



REF Sub-panel 10: Meeting 1b

Wednesday 8 January 2014, 10:00 – 15:30

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

Minutes

Present:

I. David Abrahams (Deputy Chair)	Nick Higham
Robert Archbold	Tim Hollowood (part-time, shared with SP9)
Simon Blackburn	Chris Jones
Adrian Bowman	John King
Chris Budd	Ian Leary
Mark Chaplain	Jens Marklof
Edward Corrigan	Karen Ness (Adviser)
Anne Davis	James Norris
Fred Diamond	Jonathan Pila
Simon Donaldson	Richard Pinch
Alison Etheridge	Caroline Series
Paul Fearnhead	Chris Skinner
Kevin Glazebrook	Jürgen Sprekels (international member, MPB)
Jacek Gondzio	Andrew Stuart
Iain Gordon	John Toland (Chair)
John Greenlees	Stephen Wilson
Robin Henderson	Mihail Zervos

Apologies:

Catherine Annabel (Secretary)

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and invited all to introduce themselves. As all Main Panel B sub-panels were meeting at the same time, apologies were received from the panel secretary who was supporting another sub-panel; the panel adviser acted as panel secretary on this occasion.

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

2. Conflicts of interest

2.1 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.

2.2 The chair invited members to check that the register of declared major conflicts, circulated before the meeting, was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the panel members' website.

3. Output calibration

3.1 Prior to the meeting, the 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. This sample of outputs comprised 10 selected for the Main Panel B calibration exercise, which had been selected so as to avoid major conflicts of interest for Main panel B members. A further 14 outputs had been selected so as to avoid major conflicts of interest for SP10 panellists. Outputs had been selected to represent a spread of the research areas represented within the Unit of Assessment.

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 discuss specific scores for the outputs in the calibration sample; and to form a consensus on how papers of different types and in differing research areas may be assessed equitably.

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

3.4 Panellists had submitted their scores to the panel secretary prior to the meeting. The consolidated scoring information was displayed and the panel considered how far panellists had reached a consensus on the outputs. The panel discussed outputs representing a range of research areas 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 borderline between star levels. The panel also discussed the guidance in relation to the assessment of inter-disciplinary research and the eligibility of outputs pre-published in 2007. Through this discussion the sub-panel reached an understanding on the scores for outputs within the sample 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 10 outputs from each sub-panel calibration exercise. The chair fed back the relevant main panel agreed scores and the panellists noted how they may have differed from the sub-panel agreed score and the reasons for this.

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 same way as all other outputs.

4. Output allocation arrangements

4.1 The chair outlined the proposed deadline dates for having uploaded 10-20%, 50% and 100% of their output scores in line with Main Panel B requirements.

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

- Each output will be reviewed by two panellists.
- Panellists will be allocated outputs that are as close as possible to their immediate areas of expertise.
- The deputy chair will make the allocation of outputs for institutions with which the chair has a major conflict of interest.

4.3 The chair reported that to date one reader has been allocated for the majority of outputs. These panellists were invited to suggest second panellists for the outputs that they have been allocated via their personal spreadsheets.

4.4 The panel discussed and agreed the arrangements that they will use to ensure that panellists assess the same sub-set of outputs ahead of the sub-panel meetings in late January and in early April.

5. IT systems briefing

5.1 The panel adviser 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 Wednesday 29 January 2014, 10:00 - 16:30, at CCT Venues-Smithfield, Two East Poultry Avenue, Smithfield, London EC1A 9PT.

7. Any other business

7.1 There was no further business.



REF Sub-panel 10: Meeting 2

Wednesday 29 January 2014, 10:00 – 16:30

CCT Venues, Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Professor David Abrahams (Deputy Chair)	Professor Tim Hollowood (part-time, shared with SP9)
Ms Catherine Annabel (Secretary)	
Professor Robert Archbold	Professor Chris Jones
Professor Simon Blackburn	Professor John King
Professor Adrian Bowman	Professor Ian Leary
Professor Chris Budd	Professor Jens Marklof
Professor Mark Chaplain	Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor Edward Corrigan	Professor James Norris
Professor Anne Davis	Dr Jonathan Pila
Professor Fred Diamond	Dr Richard Pinch
Professor Simon Donaldson	Professor Caroline Series
Professor Alison Etheridge	Professor Chris Skinner
Professor Paul Fearnhead	Professor Jürgen Sprekels (international member, MPB)
Professor Kevin Glazebrook	
Professor Jacek Gondzio	Professor Andrew Stuart
Professor Iain Gordon	Professor John Toland (Chair)
Professor John Greenlees	Professor Stephen Wilson
Professor Robin Henderson	Professor Mihail Zervos
Professor Nick Higham	

Apologies:

There were no apologies.

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the secretary, Catherine Annabel, who had been unable to attend the previous meeting because of the scheduling of parallel Main Panel B sub-panel meetings. Members were advised that for future meetings both the secretary and the adviser will be present.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 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, circulated at the meeting, 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 would be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Output assessment

4.1 Prior to the meeting, panellists had been asked to assess allocated outputs from a 20% tranche, identified as a subset by submitting author surname. 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 data by institution and by reviewer was presented by the adviser.

4.2 The chair outlined the aims of this exercise, highlighting that the target of 20% of outputs being assessed by this meeting had been met, but that the limited sample and the resulting unevenness in panellist loads meant that the data would contribute to a second stage calibration exercise, allowing identification of hawks and doves, and other patterns of scoring which might require adjustment.

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 submitted review articles or lecture notes contain no original research content, they should be unclassified. However, where the output contains original research, this content should be assessed according to REF guidance and criteria. Submitting HEIs had the opportunity to identify the original research content of submitted reviews, and this is provided in the Additional Output Information field.

4.3.2 There was considerable discussion about the treatment of interdisciplinary outputs not recommended for cross-referral but where the UoA specific content was light. Panellists were referred to the guidance that outputs submitted to the UoA should be assessed for overall quality and not solely on the UoA-specific content.

4.3.3 Panellists were reminded in reviewing the current distribution of scores across the 4* scale that there was 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. Panellists will use their expert knowledge of the field to inform their assessment of an output, but should not refer to citation data or journal impact factors, nor should they use the additional output information which in some cases has been provided by HEIs, except where it provides information about a review article or a non-text output.

4.3.5 The issue of duplicate outputs was discussed and it was noted that in the majority of cases pairs assessing one submission of an output would assess other submissions. Where conflicts of interest prevented this, in a small number of cases, reconciliation of scores would be required between assessors. The secretary confirmed that a report on duplicate outputs was available and that scores for these outputs were being monitored and would be reported to the next meeting.

4.3.6 It was noted that three proposed double-weighted outputs had 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 It was agreed that the chair and deputy chair will resolve all outstanding second reader queries as soon as possible to enable joint scores to be agreed. It was confirmed that panellists should use their first comment column to enter the agreed score, the second for suggestions of alternative second readers and to identify issues for the executive and the remaining columns for notes for their personal use.

4.5 For the next meeting, on 1 April, 50% of outputs will need to have been assessed. Given the timescale for completing the full task, members were encouraged where possible to reach the 60% target. An overview of scores will be prepared for discussion at the meeting and some boundary cases will be reviewed.

5. Audit briefing

5.1 The adviser presented a summary of the procedures relating to audit of outputs and staff members, both panel-instigated and REF sample based audits. Panellists were reminded that guidance was 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 SP10. 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.

6.2 It was noted that by prior arrangement SP32 (Philosophy) will accept cross-referrals for history of mathematics outputs.

7. Preparations for impact assessment

7.1 It was noted that a sample of impact case studies will be identified by the end of February for calibration. The selection methodology will be agreed by the main panel, and further guidance on scoring will be provided.

7.2 It was agreed that impact case studies will be allocated to two impact assessors/user members and two academic panel members. Impact templates will be allocated to one impact assessor/user member and two academic panel members.

7.3 Impact assessors will be fully briefed regarding the REF process and will participate fully in the calibration exercise. A lead assessor will be identified for each case study to facilitate discussion, and if possible assessors will be invited to arrive on the evening of 3 June ahead of the impact meeting (SP meeting 4, part 2) when discussions between assessor groups will take place.

7.4 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 Panellists 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 10: Meeting 3

Tuesday 1 April 2014, 10:00 – 16:30

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

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (Secretary)	Professor Tim Hollowood
Professor Robert Archbold	Professor Chris Jones
Dr Mohammed Atari (from item 6)	Professor John King
Professor Simon Blackburn	Professor Peter Lane (from item 6)
Professor Adrian Bowman	Professor Ian Leary
Professor Chris Budd	Dr Michael Lyons (from item 6)
Professor Mark Chaplain	Professor Jens Marklof
Professor Edward Corrigan	Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Dr Diane Crann (from item 6)	Professor James Norris
Professor Anne Davis	Dr Jonathan Pila
Professor Fred Diamond	Professor Caroline Series
Professor Alison Etheridge	Professor Chris Skinner
Professor Paul Fearnhead	Professor Jürgen Sprekels (international member, MPB)
Professor Kevin Glazebrook	Dr Heather Tewkesbury (from item 6)
Professor Jacek Gondzio	Professor John Toland (Chair)
Professor Iain Gordon	Professor Stephen Wilson
Professor Robin Henderson	Professor Mihail Zervos
Professor Nick Higham	

Apologies:

Apologies were received from Professor Simon Donaldson, Professor John Greenlees, Dr Richard Pinch and Professor Andrew Stuart.

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 29 January 2014, as revised on 14 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 panellists for their work on the assessment of outputs, and reported that the target of 50% had been met, with the majority of those having recorded an agreed score. A small number of outputs remained with only one reader (excluding cross-referrals) and panellists were asked to recommend second readers where these were outstanding.

5.3 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.

5.4 It was noted that three proposed double-weighted outputs have been submitted to the sub-panel, and the panel accepted the recommendations of panellists on two of these, referring the remaining output to the next sub-panel meeting.

5.5 The secretary presented a report on the outputs cross-referred to and from the sub-panel and progress in assessing them. Members were reminded that advice and scores received from other panels should be recorded and taken into account in their assessment of the output. If a decision could not be made on the basis of the advice received, a second panellist will be appointed from the home sub-panel. Advice outstanding from other panels will be monitored by the secretary.

5.6 At the next meeting, on 2-4 June, all output scores will be finalised by the panel and thus panellists will need to ensure that all outstanding agreed scores are uploaded by the revised deadline of 23 May.

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

5.8 A verbal report was provided on outputs referred to audit, the reasons for audit, and the outcomes. The secretary will ensure that responses from HEIs to matters raised for audit are communicated to the panellists assessing the outputs.

5.9 Members received an updated workplan identifying the tasks to be completed at forthcoming meetings.

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 and would be undertaken following this meeting.

6.3 It was agreed that following the meeting the calibration sample of case studies and templates 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 30 May.

6.4 In parallel with the calibration exercise, all case studies will be allocated to two impact assessors (taking account of conflicts of interest) and two academics, and templates to one impact assessor and two academics. Panellists will review, but not score, these allocations in order to identify minor conflicts of interest and potential audit queries.

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 10: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

2-3 June 2014

Wotton House, Guildford Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH5 6HS

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (Secretary)	Professor Nick Higham
Professor I David Abrahams	Professor Tim Hollowood
Professor Robert Archbold	Professor Chris Jones
Professor Simon Blackburn	Professor John King
Professor Adrian Bowman	Professor Ian Leary
Professor Chris Budd	Professor Jens Marklof
Professor Mark Chaplain	Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor Edward Corrigan	Professor James Norris
Professor Anne Davis	Dr Jonathan Pila
Professor Fred Diamond	Dr Richard Pinch
Professor Simon Donaldson	Professor Caroline Series
Professor Alison Etheridge	Professor Chris Skinner
Professor Paul Fearnhead	Professor Jürgen Sprekels (international member, MPB)
Professor Kevin Glazebrook	Professor Andrew Stuart
Professor Jacek Gondzio	Professor John Toland (Chair)
Professor Iain Gordon	Professor Stephen Wilson
Professor John Greenlees	Professor Mihail Zervos
Professor Robin Henderson	

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 1 April 2014 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the addition of Professor I David Abrahams to the list of those attending.

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. The requested output reductions were approved in 449 of the 456 cases submitted, and the panel agreed that the outstanding 7 cases, which were 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 all allocated outputs and agree scores with their co-readers. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

5.2 The chair thanked panellists for having completed the assessment of all outputs.

5.3 It was noted that 3 proposed double-weighted outputs have been submitted to the sub-panel of which 2 were accepted, and one rejected (the reserve output was assessed in this instance).

5.4 The secretary presented a report on outputs cross-referred to and from the sub-panel. Advice on one cross-referred output was still awaited and the provisional score will be reviewed when advice is received.

5.5 A report was provided on outputs referred to audit by members of the panel, the reasons for audit, and the outcomes. It was noted that the REF audit team had separately reviewed all outputs published in 2007 and in 2013, to ensure their eligibility. As a result 3 outputs submitted to SP10 had been identified as having been previously submitted to the RAE by the same staff member and will be recorded as unclassified.

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 reports and feedback statements

6.1 Panellists received the REF template and guidance on overview reports and feedback statements. Draft feedback statements on outputs were prepared for each submission. Panellists left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

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 assessors was now complete, and thanked them for their contribution.



REF Sub-panel 10: Meeting 4 (Part 2)

4 June 2014

Wotton House, Guildford Road, Dorking, Surrey, RH5 6HS

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (Secretary)	Professor Robin Henderson
Professor I David Abrahams	Professor Nick Higham
Professor Robert Archbold	Professor Chris Jones
Dr Mohammed Atari	Professor John King
Professor Simon Blackburn	Professor Peter Lane
Professor Adrian Bowman	Dr Michael Lyons
Professor Chris Budd	Professor Jens Marklof
Professor Mark Chaplain	Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Dr Peter Costigan (user member, MPB)	Dr Graeme Rosenberg (HEFCE, part-time)
Dr Diane Crann	Professor Caroline Series
Professor Anne Davis	Professor Chris Skinner
Professor Fred Diamond	Professor Jürgen Sprekels (international member, MPB)
Professor Alison Etheridge	Dr Heather Tewkesbury
Professor Paul Fearnhead	Professor John Toland (Chair)
Professor Kevin Glazebrook	
Professor Iain Gordon	

Apologies: there were no apologies for absence.

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed the impact assessors and Dr Peter Costigan, Main Panel B user member, 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

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 April 2014 were agreed as a correct record, subject to the addition of Professor I David Abrahams to the list of those attending.

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 Calibration

4.1 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.

5. Audit matters relating to impact

5.1 Panellists noted a number of potential audit queries raised to date and agreed that further queries would be sent to the secretary as soon as possible to enable these to be resolved, and where appropriate raised with the HEI, or corroboration sought from individuals named in the case studies.

6. Assessment of impact

6.1 All assessors were asked to record personal scores for their allocated case studies and templates. Lead assessors were asked to coordinate and arrive at an agreed score, and the two agreed scores (user/impact and academic) will then be discussed at Meeting 5 when the panel score for each item will be decided.

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 10: Meeting 5

8-9 July 2014

**The Studio, The Hive, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN
Manchester**

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (secretary)	Professor Iain Gordon
Professor I David Abrahams (deputy chair)	Professor Robin Henderson
Professor Robert Archbold	Professor Nick Higham
Dr Mohammed Atari	Professor Chris Jones
Professor Simon Blackburn	Professor John King
Professor Adrian Bowman	Professor Peter Lane
Professor Chris Budd	Dr Michael Lyons
Professor Mark Chaplain	Professor Jens Marklof
Dr Peter Costigan (user member, MPB)	Dr Karen Ness (adviser)
Dr Diane Crann	Dr Richard Pinch
Professor Anne Davis	Professor Caroline Series
Professor Fred Diamond	Professor Chris Skinner
Professor Alison Etheridge	Professor Andrew Stuart
Professor Paul Fearnhead	Dr Heather Tewkesbury
Professor Kevin Glazebrook	Professor John Toland (chair)

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Mr Peter Costigan, MPB user member.

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 2-4 June 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. All readers of affected outputs had been consulted and had approved the amendment. It was noted that the feedback statements drafted at the last meeting will be amended 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 cross-referral activity had been completed.

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. Two-way, and in some instances four-way agreements had also been recorded for a significant proportion of impact 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 one of the queries raised, and the impact items had been scored taking account of the audit responses received. A provisional score was recorded where audit information had not yet been received.

5.3 Panellists worked in pairs and small groups to arrive at agreed scores for all case studies and templates, and a number of borderline items and all items where agreement resulted in an unclassified item, were brought to the full panel for consideration. Panellists left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

5.4 The panel reviewed and agreed panel scores for all impact items submitted to UOA10, subject to confirmation in one item 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 to draft impact feedback statements for each submission. Panellists were also asked to consider inputs to the panel overview report to be discussed at the next meeting.

7. Environment

7.1 Members received a briefing on the assessment of environment templates and discussed the calibration sample of four templates. The chair advised that each template had 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 impact 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 10: Meeting 6

15-16 September 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (secretary)	Professor Robin Henderson
Professor I David Abrahams (deputy chair)	Professor Nick Higham
Professor Robert Archbold	Professor Chris Jones
Professor Simon Blackburn	Professor John King
Professor Adrian Bowman	Professor Jens Marklof
Professor Chris Budd	Dr Karen Ness (adviser)
Professor Mark Chaplain	Dr Richard Pinch
Professor Anne Davis	Professor Caroline Series
Professor Fred Diamond	Professor Chris Skinner
Professor Alison Etheridge	Professor Juergen Sprekels (MPB International member)
Professor Paul Fearnhead	Professor Andrew Stuart
Professor Kevin Glazebrook	Professor John Toland (chair)
Professor Iain Gordon	

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Professor Juergen Sprekels, MPB international member.

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 8-9 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. Assessment of outputs and impact

4.1 The secretary reported that all audit queries relating to staff circumstances and outputs were complete, but one impact audit query awaited a response. The response when received will be forwarded to the panel members responsible for assessing the case study, who will notify the secretary and adviser of any change to the interim score currently recorded.

4.2 The chair reported on the recalibration of impact scores following the review by Main Panel B.

5. Environment assessment

5.1 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. For many items, proposed agreed scores had also been recorded. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

5.2 The secretary reported that no audit queries had been raised by panel members.

5.3 The full sub-panel considered the proposed scores and agreed panel scores for all templates submitted to SP10. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

5.4 The sub-panel reviewed and approved HEI environment profiles. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6. Review of HEI results, feedback statements and overview report

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 SP10 and agreed that these should be recommended to Main

Panel for approval. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6.3 Panel members received and agreed previously-drafted feedback statements on outputs and impact, and agreed draft statements on environment.

6.4 The chair reported on the sub-panel's contribution to the MPB overview report and panel members were asked to provide bullet points for inclusion, particularly relating to outputs and environment, to the chair following the meeting.

7. Future meetings and work plan

8.1 Panel members received the latest version of the work plan and noted the business to be undertaken at the final meeting of the sub-panel on 22 October 2014.



REF Sub-panel 10: Meeting 7

22 October 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (secretary)	Professor Robin Henderson
Professor I David Abrahams (deputy chair)	Professor Nick Higham
Professor Robert Archbold	Professor Chris Jones
Professor Simon Blackburn	Professor John King
Professor Adrian Bowman	Professor Jens Marklof
Professor Chris Budd	Dr Karen Ness (adviser)
Professor Mark Chaplain	Dr Richard Pinch
Professor Anne Davis	Mr Graeme Rosenberg (REF Manager, morning only)
Professor Fred Diamond	Professor Caroline Series
Professor Alison Etheridge	Professor Chris Skinner
Professor Paul Fearnhead	Professor Juergen Sprekels (MPB International member)
Professor Kevin Glazebrook	Professor Andrew Stuart
Professor Iain Gordon	Professor John Toland (chair)
Professor John Greenlees	

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Professor Juergen Sprekels, MPB international member, and 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 meeting held on 15-16 September 2014 were agreed as a correct record subject to the addition of Professor John Greenlees to the list of those attending.

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 that any amendments have been recorded via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts had been notified to the chair and recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Approval of results

4.1 The chair reported that MPB had approved all the assessment results for SP10 (overall profiles and sub-profiles), including the recalibrated impact scores noted at the previous meeting of SP10, at its meeting on 30 September.

5. Assessment of outputs, impact and environment

5.1 The secretary presented a report on audit queries raised on staff circumstances, outputs and impact case studies and confirmed that all had been resolved.

5.2 The secretary presented a report on cross-referrals into and out of SP10 and confirmed that all had been dealt with.

6. Feedback statements

6.1 Panel members reviewed all feedback statements together with the overall and sub-profiles for all submissions to SP10. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest. It was agreed that the Executive will complete all final amendments for submission to the REF Team.

7. Overview reports

7.1 Panel members reviewed the draft SP10 contribution to the MPB overview report and the draft SP10-specific overview report and agreed that the Executive will complete all final amendments before submission.

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 REF exercise.