

## **REF Sub-panel 12: Meeting 1b**

**Wednesday 8 January 2014**

**CCT Venues-Barbican, London**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Adisa Azapagic  
Chris Bailey  
John Clarkson (chair)  
Jonathan Cooper  
Jon Dunsdon  
Stephen Evans  
Peter Fryer  
Richard Hall  
Eileen Harkin-Jones

Gary Hawley  
Morgan Heikal  
Elaine Martin  
Madeline McKerchar (secretary)  
Raffaella Ocone  
Robert Parkin (deputy chair)  
Koulis Pericleous  
Duc Pham  
Jin Wang

#### **Apologies:**

Matthew Cartmell  
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda. He reported that Professor Young had resigned from the panel due to other responsibilities.
- 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 and to represent a spread of the disciplines represented within the Unit of Assessment. 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 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 also reviewed the score profile for each panellist and the chair recommended that several panellists should recalibrate their scores slightly to produce a better alignment of scores across 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 instructed that the agreed scores must be discarded following the calibration and outputs must be assessed in the same way as all other outputs.

### **4. Output allocation arrangements**

- 4.1. The chair presented the allocation of outputs to panel members and output assessors for assessment. He highlighted that:
  - a. Each output would be reviewed by three panellists.

- b. The first reader would be the closest fit in terms of expertise for each output and, where possible, the second reader would be in a cognate area.
  - c. The outputs for each author would be read by the same group of panellists so that any duplication between the outputs could be identified.
  - d. All declared conflicts of interest had been taken into account in the allocation.
  - e. The deputy chair had allocated the outputs of institutions with which the chair had a major conflict of interest.
- 4.2. The chair agreed to advise panellists about the output review order so that the same sub-set would be assessed by all panellists ahead of Meetings 2 and 3.
- 4.3. Panellists were reminded of the criteria for assessing outputs and of the eligibility criteria (*'Panel criteria and working methods'*, REF 01.2012, Part 1, paragraphs 35-53 and Part 2b, paragraphs 30-68).

## **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 chair outlined the fixed deadlines by which panellists should have uploaded 10-20, 50 and 100 per cent of their output scores in line with Main Panel B requirements.

## **7. Any other business**

- 7.1. There was no other business.

## **REF Sub-panel 12: Meeting 2**

**Wednesday 5 February 2014**

**The Studio, Birmingham**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Adisa Azapagic  
Chris Bailey  
Matthew Cartmell  
John Clarkson (Chair)  
Jonathan Cooper  
Lesley Dinsdale (Adviser)  
Jon Dunsdon  
Stephen Evans  
Peter Fryer  
Richard Hall

Eileen Harkin-Jones  
Gary Hawley  
Morgan Heikal  
Elaine Martin  
Madeline McKerchar (Secretary)  
Raffaella Ocone  
Robert Parkin (Deputy Chair)  
Koulis Pericleous  
Duc Pham  
Jin Wang

There were no apologies.

#### **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 (SP12.2.1).

#### **3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct.

- 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 group of outputs 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 SP12 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. Two members left the room for discussion of outputs from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 5.2. The Chair reported that interim scores had been recorded for the outputs from three HEIs and thanked panellists for returning their scores by the deadline. He explained the method used to suggest proposed scores and the rationale for flagging outputs for detailed discussion.
- 5.3. The panel reviewed the scores for each output in turn to arrive at agreed scores. Profiles for each of the institutions' scores, plus the overall profile, were projected for information.
- 5.4. Panellists were advised that a new report had been issued which would enable them to see other panellists' scores for outputs that they had already scored. It was agreed that the Panel Executive would regularly update panellists on which outputs should be discussed to see if they could arrive at an agreed 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. Panellists were reminded that they could download a list of their allocated case studies and impact templates from the panel members' website.
- 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 interest, 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.
- 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 20.03.14 and the remaining 50 per cent by 13.05.14.

**10. Any other business**

- 10.1. There was no other business.

## **REF Sub-panel 12: Meeting 3**

**Wednesday 26 March 2014**

**CCT Venues-Barbican, London**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Adisa Azapagic	Eileen Harkin-Jones
Chris Bailey	Gary Hawley
Matthew Cartmell	Morgan Heikal
John Clarkson (Chair)	Elaine Martin
Jonathan Cooper	Madeline McKerchar (Secretary)
Lesley Dinsdale (Adviser)	Raffaella Ocone
Jon Dunsdon	Robert Parkin (Deputy Chair)
Stephen Evans	Duc Pham
Peter Fryer	Jin Wang
Richard Hall	

Andrew Hunt, Jon-Paul Sherlock and Philip Wood attended for items 8-10.

Ann Dowling (Main Panel Chair) and Duncan Shermer (REF team) attended as observers for part of the meeting.

#### **Apologies:**

Janette Bennaddi  
Koulis Pericleous

#### **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.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct.
- 3.2. The Chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings and asked them to raise any further minor conflicts with the Panel Executive.

## **4. Update on cross-referrals**

- 4.1. The Chair reported that he would review the advisory scores for outputs that had been cross-referred to SP7 (Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences) and bring any proposals for adjustments to the panel's scores to the next meeting. He noted that no further SP12 outputs had been cross-referred to other sub-panels.
- 4.2. It was reported that, in addition to those noted at the last meeting, requests for SP12 to provide advisory scores for several outputs had been received from SP5 (Biological Sciences) and SP34 (Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory). The panel agreed to accept the incoming cross-referrals.

## **5. Audit**

- 5.1. The Secretary reported that two of the three audit requests received to date had been resolved satisfactorily and agreed to follow-up the third with the audit team.
- 5.2. Panellists were reminded to submit any further audit requests via the Secretary.

## **6. Review of output scores**

- 6.1. Six members left the room for discussion of outputs from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 6.2. The Chair reported that interim scores had been recorded for the first 50 per cent of outputs and thanked panellists for their work.

- 6.3. The panel reviewed the interim scores for each output to arrive at agreed scores. Profiles for each of the institutions' scores, plus the overall profile, were projected for information.
- 6.4. Panellists noted 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, and that the grade boundaries were appropriate.
- 6.5. It was agreed that the Panel Executive should also keep the emerging score profiles under review and report on their findings and any related recommendations for producing the final scores at the next meeting.
- 6.6. The deadline for uploading the final 50 per cent of outputs was noted 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 'bulk' audits by the REF team.
- 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. Impact assessment briefing**

- 8.1. The Chair welcomed the impact assessors to their first meeting of the panel. He reported that Steve Wiseall had resigned from the panel and thanked Philip Woods for agreeing to join the panel at short notice.
- 8.2. 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.
- 8.3. 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.

- 8.4. The Chair reported that each case study and template had been allocated for review to either two impact assessors and two panel members or to one impact assessor, one user member and two panel members. He reminded panellists to raise any minor conflicts of interest or candidates for audit at the earliest opportunity.
- 8.5. Panellists were advised that materials for the calibration exercise would be circulated shortly. It was noted that the calibration sample would include eight case studies and two templates. The deadline for assessing the calibration sample was also noted.

## **9. Future meetings and updated project plan**

- 9.1. An updated version of the project plan was received and approved.
- 9.2. The panel noted the work for completion by the next meeting, and in particular the deadline for uploading the final 50 per cent of output scores.
- 9.3. It was noted that the next meeting would be held from 20-22 May 2014 in the Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon and that the meeting would be in two parts: 20-21 May for output assessors and 22 May for impact assessors.

## **10. Any other business**

- 10.1. There was no other business.

## **REF Sub-panel 12: Meeting 4 (Part 1: outputs)**

**Tuesday 20 – Wednesday 21 May 2014**

**Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Adisa Azapagic	Gary Hawley
Chris Bailey	Morgan Heikal
Matthew Cartmell	Elaine Martin
John Clarkson (chair)	Madeline McKerchar (secretary)
Jonathan Cooper	Raffaella Ocone
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)	Robert Parkin (deputy chair)
Jon Dunsdon	Koulis Pericleous
Stephen Evans	Duc Pham
Peter Fryer	Wolfgang Rodi (main panel international member)
Richard Hall	Jin Wang
Eileen Harkin-Jones	

There were no apologies.

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Wolfgang Rodi, main panel international member, as this was his first SP12 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.

### **3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct.
- 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.
- 4.2. The chair reported that 65 outputs had recently been cross-referred from SP16 (Architecture, Built Environment and Planning) and that he would liaise with panellists to allocate these outside the meeting.

### **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.
- 5.2. The panel noted that responses had not yet been received in response to two panel-instigated output audit requests. The secretary agreed to report on the outcomes of these audit requests at the next meeting.
- 5.3. The panel agreed to approve the recommended decisions for the clearly defined staff circumstance cases submitted to Unit of Assessment 12 (UoA12) 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 was 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 main 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 his scores correlated strongly with those proposed by the panel. This gave further confidence to 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 panel, for its part, approved all the draft sub-profiles, subject to the satisfactory outcome of the two outstanding audit queries, 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.
- 8.2. The panel discussed the expectations and how responsibility for drafting the reports should be divided. It also discussed the feasibility of providing feedback for different groups within a submission, given that the groups often had to be inferred since this information was not consistently provided.

## **9. Any other business**

- 9.1. The chair thanked the panellists for their hard work throughout the output assessment process and, in particular, output assessor Koulis Pericleous, for his contribution to the panel.

## **REF Sub-panel 12: Meeting 4 (Part 2: impact)**

**Thursday 22 May 2014**

**Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Adisa Azapagic	Gary Hawley
Chris Bailey	Morgan Heikal
Matthew Cartmell	Andrew Hunt
John Clarkson (chair)	Elaine Martin
Jonathan Cooper	Madeline McKerchar (secretary)
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)	Raffaella Ocone
Jon Dunsdon	Robert Parkin (deputy chair)
Stephen Evans	Duc Pham
Peter Fryer	Robert Sorrell (main panel user member)
Richard Hall	Jin Wang
Eileen Harkin-Jones	Philip Woods

Wolfgang Rodi (main panel international member) attended for items 1-4.

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

#### **Apologies:**

Janette Bennaddi and Jon-Paul Sherlock

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Robert Sorrell, main panel user member, as this was his first SP12 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.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

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

## **4. Impact calibration**

- 4.1. One attendee left the room for discussion of a case study from an institution with which he had a major conflict of interest.
- 4.2. The chair reported that the sample of eight 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 the reasons for any differences with those agreed 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. The chair reported that Janette Bennaddi had indicated that other commitments would prevent her from completing the assessment process within the agreed timeframe and consequently she had offered to resign from the panel. The panel accepted her resignation and agreed how her allocation should be reassigned.
- 5.2. An earlier deadline for uploading impact scores was agreed to allow time for panellists to discuss the scores before the next meeting.
- 5.3. 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. The secretary noted a number of other audit queries that arose from the calibration exercise and the panellists' review of their allocation.
- 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.
- 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 from 2-3 July 2014 at the Radisson Blu in Birmingham.

## **9. Any other business**

- 9.1. The chair reported that the environment template allocation was now live and that each template had been assigned to five readers, two of whom had also been

assigned impact templates for that institution. Panellists noted that the first reviewer would be expected to act as the lead for that template.

**REF Sub-panel 12: Meeting 5**  
**Wednesday 2 - Thursday 3 July 2014**  
**Radisson Blu, Birmingham**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Adisa Azapagic	Gary Hawley
Chris Bailey	Morgan Heikal
Matthew Cartmell	Andrew Hunt
John Clarkson (chair)	Elaine Martin
Jonathan Cooper	Madeline McKerchar (secretary)
Lesley Dinsdale (adviser)	Raffaella Ocone
Jon Dunsdon	Robert Parkin (deputy chair)
Stephen Evans	Duc Pham
Peter Fryer	Jon-Paul Sherlock
Richard Hall	Jin Wang
Eileen Harkin-Jones	Philip Woods

Robert Sorrell, main panel user member, attended for items 1-8 (except 4).

Kim Hackett, HEFCE policy adviser, attended as an observer for part of the meeting.

There were no apologies.

**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 impact, produce draft impact sub-profiles, and prepare for the assessment of environment.
- 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.

### **3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1. The panel received the register of its declared major conflicts of interest and a couple of new conflicts were recorded.
- 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. Twenty two attendees left the room for discussion of submissions with which they had a major conflict of interest.
- 4.2. The panel noted that both audit queries which had been outstanding at the end of Meeting 4 had been verified.
- 4.3. The chair reported that adjustments had been made to a number of output sub-profiles in response to feedback from Main Panel B and the outcomes of the REF audit team's data comparison exercise. The panel approved the approach used to make these adjustments.
- 4.4. The panel reviewed the profiles of all submissions that had been affected by the adjustments and agreed to approve the changes and to commend the resulting profiles to the Main Panel.
- 4.5. The panel also reviewed the profiles of submissions which had not been affected by the adjustments. Reviewers' comments were captured for each submission for note in the overview and feedback reports.

### **5. Impact audit outcomes**

- 5.1. A list of the queries raised by reviewers was received and noted.

### **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. Any case studies which the reviewers were concerned may not have met the threshold criteria were discussed by the full panel to ensure that a consistent approach had been applied.

- 6.3. Draft impact sub-profiles for each submission, plus the overall draft impact sub-profile, were projected for information.
- 6.4. The panel reviewed the overall profile for the Unit of Assessment and gave careful consideration to the emergent grade boundaries for the overall submission. The main panel user member confirmed that the panel's assessment process had been robust.
- 6.5. The chair also reported that the executive group had carefully scrutinized the individual reviewers' profiles and the impact allocation to ensure that no submission was subject to a marking bias.

## **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 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.
- 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.
- 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 the impact assessors Andrew Hunt, Jon-Paul Sherlock and Philip Woods for their contribution to the panel. The panel also noted that this was the secretary's last meeting before starting maternity leave.
- 10.2. Panellists noted the work for completion by the next meeting, which would be held from 9-10 September 2014 in the Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon.

## **11. Any other business**

- 11.1. There was no other business.

**REF Sub-panel 12: Meeting 6**  
**Tuesday 9 – Wednesday 10 September 2014**  
**Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon**

**Minutes**

**Present**

Adisa Azapagic	Eileen Harkin-Jones
Chris Bailey	Gary Hawley
Matthew Cartmell	Morgan Heikal (9 <sup>th</sup> September only)
John Clarkson (Chair)	Elaine Martin
Jonathan Cooper	Raffaella Ocone
Lesley Dinsdale (Adviser)	Robert Parkin (Deputy Chair)
Jon Dunsdon	Duc Pham
Stephen Evans	Duncan Shermer (HEFCE REF Team)
Peter Fryer	Jin Wang
Richard Hall	

**Apologies**

It was noted that Morgan Heikal had given his apologies for the second day of the meeting.

.

**1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, including Duncan Shermer from the HEFCE REF team, acting as Panel Secretary for this meeting.
- 1.2. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main items of business were to:
  - Produce draft environment sub-profiles
  - Review and recommend to the main panel draft overall profiles
  - Review draft feedback statements to HEIs
  - Discuss items for inclusion in the main panel overview report.
- 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 (SP12.6.1).

## **Conflicts of interest**

- 2.2. The panel received and noted the register of its declared major conflicts of interest (SP12.6.2). One member had declared a new major interest since the previous meeting and the panel approved the Chair's action in ensuring that this would not cause any conflicts during the remaining parts of the assessment process
- 2.3. The Chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

## **3. Report from Main Panel B**

- 3.1. The Chair reported that at its meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2014 the Main Panel had accepted:
  - 3.1.1. the adjusted output sub-profiles agreed at the sub-panel's last meeting;
  - 3.1.2. the impact sub-profiles that were agreed at the sub-panel's last meeting.

## **4. Audit**

- 4.1. The Panel Adviser reported the outcomes of audits carried out by the REF Team since the last meeting:
  - 4.1.1. 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 SP8 as a result of this.
  - 4.1.2. An audit of REF4a and 4b data against the relevant data submitted to HESA returns had also been carried out. An adjustment to the number of REF4a research doctoral degree awards in one year of one submission was reported.

## **5. Agreement of environment scores and production of environment sub-profiles**

- 5.1. In break-out groups, the sub panel completed discussion and reached agreement on scores for each of the four assessed components of the environment template
- 5.2. The sub- panel then reviewed the overall profile for the Unit of Assessment and gave careful consideration to the emergent grade boundaries for the overall submission.



5.3. Draft environment sub-profiles were then carefully reviewed for each submission in turn. Fifteen attendees left the room for the discussion of draft sub-profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.

5.4. The panel, for its part, approved all the draft sub-profiles and agreed to commend them to the Main Panel.

## **6. Review of draft submission profiles and confidential feedback statements**

6.1. Fifteen attendees left the room for the discussion of draft submission profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.

6.2. The panel reviewed and discussed the overall profiles for each submission, together with draft feedback statements to the institutions on each of the three elements, outputs, impact and environment. The sub-panel noted guidance on the development of feedback on environment provided by the HEFCE REF Team.

6.3. The panel, for its part, approved all the submission profiles and agreed to commend them to the Main Panel.

6.4. Draft feedback statements would be reviewed by the Panel Executive for consistency of approach.

## **7. Points for inclusion in the overview report**

7.1. Further guidance on the content and structure of the main panel overview reports was received and noted (paper SP12.6.4).

7.2. Panellists were invited to comment on items included under each of the heading in the guidance document, and to suggest any other areas upon which they wished to comment

7.3. The sub-panel's agreed points for inclusion in both the main and SP12 sections of the overview report were noted. Points from all the sub-panels would be collated and considered at the next main panel meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> September.

## **8. Business for the final meeting**

8.1. Panellists noted that the main items of business for the final meeting, which would be held on Thursday 16 October 2014 in The Studio, Manchester, would be:

8.1.1. Approval of the final versions of the confidential feedback statements to HEIs;

8.1.2. Approval of a draft of the sub-panel's section of the main panel overview report

**9. Any other business**

- 9.1. It was confirmed that a dinner would be held on the eve of the final meeting, venue to be advised.

**REF Sub-panel 12: Meeting 7**  
**Thursday 16 October 2014**  
**The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester**

**Minutes**

**Present**

Chris Bailey	Eileen Harkin-Jones
Matthew Cartmell	Gary Hawley
John Clarkson (Chair)	Elaine Martin
Jonathan Cooper	Raffaella Ocone
Lesley Dinsdale (Adviser)	Robert Parkin (Deputy Chair)
Jon Dunsdon	Duc Pham
Stephen Evans	Vicky Jones (HEFCE REF Team)
Peter Fryer	Jin Wang
Richard Hall	

**Apologies**

Apologies were received from Adisa Azapagic and Morgan Heikal

**1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, including Vicky Jones from the HEFCE REF team, acting as Panel Secretary for this meeting.
- 1.2. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main items of business were to:
  - Complete the confidential feedback to HEIs on submissions
  - Review the draft sub-panel section of the Main Panel B overview report and the draft summary of content for the Main Panel section
  - Reflect on the REF process and collect feedback from the sub-panel
- 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 (SP12.7.1). There were no amendments.

### **3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1. The panel received and noted the register of its declared major conflicts of interest (SP12.7.2). The sub-panel noted that since the last meeting Professor Harkin-Jones had declared a new major conflict with the University of Ulster.
- 3.2. The Chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

### **4. Update on audit outcomes**

- 4.1. The Panel Adviser reported the outcome of an audit carried out by the REF Team on an individual who had been submitted to the REF by two HEIs to two different units of assessment, with a combined FTE of greater than 1.0. The individual concerned had been removed from the submission in SP12, and the submitting HEI had been informed. The panel reviewed and approved the resulting adjustment to the outputs profile for the HEI. It was noted that there was no change to the overall profile.

### **5. Report from Main Panel B**

- 5.1. The Chair reported that at its meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> September the Main Panel had accepted:
  - 5.1.1. The draft environment profiles agreed at the sub-panel's last meeting;
  - 5.1.2. The draft overall profiles that were agreed at the sub-panel's last meeting.
- 5.2. The Chair reported that the Main Panel was very satisfied with the overall outcome for Engineering, Physical Sciences and Mathematics.

### **6. Feedback to HEIs on submissions**

- 6.1. Draft feedback statements to HEIs on outputs, impact and environment were reviewed by the sub-panel.
- 6.2. The statements for each HEI were discussed individually, with panellists observing the procedure for major conflicts. 13 members left the room during discussions of HEI with which they had a major conflict.
- 6.3. Additions and amendments to feedback statements were approved by the sub-panel and recorded. It was agreed that, subject to final proof-reading by the Panel Executive, the statements were now finalised.

## **7. Sub-panel contribution to the Main Panel B overview report**

- 7.1. The Chair introduced a draft of the sub-panel's section in the Main Panel B overview report (SP12.7.3). The draft was based on the points that had been collected in discussion of this item at the sub-panel's last meeting.
- 7.2. The sub-panel reviewed the draft. Comments and suggestions for additions and amendments were noted, and it was agreed that these would be incorporated by the Panel Executive into a revised version by 22<sup>nd</sup> October, for submission to the Main Panel at its next meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> October.
- 7.3. The sub-panel also reviewed a list of points that had been flagged for inclusion in the Main Panel section of the overview report, as they were considered to be generic across all the sub-panels. Comments on these were recorded and would be fed back into the Main Panel section by the Panel Adviser.

## **8. Feedback to HEFCE on the REF process**

- 8.1. It was noted that HEFCE would be holding two feedback events in November 2014 and January 2015 in order to reflect and gather feedback on the REF process from sub-panel members and assessors across Main Panel B. Three SP12 panel members had been nominated to attend these events.
- 8.2. The sub-panel was invited to review points for feedback that had been noted in previous meetings (SP12.4.4) and to suggest any additional points. It was agreed that a consolidated list would be circulated to the event attendees as an aide-memoire of the sub-panel's collective views.

## **9. Release of REF results and closure of REF systems**

- 9.1. The Panel Adviser gave a short presentation giving information to the sub-panel on:
  - 9.1.1. The timetable for the release of the results;
  - 9.1.2. The formats in which the results would be presented;
  - 9.1.3. Advice to panel members on how they should respond to requests for comments on the results from the media. Members were advised to consult the REF Team if they had any queries about this.
  - 9.1.4. Closure of REF systems and the return of USBs sticks to the REF Team. It was confirmed that the REF Team would contact members not present at the meeting to request the return of their sticks.
- 9.2. Members were reminded of the need to maintain absolute confidentiality until the results are made public on 18<sup>th</sup> December.

## **10. Any other business**

- 10.1. The Chair thanked the panel members and the secretariat for their hard work and for their huge contribution throughout the assessment period to a successful outcome for the sub-panel's work..