (deputy chair)
Professor Brian Foster (chair)
Professor William Gelletly
Professor Monica Grady
Professor Robert Kennicutt Jr.

Professor Mervyn Miles
Dr Karen Ness (adviser)
Professor Miles Padgett
Professor John Peacock
Professor Ferruccio Renzoni
Professor Christopher Sachrajda
Professor Roy Sambles
Mr Peter Saraga
Dr Frances Saunders
Professor David Wark

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

1.2 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 of the meetings held on 16-17 July 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panel members of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited panel members to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Output and impact assessment

4.1 The secretary confirmed that all outstanding audits had been resolved, with the exception of one audit query relating to staff circumstances where the HEI response was under review by the executive group. As agreed at the previous meeting, the outcome of this audit query will be taken into account before the final profile for the affected HEI is recommended to Main Panel for approval.

4.2 The chair reported on a minor recalibration of impact scores undertaken with input from a Main Panel B user member following a review of impact scoring by the main panel.

5. Environment assessment

5.1 The secretary reported on audit queries raised on environment templates. A number of queries related to the attribution to submitting units of in-kind income, and these had been investigated via the REF Audit team. The chair reported on the outcomes of this investigation and advised on how these data should be used in the assessment of environment templates. All other queries had been resolved and the relevant panel members had been advised of the outcomes.

5.2 Prior to the meeting, panel members had been asked to complete the assessment of allocated environment templates. Individual scores had been entered into personal spreadsheets and uploaded to the PMW. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

5.3 The panel reviewed and agreed panel scores for all environment templates submitted to SP9. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6. Review of HEI results and feedback statements

6.1 The adviser presented a report showing the performance of all HEIs submitted to the sub-panel across all components of the submissions.

6.2 Panel members reviewed all three sub-profiles together with the overall profiles for all submissions to SP9 and recommended them to Main Panel for approval. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6.3 Panel members revised and confirmed the previously-drafted HEI feedback statements for outputs and impact as required and approved first drafts of feedback statements for environment. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

7. Overview report

7.1 Panel members discussed the contribution that the sub-panel wished to make to the MPB overview report and it was agreed that the chair and deputy chair will prepare a draft to go to the next MPB meeting. Panel members were asked to send any additional points that they wished to be included in the report to the chair and deputy chair as soon as possible.

8. Future meeting and work plan

8.1 Panel members received the latest version of the work plan and noted the final phase of sub-panel activity and the business to be completed at the final meeting on 21 October.



REF Sub-panel 9: Meeting 7

21 October 2014

**CCT Venues-Smithfield, Two East Poultry Avenue, Smithfield,
London, EC1A 9PT**

Minutes

Present:

Mrs Catherine Annabel (secretary)
Professor Donal Bradley
Professor Martin Barstow
Professor John Chalker
Professor Richard Dendy
Professor Laurence Eaves
Professor Yvonne Elsworth
Professor Wendy Flavell (deputy chair)
Professor Brian Foster (chair)
Professor William Gelletly
Professor Monica Grady
Professor Robert Kennicutt Jr.

Professor Mervyn Miles
Dr Karen Ness (adviser)
Professor Miles Padgett
Professor Ferruccio Renzoni
Mr Graeme Rosenberg (REF
Manager, part-time)
Professor Christopher Sachrajda
Professor Roy Sambles
Mr Peter Saraga
Dr Frances Saunders
Professor David Wark

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Professor John Peacock. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, particularly Mr Graeme Rosenberg, REF Manager.

1.2 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 of the meetings held on 17-18 September 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panel members of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, and invited panel members to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and that any amendments had been recorded via the PMW. Minor conflicts had been notified to the chair and recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Output, impact and environment assessment

4.1 The secretary presented a verbal report on audit queries raised regarding staff, outputs, impact and environment, and confirmed that all outstanding audits had been resolved.

4.2 The secretary presented a verbal report on cross-referrals into SP9 and from SP9 to other sub-panels, and confirmed that all had been dealt with.

5. Approval of results

5.1 The chair reported that Main Panel B had approved all the assessment results for SP9 (overall profiles and sub-profiles) at its meeting on 30 September, including the minor updates to impact scores noted at the previous meeting.

6. Feedback statements

6.1 Panel members revised and confirmed HEI feedback statements for outputs, impact and environment. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest. It was agreed that the Executive will finalise the statements for submission to the REF Team.

7. Overview report

7.1 Panel members discussed the contribution that the sub-panel wished to make to the MPB overview report and approved amendments to the draft sub-panel overview report. It was agreed that the Executive will finalise the reports for submission to Main Panel B, and the panel feedback to HEFCE on the REF exercise.

8. Final phase of REF activity and publication of results

8.1 Panel members received a presentation on the arrangements for publication of REF results and the importance of confidentiality in the interim and following publication.

8.2 The chair advised members of a number of mechanisms by which panel members may provide feedback to HEFCE on the REF exercise, including representation by nominated panellists at two feedback events, and a forthcoming impact survey.

9. Any other business

9.1 The chair thanked all panel members for their participation in, and very substantial contributions to, the REF2014 exercise.