

**Sub-panel 13: Meeting 1b**  
**8 January 2014, 10:00 – 15:30**  
**CCT Venues-Smithfields, London**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Bashir Al-Hashimi	Glen Mchale
Serena Best	Clive Parini
David Bull	Mark Rainforth
Mike Fitzpatrick	Alwyn Seeds
Alison Hodge	Lionel Tarassenko
Paul Hogg (Deputy Chair)	Deepak Uttamchandani
David Howard	Richard Vinter
Dave Jones (acting Secretary)	Kathryn Walsh
Peter Malkin	Stephen Williamson (Chair)
John Mccanny	Bajram Zeqiri

**Apologies:**

Lewis Williams (Secretary)

**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. Outline timetable**

- 3.1. The panel considered the meeting schedule previously circulated.
- 3.2. The chair outlined the proposed deadline dates for having uploaded 12.5%, 57.9% and 100% of their output scores in line with Main Panel B requirements and upon reflection panel members agreed that the dates were achievable.

### **4. Output calibration**

- 4.1. Prior to the meeting, the chair had selected and circulated a sample of 20 outputs to the members and output assessors, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. These outputs were selected so as to avoid major conflicts of interest for panellists. In addition, 10 of the submitted outputs were selected so as to avoid major conflicts of interest for Main Panel B members. Outputs were selected to represent a spread of the disciplines represented within the Unit of Assessment.
- 4.2. 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 methods and in differing disciplines may be assessed equitably.
- 4.3. The chair recognised that asking panellists to consider all of the calibration sample sometimes took them outside of their immediate areas of expertise.
- 4.4. Panellists had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The acting 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 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.
- 4.5. 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.
- 4.6. 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.

## **5. Output allocation arrangements**

- 5.1. 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:
- a) Each output will be reviewed by three panellists.
  - b) Panellists will be allocated outputs that are as close as possible to their immediate areas of expertise.
  - c) The deputy chair will make the allocation of outputs for institutions with which the chair has a major conflict of interest; and that a third member of the panel will make the allocation of outputs for institutions with which both the chair and deputy chair have major conflicts of interest.
- 5.2. 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 29 January 2014. It is the chair's intention to make a full allocation as soon as possible.
- 5.3. The panel discussed 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.

## **6. IT systems briefing**

- 6.1. The acting 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.

## **7. Any other business**

- 7.1. There was no further business.

**Sub-panel 13: Meeting 2**  
**29 January 2014, 10:00 – 16:30**  
**CCT Venues-Smithfields, London**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Bashir Al-Hashimi  
Serena Best  
David Bull  
Mike Fitzpatrick  
Alison Hodge  
Paul Hogg (deputy chair)  
David Howard  
Peter Malkin  
John McCanny  
Glen McHale  
Clive Parini

Mark Rainforth  
Alwyn Seeds  
Sarah Sweeney (adviser)  
Lionel Tarassenko  
Deepak Uttamchandani  
Richard Vinter  
Kathryn Walsh  
Lewis Williams (secretary)  
Stephen Williamson (chair)  
Bajram Zeqiri

**Apologies:**

None

**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. Minutes of the previous meeting**

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting were an accurate record.

**3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of members' declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct.

- 3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the distinction between major and minor conflicts of interest, highlighting the following points.
- 3.3. Major conflicts of interest automatically bar panellists from reviewing any material from the HEI concerned whereas minor conflicts of interest do not. Panellists need to register major conflicts of interest via the Panel members' website (PMW) and keep this record updated. By contrast minor conflicts of interest should be reported to the secretary by REF webmail.
- 3.4. A research interest may be regarded as either a major or minor conflict of interest depending on the nature and extent of the collaboration.
- 3.5. Minor conflicts of interest do not need to be declared upfront. Rather panellists are asked to e-mail the secretary if they encounter any minor conflicts of interest with any material they have been allocated.

#### **4. Individual staff circumstances**

- 4.1. The chair explained that the individual staff circumstances information (for staff with clearly defined circumstances) provided by HEIs in respect of staff submitted with fewer than four research outputs was to be reviewed by the panel secretary and recommendations arising from that review process would be brought to future meetings of the sub-panel.

#### **5. Cross-referrals**

- 5.1. The chair explained that the sub-panel had received a small number of cross-referral requests both from submitting HEIs (requesting cross-referrals 'out') and other sub-panels (requesting cross-referrals 'in'). These requests would be managed by the deputy chair. Where inward cross-referral requests were accepted from other sub-panels, the process would require the nomination of a panellist reviewer from the sub-panel. Some particular cases were discussed.

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

- 6.1. In preparation for the meeting panellists had been asked to read and score a given number of allocated outputs. This process had resulted in 449 outputs having scores recorded from all three panellist reviewers.
- 6.2. The chair outlined the sub-panel's proposed approach to arriving at panel scores based on the three reviewer scores, and identifying which outputs need further discussion to arrive at a panel score. The sub-panel agreed to accept the approach outlined.

- 6.3. 89 of the outputs were discussed in turn. In 83 cases panel scores were agreed. In six cases the agreement of panel scores was deferred pending audit queries and/or cross-referral.
- 6.4. One panellist, having declared a major conflict of interest, left the room whilst the HEI's outputs were being discussed.
- 6.5. One panellist declared a minor conflict of interest with one of the outputs discussed. The chair ruled that the minor interest should be noted by the sub-panel, but that it should not affect the panel member's participation in assessing the submission.
- 6.6. In preparation for the next meeting panellists agreed to review and score a given number of allocated outputs and upload their scores to the PMW by 26th March. A report would then be issued to panellists on 27th March listing which outputs were likely to require discussion at the 1st April meeting.

## **7. Audit**

- 7.1. The adviser gave a presentation outlining REF audit and data verification processes, which combined audit queries raised by the REF team and queries raised by sub-panels.
- 7.2. Panellists wishing to propose audit queries should e-mail the secretary specifying the name of the submission and the identity of the item and the specific data the panellist wishes to verify or what specific additional information is needed and why.
- 7.3. Audit will be a standing item on the agenda at future sub-panel meetings.

## **8. Preparation for impact assessment**

- 8.1. The chair outlined the proposed approach of the sub-panel to impact assessment where each impact case study would be reviewed by one 'user' assessor and two others. An impact case study calibration exercise (similar to the output calibration exercise already undertaken) would be undertaken following the next sub-panel meeting.

## **9. Future meetings**

- 9.1. The sub-panel received a schedule of future meeting dates and main agenda items. The next meeting would be on 1 April 2014.

## **10. Any other business**

10.1. No further business was reported.

## **Sub-panel 13: Meeting 3**

**1 April 2014, 10:00 – 16:30**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Bashir Al-Hashimi  
Serena Best  
David Bull  
Mike Fitzpatrick  
Alison Hodge  
Paul Hogg (deputy chair)  
David Howard  
Peter Malkin  
John McCanny  
Glen McHale  
Lisa O'Reilly (part time)

Clive Parini  
Mark Rainforth  
Alwyn Seeds  
Sarah Sweeney (adviser)  
Lionel Tarassenko  
Deepak Uttamchandani  
Richard Vinter  
Kathryn Walsh  
Lewis Williams (secretary)  
Stephen Williamson (chair)  
Bajram Zeqiri

#### **Apologies:**

None

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting. The chair explained that Sub-panel 13's impact assessor, Lisa O'Reilly, had been invited to attend the meeting's afternoon session so that she could attend the impact assessment briefing (Item 8 on the meeting's agenda).
- 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 sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting were an accurate record.



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

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of members' declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct.
- 3.2. The chair thanked panellists for declaring minor conflicts of interest against the outputs they had been allocated for review. Seventy three such minor conflicts of interest had been declared to date. A register of these was being maintained and in each case the chair had made a decision whether reallocation of the output to another reviewer was necessary. Necessary reallocations had been addressed or were being addressed and individual panellists would have been or would be notified of any changes affecting their allocations.

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

- 4.1. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals. Sub-panel 13 had cross-referred a total of 55 outputs out to other sub-panels for advice as follows:
  - 22 to SP4 Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience (with one more to follow)
  - 7 to SP5 Biological Sciences
  - 3 to SP7 Earth Sciences
  - 8 to SP8 Chemistry
  - 5 to SP9 Physics
  - 1 to SP10 Mathematical Sciences
  - 7 to SP11 Computer Science and Informatics
  - 2 to SP14 Civil and Construction Engineering
- 4.2. Sub-panel 13 reviewers of the outputs concerned will receive, if they have not already done so, a suggested score and optional comment against each output from the nominated reviewers on the above sub-panels.
- 4.3. It was noted that the official deadline for raising new cross-referral requests had passed on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> March, but that exceptionally it would still be possible to raise individual new requests.
- 4.4. Sub-panel 13 had accepted a small number of cross-referrals in from other sub-panels (around 25 in total from SP7 Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences, SP19 Business and Management Studies, SP22 Social Work and Social Policy, SP34 Art and Design, History, Theory and Practice, SP35 Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts and SP36 Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management). Sub-panel 13 members nominated to provide cross-referral advice to other sub-panels would have received REF webmails requesting the advice and providing them with instructions on whom to send the advice to by webmail.

## **5. Audit**

- 5.1. The sub-panel received a paper providing full details of all panel-instigated audits raised to date and their current status. It was explained that updated versions of this report would be provided at each meeting.
- 5.2. Seventeen audit queries on outputs had been raised to date, 12 of which had been completed. Eight audit queries on staff had been raised to date, five of which had been completed, and five of which had been raised as a result of the review of individual staff circumstances (the next item on the agenda).

## **6. Individual staff circumstances**

- 6.1. The secretary explained that the panel secretariat was undertaking a review of the clearly defined circumstances information provided in respect of the 191 staff that had been submitted to Sub-panel 13 with clearly defined circumstances (REF1b data). This review was approximately one third complete. As a result of the review process so far, five audit queries had been raised where insufficient information had been provided to confirm that the criteria for the requested reduction of outputs had been met. The review would be completed before the next meeting, at which the sub-panel will be asked to approve the recommendations arising from the completed review.
- 6.2. Some discussion was held on the question of what prevented people with independent research careers outside academia from claiming early career researcher status on becoming employed by an HEI, during which it was noted that the REF guidance definition of the point at which an individual is deemed to become an independent researcher does not depend on employment by an HEI, but can be employment by any organisation. One particular case involving this issue would be addressed following the meeting.

## **7. Review of output scores**

- 7.1. In preparation for the meeting panellists had been asked to have reviewed all their allocated outputs up to and including those to Queen's University, Belfast, when the list is arranged alphabetically by submission name.
- 7.2. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the approach agreed to arriving at panel scores from three reviewer scores.
- 7.3. The chair explained the position with regard to output scoring to be as follows. The panel had a total of 4,028 outputs to review. Of these 73 were known duplicates of other outputs, which could therefore be addressed separately from the main reviewing process. This left 3,955 outputs needing panel scores. Of these 440 had panel scores arrived at from the previous meeting. This left 3,515.

Of these 1,496 had scores recorded from all three reviewers as at 8.40am Friday, 28<sup>th</sup> March. Of these 1,269 had panel scores yielded from the application of the agreed approach to arriving at panel scores. This left 227 outputs as candidates for panel discussion. On Friday, 28<sup>th</sup> March, panellists had been asked to review their scoring for these 227 outputs with a view to providing revised scores in borderline cases. As a result of such revisions 144 of the 227 now had panel scores yielded from the agreed approach. This left 83 outputs where there was insufficient consensus in the scoring to be discussed at the meeting.

- 7.4. These 83 outputs were discussed in turn. In all cases panel scores were agreed. However it was agreed that a new cross-referral request should be made in respect of one output (to seek advice on it from SP9 Physics) and that the panel scores of all outputs with cross-referral advice requested would be reviewed at the next meeting, at which point there would have been time for all incoming cross-referral advice to have been received and considered.
- 7.5. During these discussions a total of 11 panellists, having declared major conflicts of interest with one or more of the HEIs whose submissions were being discussed, left the room at various points during the meeting whilst the outputs of the respective HEIs with which they had declared conflicts of interest were discussed. Similarly both the adviser and the secretary left the room at the different points at which the submissions from HEIs with which they had respectively declared major conflicts of interest were discussed. Both the chair and deputy chair were amongst the 11 panellists that left the room at particular points due to major conflicts of interest. During the period where the chair was conflicted and therefore absent from the room, but the deputy chair not conflicted and therefore present in the room, the deputy chair chaired the meeting. During the period where both the chair and deputy chair were conflicted and therefore absent from the room, an arrangement had been made for another panellist to chair the meeting,
- 7.6. One panellist declared a minor conflict of interest with one of the outputs discussed. The chair ruled that the minor interest should be noted by the sub-panel, but that it should not affect the panel member's participation in assessing the submission.
- 7.7. The issue of pre-publication arose in connection in the discussion of one output and it was noted that the exception allowing "pre-publication" in the REF guidance (paragraph 43 on p.7 of the *Panel criteria*) only applied to outputs "pre-published" in the calendar year 2007 and thereby not those "pre-published" in 2006.
- 7.8. The issue of the scoring of duplicate outputs was discussed. Although the expectation would be for each instance of a duplicated output (the same output submitted by two or more different HEIs against their respective two or more different members of staff) to receive the same panel scores, differences were theoretically possible due to the different additional information (the maximum 100

words covering factual information about the significance of the output) being supplied with each instance of the duplicate output. It was agreed that the chair would review the additional information supplied with all instances of duplicated outputs, with this issue in mind, to assess whether there was a case for any duplicated outputs to receive different panel scores from their respective duplicates.

- 7.9. In addition to the 73 cases of duplication already identified, two other pairs of duplicate outputs were identified from amongst other outputs during the course of the meeting. The scoring of one of these duplicate pairs was discussed at the meeting and the scoring of the other would be discussed at the next meeting.
- 7.10. It was agreed that the approach of giving panellists a brief window immediately before the meeting, in which to review their scores in the light of their co-reviewers' scores, would be followed for the next meeting. Panellists would be asked to have completed reviewing all their allocated outputs and to have uploaded their scores by close of play on **Thursday, 29<sup>th</sup> May**. Analysis would then be undertaken to ascertain which outputs had scoring which did not yield panel scores according to the agreed approach and individual lists would be sent to panellists on Friday 30<sup>th</sup> May in the same way as they had been sent to panellists on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> March

## **8. Impact assessment briefing**

- 8.1. Lisa O'Reilly, Sub-panel 13's impact assessor, joined the meeting for this item.
- 8.2. The adviser presented a detailed briefing on the assessment of impact in the REF, inviting any questions from panellists during the presentation. Discussion was held on a number of points, mainly related to the threshold criteria involved in the assessment of impact case studies.
- 8.3. It was explained that the impact calibration exercise would be undertaken on the third day of the next meeting, and that in advance of this all panellists would be asked to review and score the same calibration sample of ten impact case studies and four impact templates. This material would be e-mailed to panellists shortly following the present meeting, with instructions provided on how to return their calibration scores. A deadline for the return of calibration scores was agreed to be the same as that for the completion of output scoring, close of play on **Thursday, 29<sup>th</sup> May**.
- 8.4. Panellists were advised that the process of allocating impact material for review had been completed and panellists could now see their individual allocations by regenerating their personal spreadsheets and selecting the impact worksheet from within the workbook. If possible panellists were asked to "scan" their allocations before the next meeting, with a view to identifying candidates for items

for audit with details to be e-mailed to the secretary by the same 29<sup>th</sup> May deadline.

**9. Project plan**

- 9.1. The sub-panel received an updated version of the SP13 project plan and briefly discussed the agenda for the next meeting, which will take place over the course of three days, with the first two days covering outputs and the third day impact. It was agreed that environment assessment might also briefly begin to be discussed at some point during the three day meeting.

**10. Any other business**

- 10.1. No further business was reported.

**11. Next meeting**

- 11.1. The next meeting will be 3-5 June 2014.

## **Sub-panel 13: Meeting 4**

**3-5 June 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present (Day 1):**

Bashir Al-Hashimi  
Serena Best  
David Bull  
Mike Fitzpatrick  
Alison Hodge  
Paul Hogg (deputy chair)  
David Howard  
Peter Malkin  
John McCanny  
Glen McHale  
Clive Parini

Mark Rainforth  
Alwyn Seeds  
Sarah Sweeney (adviser)  
Lionel Tarassenko  
Deepak Uttamchandani  
Richard Vinter  
Kathryn Walsh  
Lewis Williams (secretary)  
Stephen Williamson (chair)  
Bajram Zeqiri

#### **Apologies:**

None

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda, explaining that Day 1 and Day 2 of the meeting would be focused on matters related to the assessment of outputs, with Day 3, to which the sub-panel's impact assessor had additionally been invited, to be focused on matters related to the assessment of impact.
- 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 sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting were an accurate record.

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

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of members' declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct.
- 3.2. The chair thanked panellists for declaring minor conflicts of interest against the outputs they had been allocated for review. Eighty such minor conflicts of interest had been declared. A register of these had been maintained and in each case the chair had made a decision whether reallocation of the output to another reviewer was necessary. Necessary reallocations had been dealt with and individual panellists notified of any changes affecting their allocations.
- 3.3. It was noted that a similar process was being followed for minor conflicts of interest with respect to impact case studies and impact templates. Panellists should e-mail the panel secretary if they come across any minor conflicts of interest with impact material they have been allocated for review. The conflict will then be registered and the chair will make a decision whether reallocation of the item(s) in question to another reviewer is necessary.

### **4. Audit**

- 4.1. The sub-panel received a paper providing full details of all panel-instigated audits raised to date and their current status. It was explained that updated versions of this report would be provided at each meeting.
- 4.2. No audit queries on impact items had yet been raised. Sixteen audit queries on outputs had been raised to date, 15 of which had been completed. Eighteen audit queries on staff had been raised to date, all of which had been completed, at least in terms of HEIs supplying the additional information requested of them, and fifteen of which had been raised as a result of the review of individual staff circumstances (the next item on the agenda).

### **5. Individual staff circumstances**

- 5.1. The secretary explained that the panel secretariat had completed its review of the clearly defined circumstances information provided by submitting HEIs in respect of the 191 staff that had been submitted to Sub-panel 13 with clearly defined circumstances (REF1b data). As a result of the review process, 15 audit queries had been raised where insufficient information had been provided to confirm that the criteria for the requested reduction of outputs had been met.
- 5.2. The sub-panel approved the recommendations arising from the completed review that, in all but the above 15 cases, all requested reductions of outputs on the grounds of clearly defined circumstances should be accepted.

- 5.3. The secretariat would review the additional information provided by HEIs in respect of the 15 audited cases and bring recommendations concerning these cases to the next meeting.

## **6. Review of output scoring**

- 6.1. The chair explained that preparation for the meeting, including presenting panellists with the opportunity to revise borderline scoring cases prior to the meeting with a view to reducing the number of outputs requiring discussion at the meeting, had meant that the vast majority of outputs now had provisional panel scores. However there were left some cases of outputs where there either remained insufficient consensus among panellist reviewers for a provisional panel score to be yielded, or where for some reason one panellist had not recorded their score for the output
- 6.2. The sub-panel discussed in turn each of the outputs where insufficient consensus among panellist reviewers existed for a provisional panel score to be yielded. All such cases were resolved in discussion, with in each case one or more panellists agreeing to revise their individual scores so that a provisional panel score was yielded.
- 6.3. During these discussions there were a total of 20 instances of panellists, having declared major conflicts of interest with respect to the HEIs whose outputs were being discussed, being asked to leave the room whilst the outputs of that HEI were discussed.
- 6.4. Both the chair and deputy chair were amongst the panellists that left the room at particular points during these discussions due to major conflicts of interest. Here and at other points during the three days of the meeting, where the chair was conflicted and therefore absent from the room, but the deputy chair not conflicted and therefore present in the room, the deputy chair chaired the meeting. During the period where both the chair and deputy chair were conflicted and therefore absent from the room, an arrangement had been made for another panellist to chair the meeting.
- 6.5. The sub-panel then discussed in turn each of the outputs that were missing a score from one of their reviewers. Some instances of missing scores could be resolved immediately, and consequently provisional panel scores yielded for the outputs concerned. However there remained a small number of cases (eight outputs) where it was agreed that, for one reason or another, a new reviewer would need to be assigned the output to provide the missing score. The required new reviewers were agreed for these outputs. There were also four outputs where it was agreed that the cross-referral advice requested in respect of them from another sub-panel but not yet received, should be obtained before panel scores could be decided. The secretary agreed to chase the sub-panel concerned for the missing cross-referral advice.



- 6.6. The sub-panel then discussed the scoring on one particular output where cross-referral advice had only latterly been received. One panellist was asked to leave the room during this discussion due to a conflict of interest.
- 6.7. As a result of the above discussions (6.1-6.6) provisional panel scores could now be yielded for all but 12 outputs submitted to UOA13.
- 6.8. The panel discussed the overall outputs profile yielded from the provisional panel scores. It was agreed to amend the method for combining personal scores to reach an agreed panel score. It was agreed that the secretariat would enact the above change during the evening, to enable revised data to be presented to the meeting on Day 2.

**7. Any other business (Day 1)**

- 7.1. No further business was reported.

## **Present (Day 2):**

Bashir Al-Hashimi  
Serena Best  
David Bull  
Mike Fitzpatrick  
Alison Hodge  
Paul Hogg (deputy chair)  
David Howard  
Peter Malkin  
John McCanny  
Glen McHale  
Clive Parini

Mark Rainforth  
Alwyn Seeds  
Sarah Sweeney (adviser)  
Lionel Tarassenko  
Deepak Uttamchandani  
Richard Vinter  
Kathryn Walsh  
Lewis Williams (secretary)  
Stephen Williamson (chair)  
Bajram Zeqiri

## **Apologies:**

None

## **8. Introduction**

8.1. The chair welcomed attendees to Day 2 of the meeting.

## **9. Assessment of outputs (overall profile)**

9.1. The chair presented an updated overall outputs profile now based on the agreement reached on Day 1 and based on scores from all but 12 out of 4,028 outputs.

## **10. HEI feedback statements (outputs)**

10.1. The chair explained that Sub-panel 13, as with all sub-panels, is tasked with producing a concise feedback statement for each submission, which will be provided in confidence to the head of institution in January 2015. The purpose of these statements is to provide informative feedback to assist the institution in understanding the reasons for the profile it has been awarded. To this end, the feedback statements will provide a brief comment on each of the three sub-profiles (outputs, impact and environment).

10.2. The chair explained that the majority of Day 2 of the meeting would be devoted to drafting comments for inclusion in the feedback statements institutions would receive on their outputs sub-profile. To this end, each of the 37 submissions to UOA13 would be discussed in turn.

10.3. Before the discussion of each submission any panellists with a major conflict of interest with respect to the institution concerned were asked to leave the room

and were only recalled once the discussion concerning that institution had been concluded.

- 10.4. All 37 submissions were discussed and feedback statements drafted. In each case the following data was presented to the sub-panel to help inform its discussion: the size of submission (total number of outputs); the outputs sub-profile; and a breakdown of the provisional outputs sub-profile by research groups (where the submission had been made using research groups).

## **11. Overview report (outputs)**

- 11.1. Overview comments on research outputs submitted to UOA13 were discussed and agreed for potential inclusion in the outputs section of the sub-panel's overview report.

## **12. Environment assessment (preliminary discussion)**

- 12.1. This item was brought forward from its original position on the agenda for Day 3.
- 12.2. The chair introduced a preliminary discussion on how the sub-panel might approach environment assessment. Some ideas were mooted and it was agreed that a full proposal for the sub-panel's approach to the assessment of environment would be presented at the next meeting.

## **13. Any other business (Day 2)**

- 13.1. No further business was reported.

**Present (Day 3):**

Bashir Al-Hashimi	Clive Parini
Serena Best	Mark Rainforth
David Bull	Graeme Rosenberg (REF manager)
Peter Costigan (Main Panel B member)	Alwyn Seeds
Mike Fitzpatrick	Sarah Sweeney (adviser)
Alison Hodge	Lionel Tarassenko
Paul Hogg (deputy chair)	Deepak Uttamchandani
David Howard	Richard Vinter
Peter Malkin	Kathryn Walsh
John McCanny	Lewis Williams (secretary)
Glen McHale	Stephen Williamson (chair)
Lisa O'Reilly	Bajram Zeqiri

**Apologies:**

None

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

- 14.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting including those joining the meeting for Day 3 only, Lisa O'Reilly (Sub-panel 13 impact assessor), Peter Costigan (Main Panel B user member) and Graeme Rosenberg (REF manager, joining the meeting for part of its time).
- 14.2. The chair introduced the agenda, explaining that this would cover importantly the sub-panel's impact calibration exercise and planning for impact assessment.
- 14.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

**15. Minutes of the previous meeting**

- 15.1. Now with the benefit of the impact assessor joining the meeting for Day 3, the sub-panel again confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting were an accurate record.

**16. Conflicts of interest**

- 16.1. For the benefit of the impact assessor now attending, the sub-panel again received the register of members' declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct.

## **17. Impact calibration**

- 17.1. In preparation for the meeting all panellists had been asked to have reviewed the same calibration sample comprising ten impact case studies and four impact templates, and submit their scores for the items on a nine point scale (U/0.5\*/1\*/1.5\*/2\*/2.5\*/3\*/3.5\*/4\*).
- 17.2. The chair and the secretary presented the results of the sub-panel's scoring with analysis that included the overall distribution of scores and individual panellists' means and standard deviations.
- 17.3. Each impact item was then discussed in turn, in the light of its distribution of scores from panellists and the views of panellists. A meeting calibration score was agreed for each item.
- 17.4. Some key points arising from the calibration discussion were as follows.
- 17.5. The sub-panel should bear in mind that it is not a requirement for an impact to have reached its maximum potential for its case study to receive a four star grade.
- 17.6. The sub-panel should always keep in mind that impact case studies should be graded based on the reach and significance of the impacts evidenced within them, and not with reference to the degrees of success with which they clear the thresholds required in order to be eligible (e.g. the requirement for the underpinning research to be of predominantly two star quality), which, assuming the thresholds are met should not be factors in the grade the case study receives.

## **18. Impact audits**

- 18.1. The panel adviser gave a brief presentation on the process for impact audits and the types of items which could be audited and which could not. Audit queries should only be raised for the following reasons: where a case study risks failing the threshold criteria unless further information is provided; where the quality of the underpinning research is doubted and the panellist has not otherwise been able to access the underpinning outputs; or where corroboration of impacts is required, but only if the panellist has reason to doubt the claims made in the case study, and not for further information.
- 18.2. Given that the next meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> July needs to address the production of draft impact profiles, panellists were asked to submit any requests for impact audits as soon as possible. Additionally panellists were asked not to withhold scoring on items where they had requested audits, but to continue to award provisional scores based on the assumption that the audit had been passed, which scores could then be revisited in the event that the audit is not passed.

## **19. Planning for impact assessment**

19.1. Plans for scoring impact items in the lead up to the next meeting were discussed and the following points agreed (19.2 through to 19.8).

19.2. Each impact case study and each impact template has been assigned three reviewers.

[Note: Subsequent to the SP13 meeting and following the Main Panel B meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> June, this was changed to three reviewers for each impact case study and *four* reviewers for each impact template, in order that 'user' members of SP13 be involved in the review of impact templates as well as impact case studies.]

19.3. Each panellist should score all impact case studies and/or templates assigned to them via their personal spreadsheet using the nine point scale (U/0.5\*/1\*/1.5\*/2\*/2.5\*/3\*/3.5\*/4\*) scale and upload all scores to the Panel Members Website (PMW) by close of play on Wednesday 2nd July.

19.4. The chair and secretary will analyse scores received and if all three scores are in sufficient agreement on the nine point scale then reviewers will not be asked to look at their scores again before the 9-10th July meeting.

19.5. The list of those items where all three scores are not in sufficient agreement will form the provisional list of items requiring discussion at the meeting.

19.6. However, in a similar manner as was done with outputs, panellists will be given the option to submit revised scores, if they wish to do so and in the light of their co-reviewers' scores, with the aim of reducing the number of items requiring discussion at the meeting.

19.7. Towards this end, before the weekend of 5th and 6th July, panellists will be sent individual lists of all impact items they have scored where their scores and those of their co-reviewers are not in sufficient agreement on the scale. Panellists will then be asked to return any revised scores they wish to submit by close of play on Monday 7th July in order that they may be taken into account in time before the meeting.

19.8. Additionally all panellists should e-mail the panel secretary if and when they come across them, if they have case studies that they believe fail the threshold test for the underpinning research being 'predominantly of at least two star quality'.

## **20. Project plan**

20.1. The sub-panel received an updated version of the project plan.

## **21. Any other business (Day 3)**

21.1. No further business was reported.

**22. Next meeting**

22.1. The next meeting will be 9-10 July 2014.

## **Sub-panel 13: Meeting 5**

**9-10 July 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present (Days 1 and 2):**

Bashir Al-Hashimi	Clive Parini
Serena Best	Mark Rainforth
David Bull	Alwyn Seeds
Peter Costigan (Main Panel B)	Sarah Sweeney (adviser)
Mike Fitzpatrick	Lionel Tarassenko
Alison Hodge	Deepak Uttamchandani
Paul Hogg (deputy chair)	Richard Vinter
David Howard	Kathryn Walsh
Peter Malkin	Lewis Williams (secretary)
John McCanny	Stephen Williamson (chair)
Glen McHale	Bajram Zeqiri
Lisa O'Reilly	

#### **Apologies:**

None

#### **Observer part attending meeting Day 1:**

Claire Thompson, Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, explaining that the meeting would be joined for part of its time by Main Panel B user member Peter Costigan, who would contribute to the discussion on impact assessment, and by Claire Thompson of the Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland, who would be attending in an observational capacity.
- 1.2. The chair introduced the agenda explaining that the substantial items of business were for Day 1, impact case study scoring and impact template scoring and for Day 2, preparing draft impact feedback statements and planning for environment assessment.



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

## **2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting were an accurate record.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of members' declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct.
- 3.2. The chair thanked panellists for declaring minor conflicts of interest against outputs and against impact items that they had been allocated for review. Eighty one minor conflicts of interest had been declared against outputs and seven against impact items. A register of these had been maintained and in each case the chair had made a decision whether reallocation of the item to another reviewer was necessary. Necessary reallocations had been dealt with and individual panellists notified of any changes affecting their allocations.
- 3.3. It was noted that a similar process would be followed for minor conflicts of interest with respect to environment assessment. Panellists should e-mail the panel secretary if they come across any minor conflicts of interest with environment material they have been allocated for review. The conflict will then be registered and the chair will make a decision whether reallocation of the item in question to another reviewer is necessary.

## **4. Audit**

- 4.1. The sub-panel received a paper providing details of all panel-instigated audits raised and their current status. It was explained that updated versions of this report would be provided at each meeting.
- 4.2. An update was provided on the information given in the paper on impact item audits. As at the date of the meeting, 12 impact item audits had been raised, eight of which had been completed.
- 4.3. In the light of there being a small number of audit queries on impact items awaiting completion, it was agreed that the principle would be followed that the items concerned should be scored by the sub-panel as though the results of the audit had proved satisfactory and in the event that the further information to be obtained through the audit did not prove satisfactory, scoring on the item concerned would be revisited.

- 4.4. No audit queries on environment had yet been raised. Sixteen audit queries on outputs had been raised to date, all of which had been completed. Twenty two audit queries on staff had been raised to date, all of which had been completed at least in terms of HEIs supplying the additional information requested of them, and 19 of which had been raised as a result of the review of individual staff circumstances (the next item on the agenda).

## **5. Individual staff circumstances**

- 5.1. It was explained that the only outstanding matter from the review of clearly defined individual staff circumstances undertaken by the panel secretariat was in respect of the 19 cases with now completed audits (15 of which were audits raised by the panel secretariat and four of which were audits raised by the REF team as a result of the process whereby the secretariat had been asked to provide a list of HEIs that had provided only minimal information in respect of early career researchers). The secretariat had reviewed the further information provided by HEIs in these cases and judged that sufficient information had now been provided in order that it could be confirmed that required criteria for the requested reductions had been met and the reductions correctly calculated. The panel accepted the secretariat's recommendation that therefore the requested reductions in the number of outputs to be assessed should be accepted in these 19 cases.

## **6. Impact case study scoring**

- 6.1. The chair thanked panellists for submitting for the pre-meeting deadline their individual scores on impact case studies allocated to them. He explained that there was a good degree of consensus with the scoring. For 124 out of the 141 case studies the three reviewers' scores agreed within one and a half star ratings. For 98 out of the 141 case studies the three reviewers' scores agreed within one star rating.
- 6.2. In the light of the above, it was agreed that for this agenda item each of the 43 case studies where the scoring did not agree within one star rating would be discussed in turn, with a view to one or more of the reviewers revising their scores such that the three scores would all agree within one star rating of each other.
- 6.3. During these discussions there were a total of 15 instances of panellists, having declared major conflicts of interest with respect to the HEIs whose impact case studies were being discussed, being asked to leave the room whilst the impact case studies of that HEI were discussed.
- 6.4. Both the chair and deputy chair were amongst the panellists that left the room at particular points during these discussions due to major conflicts of interest. Here and at other points during the two days of the meeting, where the chair was conflicted and therefore absent from the room, but the deputy chair not conflicted

and therefore present in the room, the deputy chair chaired the meeting. During the period where both the chair and deputy chair were conflicted and therefore absent from the room, an arrangement had been made for another panellist to chair the meeting.

- 6.5. The sub-panel discussed in turn each of the 43 impact case studies where insufficient consensus among panellist reviewers had been identified. All such cases were resolved in discussion, with in each case one or more panellists agreeing to revise their individual scores so that the three scores were within one star rating of each other.

## **7. Impact template scoring**

- 7.1. The chair thanked panellists for submitting for the pre-meeting deadline their individual scores on impact templates allocated to them, in particular thanking 'user' members of the sub-panel who add been added as fourth reviewers on the templates in the period following the last meeting. He explained that, as had been the case with impact case studies, there was a good degree of consensus with the scoring. For 32 out of the 37 impact templates the four reviewers' scores agreed within one and a half star ratings. For 24 out of the 37 impact templates the three reviewers' scores agreed within one star rating.
- 7.2. In the light of the above, it was agreed that for this agenda item each of the 13 impact templates where the scoring did not agree within one star rating would be discussed in turn.
- 7.3. During these discussions there were a total of eight instances of panellists, having declared major conflicts of interest with respect to the HEIs whose impact templates were being discussed, being asked to leave the room whilst the impact templates of that HEI were discussed.
- 7.4. The sub-panel discussed in turn each of the 13 impact templates where insufficient consensus among panellist reviewers had been identified. All such cases were resolved in discussion, with in each case one or more panellists agreeing to revise their individual scores so that the four scores were within one star rating of each other.

## **8. Any other business (Day 1)**

- 8.1. With the discussions on the scoring of individual impact items completed before the end of Day 1, some discussion on planning for environment assessment was brought forward.
- 8.2. Different approaches to environment assessment were discussed including the possibility of reviewers awarding scores for a given section of all environment

templates as opposed to awarding scores for all sections of a given selection of environment templates.

- 8.3. The sub-panel agreed that each environment template should be allocated to five reviewers, so that each panellist would be asked to award scores on each of the four sections of ten or eleven environment templates in total.

## **9. Introduction (Day 2)**

- 9.1. The chair welcomed attendees to Day 2 of the meeting.

## **10. Assessment of impact (overall profile)**

- 10.1. Following the previous day's meeting the secretariat had undertaken some calculation and analysis based on the scores agreed at the meeting. An overall impact profile was presented to the sub-panel, based on these scores. The panel discussed and agreed its approach yielding the panel scores for each item and, in turn, the overall impact profile.

## **11. HEI feedback statements (impact)**

- 11.1. The chair explained that Sub-panel 13, as with all sub-panels, is tasked with producing a concise feedback statement for each submission, which will be provided in confidence to the head of institution in January 2015. The purpose of these statements is to provide informative feedback to assist the institution in understanding the reasons for the profile it has been awarded. To this end, the feedback statements will provide a brief comment on each of the three sub-profiles (outputs, impact and environment).
- 11.2. The chair explained that the majority of Day 2 of the meeting would be devoted to drafting comments for inclusion in the feedback statements institutions would receive on their impact sub-profile. To this end, each of the 37 submissions to UOA13 would be discussed in turn.
- 11.3. Before the discussion of each submission any panellists with a major conflict of interest with respect to the institution concerned were asked to leave the room and were only recalled once the discussion concerning that institution had been concluded.
- 11.4. All 37 submissions were discussed and feedback statements drafted. In each case the following data was presented to the sub-panel to help inform its discussion: the submission's overall impact sub-profile; a list of the submission's case studies and their panel scores; and the submission's impact template panel score.

## **12. Overview report (impact)**

- 12.1. Overview comments on impact case studies and templates submitted to UOA13 were discussed and agreed for potential inclusion in the impact section of the sub-panel's overview report.

### **13. Environment assessment**

- 13.1. Further to yesterday's agreement that each environment template would be allocated to five reviewers, further aspects of environment assessment were discussed and a deadline agreed of close of play on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> September by which panellists should upload their completed scores to the Panel Members' Website.

### **14. Any other business (Day 2)**

- 14.1. No further business was reported. In closing the meeting the chair in particular thanked impact assessor Lisa O'Reilly, today attending her last meeting of the sub-panel, for her valued contributions to the work of the sub-panel.

### **15. Next meeting**

- 15.1. The next meeting will be 18-19 September 2014.



## **Sub-panel 13: Meeting 6**

**18-19 September 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present (Days 1 and 2):**

Bashir Al-Hashimi  
Serena Best  
David Bull  
Mike Fitzpatrick  
Alison Hodge  
Paul Hogg (deputy chair)  
David Howard  
Peter Malkin  
John McCanny  
Glen McHale

Clive Parini  
Mark Rainforth  
Alwyn Seeds  
Sarah Sweeney (adviser)  
Lionel Tarassenko  
Deepak Uttamchandani  
Richard Vinter  
Kathryn Walsh  
Lewis Williams (secretary)  
Stephen Williamson (chair)

#### **Apologies:**

Bajram Zeqiri

#### **Observer attending meeting Day 1:**

Vicky Jones, Deputy REF Manager

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2. The chair introduced the agenda explaining that the substantial items of business were to agree panel scores for environment assessment, to draft environment feedback statements for HEIs and to discuss content for the sub-panel's overview report.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

## **2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting were an accurate record.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of members' declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. No minor conflicts had been declared by panellists against any aspects of the environment material that they had been allocated for review.

## **4. Impact assessment update**

- 4.1. The chair proposed that, following discussion of overall impact profiles at the Main Panel B meeting, the same process that had been employed by the sub-panel with impact scores at the 3\*/4\* border should be applied to scores at the 2\*/3\* border. The sub-panel agreed to this change being enacted.

## **5. Audit**

- 5.1. The sub-panel received a paper providing details of all panel-instigated audits raised and their current status.
- 5.2. An update was provided to the information given in the paper on impact item audits. As at the date of the meeting, 14 impact item audits had been raised, all of which had now been completed.
- 5.3. It was noted that in addition to any panel-instigated audits, the REF audit team had undertaken a bulk audit process of environment data, whereby REF4a data (research doctoral degrees awarded) and REF4b data (research income) were evaluated against the related HESA data and HEIs were audited in the event there being discrepancies between the REF and HESA data beyond a set of given threshold criteria. This process had resulted in one data change to one submission to UOA13. The panellist reviewers of the submission in question had been notified of this data change and given the opportunity to amend their scores in its light.
- 5.4. In accordance with the principle previously agreed (that impact items would be scored as though the results of the audit had proved satisfactory and in the event that the further information to be obtained through the audit did not prove satisfactory scoring on the item concerned would be revisited), a request was made to revisit the scoring on one impact case study in the light of information obtained through audit. It was agreed that the three panellist reviewers of the case study concerned should discuss the matter of the scoring of the item in the

light of additional information obtained through audit, and report back on their decision on Day 2 of the meeting (see item 11.1 below).

## **6. Environment scoring**

- 6.1. The chair thanked panellists for submitting for the pre-meeting deadline their individual scores on environment template sections. He reminded the sub-panel that the environment scoring process required the sub-panel to agree panel scores for each of the four sections of each of the environment submissions (and not an overall score for each submission) and that thereby the business of the sub-panel was to agree panel scores for 148 environment 'items', that is, four section scores for each of the 37 environment submissions.
- 6.2. The chair and secretary presented some analysis in terms of individual scoring. This provided reassurance that there were no disparities between panellists that should cause any particular concern and indicated a good degree of existing consensus amongst reviewers. For 144 out of the 148 environment items the five reviewers' scores agreed within one and a half star ratings. For 111 out of the 148 case studies the five reviewers' scores agreed within one star rating.
- 6.3. In the light of the above, it was agreed that for this agenda item each of the 37 environment items where the scoring did not agree within one star rating would be discussed in turn, with a view to one or more of the reviewers revising their scores such that the three scores would all agree within one star rating of each other.
- 6.4. During these discussions there were a total of 15 instances of panellists, having declared major conflicts of interest with respect to the HEIs whose environment items were being discussed, being asked to leave the room whilst the environment submission of the HEI concerned was discussed.
- 6.5. The sub-panel discussed in turn each of the 37 environment items where insufficient consensus among panellist reviewers had been identified. All such cases were resolved in discussion, with in the vast majority of cases one or more panellists agreeing to revise their individual scores so that the five scores were within one star rating of each other.
- 6.6. An overall environment profile was presented to the sub-panel based on the panel score for each environment item being the average score of the individual marks for that item, rounded to the nearest half mark (so as for the panel score to be in terms of the nine point scale, 4\*/3.5\*/3\*/2.5\*/2\*/1.5\*/1\*/0.5\*/U, as it needed to be). The panel discussed the overall environment profile yielded and agreed that no changes to the above method of arriving at the panel scores were necessary.

## **7. HEI feedback statements (environment)**



- 7.1. The chair introduced the requirement for Sub-panel 13, as it had done with outputs and impact, to produce a concise feedback statement for each submission, which will be provided in confidence to the head of institution in January 2015. The purpose of these statements is to provide informative feedback to assist the institution in understanding the reasons for the profile it has been awarded. .
- 7.2. The chair explained that the remainder of Day 1 of the meeting and the first part of Day 2 of the meeting would be devoted to drafting comments for inclusion in the feedback statements institutions would receive on their environment sub-profile. To this end, each of the 37 submissions to UOA13 would be discussed in turn.
- 7.3. Before the discussion of each submission any panellists with a major conflict of interest with respect to the institution concerned were asked to leave the room and were only recalled once the discussion concerning that institution had been concluded. Both the chair and deputy chair were amongst the panellists that left the room at particular points during these discussions due to major conflicts of interest. Where the chair was conflicted and therefore absent from the room, but the deputy chair not conflicted and therefore present in the room, the deputy chair chaired the meeting. During the period where both the chair and deputy chair were conflicted and therefore absent from the room, an arrangement had been made for another panellist to chair the meeting.
- 7.4. All 37 submissions were discussed and feedback statements drafted. In each case the following data was presented to the sub-panel to help inform its discussion: the submission's overall environment sub-profile; and the individual section panel scores, which would not be seen by the HEI itself.

## **8. Overall submission profiles**

- 8.1. Once the business of drafting HEI feedback statements had been concluded during the morning session of Day 2, the chair and secretary presented the sub-panel with some analysis of the overall scoring results of the sub-panel in terms of overall submission profiles.

## **9. Overview report**

- 9.1. The chair introduced discussion to provide the content of the sub-panel's overview report, explaining that the aim was to agree a series of bullet points for the report under each of the three headings, outputs, impact and environment, which would then be drafted into a document to be presented at the next meeting. The material under the headings outputs and impact had previously been discussed, but was revisited for this discussion. Discussion of the content for the environment section was addressed for the first time.

## **10. Planning for next meeting**

- 10.1. It was agreed that before the next meeting there would be a process whereby panellists would each be asked to review the collective HEI feedback statements for two or three submissions. This would not be with a view to significant changes being made, but in order to 'sense check' the content of the three statements when considered together and when considered against the sub-profiles and their corresponding breakdowns (the outputs sub-profile by research groups, where applicable; the impact profile by individual items scores; and the environment profile by individual section scores.)
- 10.2. A split of the 37 submissions between panellists such that each panellist was allocated two or three submissions was agreed, and in order to facilitate the above process the secretary agreed to provide panellists with the relevant information by 26th September. It was further agreed that panellists would respond with confirmation of the appropriateness of the feedback statements or changes to them by 8th October in order that the returns could be collated in time for presentation at the next meeting.

## **11. Any other business**

- 11.1. The reviewers of the impact case study, where the scoring was being revisited in the light of information obtained through audit, reported back their decision that the underpinning research was judged not to be of predominantly at least two star quality. As a consequence, the score of the case study in question was amended so that it received an unclassified grade. A change to the relevant HEI feedback statement was also discussed and agreed to reflect the scoring change.
- 11.2. The secretary explained how the process for the eventual return of panellists' USB sticks would work. In line with its data retention schedule, the REF team is required to receive and erase all USB pens by the date of the publication of results. Panellists will each receive an addressed and pre-paid envelope in November to use to return their USB sticks to the REF team, who would appreciate the return of USB sticks as soon as possible after panellists receive their return request.

## **12. Next meeting**

- 12.1. The next meeting will be 16 October 2014.

## **Sub-panel 13: Meeting 7**

**16 October 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Bashir Al-Hashimi  
Serena Best  
David Bull  
Mike Fitzpatrick  
Alison Hodge  
Paul Hogg (deputy chair)  
David Howard  
Peter Malkin  
John McCanny  
Glen McHale

Clive Parini  
Mark Rainforth  
Alwyn Seeds  
Sarah Sweeney (adviser)  
Deepak Uttamchandani  
Richard Vinter  
Kathryn Walsh  
Lewis Williams (secretary)  
Stephen Williamson (chair)  
Bajram Zeqiri

#### **Apologies:**

Lionel Tarassenko

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2. The chair introduced the agenda explaining that the substantial items of business were to review the sub-panel's draft overview statement and to review the sub-panel's set of draft feedback statements for HEIs.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

#### **2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting were an accurate record.

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

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of members' declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct.

### **4. Audit**

- 4.1. The sub-panel received a paper providing details of all panel-instigated audits raised to date and their current status. All such panel-instigated audits had now been completed.

### **5. Environment assessment update**

- 5.1. The chair reported that the Sub-panel 13 overall environment profile had been well received at the Main Panel B meeting and that the sub-panel's results were in keeping with those of other Main Panel B sub-panels.

### **6. Results process and confidentiality**

- 6.1. The sub-panel received a presentation outlining the timetable for the results process, detailing the information that would be available to whom and when, and covering the confidentiality requirements on panellists. The chair stressed the importance of confidentiality requirements, including that REF results be kept absolutely confidential until publication.

### **7. Overview report**

- 7.1. The sub-panel received the current draft sub-panel overview report, which was discussed.
- 7.2. Various changes to the overview report were discussed and those that were agreed were made.
- 7.3. The final version of the overview report would go forward to be included in the papers for the next Main Panel B meeting.

### **8. HEI feedback statements (outputs, impact and environment)**

- 8.1. The chair thanked panellists for their individual input in reviewing selected HEI feedback statements in accordance with the plans agreed at the last meeting. The chair explained that the remainder of the meeting would largely be devoted to the sub-panel as a whole reviewing all HEI feedback statements. To this end, each of the 37 submissions to UOA13 would be discussed in turn. For the discussion of each submission, the submission's overall profile, sub-profiles and feedback statements would be displayed on the screen, together with contextual

information. The panel adviser would record any amendments to the text of the feedback statements agreed by the sub-panel.

- 8.2. Before the discussion of each submission any panellists with a major conflict of interest with respect to the institution concerned were asked to leave the room and were only recalled once the discussion concerning that institution had been concluded. During periods when the chair was conflicted and therefore absent from the room, the meeting was chaired by the deputy chair. During the period when both the chair and the deputy chair were conflicted and therefore absent from the room, an arrangement had been made for another panellist to chair the meeting.
- 8.3. All submissions were discussed and their outputs, impact and environment feedback statements reviewed. Any agreed changes to the statements were made.

## **9. Any other business**

- 9.1. In accordance with the change of procedure on this matter, of which panellists had been advised by e-mail, the panel secretary collected USB sticks from panellists for return to the REF team. Those panellists not having their USB sticks with them for collection would receive a pre-paid padded envelope from the REF team with which to return their USB sticks.
- 9.2. In closing the meeting, the chair thanked the panel secretary and panel adviser for their work in supporting the work of the sub-panel, and thanked panellists for all their work in reviewing a very large number of items and preparing for and contributing to the sub-panel meetings.