



REF Sub-panel 20: Meeting 2

6 February 2014

Grand Connaught Rooms, London

Minutes

Present:

Professor Anthony Arnull, Professor Rosemary Auchmuty, Professor Ben Bowling, Professor Trevor Buck, Professor Joanne Conaghan (deputy chair), Professor Matt Craven, Professor Adam Crawford, Professor Simon Deakin, Ms Anita Dockley, Professor Gillian Douglas (chair), Professor Neil Duxbury, Ms Nina Fletcher, Professor Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Professor David Fraser, Professor Colin Harvey, Professor Herbert Kritzer (international main panel member), Professor Iain MacNeil, Professor Kate Malleon, Mrs Katy McKen (Panel adviser), Professor Alan Norrie, Professor Suzanne Ost, Professor Roderick Paisley, Professor Dennis Patterson, Professor Colin Reid, Professor Chris Rodgers, Professor Jo Shaw, Mrs Clair Thrower (Panel secretary), Professor Charlotte Waelde, Professor Nigel White, Professor Simon Whittaker

Apologies:

No apologies were received.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed existing members and new assessors, and the international member of Main Panel C to the meeting. Each member and assessor and the secretariat introduced themselves briefly.
- 1.2. 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 paper 1, the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record of major interest were needed in future, panellists should inform the panel secretary and record them on the panel members' website (PMW).

3. Output calibration

- 3.1. The chair gave a summary of the work the sub-panel had undertaken in preparation for the calibration, focussing on the first tranche of outputs which had been reviewed to inform feedback at the main panel meeting, and followed by a second, larger tranche.
- 3.2. With input from the main panel member, the chair reported the findings of the output calibration exercise undertaken by the main panel, which included the following points:
 - The exercise had focused on the characteristics of the assessment criteria.
 - Outputs had not been given a score.
 - Each output had been assigned to a rapporteur from a different sub-panel to lead the discussions.
- 3.3. With reference to paper 2, the deputy chair led a plenary discussion of the initial five outputs during which the following points were noted:
 - i. All outputs submitted are expected to meet the REF definition of research, stated in Annex C of 'Assessment framework and guidance on submissions' (REF02.2011). They should also meet the generic requirements for submission laid out in Part 3 section 2 of 'guidance on submissions' and Part 1 of 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF01.2012), paragraphs 40 to 53.
 - ii. The sub-panel will reach its decisions in accordance with the guidance on assessing outputs in Part 2C, section C2 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF01.2012), and in particular the guidance in paragraph 71 on the interpretation of generic level definitions for outputs.
 - iii. That the full range of marks should be used in scoring outputs, from 4* to Unclassified. The use of half marks during the assessment had been agreed by Main Panel C, but that the final outcome for each output must be an integer in the range 4 to 0, 0 being equivalent to 'unclassified'.
 - iv. If an output did not meet the definition of research, or fell below the standard required for 1* quality, it should be graded 'unclassified'.
 - v. The sub-panel had received a large proportion of co-authored work, which should be assessed according to the arrangements in Section C2, paragraphs 42 to 49 of the 'panel criteria'. In particular, once the sub-panel was satisfied that the author submitting the output had made a "substantial research contribution" to it, the output should be assessed as a whole.

4. Use of half marks in scoring

- 4.1. The sub-panel discussed the proposal outlined in paper 3, noting that the use of half marks during the assessment had been agreed by Main Panel C.
- 4.2. The sub-panel agreed an initial working method of using half marks to indicate doubt as to whether an output should receive a higher score. It was agreed that where different scores had been awarded, pairs of readers should discuss, and if agreement could be reached, one score would be altered to reflect the outcome. If agreement could not be reached, the matter would be discussed at the next meeting of the sub-panel. The sub-panel agreed to use their personal spreadsheets to capture brief rationales for their decisions, as workloads permitted.
- 4.3. The sub-panel agreed to review the working method at its next meeting, and make adjustments if necessary.
- 4.4. The sub-panel noted that the final outcome for each output must be an integer in the range 4 to 0, 0 being equivalent to 'unclassified'.

5. Output calibration (remainder)

- 5.1. The sub-panel split into four groups which then discussed different sub-sets of all the remaining outputs.

6. Feedback to plenary and summation

- 6.1. The chair summarised the morning's work, with reference to the guidance received from the main panel in this regard.

7. Lunch

8. Double weighting

- 8.1. Discussion centred around the outputs requested for double weighting that had been assessed in the calibration exercise. The sub-panel noted paragraphs 50 to 56 of Part 2C in the 'panel criteria', and in particular the description of double-weighting in paragraph 50.
- 8.2. The sub-panel discussed whether it was possible to agree a claim for double-weighting based solely on the statement provided by the submitting HEI, and agreed to discuss further at the meeting to be held in March 2014.

9. Allocations and managing conflicts of interest

- 9.1. The sub-panel noted paper 5, and agreed to notify the chair by webmail of any minor conflicts of interest relevant to the allocation of outputs.

- 9.2. The sub-panel noted paper 6, discussed the proposed treatment of minor conflicts of interest, and agreed that the panel secretary should keep a separate register.

10. Audit and data verification

- 10.1. The sub-panel noted paper 7, and agreed to send any potential output audit queries to the panel secretary.
- 10.2. Further, it noted that impact case studies requiring audit should be identified as soon as possible and by the end of the March meeting at the latest.

11. Cross-referral and specialist advice

- 11.1. The sub-panel noted paper 8, and agreed that where an item had been requested for cross-referral by the submitting HEI, the allocated panellists should consider whether they were able to assess the output, and if not to alert the chair by **28 February 2014**.
- 11.2. The sub-panel agreed to forward all additional requests for output and impact cross-referrals to the chair by **31 March 2014**.
- 11.3. The chair observed that some foreign language outputs had been submitted to the sub-panel, and specialist advice would be sought.
- 11.4. The sub-panel noted that in the case of both cross-referral and specialist advice, responsibility for scoring remained with the sub-panel.

12. REF IT systems

- 12.1. The panel adviser gave a presentation covering the major items of IT to be used in the assessment phase, and promised to load a copy of the slides on the meeting area of the panel members' website (PMW).
- 12.2. Crucial points for panellists to note were identified as:
- Always using REF webmail for confidential communication.
 - Never using the 'forgot password' option on the USB pen login screen.
 - Always downloading REF work to the USB pen instead of a local drive.
 - Uploading personal spreadsheets to the PMW very frequently.
 - User support was available from the guidance section of the PMW.
 - Alternative sources of support were FAQs, known issues and helpdesk.

13. Impact calibration exercise

- 13.1. The chair summarised the approach to be taken in the assessment of impact:
- i. A main panel impact calibration exercise would be undertaken, assessing both impact case studies and templates.

- ii. A further sub-panel calibration involving both elements would be undertaken by the sub-panel, informed by the results of the main panel calibration.
- 13.2. The sub-panel agreed to skim read all the impact items allocated to them, and alert the chair of any problematic features by **28 February 2014**.
- 13.3. The sub-panel noted that full details of the impact calibration exercise would be provided soon after the meeting.

14. Items for information

- 14.1. The sub-panel noted paper 9, physical outputs.
- 14.2. The sub-panel noted paper 10, schedule of future meetings.
- 14.3. The chair explained that an updated equality briefing paper was expected to be made available on the guidance section of the PMW shortly.

15. Any other business

- 15.1. No other business was noted.



REF Sub-panel 20: Meeting 3 (Part 1)

19 March 2014

The Studio, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Professor Rosemary Auchmuty, Professor Trevor Buck, Professor Joanne Conaghan (deputy chair), Professor Adam Crawford, Dr Frederique Dahan, Professor Simon Deakin, Ms Anita Dockley, Professor Gillian Douglas (chair), Dr Moira Dustin, Ms Rebecca Endean, Ms Nina Fletcher, Professor Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Professor David Fraser, Professor Colin Harvey, Professor Iain MacNeil, Professor Kate Malleson, Mrs Katy McKen (panel adviser), Professor Alan Norrie, Professor Dennis Patterson, Mr Richard Percival, Professor Colin Reid, Professor Jo Shaw, Professor Betsy Stanko, Mrs Clair Thrower (panel secretary), Professor Nigel White, Professor Simon Whittaker, Professor Paul Wiles (Main Panel C), Ms Katharine Wright.

Apologies:

No apologies were received.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to Birmingham, particularly the user members who were attending their first meeting, and the main panel representative. The chair invited each attendee to introduce themselves briefly.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the business of the meeting, noting that it was arranged in two parts dealing with impact and research outputs, respectively. The sub-panel noted the principal task of the day, namely to agree an approach to operationalising the guidance and published criteria for the assessment of impact.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.
- 2.2. The sub-panel noted that, as agreed at that meeting, the updated Equality Briefing paper had been circulated for information.
- 2.3. The chair explained that all other matters arising were covered by subsequent items on the current agenda for the second day.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed paper 2, the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record of major interest were needed in future, panellists should inform the panel secretary and record them on the panel members' website (PMW).
- 3.2. The sub-panel agreed that, in alignment with the approach taken by the main panel, for the purpose of impact calibration during which no final scores would be agreed, attendees with conflicts of interest need not leave the room but would not participate in the discussion.

4. Impact briefing

- 4.1. The panel adviser gave a presentation summarising the key aspects for panellists to consider when judging whether an impact case study met the required thresholds for eligibility, and promised to add it to the PMW as a resource for future reference. She reminded the sub-panel that the primary source for information in the assessment of impact remained the guidance published in 'guidance on submissions' and the 'panel criteria', supplemented by the REF FAQ.

5. Impact case study calibration

- 5.1. The chair introduced the impact case study calibration item, summarising the work that the sub-panel had done in preparation; namely that each member had assessed the same set of impact case studies that had been chosen to avoid any major conflicts of interest.
- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed the first set of case studies in turn in plenary, noting any issues and queries that had arisen during their individual review of the items. The range of scores awarded was compared across each case study, and the sub-panel reached a consensus to awarding quality levels in the future assessment.
- 5.3. The remaining case studies were discussed in small groups, and a final plenary session explored any further issues which had arisen during discussion.

6. Audit and data verification - impact

- 6.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel that a paper concerning the audit and data verification of impact had been presented at the previous meeting.
- 6.2. The sub-panel noted guidance from the main panel that any case study which would potentially be scored as 'unclassified' should be discussed by the whole sub-panel.
- 6.3. The sub-panel agreed to notify the panel secretary of any case studies requiring audit by a final deadline of **14 April 2014**.

7. Impact template calibration

- 7.1. The chair thanked the sub-panel for their work in preparation for this item, which again had involved the assessment of a small number of impact templates from non-conflicted HEIs.
- 7.2. The sub-panel discussed the range of issues that had been noted, and reviewed the scores awarded. An approach to reviewing the remainder of the templates was agreed.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. There being no further business the chair thanked the sub-panel for its contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 20: Meeting 3 (Part 2)

20 March 2014

The Studio, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Professor Anthony Arnull, Professor Rosemary Auchmuty, Professor Ben Bowling, Professor Trevor Buck, Professor Joanne Conaghan (deputy chair), Professor Matt Craven, Professor Adam Crawford, Professor Simon Deakin, Ms Anita Dockley, Professor Gillian Douglas (chair), Professor Neil Duxbury, Professor Dame Janet Finch, Ms Nina Fletcher, Professor Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Professor David Fraser, Professor Colin Harvey, Professor Iain MacNeil, Professor Kate Malleson, Mrs Katy McKen (panel adviser), Professor Alan Norrie, Professor Suzanne Ost, Professor Roderick Paisley, Professor Dennis Patterson, Professor Colin Reid, Professor Chris Rodgers, Professor Jo Shaw, Mrs Clair Thrower (panel secretary), Professor Charlotte Waelde, Professor Nigel White, Professor Simon Whittaker, Professor Paul Wiles.

Apologies:

No apologies were received.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

8.2. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to part 2 of the meeting, noting that any apparent overlap in the agenda was to ensure that output assessors were aware of all the standing items. The chair invited each attendee to introduce themselves briefly.

1.1. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.

2.2. The sub-panel noted that, as agreed at that meeting, the updated Equality Briefing paper had been circulated for information.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1. The sub-panel reviewed paper 2, the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record

of major interest were needed in future, panellists should inform the panel secretary and record them on the panel members' website (PMW).

4. Audit and data verification

- 4.1. The panel secretary provided a verbal update on progress with items identified for audit.

5. Matters arising from Meeting 2

- 5.1. As agreed at the previous meeting, the sub-panel discussed the issue of double weighting in the light of their experience of reviewing such claims. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the guidance that had been received from the main panel.
- 5.2. The sub-panel agreed a set of characteristics which would justify double weighting. The main panel chair recommended that in cases of doubt, double weighting claims should be discussed in plenary sub-panel meetings.
- 5.3. The sub-panel also reviewed its use of half marks in scoring outputs, and agreed that the current methodology was working well in practice and should be continued.
- 5.4. The chair introduced the topic of outputs having material in common, and the sub-panel discussed how this should be taken into account in the assessment. With reference to the guidance in paragraphs 40 and 41 in of Part 2C, section C2 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF01.2012), the sub-panel noted that overlap in content could impact on its assessment of the originality of an output.

6. Assessment of outputs

- 6.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest, and accordingly 31 attendees left the room at the relevant points in the proceedings.
- 6.2. In plenary format, the sub-panel reviewed those outputs which had been scored by the allocated panellists, and recorded agreed scores for each.
- 6.3. The chair of the main panel provided clarification that scores recorded must reflect the agreed assessment of the entire sub-panel, rather than solely the panellists allocated to it.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There being no further business the chair thanked the sub-panel for its contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 20: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

13 – 14 May 2014

Ettington Chase Hotel, Banbury Road, Ettington, CV37 7NZ

Minutes

Present:

Professor Rosemary Auchmuty, Professor Trevor Buck, Professor Joanne Conaghan (deputy chair), Professor Adam Crawford, Dr Frederique Dahan, Professor Simon Deakin, Ms Anita Dockley, Professor Gillian Douglas (chair), Dr Moira Dustin, Ms Rebecca Endean, Ms Nina Fletcher, Professor Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Professor David Fraser, Professor Colin Harvey, Professor Iain MacNeil, Professor Kate Malleson, Mrs Katy McKen (panel adviser), Professor Alan Norrie, Professor Dennis Patterson, Mr Richard Percival, Professor Colin Reid, Professor Jo Shaw, Professor Betsy Stanko, Mrs Clair Thrower (panel secretary), Professor Nigel White, Professor Simon Whittaker, Professor Paul Wiles (Main Panel C), Ms Theresa Williams (Main Panel C, 14 May), Ms Katharine Wright.

Apologies:

No apologies were received.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the meeting, and outlined the main items of business for part 1 of the meeting, namely to agree scores for impact templates and case studies.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Assessment of impact templates

- 2.1. The chair summarised the preparatory work that had been done by the sub-panel in assessing impact templates, in accordance with 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012) Part 2C section C3. She confirmed that, in accordance with paragraph 115 of Part 1 of the panel criteria, each impact template had been assessed by groups of three (or, in the case of the largest HEIs, four) panellists, each group including at least one academic member and one user member.

- 2.2. The sub-panel discussed the guidance that had been provided by the main panel, following its impact calibration exercise, and agreed an approach to allocating scores on the half mark scale. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the criteria level definitions for impact given in 'Assessment framework and guidance on submissions' (REF02.2011), table A3.
- 2.3. The chair presented an analysis of the raw scores that had been collated ahead of the meeting, starting with the submissions where no major conflicts of interest existed. In the light of the prior discussion, final scores were agreed.
- 2.4. According to the running order presented in paper 1, the sub-panel discussed the remaining submissions in turn, during which 28 attendees left the meeting as appropriate to their major or minor conflicts of interest.
- 2.5. The outcomes were recorded in the panel spreadsheet and uploaded to the Panel members' website (PMW).

3. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 3.1. The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as an accurate record.

4. Conflicts of interest

- 4.1. The sub-panel reviewed paper 3, the register of declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record of major interest were needed in future, panellists would record them on the panel members' website (PMW).

5. Update on Main Panel C impact assessment

- 5.1. The chair summarised discussions that had been held by Main Panel C, supported by slides prepared by the panel advisor, analysing the outcomes of the main panel impact calibration exercise.

6. Audit and data verification - impact

- 6.1. The secretary gave a verbal report on the impact audits that had been requested at the last meeting. Whilst some had been completed, some were still to be finalised.

7. Assessment of impact case studies

- 7.1. The chair led a discussion of the various issues panellists had encountered in their reading of the impact case studies and reminded everyone of the eligibility thresholds that had to be passed before a case study should be judged eligible. Some generic issues were noted, and the sub-panel agreed its approach to impact arising from commissioned research, impact spanning the REF period deadlines, impact upon different kinds of audiences and impact relating to consultancy.

- 7.2. The chair summarised the process by which each case study had been allocated, noting that each group of assessors had included at least one of the user members or impact assessors. One panellist from each group was invited to give a brief overview of each case study, with contributions from the other members. Scores were recommended, and agreed by the sub-panel.
- 7.3. Case studies were assessed in the order set out in paper 4, starting with those where no major conflicts of interest existed. Finally the sub-panel went on to agree a score for each case study for submissions with which panellists had conflicts of interest (during which 31 attendees left the room at appropriate points), using the same process.
- 7.4. The sub-panel reviewed the evidence that had been provided and reached collective decisions about the outcomes to be recorded. Each item which would possibly be awarded an 'unclassified' score was discussed in plenary session by all sub-panel members without major conflicts.
- 7.5. Where audit responses were still awaited, the sub-panel agreed a preliminary score, if possible, to be confirmed or modified later in the light of future responses.

8. Review of impact sub-profiles

- 8.1. The sub-panel reviewed the resulting overall sub-profile for impact, noting that the half marks were split equally between the nearest integer scores.
- 8.2. The sub-panel discussed themes that had become apparent during the case study presentations, some of which were agreed for feedback to the main panel.

9. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 9.1. The sub-panel noted paper 5, a briefing paper prepared by the REF team about the process for agreeing feedback statements for HEIs, and for collating the sub-panel's contributions to the main panel overview report.
- 9.2. The sub-panel agreed to work in small groups focussing on particular submissions, to be allocated following the meeting.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. There being no further business the chair thanked the sub-panel for its contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 20: Meeting 4 (Part 2)

15 – 16 May 2014

Ettington Chase Hotel, Ettington

Minutes

Present:

Professor Anthony Arnull, Professor Rosemary Auchmuty, Professor Ben Bowling, Professor Trevor Buck, Professor Joanne Conaghan (deputy chair), Professor Matt Craven (15 June), Professor Adam Crawford, Professor Simon Deakin, Ms Anita Dockley (15 June), Professor Gillian Douglas (chair), Professor Neil Duxbury, Ms Nina Fletcher (15 June), Professor Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Professor David Fraser, Professor Colin Harvey, Professor Iain MacNeil, Professor Kate Malleson (15 June), Mrs Katy McKen (panel adviser), Professor Alan Norrie, Professor Suzanne Ost, Professor Roderick Paisley, Professor Dennis Patterson, Professor Colin Reid, Professor Chris Rodgers, Professor Jo Shaw, Mrs Clair Thrower (panel secretary), Professor Charlotte Waelde, Professor Nigel White, Professor Simon Whittaker, Professor Paul Wiles (Main Panel C).

Apologies:

No apologies were received.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to part 2 of the meeting, and thanked them for all the work that had been done in preparation for the meeting.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the main business of the meeting, being to agree and record panel scores for outputs in line with the target proportion requested by the main panel.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed paper 2, the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record of major interest were needed in future, panellists should inform the panel secretary and record them on the panel members' website (PMW).

4. Chair's update

- 4.1. The chair gave a verbal update on a number of issues that had arisen since the last meeting, including:
 - 4.1.1. The publication of a revised expenses policy.
 - 4.1.2. The status of deliveries from the REF warehouse.
 - 4.1.3. A reminder to panellists to record receipt of cross-referral advice in their personal spreadsheets.
 - 4.1.4. A reminder to panellists to record any outputs passed to other panellists on their reading lists.
 - 4.1.5. A brief forward look to the environment calibration which was planned for the July meeting.
- 4.2. The panel secretary gave a demonstration of the submission viewer element of the panel members' website.

5. Audit and data verification - outputs

- 5.1. The secretary reported that a number of outputs had been identified for audit, of which most cases had been resolved before the meeting. Where necessary, errors in the provision of PDFs by HEIs had been corrected, and amendments made to the metadata held in the REF database.

6. Review of sub-panel scoring pattern to date

- 6.1. The panel adviser presented an anonymised analysis of sub-panel scoring patterns, by individual and the whole sub-panel. The sub-panel discussed the possible reasons where discrepancies were observed, and the potential implications for the final quality profile. The chair encouraged the sub-panel to ensure it used the full range of marks available.

7. Assessment of outputs

- 7.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest, and accordingly 26 attendees left the room at the relevant points in the proceedings.
- 7.2. In plenary format, the sub-panel reviewed the scores that had been agreed by the allocated panellists, and recorded agreed panel scores for each.

- 7.3. Requests for double-weighting were evaluated when the output was discussed. The chair referred to the guidance provided by the main panel, and reiterated the distinction between judgements about the quality of an output and the double-weighting claim, in accordance with the provisions of Part 2C, paragraph 52 of 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012).

8. Review of emerging sub-profiles by submission

- 8.1. The sub-panel reviewed the overall emerging profile for outputs in the Unit of Assessment.

9. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 9.1. The sub-panel noted paper 3, a briefing paper prepared by the REF team about the process for agreeing feedback statements for HEIs, and for collating the sub-panel's contributions to the main panel overview report.
- 9.2. The sub-panel agreed to work in small groups focussing on particular submissions, to be allocated following the meeting.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. There being no further business the chair thanked the sub-panel for its contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 20: Meeting 5

22-23 July 2014

The Studio, Manchester M1 1FN

Minutes

Present:

Professor Anthony Arnull, Professor Rosemary Auchmuty, Professor Ben Bowling, Professor Trevor Buck, Professor Joanne Conaghan (deputy chair), Professor Matt Craven, Professor Adam Crawford, Professor Simon Deakin, Professor Gillian Douglas (chair), Professor Neil Duxbury, Professor Dame Janet Finch (Main Panel C, 22 July 2014), Professor Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Professor David Fraser, Professor Colin Harvey, Professor Herbert Kritzer (Main Panel C), Professor Iain MacNeil, Professor Kate Malleson, Mrs Katy McKen (panel adviser), Professor Alan Norrie, Professor Suzanne Ost, Professor Roderick Paisley, Professor Colin Reid, Professor Chris Rodgers, Professor Jo Shaw, Mrs Clair Thrower (panel secretary), Professor Charlotte Waelde, Professor Nigel White, Professor Simon Whittaker.

Apologies:

Apologies were received from Ms Anita Dockley, Ms Nina Fletcher and Professor Dennis Patterson.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the meeting, and commended the progress that had been made.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the main business of the meeting, being to agree and record panel scores for the remainder of outputs.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Impact follow up

- 2.1. The sub-panel noted that scores for several impact items considered at the previous meeting remained to be settled. After discussion, and consideration of audit outcomes, the sub-panel agreed the majority of scores.

- 2.2. Two outstanding items were agreed for carry forward to the next meeting.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 3.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.

4. Conflicts of interest

- 4.1. The sub-panel reviewed paper 2, the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record of major interest were needed in future, panellists should inform the panel secretary and record them on the panel members' website (PMW).

5. Review of sub-panel scoring pattern to date

- 5.1. The panel adviser presented an update of the anonymised analysis of sub-panel scoring patterns, by individual and the whole sub-panel, that had been presented at the last meeting. The sub-panel observed progress that had been made, and discussed further the possible reasons where discrepancies were noted. The chair encouraged the sub-panel to ensure the full range of marks was used.

6. Audit and data verification - outputs

- 6.1. The secretary reported that a number of outputs had been identified for audit, of which most cases had been resolved before the meeting. Where necessary, errors in the provision of PDFs by HEIs had been corrected, and amendments made to the metadata held in the REF database.

7. Assessment of outputs

- 7.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest, and accordingly 28 attendees left the room at the relevant points in the proceedings.
- 7.2. In plenary format, the sub-panel reviewed the scores that had been proposed by the allocated panellists, and recorded agreed panel scores for each.
- 7.3. Requests for double-weighting were evaluated when the output was discussed. The chair referred to the guidance provided by the main panel, and reiterated the distinction between judgements about the quality of an output and the double-weighting claim, in accordance with the provisions of Part 2C, paragraph 52 of 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012).

8. Review of emerging sub-profiles by submission

- 8.1. The sub-panel reviewed the overall emerging profile for outputs in the Unit of Assessment.

9. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 9.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the briefing paper prepared by the REF team presented at the previous meeting, about the process for agreeing feedback statements for HEIs, and for collating the sub-panel's contributions to the main panel overview report.
- 9.2. The sub-panel agreed to work in small groups focussing on particular submissions, to be allocated following the meeting.

10. Individual staff circumstances

- 10.1. The sub-panel noted paper 3, a briefing paper prepared by the REF team outlining the background to the individual staff circumstances arrangements.
- 10.2. The secretary presented an overview of the process by which individual staff circumstances had been evaluated, and confirmed that audits had been raised as necessary.
- 10.3. The sub-panel noted that all 'complex' individual staff circumstances had been reviewed by the Equality and Diversity Panel (EDAP), and the outcomes recorded in the panel spreadsheet. A minority of cases had not been accepted, and accordingly EDAP had awarded 'unclassified' grades to the 'missing' outputs.
- 10.4. The secretariat proposed that the majority of 'clearly defined' cases were accepted, which was agreed by the sub-panel. Where an 'unclassified' grade was proposed, the secretary explained the reasoning behind the recommendation. The sub-panel agreed all recommendations.

11. Environment calibration

- 11.1. The chair thanked the sub-panel for their work in preparation for this item, which had involved the assessment of a small number of environment templates from non-conflicted HEIs.
- 11.2. The sub-panel discussed the environment templates in turn in plenary, noting any issues and queries that had arisen during their individual review of the items. The range of scores awarded was compared across each template, and the sub-panel reached a consensus to awarding quality levels in the future assessment.
- 11.3. A final plenary session explored any further issues which had arisen during discussion.

12. Any other business

- 12.1. There being no further business the chair thanked the sub-panel for its contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 20: Meeting 6

16-17 September 2014 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Professor Rosemary Auchmuty, Professor Trevor Buck, Professor Joanne Conaghan (deputy chair), Professor Adam Crawford, Professor Simon Deakin, Ms Anita Dockley (17 September 2014), Professor Gillian Douglas (chair), Dr Geri Echue (REF team, 16 September 2014), Professor Dame Janet Finch (Main Panel C, 17 September 2014), Ms Nina Fletcher (17 September 2014), Professor Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Professor David Fraser, Professor Iain MacNeil, Professor Kate Malleson, Mrs Katy McKen (panel adviser), Professor Alan Norrie, Professor Dennis Patterson, Professor Colin Reid, Professor Jo Shaw, Mrs Clair Thrower (panel secretary), Professor Nigel White, Professor Simon Whittaker.

Apologies:

Apologies were received from Professor Colin Harvey.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the meeting, and commended the progress that had been made.
- 1.2. The chair summarised the principal items of business, being to finalise items outstanding in the assessment of outputs and impact; perform the environment assessment and to make progress with the feedback and overview reports.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed paper 2, the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record of major interest were needed in future, panellists should inform the panel secretary and record them on the panel members' website (PMW).

4. Assessment of environment

- 4.1. The chair introduced the environment assessment, noting that the four elements of the research environment template were to be scored separately, on the half mark scale.
- 4.2. Commending the work that had been done ahead of the meeting, the chair referred to the results of the environment calibration exercise carried out at the previous meeting. She reported that the majority of environment scores had been agreed by the allocated panellists and recommended for endorsement by the sub-panel.
- 4.3. The chair then invited discussion of any areas that panellists had found challenging, and a wide-ranging discussion was held, during which several themes emerged. The sub-panel noted that all the metric data available had been evaluated in conjunction with the narratives and the two had been interpreted together.
- 4.4. The sub-panel concluded its assessment of the research environment templates. In plenary format, the sub-panel agreed scores to be entered in the panel spreadsheet under 'strategy', 'people', 'income' and 'collaboration' to create a recommended profile for each submission to be passed to main panel for endorsement. Each submission was reviewed in turn, starting with those where no major conflicts of interest existed.
- 4.5. In accordance with paragraph 6 of Annex D of the 'panel criteria', 18 panellists and members of the secretariat withdrew from the room whilst institutions with which they had a major conflict of interest were discussed under this item.

5. Audit and data verification - outputs

- 5.1. The secretary reported that all output audits had been successfully concluded, and that where necessary, errors in the provision of PDFs by HEIs had been corrected, and amendments made to the metadata held in the REF database.

6. Review of sub-panel scoring pattern to date

- 6.1. The panel adviser presented an analysis of the emerging outputs sub-profile, compared to the status at the previous meeting and also the current overall main panel profile. The sub-panel confirmed its confidence in the results that had been

recorded, and noted that the few items remaining to be settled were unlikely to result in any significant alterations.

7. Assessment of outputs

- 7.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest as above, and accordingly 18 attendees left the room at the relevant points in the proceedings.
- 7.2. In plenary format, the sub-panel reviewed the outstanding scores that had been agreed by the allocated panellists, and recorded agreed panel scores for each.
- 7.3. Final requests for double-weighting were evaluated. The chair referred to the guidance provided by the main panel, and reiterated the distinction between judgements about the quality of an output and the double-weighting claim, in accordance with the provisions of Part 2C, paragraph 52 of 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012). The sub-panel reached decisions on each case, which were recorded in the panel spreadsheet.
- 7.4. The sub-panel reviewed the decision-making process for each output that had been awarded an 'unclassified' score, and agreed that the outcomes had been appropriate.
- 7.5. The sub-panel noted a number of cases where co-authored outputs had been submitted more than once, both within the same submissions and by different HEIs. Each set of duplicate items was checked to ensure that the same rating had been applied to all members of the set.

8. Assessment of impact

- 8.1. The sub-panel noted that satisfactory responses to all audit queries on impact case studies had been received, allowing final scores to be agreed for each one.
- 8.2. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest as above, and accordingly 20 attendees left the room at the relevant points in the proceedings.
- 8.3. The sub-panel reviewed the resultant impact sub-profile for the entire UOA, and compared it to the emerging main panel profile.
- 8.4. With reference to a request received from the main panel, the sub-panel reviewed a sub-set of impact scores, and in the light of its discussions, made some adjustments as it considered appropriate.

9. Review and sign-off of sub-profiles

- 9.1. The panel adviser displayed a report prepared by the REF team, presenting an anonymised analysis of the sub-profiles. In accordance with guidance received

from the main panel, the sub-panel also viewed the quality profiles of each submission in turn, in plenary format. No discussion was held.

- 9.2. The sub-panel agreed that the sub-profiles represented an accurate reflection of its work.

10. Overview report

- 10.1. The chair acknowledged the constructive comments that had been received from the sub-panel for inclusion in the overview report. A detailed discussion was held to determine priorities for the final version.

11. Feedback statements

- 11.1. The chair outlined the purpose of the feedback statements, being to give HEIs constructive comments that conveyed more than an articulation of the overall and sub-profile percentages.
- 11.2. The sub-panel agreed an approach to drafting the next iteration of the feedback, and a process by which it would be circulated ahead of the final meeting. In a wide-ranging discussion, the sub-panel agreed a set of conventions to be used, to ensure that feedback given was appropriate and consistent.

12. Preparation for final meeting

- 12.1. The sub-panel agreed a process for finalising the remaining items, and series of interim deadlines ahead of the final meeting.

13. Any other business

- 13.1. There being no further business the chair thanked the sub-panel for its contributions and declared the meeting closed.



REF Sub-panel 20: Meeting 7

16 October 2014 2014

CCT Venues - Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Professor Rosemary Auchmuty, Professor Trevor Buck, Professor Joanne Conaghan (deputy chair), Professor Adam Crawford, Professor Simon Deakin, Ms Anita Dockley, Professor Gillian Douglas (chair), Ms Nina Fletcher, Professor David Fraser, Professor Colin Harvey, Professor Iain MacNeil, Professor Kate Malleson, Mrs Katy McKen (panel adviser), Professor Alan Norrie, Professor Dennis Patterson, Professor Colin Reid, Mr Graeme Rosenberg (REF team), Professor Jo Shaw, Mrs Clair Thrower (panel secretary), Professor Nigel White, Professor Simon Whittaker.

Apologies:

Apologies were received from Professor Lorna Fox O'Mahony.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, and outlined the main business of the meeting, being to finalise any outstanding items and agree feedback statements and the overview report.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed paper 2, the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record of major interest were needed in future, panellists should inform the panel secretary and record them on the panel members' website (PMW).

4. Chair's update

- 4.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the summary of discussion she had circulated shortly after the last main panel meeting, and noted that the main panel had had its first opportunity to compare results of the environment assessment across all the sub-panels.

5. Assessment of environment

- 5.1. The chair reported further on the main panel discussion about environment, with particular reference to a request received from the main panel that the sub-panel should review the process it had undertaken in arriving at sub-profiles for the research environment, and the outcomes recorded.
- 5.2. Due to conflicts of interest, three members of the sub-panel left the room for the subsequent discussions.
- 5.3. In the light of the discussions, the sub-panel made what adjustments it considered appropriate.

6. Assessment of impact

- 6.1. In accordance with the guidance contained in paragraph 160b and Table A3 of 'Guidance on Submissions' (REF 02.2011), the sub-panel agreed amendments to the scores for two case studies.

7. Review and sign-off of sub-profiles

- 7.1. The panel adviser displayed a report prepared by the REF team, presenting an anonymised analysis of the sub-profiles. In accordance with guidance received from the main panel, the sub-panel also viewed the quality profiles of each submission in turn, in plenary format. No discussion was held.
- 7.2. The sub-panel agreed that the sub-profiles represented an accurate reflection of its judgements.
- 7.3. According to paragraph 130 of 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012), the sub-panel agreed to recommend the overall quality profile for each submission to the main panel, confirming that:
 - 7.3.1. It had reached collective decisions, within the framework of the exercise and in accordance with the published statement of criteria and working methods. It had debated the reasoning behind the quality profiles in sufficient detail to reach such collective conclusions, and made recommendations to the main panel on the basis of its collective judgement. It had achieved a consensus on all the overall quality profiles recommended to the main panel.

7.3.2. Each submission had been assessed against the published criteria for UOA20 (including in cases where parts of submissions have been cross-referred to other sub-panels for advice) and according to the published procedures.

7.3.3. Each submission had been examined in sufficient detail to form robust judgements, and that appropriate expertise has been deployed in assessing submissions.

8. Feedback statements

8.1. The sub-panel reviewed the current iteration of the feedback statements, and agreed a process by which they would be finalised following the meeting.

9. Overview report

9.1. The sub-panel noted paper 3. The chair acknowledged the constructive comments that had been received from the sub-panel for inclusion in the overview report. A detailed discussion was held to determine priorities for the final version.

10. Feedback to the REF team on the REF process

10.1. The sub-panel noted paper 4, comprising their collated commentary and recommendations on the REF process. After a short discussion, suggestions for amendments were noted for inclusion in the final version after the meeting.

11. Information for sub-panel members post assessment

11.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the confidentiality arrangements surrounding the REF, and the need to maintain absolute confidentiality about the results and process both ahead of the publication of results, and in the period following publication.

11.2. The panel adviser gave a presentation, prepared by the REF team, outlining the timetable for results, giving an overview of the results website and reiterating the need for total confidentiality of assessment materials. It was agreed that a copy of the slides would be circulated to the sub-panel.

12. Arrangements for finalising documentation

12.1. The sub-panel noted that following the final main panel meeting, amendments to the feedback statements and overview report might be required. Accordingly, the sub-panel agreed to delegate approval of future changes, and sign-off of the minutes of the final meeting to chair's action.

13. Any other business

13.1. There being no further business the chair thanked the members of the sub-panel for their dedicated and conscientious contributions throughout the REF process, expressed thanks to the Deputy Chair for her invaluable advice and support and

on behalf of the members and assessors, thanked the Panel Advisor and Secretary for all their hard work in enabling the sub-panel to deal with its business so efficiently. The chair then declared the meeting closed.