



## **REF Sub-panel 19: Meeting 2**

**12 and 13 February 2014**

**Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Thomas Archibald  
John Arnold  
Jan Bebbington  
David Blackaby  
Robert Blackburn  
Jane Broadbent (deputy chair)  
Chris Brooks  
Sally Dibb  
Ian Drummond  
Colin Eden  
Paul Edwards  
Guy Fitzgerald  
Carola Frege (day 1)  
Alan Gregory  
Mark Jenkins  
Martin Laffin  
Jone Pearce  
Michael Pidd (chair)  
Deborah McClean (adviser)  
Kathrin Moeslein  
Peter Naude  
Andy Neely  
Jone Pearce  
Richard Thorpe  
Ian Tonks  
Caroline Tynan  
David Wainwright  
Gillian Weale (secretary)  
Terry Williams  
Hugh Willmott

## **Apologies:**

Carola Frege (day 2)

Keith Glaister

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced new members and assessors, including Jone Pearce, an international member of Main Panel C, attending as an observer. He reminded members that David Blackaby was also a member of Sub-panel 18 Economics, intended to assist in co-ordination between sub-panels 18 and 19.
- 1.2. The chair was sorry to report that one panel member had to withdraw from the REF due to personal circumstances. This would necessitate the appointment of an additional output assessor in the field of international business, which the chair and adviser would pursue with the REF team. Members were encouraged to suggest possible names.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

### **2. Conflicts of interest**

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest, and were invited to update these via the PMW. Members were encouraged to report any possible minor conflicts of interest via webmail to the chair, who would decide how to handle each case, with a copy to the secretary for the record.

### **3. Audit**

- 3.1. The panel's attention was drawn to paper SP19.2.2 which outlined the procedures for audit. Audit queries could be raised by sub-panel members throughout the assessment phase in relation to outputs, where, for example, there was concern about the contribution made on a co-authored output. As well as panel-instigated audit, the REF audit team would be undertaking a systematic audit of submissions, to include a check of any outputs submitted to the RAE in 2008.
- 3.2. Panel members were reminded of the guidance for dealing with potential overlap, which could be found in paragraphs 40-41 of Section C2 in the 'panel criteria' document. In the case of working papers submitted to the RAE in 2008, and resubmitted to the REF, only the new material should be assessed. Where outputs had been published in a journal within the assessment period, and then withdrawn from publication, decisions on assessment would be made on a case by case basis.

- 3.3. The chair had already reviewed double-weighting requests in the relevant outputs, and consulted with individual sub-panel members. The Main Panel C meeting in March would be looking at problematic double-weighting cases and the chair would feed back on the discussion. He reminded the sub-panel that reviewing the case for double-weighting was independent of reviewing its quality.
- 3.4. The rules governing the submission of staff in 'Guidance on submissions' and 'Panel criteria and working methods' gave 0.2FTE as a minimum contracted FTE to qualify for submission. The sub-panel would be looking at the staff profile holistically in making its assessment, alongside the environment statement and related data.
- 3.5. The arrangements for auditing impact case studies were different. Sub-panel members would be asked to identify case studies which were candidates for audit, to enable between 5 and 10 per cent of case studies submitted to each UOA to be audited. Further guidance on the audit of impact would be forthcoming from the secretary before the sub-panel's next meeting.

#### **4. Output calibration**

- 4.1. The chair introduced the calibration exercise, thanking everyone for their preparation for the meeting. Each sub-panel member had been asked to nominate three outputs, from which the chair had selected 25 for calibration. All sub-panel members had been asked to read, but not score, all 25 papers in advance of the meeting. Each paper was introduced by a non-specialist, and followed up by comments from a specialist, before comments were invited from other sub-panel members. The chair encouraged the sub-panel to focus discussion on issues of principle in relation to the application of the criteria of originality, significance and rigour, and scores were not assigned to outputs during the discussion.
- 4.2. In discussion of the calibration outputs, the following points emerged:
  - 4.2.1. Outputs, including polemical and value-based outputs, should be judged on their own terms, and no account should be taken of the place of publication or knowledge of the author's wider work.
  - 4.2.2. An holistic judgement should be made of each output, there being no need to score each criterion separately to arrive at an overall score.
  - 4.2.3. The "significance" criterion was primarily to be defined as significance to the academy. However, in this discipline, if an author had identified any potential practical significance of their research, or relevance to practitioners or policy-makers outside the academy this might be taken into account in the assessment of an output's significance.

- 4.2.4. The sub-panel confirmed that, in accordance with the 'Panel criteria' document Part C2 para. 64, it would not be taking account of citation data or journal impact factors in its assessment of outputs. Outputs cross-referred to SP18, where citation data were being used, would nevertheless be assessed without reference to citation data.
- 4.2.5. Replication studies would not necessarily score low on the "originality" criterion, as the application of an existing method to new data or a different dataset could yield important new insights.
- 4.2.6. In cases where the questions raised or conclusions reached in an output had been superseded by events within the REF2014 assessment period, the output should be judged on the basis of its significance at the time of its writing.
- 4.2.7. Sub-panel members were encouraged to discuss outputs with each other during the assessment, particularly where advice from another member was necessary to arrive at a score. Items would be cross-referred to another sub-panel if there was insufficient expertise to assess an output within SP19, and a significant number had already been identified for cross-referral to SP18.
- 4.3. The sub-panel gave close consideration to the minutes of the Main Panel C meeting held on 23 January 2014, which included discussion of the application of the criteria when assessing outputs. In the light of these minutes, the sub-panel confirmed that its primary reference point during assessment would be the published documents. The chair explained that the Main Panel would be able to see the scoring of outputs in real time during the assessment phase, in order to take an overview of progress and ensure consistency between sub-panels.
- 4.4. Calibration would continue throughout the assessment period, through discussions at sub-panel meetings, and between sub-panel members. There would be further calibration discussion at the next meeting, when members had had time to read a selection from their allocation, and this discussion might focus on instances where outputs were straddling the boundaries between star levels.

## **5. Output allocation arrangements**

- 5.1. The output allocation was almost complete, and the chair had unlocked personal spreadsheets for members to view their reading lists. He thanked everyone who had assisted with making the allocation, which had been achieved by dividing the total submission into sub-disciplines and asking members of the panel in those sub-disciplines to select outputs falling within their areas of expertise. Colleagues were advised to review their allocation and make changes within sub-discipline groups where desired, reporting to the secretary who would then adjust the allocation in the panel spreadsheet.
- 5.2. The chair had allocated primary and secondary co-ordinators for each submission, to ensure that an overview could be taken of the emerging profile for

every institution, and to lead on the writing of the feedback at the end of the assessment. The chair and secretary would approach the REF team to see if a workaround could be put in place so that submission co-ordinators could see scores for their submissions as they emerged. Co-ordinators would also be the primary and secondary readers of environment statements, although the whole sub-panel would be reviewing these to ensure a full, collective assessment could be made.

- 5.3. Sub-panel members were advised to keep personal, confidential records on their scores so that these could be referred back to later in the process if necessary. The comments columns on the personal spreadsheet could be used for notes as well.
- 5.4. It was agreed that, in preparation for the next meeting, sub-panel members would read the first 50 outputs in their allocation, having ordered the list by author's name, to ensure a spread of reading across submissions.

## **6. Impact allocation**

- 6.1. The chair thanked members for skim-reading the case studies in their submissions to check for instances where a specialist view might be necessary. In most cases, case studies could be judged without needing specialist expertise, but there was a concern to make best use of the impact assessors' skills and experience in this part of the assessment. All impact documents needed to be assessed by at least one impact assessor, as well as an academic member of the sub-panel.
- 6.2. In the light of discussion, where several different approaches to impact allocation were suggested, it was agreed that the chair would write to all the impact assessors and ask them to update or confirm their areas of expertise. Case studies would be allocated to the primary and deputy submission co-ordinators on the academic side, and if no special expertise was required, to the same impact assessor, then adjustments would be made to balance out the load. All impact assessors would be allocated a "buddy" from amongst the panel members, so they had a single point of contact.
- 6.3. Impact calibration would take place at the next meeting.

## **7. Environment assessment**

- 7.1 The chair introduced a preliminary discussion of the environment assessment, which was led by two other members of the sub-panel, who had been asked to think about approaches to assessing this part of the submission. Both had developed a possible toolkit to help with reading each environment statement, and had then applied these to three contrasting examples from amongst the environments statements in the submission. These toolkits would also help in pulling out points from submissions which could be used in the feedback reports.

7.2. In discussion of the sample environment statements, the following general points emerged:

7.2.1 It would be important that environment statements were read by several panel members in addition to the primary and deputy co-ordinators for a submission, as different perspectives on the statements and the data were likely to emerge.

7.2.2 It would be necessary when coming to the formal calibration exercise for environment to reach a view on the expectations of each star level of environment, bearing in mind that no institution could be expected to do everything.

7.2.3. The environment statement should be read in the context of the overall submission, particularly in relation to data on staff submitted.

7.2.4 Professional doctorates should be considered on a par with regular PhDs.

7.2.5. The sub-panel would need to be conscious of the differences in size and scale between submissions when assessing environment, particularly when adopting standard data analyses to compare submissions.

7.4 The sub-panel agreed that there would need to be time made for very careful consideration and reflection of impact and environment scores towards the end of the assessment phase.

## **8. IT systems briefing**

8.1. The adviser gave a short briefing on how to use the REF IT systems. Members could request further help from her or the secretary or from the REF admin team.

## **9. Project plan and future meetings**

9.1 The sub-panel reviewed the project plan which outlined what work would be done at each meeting and the preparation required between meetings. The chair drew attention to the output reading targets, and it was agreed, given the volume of work within this sub-panel, that reading 50% of outputs by May could be a challenge. The next target of reading 75% by July, was more realistic, but not all panel members had been granted teaching relief by their institutions.

9.2 Meeting the timetable for impact was more challenging, and the chair would be consulting with the REF team to see if it would be possible to extend the impact assessment into the July meeting, subject to the availability of the impact assessors.

9.3 The next meeting would take place on 19, 20 and 21 March 2014 at Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon.

**10. Any other business**

10.1 There being no other business, the chair thanked members for their attendance and contribution, and closed the meeting.



## **REF Sub-panel 19: Meeting 3 Part 1**

**19 March 2014**

**Selsdon Part Hotel, South Croydon**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Thomas Archibald  
John Arnold  
Jan Bebbington  
David Blackaby  
Robert Blackburn  
Jane Broadbent (deputy chair)  
Chris Brooks  
Hazel Crabb-Wyke (REF team)  
Sally Dibb (afternoon only)  
Nigel Driffield  
Ian Drummond  
Colin Eden  
Paul Edwards  
Janet Finch (Main Panel chair)  
Guy Fitzgerald  
Carola Frege  
Alan Gregory  
Mark Jenkins  
Martin Laffin  
Deborah McClean (adviser)  
Kathrin Moeslein  
Peter Naude  
Andy Neely  
Richard Thorpe  
Ian Tonks  
Caroline Tynan  
David Wainwright  
Gillian Weale (secretary)  
Terry Williams  
Hugh Willmott



## **Apologies:**

Michael Pidd (chair)

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

- 1.1. The deputy chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that in the absence of the chair, she would be chairing this meeting. The chair would be re-joining the sub-panel to chair its next meeting.
- 1.2. The deputy chair introduced Nigel Driffield, replacing Keith Glaister, and thanked him for joining the sub-panel at short notice. Janet Finch, chair of Main Panel C, and Hazel Crabb-Wyke, a member of the REF team, both attending as observers, were also welcomed.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

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

- 2.1 The sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 and 13 February 2014 were an accurate record of the discussion.
- 2.2 The deputy chair reported that Main Panel C minutes had been amended to clarify that discussion at calibration expand on but do not change the criteria as published.

### **3. Register of interests**

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Members agreed to record any amendments to major conflicts via the Panel Members' website, and to email minor conflicts to the chair and secretary for a decision and for the record.

### **4. Audit**

- 4.1. The adviser explained the systematic audits which were being carried out by the REF Audit team on a selection of areas within submissions. Outcomes of audits raised by members of the sub-panel would be fed back as responses became available. Reports on audits raised would also be received at future sub-panel meetings.

## **5. Double-weighting**

- 5.1 The sub-panel discussed the treatment of double-weighting requests, of which a small number had been received in submissions to this UOA. Any such requests had to be accompanied by a 100-word statement to justify the request. The sub-panel would need to decide whether or not to accept requests for double-weighting within its unit of assessment, this decision being separate from the judgement of the quality of the output. In some cases the decision on double-weighting would require consideration of the justification statement and features of the output itself.
- 5.2 This subject had been a matter for discussion at the Main Panel C meeting on 5 March, where it was confirmed that the decision on double-weighting requests should be based on 'scale and scope' of the output itself, and not on the circumstances in which the output was written.
- 5.3 Outputs with significant material in common might arise separately from the matter of double-weighting, and members of the sub-panel would be alert to this. Where outputs from the same author had not been allocated to the same readers, it was possible to check the complete submission for each author via the USB stick. Submission co-ordinators would also take a role in monitoring this, and ensuring relevant readers conferred where necessary.

## **6. Outputs assessment**

- 6.1. The secretariat projected provisional scoring profiles for sub-panel members and output assessors, based on a common number of outputs having been read since the previous meeting. The results were discussed. It was agreed that at future meetings, after more reading had been completed, provisional profiles by institution should be reviewed, as well as a range of other data, so that progress and the emerging results could be monitored.
- 6.2. Given the size of the panel and the range of sub-disciplines represented, members and assessors were encouraged to confer with each other in cases where first readers felt unable to judge the quality level of an output, especially in relation to 'significance' or 'originality'.
- 6.3. A significant number of outputs had been cross-referred to other panels, and advice was being received via webmail from advising panellists. Members were asked to send this feedback on to the secretary, unless she had already been copied in, so that she could collate it. Where readers from advising sub-panels were suggesting the award of a 1\* or a U grade, reasons should be given. Panel members were reminded that the final grade for an item cross-referred to another panel remained the responsibility of this sub-panel.

- 6.4. The deputy chair orchestrated the allocation of remaining outputs. During this exercise a further large tranche of outputs to be cross-referred to SP18: Economics and Econometrics was identified.

## **7. Project plan and future meetings**

- 7.1 The next meeting to discussion outputs was scheduled for 29 May 2014, at Ettington Chase, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon.
- 7.2 According to the project plan, the aim was to have provisional scores available for 50% of outputs. However, this was a very challenging target at this stage of the project, given that 100% of impact materials also had to be read to the same timetable. It was agreed that the deputy chair would discuss this with the chair and agree a way forward.

## **8. Any other business**

- 8.1. The deputy chair thanked members for their hard work and their support for her chairmanship at this meeting.

## **REF Sub-panel 19: Meeting 3 Part 2**

**20 March 2014**

**Selsdon Part Hotel, South Croydon**

### **Minutes**

**Present:**

Thomas Archibald  
John Arnold  
Jan Bebbington  
Lucy Beverley  
David Blackaby  
Robert Blackburn  
Jane Broadbent (deputy chair)  
Chris Brooks  
Nigel Driffield  
Ian Drummond  
Colin Eden  
Paul Edwards  
Guy Fitzgerald  
Carola Frege  
Alan Gregory  
Mark Jenkins  
Martin Laffin  
Deborah McClean (adviser)  
Kathrin Moeslein  
Peter Naude  
Andy Neely  
Sue Rossiter  
Geoff Royston  
Brian Singleton-Green  
Rosemary Stamp  
Richard Thorpe  
Ian Tonks  
Caroline Tynan  
Terry Warren  
Gillian Weale (secretary)  
Terry Williams  
Hugh Willmott

## **Apologies:**

Gill Dix

Michael Pidd (chair)

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

- 1.1. The deputy chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly impact assessors attending for the first time. She also welcomed a member of Main Panel C attending as an observer. Colleagues introduced themselves.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

### **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Members agreed to record any amendments to major conflicts via the Panel Members' website, and to email minor conflicts to the chair and secretary for a decision and for the record.

### **3. Impact calibration**

- 3.1. The adviser gave a short presentation outlining the impact assessment process and criteria. She drew attention to the five threshold criteria which should be applied when reviewing case studies. If any of these criteria were not met, the case study would be awarded a 'U'. There was the option to audit against the threshold criteria if there was insufficient information in the case study to determine whether the threshold criteria had been met, but on the whole the case study was intended to be self-contained, and should be assessed on the basis of how far the claim made about impact had been supported by evidence within the document. Therefore the quality of the underlying research and the sources of corroborating statements should normally only be followed up by an audit query where there was a risk of the case study being awarded a 'U' or there was significant doubt about the veracity of the claims made.
- 3.2. Once the threshold criteria had been assessed, the quality of the impact claimed could then be judged. The chair drew attention to the definitions of 'reach' and 'significance' within the documents 'Panel criteria and working methods' and 'Assessment framework and guidance on submissions' and reiterated the need to assess only on the basis of what was included within the case study, in order to be fair to all submissions. If links to corroborating evidence were followed up by panel members, they should report this to the secretary so that it could be recorded as an audit.

- 3.3. Prior to the meeting, members and assessors had been asked to read, but not score, 16 case studies and 16 impact templates. Each case study was introduced by both academic and user members, followed by general discussion. All the impact case studies selected for calibration were discussed and three of the impact templates. In discussion, the following points emerged:
- 3.3.1 The criterion of 'reach' did not refer to geographical spread or location, but to how far the claimed impact had reached its community of beneficiaries. If the impact claimed had been on one small organisation, this could still score well on reach, as long as this was consistent with what had been claimed.
  - 3.3.2 Although dissemination on its own could not constitute impact, it was possible to claim impact if sufficient influence on public or policy debate could be demonstrated.
  - 3.3.3 Case studies which used a portfolio of connected activities and impacts should be judged on the basis of their strongest elements.
  - 3.3.4 Case studies should be assessed on the basis of impact already achieved, not on the basis of potential or future possible impact.
  - 3.3.5 Case studies which were focussed on a technical or specialist area might require additional input from across the sub-panel. Colleagues were encouraged to discuss such cases with other members of the sub-panel, who were more knowledgeable about the field in question.
  - 3.3.6 Case studies could be cross-referred to other sub-panels but it was agreed only to do this in cases where there was absolutely no expertise within SP19, thus ensuring cross-referrals were kept to a minimum.
  - 3.3.7 The impact templates were designed to allow institutions to describe their strategies and approaches to impact. Thus a strong impact template would have a clearly articulated strategy and description of its beneficiaries and user groups.
  - 3.3.8 Impact case studies and templates would be read in the context of each other, and this was reflected in the allocation of impact material by submission to the same three readers. The relationship between the impact case studies and the impact template might not correlate entirely, as while effective impact strategies would facilitate the impact of research in areas where this was intended, impact could also occur serendipitously in unexpected ways.
- 3.4 The chair reported on the calibration exercise by MPC, which had met on 6 March 2014. The Main Panel had discussed a selection of case studies and impact templates from across the sub-panels in its remit, some in plenary session, and some in breakout groups. Minutes of this discussion, which included general points on both the case studies and impact templates would be circulated to the sub-panel for reference.
- 3.5 The chair had allocated the impact case studies and templates and this allocation was now available to sub-panel members and impact assessors via the PMW. Each institution's submission – cases studies and template – had been allocated to the primary and secondary academic co-ordinator for each submission, with an impact assessor as the third reader. It was expected that the academic readers

of the case studies would take the lead in determining the quality of the underlying research in each case study. Further guidance on how the groups of three should agree scores and prepare for discussion at the next meeting would be circulated via webmail once the sub-panel executive group had conferred further.

#### **4. Audit of impact case studies**

- 4.1 Confirming the discussion under item 3.1 above, the chair drew attention to the guidance in SP19.3.6 concerning the audit of impact case studies. Several members had identified candidates for audit in advance of the meeting and the panel executive group would confirm the list of case studies to be taken forward for audit. Any further cases should be raised with the secretary as soon as possible, so that the results were available in time for the meeting on 27 and 28 May.

#### **5. Project plan and future meetings**

- 5.1 The next meeting to discuss impact was scheduled for 27 and 28 May 2014, at Ettington Chase, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon.
- 5.2 The sub-panel was reminded that all impact material needed to be read in advance of the May meeting, and agreed scores submitted so that draft impact profiles were available for discussion. This work would extend to a further day's discussion on 15 July 2014, venue to be confirmed.

#### **6. Any other business**

- 6.1. There being no other business, the deputy chair thanked members for their hard work and closed the meeting.



## **REF Sub-panel 19: Meeting 4 Part 1**

**27 and 28 May 2014**

**Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Thomas Archibald  
John Arnold  
Jan Bebbington  
Lucy Beverley  
David Blackaby  
Robert Blackburn  
Jane Broadbent (deputy chair)  
Chris Brooks  
Gill Dix  
Nigel Driffield  
Ian Drummond  
Colin Eden  
Paul Edwards  
Guy Fitzgerald  
Clive Grace  
Alan Gregory  
Mark Jenkins  
Martin Laffin  
Deborah McClean (adviser)  
Peter Naude  
Andy Neely  
Jone Pearce (main panel member)  
Michael Pidd (chair)  
Graeme Rosenberg (REF team)  
Sue Rossiter (main panel member)  
Geoff Royston  
Brian Singleton-Green  
Rosemary Stamp  
Richard Thorpe  
Ian Tonks  
Caroline Tynan  
Terry Warren  
Gillian Weale (secretary)



Terry Williams  
Hugh Willmott

**Apologies:**

Kathrin Moeslein

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed everyone to this meeting, and thanked members for their preparation for it.
- 1.2. The chair reported that Faith Boardman had been replaced as an impact assessor by Clive Grace, whom he thanked for joining the sub panel at short notice.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

**2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

- 2.1 The sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 March 2014 were an accurate record of discussion.

**3. Register of interests**

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and were reminded that major conflicts should be updated via the panel members' website. Minor conflicts should be notified to the chair via REF webmail with a copy to the secretary for the record.

**4. Impact assessment**

- 4.1. The chair introduced the impact assessment by referring to discussions at the previous Main Panel C meeting held on 24 April at which emerging impact sub-profiles had been reviewed. It would be important to understand the reasoning behind scores given to impact material submitted to this sub-panel so that any variations between sub-panels within the main panel could be explained.
- 4.2. At this meeting, draft impact sub-profiles for two-thirds of submissions would be reviewed in detail, in order to confirm panel agreed scores, and collect comments for the impact section of the feedback reports. The remaining submissions would be assessed at the sub-panel's July meeting. In advance of the meeting, each impact template and case study had been read by two academic members of the sub-panel and one impact assessor or user member. The three readers for each impact item had then discussed their views and arrived at an agreed score, which was then submitted by the primary co-ordinator for each submission. The

secretariat projected draft impact sub-profiles based on the panellists' agreed scores.

- 4.3. The sub-panel held a plenary discussion of the impact submissions where no member or assessor had a conflict of interest. Each case study and impact template was reviewed and a panel agreed score arrived at where possible. In some cases, in the light of discussion, it was agreed that readers would reflect further on their recommended score and report a revised score to the July meeting. Comments for feedback reports were collected.
- 4.4. After the plenary session, the sub-panel assessed further impact submissions in two sets of two parallel groups, engineered to avoid major conflicts of interest. The same process was followed to arrive at panel agreed scores and collect comments for feedback reports. Having completed the assessment of two-thirds of impact submissions, the whole sub-panel reviewed the overall impact profile for the UoA so far.
- 4.5. Members of the sub-panel absented themselves from discussions of impact templates and case studies from institutions with which they had conflicts of interest.

## **5. Audit**

- 5.1 The secretary gave an oral report on audits raised on impact cases. Some further audits were requested by panel members during the course of discussion of individual impact submissions. The results of these would be reported to readers via REF webmail.

## **6. Future meetings**

- 6.1. The next meeting at which impact would be discussed was scheduled for 15 July 2014 at Felbridge Hotel and Spa, East Grinstead.
- 6.2 It was agreed that sub-panel members would submit revised recommended scores for the impact submissions discussed at this meeting by 13 June, and ensure that scores for submissions to be discussed in July had also been uploaded by this date.

## **7. Any other business**

- 7.1. There being no other business the chair thanked members and assessors for their contributions and closed the meeting.



## **REF Sub-panel 19: Meeting 4 Part 2**

**29 May 2014**

**Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Thomas Archibald  
John Arnold  
Jan Bebbington  
David Blackaby  
Robert Blackburn  
Jane Broadbent (deputy chair)  
Chris Brooks  
Sally Dibb  
Nigel Driffield  
Ian Drummond  
Colin Eden  
Paul Edwards  
Guy Fitzgerald  
Carola Frege  
Alan Gregory  
Mark Jenkins  
Martin Laffin  
Deborah McClean (adviser)  
Peter Naude  
Andy Neely  
Jone Pearce (main panel member)  
Michael Pidd (chair)  
Graeme Rosenberg (REF team)  
Richard Thorpe  
Ian Tonks  
Caroline Tynan  
Gillian Weale (secretary)  
Terry Williams  
Hugh Willmott

#### **Apologies:**

Kathrin Moeslein  
David Wainwright

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members and output assessors to the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

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

- 2.1 The sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19 March 2014 were an accurate record of the discussion.

## **3. Register of interests**

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct

## **4. Outputs assessment**

- 4.1. The secretariat displayed the draft output profile for the whole UoA, based on 29% outputs scored by panellists. Owing to the volume of work associated with the impact assessment, it had previously been highlighted that it was unlikely that the 50% reading target for this meeting would be met. In the light of the emerging output profile, it was agreed that panellists' scores submitted so far should be accepted as panel agreed scores.
- 4.2. The sub panel also reviewed scoring patterns by panel member. Members were reminded that if they were having difficulties in deciding on a score for an output, they could seek advice from other panel members. Discussions between panel members were already taking place, especially in relation to outputs at the extreme ends of the range.
- 4.3. The sub-panel discussed the question of outputs submitted as pre-published papers to the RAE in 2008 and also, in fully published form, to the REF. A certain number of these had been identified by panel members. The REF audit team was carrying out a systematic comparison of the RAE and REF returns and would be providing results to panels in due course, at which point those in the panel's list could be checked.

## **5. Environment calibration**

- 5.1. The chair introduced the environment calibration exercise, referring back to the preliminary discussions on environment which took place at the sub panel's meeting on 12 and 13 February. Environment submissions from four institutions

where no panellists had a conflict of interest had been chosen as the calibration sample. Copies were distributed to panel members in the meeting, and time made available for reading them. The calibration sample was then discussed in groups of four panellists before being subject to a plenary session. In the plenary session, the following general points were made:

- 5.1.1 Mismatches between what was said by institutions in their environment template and the numbers in the data analyses and staff list could be confusing, but should not weight heavily in the assessment unless they were material.
- 5.1.2 Care should also be taken when reviewing the research income per staff FTE, as institutions with a small number of staff submitted might show a higher sum than larger institutions. In a similar way, institutions submitting a small number of staff but describing a large number of research centres might score lower on sustainability. It could be hard to judge statements about spend on research as universities used different internal resource allocation mechanisms.
- 5.1.3 The position of staff on fractional contracts (where these did not relate to individual staff circumstances), honorary and visiting staff were explained in highly scoring 'People' sections of environment templates.
- 5.1.4 Highly scoring environment submissions were likely to include a coherent 'Strategy' section which reflected honestly on the submitting unit's successes and failures and gave a clear sense of unit's character. They would also be able to show good support structures and development for staff at all stages of career (and for both men and women), and a credible relationship between the staffing plan and the environment for PGR students. A good 'Collaboration' section would go further than simply listing involvements and activities.
- 5.2 All environment submissions would be read by the primary and secondary submission co-ordinators, who would also be responsible for drafting feedback reports for all aspects of the submissions for which they were co-ordinating.

## **6. Future meetings**

- 6.1 The next meeting was scheduled to be held on 14, 15 and 16 July at Felbridge Hotel and Spa, East Grinstead.
- 6.2 In advance of this meeting, panel members were requested to continue reading outputs to reach at least 50% of their allocation. In preparation for the environment assessment, they were also asked to read and score their environment allocation.

## **7. Any other business**

- 7.1. There being no other business, the chair thanked members for their contribution and closed the meeting.



## **REF Sub-panel 19: Meeting 5 (Part 1)**

**14 and 16 July 2014**

**Felbridge Hotel and Spa, East Grinstead**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Thomas Archibald  
John Arnold  
Jan Bebbington  
David Blackaby  
Robert Blackburn  
Jane Broadbent (deputy chair)  
Chris Brooks  
Janet Finch (Main Panel chair)  
Sally Dibb  
Nigel Driffield  
Ian Drummond  
Colin Eden  
Paul Edwards  
Guy Fitzgerald  
Alan Gregory  
Mark Jenkins  
Martin Laffin  
Deborah McClean (adviser)  
Kathrin Moeslein  
Peter Naude  
Andy Neely  
Michael Pidd (chair)  
Richard Thorpe  
Ian Tonks  
David Wainwright  
Gillian Weale (secretary)  
Terry Williams  
Hugh Willmott

#### **Apologies:**

Carola Frege  
Caroline Tynan

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members and assessors to the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

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

- 2.1. The panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 May 2014 were an accurate record of the discussion.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. It was noted that two changes had been registered by members via the panel members' website. Hugh Willmott had a major conflict of interest with City University and Nigel Driffield a major conflict with the University of Warwick. Arrangements were in hand for the re-allocation or moderation of outputs where necessary.

## **4. Outputs assessment**

- 4.1. The sub-panel reviewed the overall sub-profile for outputs, 48% having been read to date. By way of comparison, it also looked at the emerging output sub-profiles for other sub-panels within Main Panel C. It was noted that the scores for SP19 did not yet include scores for outputs cross-referred to SP18 Economics, as these were yet to be finalised. Panel members were alerted to instances where duplicate outputs had been given a different score, and asked to inform the secretary of the reconciled score once they had conferred with the other reader. It was agreed that primary and secondary submission co-ordinators should review the emerging scoring patterns for their submissions, using the report available via the PMW, with a view to leading discussions on output profiles at the sub-panel's next meeting.

## **5. Environment assessment**

- 5.1. The chair introduced the environment assessment, by reminding the sub-panel that draft sub-profiles for two thirds of environment submissions would be discussed at this meeting, with the remaining one third covered at the next meeting in September. All environment submissions would be read by the primary and secondary submission co-ordinators plus two further members of the sub-panel. The primary and secondary co-ordinators had uploaded an agreed score in advance of the meeting, and this provided the starting point for discussion.



- 5.2. The sub-panel held a plenary discussion of environment submissions where no member had a conflict of interest. Each section of each environment statement, and its accompanying data was discussed, and adjustments made to the preliminary sub-profiles where agreed. In some cases primary and secondary co-ordinators reflected further on scores given, in the light of discussion, and recommended further adjustments. Comments were collected for the feedback reports.
- 5.3. Following the plenary discussion, the sub-panel assessed further environment submissions in two sets of two parallel groups, engineered to avoid major conflicts of interest. The same process was followed to arrive at panel agreed scores and collect comments for feedback reports.
- 5.4. The emerging draft sub-profiles were then reviewed, after discussions of individual submissions. It was agreed that in advance of the next meeting, sub-panel members would read all environment submissions for which they did not have a conflict of interest, to inform a plenary discussion in which all could participate. The chair would also initiate a further calibration exercise to be undertaken before September, and which would also form the basis for discussion at the next meeting.
- 5.5. Members of the sub-panel absented themselves from discussions of environment submissions from institutions with which they had conflicts of interest.

## **6. Feedback reports**

- 6.1. Guidance on the drafting of feedback reports had been circulated with the papers for the meeting, and primary and secondary submission co-ordinators would be responsible for preparing them. The panel secretary and adviser were available to assist with formatting and phrasing, but the aim of the report was to provide helpful feedback based on the assessment criteria. Panel members were requested to make a start on drafting the impact feedback, and the secretary would be circulating information to help with this shortly.

## **7. Individual staff circumstances**

- 7.1. The secretariat gave a report on the review of individual staff circumstances and explained in more detail those cases with clearly defined circumstances where it was considered that the criteria for a reduction in outputs had not been met. Some cases were still subject to the results of audits and it was agreed to update the sub-panel again at its next meeting with a revised list of recommendations.

## **8. Audit**

- 8.1. The results of the data comparison audit undertaken by the REF audit team, were discussed, following concerns raised at the previous meeting about outputs submitted for both the RAE2008 and REF2014. A number of unclassified grades

had been recommended as a result of the data comparison audit and audit queries arising from sub-panel members. Further audits on this and other aspects of submissions, including environment material, could continue to be raised.

**9. Future meetings**

- 9.1. The next meeting was to be held on 17, 18 and 19 September at Ettington Chase, Banbury Road, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon.
- 9.2. The chair and secretary would be in touch in due course with further details of the preparation necessary for this meeting, at which output sub-profiles based on 100% scores would be reviewed, as well as the environment assessment completed.

**10. Any other business**

- 10.1. There being no other business, the chair thanked members warmly for their contributions and closed the meeting.



## **REF Sub-panel 19: Meeting 5 (Part 2)**

**15 July 2014**

**Felbridge Hotel and Spa, East Grinstead**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Thomas Archibald  
John Arnold  
Jan Bebbington  
David Blackaby  
Robert Blackburn  
Jane Broadbent (deputy chair)  
Chris Brooks  
Nigel Driffield  
Ian Drummond  
Colin Eden  
Paul Edwards  
Guy Fitzgerald  
Alan Gregory  
Mark Jenkins  
Martin Laffin  
Deborah McClean (adviser)  
Kathrin Moeslein  
Peter Naude  
Andy Neely  
Michael Pidd (chair)  
Geoff Royston  
Brian Singleton-Green  
Rosemary Stamp  
Richard Thorpe  
Ian Tonks  
Gillian Weale (secretary)  
Terry Williams  
Hugh Willmott

#### **Apologies:**

Lucy Beverley  
Gill Dix

Stephen Legg  
Caroline Tynan  
Terry Warren

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members and assessors to the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

**2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

- 2.1. The panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 27 and 28 May 2014 were an accurate record of the discussion.

**3. Conflicts of interest**

- 3.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. It was noted that two changes had been registered by members via the panel members' website. Hugh Willmott had a major conflict of interest with City University and Nigel Driffield a major conflict with the University of Warwick.

**4. Impact assessment**

- 4.1. The chair reported on the discussion of emerging impact profiles which had taken place at the Main Panel C meeting on 19 June. The sub-panel reviewed its own sub-profile for the impact assessment completed to date, in the light of comparative data for other sub-panels within Main Panel C, and in relation to both case studies and impact templates. The Main Panel was carrying out an audit of impact to ensure consistency of judgement across UOAs within its remit.
- 4.2. The sub-panel reviewed the remaining one-third of impact submissions yet to be assessed, by breaking into two parallel groups, engineered to avoid conflicts of interest. Each impact submission had been read by two academic members of the sub-panel and one impact assessor, and provisional scores agreed in advance of the meeting. During discussion, these scores were either confirmed as panel agreed scores, or revised as a result of the discussion and reflection by the readers. Comments were noted for the feedback reports.
- 4.3. Members of the sub-panel absented themselves from discussions of impact submissions from institutions with which they had conflicts of interest.
- 4.4. After the discussion of each individual submission had been completed, the sub-panel reviewed the impact sub-profile. After making a series of observations and

reflecting on the overall position, further amendments to panel agreed scores, as proposed by an impact assessor, were made.

- 4.5. The chair reminded primary and secondary submission coordinators that they would be responsible for drafting feedback to institutions on their impact submissions. The secretary undertook to circulate notes taken from the discussion and summary data to assist in the preparation of this feedback.

## **5. Any other business**

- 5.1. On behalf of the sub-panel, the chair extended warmest thanks to the impact assessors for their valuable contribution to this part of the assessment.

**Sub-panel 19: Meeting 6**  
**17, 18 & 19 September 2014**  
**Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Thomas Archibald  
John Arnold  
Jan Bebbington  
David Blackaby  
Robert Blackburn  
Jane Broadbent (deputy chair)  
Chris Brooks  
Sally Dibb – Day 2  
Nigel Driffield  
Ian Drummond  
Colin Eden  
Paul Edwards  
Guy Fitzgerald  
Alan Gregory  
Mark Jenkins  
Martin Laffin  
Deborah McClean (adviser)  
Kathrin Moeslein  
Peter Naude  
Andy Neely  
Michael Pidd (chair)  
Richard Thorpe  
Ian Tonks  
Caroline Tynan – Days 1 and 2  
David Wainwright – Day 2  
Gillian Weale (secretary)  
Terry Williams  
Hugh Willmott

**Apologies:**

Carola Frege

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting and outlined the order of business.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

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

- 2.1 The sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the meeting held on 14, 15 and 16 July (Parts 1 and 2) were an accurate record of the discussion.

## **3. Register of interests**

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct, noting some changes made since the previous meeting.

## **4. Environment assessment**

- 4.1. The sub-panel reviewed the remaining one-third of environment submissions yet to be assessed, by breaking into two groups, engineered to avoid conflicts of interest. All environment submissions had been read by the primary and secondary submission co-ordinators, plus two other members of the sub-panel. The submission co-ordinators presented a recommended score to the group, with justification in relation to the criteria, and this was discussed before arriving at an agreed score for each submission.
- 4.2. Having completed discussion of each submission individually, the sub-panel reviewed the environment sub-profiles and carried out a re-calibration exercise. In advance of the meeting, the chair and deputy chair had asked different pairs of panel members to read and review the provisional scores of those submissions with an emerging sub-profile of more than 50% at 4\*. In addition, a group of six panel members had been asked to read, review and submit their recommended score for a further group of five submissions, as a further check on consistency of scoring.
- 4.3. Emphasising the confidentiality of the position at this stage, the deputy chair led a discussion of the five submissions emerging as those with the highest proportion of 4\* in their environment sub-profile. Members of the sub-panel with major conflicts of interest in this group of submissions left the room for this discussion. Further discussions were then held in the same manner about groups of submissions in the middle and at the end of the range, to ensure that the sub-profiles were an appropriate reflection of the evidence presented in the environment statements and accompanying data. Members of the sub-panel again left the room during the discussion of submissions from institutions with which they had a conflict of interest.

- 4.4. The sub-panel gave careful consideration to submissions in which there was a significant number or proportion of staff on fractional and/or fixed-term contracts who had also submitted four outputs.
- 4.5. In the light of the moderation and re-calibration exercises, and consideration of staff contracts, the sub-panel approved various adjustments to the environment sub-profiles. Having satisfied itself of the justification for each environment score, the sub-panel confirmed the revised sub-profiles for consideration by the Main Panel.

## **5. Outputs assessment**

- 5.1 The sub-panel reviewed output scores by panellist based on almost 100% read. Some differences in scoring patterns could be explained by the nature of the material allocated to them, for example a different mix of institutions, and the multi-disciplinary nature of the UoA. Panel members were asked to review their scores between this meeting and the next, with particular reference to other scorers in their sub-discipline. Any features emerging within sub-disciplines could be reported to the chair so that comments on these could be included in the sub-panel's overall feedback report.
- 5.2 Professor Blackaby (joint member of SP19 and SP18: Economics) gave a presentation to the sub-panel on the scores of outputs cross-referred to Economics. A full econometric analysis of scores given to outputs cross-referred from SP19, compared with those given to outputs originally submitted to SP18, had been undertaken by the deputy chair of SP18. The data showed that once controls had been applied for the effect of submitting institution, there was no difference in the treatment of outputs in the two groups. Cross-referred outputs from SP19 had been read and scored by SP18 according to the assessment criteria for MPC, without reference to citation data, and without taking journal title as a proxy for quality. There was a small group of cross-referred outputs where the scores recommended by SP18 were to be reviewed by Professor Blackaby and another member of SP19.
- 5.3 Panellists were reminded to come to a view about requests to double-weight outputs, and any outputs where no score had been reported, as soon as possible.

## **6. Overall sub-profiles and feedback reports**

- 6.1 The sub-panel reviewed the sub-profiles and overall profiles for each submission, comparing the results with that for SP19 as a whole. Results were also considered in relation to performance in the RAE 2008, where relevant. Comments were collected to assist with drafting feedback.



6.2 Panellists were reminded of the guidance previously circulated and available via the PMW, on drafting feedback on individual submissions. Primary co-ordinators were asked to prepare drafts in advance of the next meeting, where these would be discussed and confirmed.

6.3 Once again, members of the sub-panel left the room for discussion of submissions with which they had a major conflict of interest.

## **7. Future meetings**

7.1. The next meeting will be held on 16 and 17 October 2014 at The Palace Hotel, Oxford Street Manchester, M60 7HA.



**Sub-panel 19: Meeting 7**  
**16 & 17 October 2014**  
**The Palace Hotel, Manchester**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Thomas Archibald  
John Arnold  
Jan Bebbington  
David Blackaby  
Robert Blackburn  
Jane Broadbent (deputy chair)  
Chris Brooks  
Nigel Driffield  
Ian Drummond  
Geri Echue (REF team) – Day 2  
Colin Eden  
Paul Edwards  
Guy Fitzgerald  
Alan Gregory  
Mark Jenkins  
Martin Laffin  
Deborah McClean (adviser)  
Kathrin Moeslein  
Peter Naude  
Andy Neely  
Michael Pidd (chair)  
Richard Thorpe  
Ian Tonks  
Caroline Tynan  
Gillian Weale (secretary)  
Terry Williams  
Hugh Willmott

**Apologies:**

None.

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting, and introduced Geri Echue from the REF team who was attending on the second day, to observe the sub-panel's deliberations.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

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

- 2.1 The sub-panel confirmed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17, 18 and 19 September were an accurate record of discussion.

## **3. Register of interests**

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.

## **4. Environment assessment**

- 4.1. The chair reported on discussions of the emerging environment sub-profiles at the Main Panel C meeting on 1 October. In response to the position of the sub-panel's environment profile relative to other sub-panels' profiles, the chair had undertaken further analysis of submissions, in consultation with primary co-ordinators. This review had also taken account of the Main Panel's invitation to consider submissions with a high proportion of 4\*.
- 4.2. In the light of the results of the review, and the sub-panel's discussion, a moderation exercise across all environment submissions was undertaken. This resulted in an increase in the number of submissions receiving 100% at 4\*.

## **5. Overall profiles and feedback reports**

- 5.1 The sub-panel reviewed draft feedback statements for all submissions, in the light of the final sub-profiles and overall profiles. It agreed some common drafting principles to ensure feedback was consistent to all submitting institutions. The sub-panel considered a selection of these reports in plenary, before dividing into two groups to complete the rest of the review. Primary co-ordinators were requested to finalise their feedback statements by 24 October.
- 5.2 The sub-panel confirmed recommended output, impact and environment sub-profiles and an overall quality profile for each of the following submissions to the UOA, based in each case on its full and final assessment of the complete submission, made in accordance with the published criteria and working methods:

University of Aberdeen  
Aberystwyth University  
Anglia Ruskin University  
Aston University  
Bangor University  
University of Bath  
University of Bedfordshire  
Birkbeck College  
University of Birmingham  
Birmingham City University  
Bournemouth University  
University of Bradford  
University of Brighton  
University of Bristol  
Brunel University  
Buckinghamshire New University  
University of Cambridge  
Cardiff University  
University of Central Lancashire  
University of Chester  
City University, London  
Coventry University  
Cranfield University  
University of Cumbria  
De Montfort University  
University of Derby  
University of Dundee  
University of Durham  
University of East Anglia  
University of East London  
University of Edinburgh  
Edinburgh Napier University  
University of Essex  
University of Exeter  
University of Glasgow  
Glasgow Caledonian University  
University of Greenwich  
Heriot-Watt University  
University of Hertfordshire  
University of Huddersfield  
University of Hull  
Imperial College London  
Keele University  
University of Kent  
King's College London  
Kingston University

Lancaster University  
University of Leeds  
Leeds Metropolitan University  
University of Leicester  
University of Lincoln  
University of Liverpool  
London Business School  
London Metropolitan University  
London School of Economics and Political Science  
London South Bank University  
Loughborough University  
University of Manchester  
Manchester Metropolitan University  
Middlesex University  
University of Newcastle upon Tyne  
University of Northampton  
University of Northumbria at Newcastle  
University of Nottingham  
Nottingham Trent University  
Open University  
University of Oxford  
Oxford Brookes University  
University of Plymouth  
University of Portsmouth  
Queen Mary, University of London  
Queen's University Belfast  
University of Reading  
Robert Gordon University  
Roehampton University  
Royal Holloway, University of London  
University of Salford  
School of Oriental and African Studies  
University of Sheffield  
Sheffield Hallam University  
University of South Wales  
University of Southampton  
University of St Andrews  
Staffordshire University  
University of Stirling  
University of Strathclyde  
University of Sunderland  
University of Surrey  
University of Sussex  
Swansea University  
Teesside University  
University of Ulster

University College London  
University of Warwick  
University of the West of England, Bristol  
University of the West of Scotland  
University of Westminster  
University of Wolverhampton  
University of Worcester  
University of York  
York St John University

The sub-panel resolved to recommend the quality profiles for each of the submissions listed above, as set out in the panel spreadsheet, to the main panel for agreement.

- 5.3 Members of the sub-panel left the room during discussion of submissions with which they had a major conflict of interest.
- 5.4 The draft overview report was also considered. The chair requested that sub-discipline reports for inclusion in the sub-panel's overview report be sent to him by 20 October.
- 5.5 Two representatives from the sub-panel would be attending feedback meetings on the REF process in forthcoming months. They were asked to include comments around the following points when feeding back from this sub-panel:
  - 5.5.1 The possibility of a mechanism for developing an institutional memory for the benefit of any future exercises, given that the personnel were likely to change.
  - 5.5.2 The size and complexity of this sub-panel, and the related workload issues for sub-panel members and impact assessors.
  - 5.5.3 The timetable for the assessment of each element of submissions.
  - 5.5.4 The success of the IT systems used in the assessment phase.
  - 5.5.5 The relationship between staff FTE and the number of outputs submitted.
  - 5.5.6 The scoring method for the assessment of environment submissions.
  - 5.5.7 The role and engagement of impact assessors and user members in the assessment of impact, and how their expertise could be most effectively deployed.
  - 5.5.8 The way evidence for impact was required to be presented in the impact case studies.

## **6. Data security and return of materials**

- 6.1. The sub-panel was reminded of the confidentiality arrangements surrounding its deliberations and the results as the assessment entered the closing stages. The results would be published on 18 December, after which information in the public domain could be discussed. Feedback reports on submissions would remain confidential to submitting institutions.

## **7. Any other business**

- 7.1. Warmest thanks were expressed to all members, the chair, deputy chair and the secretariat for their hard work and contribution across the period of the assessment.