



REF Sub-panel 21: Meeting 2
6 February 2014
Grand Connaught Rooms, London

Minutes

Present:

Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
John Dumbrell
James Dunkerley
Richard English
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Charlie Jeffrey
Peter John
Herbert Kritzer (Main panel C International adviser)
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Nicola Phillips
Shirin Rai
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel and thanked them for taking part.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.
- 1.3. The chair updated the sub-panel on changes to membership, and welcomed the new sub-panel secretariat.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The feedback from the previous sub-panel meeting to the main panel was approved.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1 The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Individuals were asked to inform the executive group of any updates to their conflicts of interest during the year. The sub-panel noted paper 01.2014.

4. Housekeeping (IT systems, working methods)

- 4.1 A member of the REF admin team gave a brief presentation on the IT systems and was available to give individual assistance to sub-panel members during the meeting.

5. Feedback from Main Panel meeting

- 5.1 The chair updated the sub-panel on the recent meeting of main panel C.
- 5.2 A section of the minutes relating to output calibration, specifying some principles relating to each of the criteria in the evaluation of individual items, would be circulated to the sub-panel. It was agreed that the full minutes from the main panel meeting would be circulated once they had been approved.
- 5.3 Members were asked to note the deadline for cross-referral requests and to inform the executive group if any of their allocated outputs required cross-referral.
- 5.4 Members were informed that impact calibration would take place at the following main panel meeting and that three case studies and two impact templates would be identified for main panel calibration.

6. Output allocation

- 6.1 The chair informed the sub-panel that allocations were underway and that all outputs would shortly be allocated to two readers.
- 6.2 Members were asked to note the deadline for cross-referral requests and to inform the executive group if any of their allocated outputs required cross-referral.
- 6.3 Members were reminded to alert the executive group to any minor conflicts of interest which would require re-allocation of outputs.

7. Output calibration and procedure for reconciling output grades

- 7.1 The sub-panel discussed paper 02.2014 which outlined the procedure for reconciling output grades.

- 7.2 It was agreed that each output would be assessed by two readers who would then reconcile their scores and upload the provisional score to the panel members' website.
- 7.3 The chair, or the deputy chair where the chair was conflicted, would be alerted to any instances where it was not possible to reconcile scores.
- 7.4 The sub-panel were reminded of the requirement to have scored 50% of outputs by the May meeting and the need to ensure that scores were reconciled in advance of the meeting.
- 7.5 The sub-panel were informed that specialist advice would be sought for items not in English and that cross-referrals would be sought for items where both readers felt that particular expertise would be needed in order to assess the output. The sub-panel was again reminded of the need to alert the executive group to items that need cross referral before the deadline.
- 7.7 The sub-panel had been sent a set of outputs for calibration and discussed the outputs in sets, focusing on the extent to which each set of outputs satisfied the criteria of originality, significance and rigour.
- 7.8 The sub-panel adviser clarified that the unclassified score could be awarded to outputs which either don't meet the definition of research, or don't meet the criteria for 1* grade.

8. Double weighting

- 8.1 Members discussed paper 03.2014 which contained examples of double weighting requests for calibration.

9. Audit

- 9.1 The sub-panel noted paper 04.2014.
- 9.2 Members were reminded to raise all audit queries with the secretariat via webmail.

10. Future meetings

Initial guidance on assessing Impact

- 10.1 The sub-panel noted paper 05.2014.
- 10.2 The chair would complete allocation of impact case-studies following the meeting.
- 10.3 The chair informed the sub-panel that impact case-study calibration would take place at the next meeting, which would include feedback from the main panel meeting.

11. A.O.B.

- 11.1 There being no further business the chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.



REF Sub-panel 21: Meeting 3

19 – 20 March 2014

10.00 – 16.30

The Studio, 7 Cannon Street, Birmingham, B2 5EP

Minutes

Day 1 – 19 March 2014

Present:

Stephen Blakeley (Impact assessor)
Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
John Dumbrell
James Dunkerley
Richard English
Paul Evans (Impact assessor)
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Charlie Jeffrey
Peter John
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Julie Lyon (Impact assessor)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Shirin Rai
Graeme Rosenberg (REF Manager)
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Trevor Taylor (Impact assessor)
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)
Paul Wyles (Deputy chair of main panel C)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy
Pilar Domingo (Impact assessor)
Catherine Fieschi (Impact assessor)
Guy Lodge (Impact assessor)
Nicola Phillips

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1 The chair welcomed the sub-panel and thanked them for attending.
- 1.2 In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The minutes from the previous meeting held on 6 February 2014 were discussed.
- 2.2 An amendment was made to item 7.4 to correct the date when 50% of output scores would be agreed. The minute now reads: "7.4 The sub-panel were reminded of the requirement to have scored 50% of outputs by the May meeting and the need to ensure that scores were reconciled in advance of the meeting."
- 2.3 The minutes from the previous meeting were then approved.
- 2.4 It was agreed that a list of agreed actions and deadlines would be circulated to the sub-panel following each meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1 The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Individuals were reminded to inform the executive group of any updates to their conflicts of interest during the year.

4. Housekeeping

- 4.1 Members were reminded to upload reconciled scores to the panel members' website regularly.

5. Feedback from Main Panel meeting – impact

- 5.1 The chair updated the sub-panel on the recent meeting of main panel C which had involved impact calibration.
- 5.2 The chair fed back comments from main panel on individual calibration items when they were discussed.
- 5.3 There was some discussion about the supporting evidence within impact case studies and the extent to which the sub-panel members would need to follow weblinks to verify the claims made within them. Guidance from the main panel suggested that this should not be necessary, although there was nothing to preclude members from doing so, provided that they were verifying information rather than seeking additional information.

6. Sub-panel procedures

a. Reconciling impact case study and impact template scores

- 6.1 The sub-panel adviser gave a short presentation about threshold decision making for impact case studies. He answered queries about threshold judgements and advised sub-panel members to raise audit queries if a case study could be awarded an unclassified grade.
- 6.2 The sub-panel discussed paper 06e.2014 which suggested a procedure for reconciling impact case study and impact template scores.
- 6.3 It was agreed that all impact case studies would be allocated to two academic assessors and one impact assessor. There would be a common academic reader (for all case studies submitted by an institution), who would also be involved in assessing the impact template and would act as 'impact rapporteur' for that UOA.
- 6.4 Members agreed to read impact case studies and impact templates in number order to co-ordinate the scoring and ensure that 50% of scores could be uploaded to the panel members' website by 20 April and reported to the main panel meeting on 24 April. The remainder of scores would be reconciled and uploaded by 10 May.
- 6.5 The revised paper would be circulated to members shortly after the meeting.

b. Audit queries

- 6.6 Paper 06d.2014 was noted.
- 6.7 There was a discussion about the types of audit query which should be raised for impact case studies.
- 6.8 Members were reminded to raise audit queries on impact case studies with the executive group by 28 March.

7. Impact Calibration

- 7.1 The sub-panel had been sent a set of impact case studies and templates for calibration.
- 7.2 Papers 06a.2014, 06b.2014, 06c.2014 were used to facilitate the discussion.
- 7.3 The panel discussed how the calibration case studies had demonstrated the criteria of significance and reach.

- 7.4 The panel discussed the types of evidence which could be provided to support the claims made within case studies and referred to the Panel Criteria and Working Methods document.
- 7.5 There was some discussion about the extent to which claims made within case studies were credible and whether the evidence provided was sufficient. Members were reminded that audit queries could be raised to see corroborating sources which verified claims made.
- 7.6 The REF manager and the Deputy chair of main panel C joined the meeting.
- 7.7 There was concern that some case studies described impact which might not necessarily fall within the descriptor for the sub-panel. Members were reminded that case studies could be cross-referred if necessary, however the sub-panel chair was confident that the range of expertise within the sub-panel meant that all of the impact case studies submitted could be assessed without cross-referral.
- 7.8 The sub-panel's approximate scores for the calibration items which were discussed at the main panel were consistent with the approximate scores given by other members of the main panel. This indicated that the calibration exercise had been successful in ensuring that items would be scored consistently.
- 7.9 The sub-panel discussed the calibration impact templates, which had produced a range of approximate scores. The discussion focused on the ways in which the templates demonstrated that the submitting unit's approach was conducive to achieving impacts of reach and significance.
- 7.10 The sub-panel were impressed at the level of engagement and range of impacts submitted to the unit of assessment.
- 7.11 Members were reminded to upload 50% of their impact scores to the panel members' website by 20 April, and 100% of scores by 10 May.
- 7.12 The sub-panel chair thanked members for their contributions and ended the first day of the meeting.

Day 2 - 20th March

Present:

Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
James Dunkerley
Richard English
Janet Finch (Main panel C chair)
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Charlie Jeffrey
Peter John
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Nicola Phillips
Shirin Rai
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)
Paul Wyles (Deputy chair of main panel C)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy
John Dumbrell

8. Feedback from the Main Panel meeting – outputs and double-weighting

- 8.1 The sub-panel chair gave an update on the discussion about double-weighting at the main panel meeting.
- 8.2 It was agreed that the sub-panel chair and deputy sub-panel chair would make provisional decisions on the double-weighting requests.
- 8.3 It was further agreed that changes to decisions on double-weighting cases would be agreed by the sub-panel at a subsequent meeting.

9. Output reconciliation and grading

a. Discussion of data on grading so far

- 9.1 The sub-panel discussed the emerging grade profile from the output scores which had been reconciled and uploaded to date.
- 9.2 The chair of main panel C joined the meeting.
- 9.3 The sub-panel discussed the process for reconciling and uploading scores for outputs. It was clarified that scores would only become final at the end of the process and that changes could be made up until that point.
- 9.3 There was some discussion about multi-authored outputs and the sub-panel adviser clarified the guidance on when audit queries would be appropriate.

b. Opportunity to reconcile scores

9.4 The sub-panel discussed output scores and reconciled grades in pairs.

10. Future meetings

a. Timetable for decisions and workload management

10.1 The sub-panel chair presented the sub-panel with a list of upcoming deadlines, which would also be circulated following the meeting. He recognised that there was a large amount of work to be done before the next meeting and requested that members strive to meet the deadlines.

10.2 The sub-panel discussed the next meeting in May. It was agreed that three days would be sufficient for this meeting, rather than the four days originally planned.

11. Any Other Business

11.1 There being no further business the chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.



REF Sub-panel 21: Meeting 4 Part 1

13 – 14 May 2014

10.00 – 16.30

**Ettington Chase Hotel, Banbury Road, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon,
CV37 7NZ**

Minutes

Day 1 – 13 May 2014

Present:

Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
Pilar Domingo (Impact assessor)
John Dumbrell
James Dunkerley
Richard English
Paul Evans (Impact assessor)
Catherine Fieschi (Impact assessor)
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Peter John
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Julie Lyon (Impact assessor)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Nicola Phillips
Shirin Rai
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Trevor Taylor (Impact assessor)
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)
Paul Wyles (Deputy chair of main panel C)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy
Stephen Blakeley (Impact assessor)
Charlie Jeffrey
Guy Lodge (Impact assessor)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1 The chair welcomed the sub-panel and thanked them for attending.
- 1.2 In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 19 – 20 March 2014, were approved.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1 The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Individuals were reminded to inform the executive group of any updates to their conflicts of interest during the year.
- 3.2 The sub-panel were reminded that whilst discussing institutional sub-profiles, members with conflicts of interest would be required to leave the room.

4. Housekeeping

- 4.1 The sub-panel were reminded that new procedures regarding expenses were now in operation and asked to read the guidance document on the panel members' website to familiarise themselves with them.

5. Feedback from Main Panel meeting

- 5.1 The chair updated members on the recent main panel meeting, where the emerging impact sub-profiles were discussed. He stressed that the data for that meeting was based on a small sample, and involved unreconciled, individual scores.
- 5.2 The data discussed at main panel level indicated that there were variations in scoring across the eleven sub-panels in main panel C, but that this variation was within what the main panel considered an acceptable range.
- 5.3 The chair reminded the sub-panel that HEIs will not receive scores for individual impact items. The main panel discussed feedback reports, which may contain further information, particularly if a case study was unclassified. The main panel's view was that where a unit performed poorly, more feedback should be provided to give help and guidance.

6. Audit

- 6.1 The chair informed the sub-panel that responses had been received for all of the audit queries raised on impact case studies.

7. Discuss and approve draft impact sub-profiles

- 7.1 The sub-panel discussed the draft impact sub-profiles, comprising aggregated scores from the impact template and impact case studies for each HEI.
- 7.2 A rapporteur introduced each impact sub-profile, commenting on how the profile was reached and giving any points for feedback to the HEI.
- 7.3 Where appropriate, following discussion in full sub-panel, readers discussed case studies again and a small number of changes were made to scores.
- 7.4 The allocation of each case study to two academic readers and an impact assessor meant that the sub-panel were confident that case studies had been assessed consistently.
- 7.5 The sub-panel discussed those HEIs where there were no conflicts of interest first.

Day 2 – 14 May 2014

Present:

Stephen Blakeley (Impact assessor)
Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
Pilar Domingo (Impact assessor)
John Dumbrell
James Dunkerley
Richard English
Paul Evans (Impact assessor)
Catherine Fieschi (Impact assessor)
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Charlie Jeffrey
Peter John
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Guy Lodge (Impact assessor)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Julie Lyon (Impact assessor)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Nicola Phillips

Shirin Rai
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Trevor Taylor (Impact assessor)
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)
Paul Wyles (Deputy chair of main panel C)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy

7. Discuss and approve draft impact sub-profiles

- 7.6 The sub-panel continued their discussions of draft impact sub-profiles.
- 7.7 23 Members left the room when they had a conflict of interest with the HEI under discussion, or when they had a conflict of interest with a particular impact case study.
- 7.8 The chair confirmed the process for making changes to impact scores, if necessary, following the panel's discussions.
- 7.9 It had not been possible to agree a score for one case study. It was agreed that the case study would be allocated to three new readers who would reconcile a score. It was further agreed that the chair would take action to agree the score once a reconciled score was proposed by the new readers and report back to the next meeting.
- 7.10 The sub-panel were reminded that the impact scores were provisional and subject to the ongoing calibration procedures of the main panel.
- 7.11 The sub-panel agreed to recommend the provisional impact profiles to the main panel.
- 7.12 The sub-panel agreed that there was a wide range of diverse and high quality impact submitted and felt that this was representative of the nature of the academic discipline where there was a long history of engagement and longstanding relationships with users.
- 7.13 The chair thanked the impact assessors for their valuable contribution to the impact assessment.
- 7.14 The chair thanked members for the hard work which had enabled the sub-panel to approve the provisional impact sub-profiles on schedule.

REF Sub-panel 21: Meeting 4 Part 2

15 May 2014

Minutes

Present:

Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
John Dumbrell
James Dunkerley
Richard English
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Charlie Jeffrey
Peter John
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Nicola Phillips
Shirin Rai
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)
Paul Wyles (Deputy chair of main panel C)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy

9. Environment Calibration

- 9.1 The chair explained that all environment statements would be allocated to two readers, who would reconcile scores in advance of the next meeting. The rapporteur would be required to draft the feedback paragraph for environment. The chair confirmed that allocations would be made shortly after the meeting.
- 9.2 The sub-panel considered six environment statements and associated data from submissions without conflicts of interest for calibration. Paper 07.2014 was used to inform the discussion.
- 9.3 A rapporteur introduced each environment statement and the sub-panel discussed issues pertaining to the assessment of the vitality and sustainability of the research environment.

- 9.4 The sub-panel discussed the issue of fractional appointments. In some cases, submissions contained examples of high profile staff employed on fractional contracts where there was no evidence in the REF5 that these staff were either contributing to, or integrated within, the unit of assessment's research environment. The sub-panel felt strongly that such examples should be considered very carefully in terms of the REF criterion of sustainability and that certain cases warranted an amount of unclassified in their environment profile. It was agreed that the chair would report this back to the main panel to seek a consistent approach to this issue across the eleven main panel C sub-panels.
- 9.5 The sub-panel also discussed conformity to the template. Some HEIs had not included information in the correct part of the template. Sub-panel members were prepared to recognise evidence of sustainability and vitality regardless of where it appeared in the REF5, but were clear that it was important for environment statements to give a coherent narrative about an HEI's strategy. Members recognised that it would be difficult to award high scores to those environment statements which did this poorly.

10. Output reconciliation and grading

- 10.1 The sub-panel adviser presented data on output scoring to date, showing individual members' scoring averages and standard deviation.
- 10.2 The sub-panel discussed issues which had arisen during the process of reading and reconciling output scores.
- 10.3 There was a query regarding overlapping items. It was confirmed that where a book had been submitted alongside other outputs which also appeared in the book, the book should be assessed without the repeated content, regardless of chronology. Where a book chapter had been submitted that was identical to another output, the earlier item should be scored, and the later item should receive an unclassified score.
- 10.4 The sub-panel expressed some concern a number of items which had been submitted to SP21 but which did not necessarily fall within the UOA descriptor. In some cases, this had arisen due to staff in smaller units working across disciplines who's work did not necessarily map directly on to one UOA. The chair stressed that the UOA descriptor had been developed to be as inclusive as possible.
- 10.5 The deputy sub-panel chair reminded members that if both readers felt unable to assess an output, a third reader could be allocated.

11. Report provisional scores for 50% of outputs

- 11.1 The sub-panel agreed to recommend scores for 42.8% of outputs to the main panel.

12. Panel overview reports

- 12.1 The sub-panel noted paper 08.2014 which contained guidance on the feedback statements which would be sent to HEIs.
- 12.2 It was agreed that impact rapporteurs would provide draft feedback paragraphs to the executive group following the meeting.
- 12.3 The sub-panel discussed the feedback reports and agreed that it was important that these were helpful, focusing on the positive elements of submissions, but also giving constructive feedback on weaknesses.

13. Future meetings

- 13.1 The sub-panel agreed that the three day meeting in July should be shortened to a two day meeting.
- 13.2 Members agreed to bring the assessment of environment statements forward so that provisional environment sub-profiles would be agreed at the July meeting, rather than in September as originally planned. 75 % of output scores would also be recommended to the main panel following the July meeting.
- 13.3 Members further agreed that all UOA sub-profiles would be approved at the September meeting.

14. Any Other Business

- 14.1 There being no further business the chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.



REF Sub-panel 21: Meeting 5

21 - 22 July 2014

10.00 – 18.00

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

Minutes

Day 1 – 21 July 2014

Present:

Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
John Dumbrell
James Dunkerley
Richard English
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Charlie Jeffrey
Peter John
Herbert Kritzer (International member, main panel C)
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Nicola Phillips
Shirin Rai
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed the sub-panel and thanked them for attending.

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 13 – 14 May 2014, were approved, with minor typographical corrections.
- 2.2 A matter arising was dealt with under any other business.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1 The sub-panel reviewed the register of members' declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Individuals were reminded to inform the executive group of any updates to their conflicts of interest during the year.
- 3.2 The sub-panel were reminded that whilst discussing institutional sub-profiles, members with conflicts of interest would be required to leave the room.

4. Housekeeping

- 4.1 The sub-panel were reminded that items returned to the warehouse should not be annotated.

5. Feedback from Main Panel meeting

- 5.1 The chair updated members on the recent main panel meeting, which reviewed the emerging impact profiles.
- 5.2 The sub-panel adviser presented data on the impact profiles for SP21 and anonymised data for other sub-panels in main panel C. It was noted that these profiles were weighted by FTE.
- 5.3 The main panel were auditing the proposed impact profiles to ensure that all sub-panels had applied the criteria consistently whilst scoring.
- 5.4 The chair reported that the next main panel meeting would consider emerging output profiles, and feedback to HEIs.

6. Audit

- 6.1 There were no outstanding audit queries at the time of the meeting.

7. Equality and Diversity

7.1 The sub-panel secretary presented paper 09.2014 which outlined recommendations for individual staff circumstances.

7.2 The sub-panel approved the recommendations within the paper.

8. Discuss and approve draft environment sub-profiles

8.1 The sub-panel discussed the draft environment sub-profiles, using paper 10.2014.

8.2 The sub-panel adviser presented the emerging environment profile for SP21 and it was noted that, due to the decision to bring the environment assessment forward, there was no comparison data from the main panel available.

8.3 The environment rapporteur for each HEI introduced the draft profile and explained how it had been reached.

8.4 The sub-panel discussed the non-conflicted institutions first.

Day 2 – 22 July 2014

Present:

Chris Brown

Roland Dannreuther

John Dumbrell

James Dunkerley

Richard English

Janet Finch (Chair, main panel C)

Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)

Andrew Hurrell

Vivienne Jabri

Charlie Jeffrey

Peter John

Herbert Kritzer (International member, main panel C)

Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)

Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)

Colin McInnes

Iain McLean

Nicola Phillips

Shirin Rai

David Sanders

Judith Squires

Jonathan Tonge

Martin Williamson

Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy

8. Discuss and approve draft environment sub-profiles

- 8.5 The sub-panel continued its discussion of the draft environment sub-profiles.
- 8.6 20 members left the room when they had a conflict of interest with the HEI under discussion.
- 8.7 The sub-panel adviser presented the FTE weighted profile for environment. The sub-panel noted that there was a strong correlation between the number of FTE submitted and the GPA.
- 8.8 The sub-panel discussed the issue of selectivity and the fact that some institutions may score very highly for environment despite returning a small fraction of the total number of staff. It was noted that HESA data on the percentage of eligible staff that were submitted to the REF would be published at the same time as the results.
- 8.9 The sub-panel agreed that in some cases, amendments should be made to the scoring of certain elements of the environment in order to ensure consistency. These amendments would be communicated to the executive group by those sub-panel members who had originally assessed the environment template.
- 8.10 The sub-panel agreed to recommend the draft environment profiles to the main panel.

9. Produce draft output sub-profiles

- 9.1 The sub-panel adviser presented emerging profile data for outputs in SP21, and anonymised data for other sub-panels within main panel C. He also presented data on mean scores and standard deviation.
- 9.2 The sub-panel agreed to recommend scores for 78% of outputs to the main panel.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1 It was agreed that at the September meeting, the sub-panel would review the combined sub-profiles for outputs, impact and environment and would discuss feedback on outputs.
- 10.2 It was agreed that feedback for outputs would be drafted by sub-panel members. The sub-panel chair would allocate HEIs to members before the next meeting, and profile data would be provided to assist them in preparing draft feedback.
- 10.3 The sub-panel chair would send exemplar feedback to members following the main panel meeting to allow them to amend impact feedback if necessary, and

write environment and outputs feedback to ensure consistency across the main panel.

- 10.4 It was agreed that draft environment feedback should be sent to the executive group by 1 September 2014.
- 10.5 The sub-panel noted that its last meeting would be a one day meeting in October, where feedback reports would be formally signed off, and the subject overview report would be discussed.

11. Any Other Business

- 11.1 Two members of the sub-panel left the room, due to conflicts of interest.
- 11.2 As noted in minute 7.9, at the previous meeting it had not been possible to agree a score for one case study. The case study had been allocated to three new readers who had reconciled a score which had been agreed by the chair.
- 11.3 Despite strong dissent from one member, the sub-panel concluded that the process to agree the score had been robust, consistent and fair, and approved the score for the impact case study.
- 11.4 There being no further business the chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.



REF Sub-panel 21: Meeting 6

8 – 9 September 2014

10.00 – 18.00

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

Minutes

Day 1 – 8 September 2014

Present:

Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
John Dumbrell
James Dunkerley
Richard English
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Charlie Jeffrey
Peter John
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Nicola Phillips
Shirin Rai
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed the sub-panel and thanked them for attending.

- 1.2 In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 21 – 22 July 2014, were approved, without change.
- 2.2 All matters arising were dealt with during the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1 The sub-panel reviewed the register of members' declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.
- 3.2 The sub-panel were reminded that whilst discussing institutional sub-profiles, members with conflicts of interest would be required to leave the room.

4. Housekeeping

- 4.1 The sub-panel were reminded that books should be returned to the warehouse in good time.
- 4.2 The sub-panel were asked to return the USB pens to the sub-panel secretary at the final meeting in October.

5. Feedback from Main Panel meeting

- 5.1 The chair gave feedback on the recent main panel meeting at which emerging output profiles had been discussed.
- 5.2 No specific issues had been identified for SP21 to discuss as a result of the main panel meeting.

6. Audit

- 6.1 There were no outstanding audit queries at the time of the meeting.

7. Review combined sub-profiles

- 7.1 The sub-panel discussed the draft quality profiles for all units of assessment.
- 7.2 The sub-panel adviser presented comparison data from the main panel, showing the anonymised emerging output profiles.
- 7.3 An audit query on an environment template had not provided sufficient information for the sub-panel to give a score for one element. The sub-panel chair agreed to seek advice from the REF team.

- 7.4 In a small number of cases, it was agreed that the sub-panel members originally allocated to assess an environment template may wish to discuss their scores and make recommendations to the executive group of any appropriate changes. It was agreed that a change of half a grade would be approved by chair's action and that any changes of one full grade or more would be reported to the sub-panel at its next meeting.
- 7.5 4 members left the room when they had a conflict of interest with the HEI under discussion.

Day 2 – 9 September 2014

Present:

Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
John Dumbrell
James Dunkerley
Richard English
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Charlie Jeffrey
Peter John
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Nicola Phillips
Shirin Rai
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)

Apologies:

Richard Bellamy

7. Review combined sub-profiles

- 7.6 The sub-panel continued their discussion of draft quality profiles.
- 7.7 17 members left the room when they had a conflict of interest with the HEI under discussion.

8. Sign off output sub-profile (100% of outputs)

- 8.1 The sub-panel had completed the assessment of 100% of outputs, with every submitted output assessed by at least two sub-panel members.

- 8.2 The sub-panel agreed to recommend the output scores to the main panel.
- 8.3 The sub-panel chair thanked members for their work in assessing and reconciling scores by the required deadline.

9. Future meetings

- 9.1 The sub-panel discussed the final meeting which would take place in October 2014.
- 9.2 It was agreed that members would provide comments to the chair and deputy chair to be incorporated into the subject overview report. Further information about this process would be circulated following the meeting.
- 9.3 It was further agreed that feedback to HEIs on outputs, impact and environment would be edited into a near final version which would be circulated in advance of the next meeting. Members were asked to provide any changes that they wished to make to existing feedback paragraphs to the sub-panel secretary by Friday 12th September.

10. Any Other Business

- 10.1 No other business was discussed. The chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 21: Meeting 7

10 October 2014

10.00 – 16.30

**CCT Venues-Smithfield, Two East Poultry Avenue,
London, EC1A 9PT**

Minutes

Present:

Chris Brown
Roland Dannreuther
John Dumbrell
Richard English
Colin Hay (Sub-panel chair)
Andrew Hurrell
Vivienne Jabri
Charlie Jeffrey
Peter John
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)
Vivien Lowndes (Deputy sub-panel chair)
Colin McInnes
Iain McLean
Nicola Phillips
Shirin Rai
David Sanders
Judith Squires
Jonathan Tonge
Martin Williamson
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)

Apologies:

James Dunkerley

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1 The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the final meeting and thanked them for attending.
- 1.2 In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed that it was competent to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 8 – 9 September 2014, were approved, without change.
- 2.2 All matters arising were dealt with during the meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Housekeeping

- 4.1 The sub-panel adviser presented a set of slides which outlined the timetable for the release of results, and procedures to follow at the end of the assessment.
- 4.2 Members were reminded of the confidentiality of the assessment process, and that they should only comment on information which would be publicly available.
- 4.3 Members were reminded to destroy all hand-written notes pertaining to the assessment before the publication of the results on 18 December.
- 4.3 The sub-panel secretary collected members' USB pens for returning to the REF team.

5. Audit

- 5.1 There were no outstanding audit queries at the time of the meeting.

6. Feedback from Main Panel meeting

- 6.1 The chair gave feedback on the recent main panel meeting at which emerging quality profiles had been discussed.
- 6.2 The main panel had identified variations in scoring, in particular in relation to the use of 100 per cent 4*.
- 6.3 In light of the main panel discussion, some sub-panels were invited to review their environment scores to ensure that the 4* boundary had been appropriately applied and the grades awarded reflected the quality of the material submitted.

7. Environment calibration

- 7.1 The sub-panel discussed the environment scores, and made adjustments to scoring in line with the main panel calibration.

- 7.2 10 members left the room when they had a conflict of interest with the HEI under discussion.

8. Feedback on submissions

- 8.1 The sub-panel confirmed recommended output, impact and environment sub-profiles and an overall quality profile for each of the following submissions to SP21, 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
Birkbeck College
University of Birmingham
University of Bradford
University of Bristol
Brunel University
University of Cambridge
Canterbury Christ Church University
Cardiff University
City University, London
Coventry University
University of Dundee
University of Durham
University of East Anglia
University of Edinburgh
University of Essex
University of Exeter
University of Glasgow
Goldsmiths' College
University of Hull
Keele University
University of Kent
King's College London
University of Leeds
University of Leicester
University of Lincoln
University of Liverpool
Liverpool Hope University
London Metropolitan University
London School of Economics and Political Science
University of Manchester
University of Newcastle upon Tyne
University of Nottingham

University of Oxford
Oxford Brookes University
Queen Mary, University of London
Queen's University Belfast
University of Reading
Robert Gordon University
Royal Holloway, University of London
School of Oriental and African Studies
University of Sheffield
University of Southampton
University of St Andrews
St Mary's University College Belfast, A College of QUB
University of Strathclyde
University of Surrey
University of Sussex
Swansea University
University of Ulster
University College London
University of Warwick
University of West of England, Bristol
University of Westminster
University of York

8.2 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.

8.3 HEI feedback had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting (respecting conflicts of interest).

8.4 2 members left the room if discussion was necessary on feedback for any HEI.

8.5 The sub-panel resolved to recommend the feedback on submissions to the main panel, subject to further edits which may be made by the executive group.

9. Subject overview report

9.1 Sub-panel members had responded to a pro-forma gathering information for the subject overview report.

9.2 The sub-panel discussed issues and made suggestions for items to include in the report and the data which should be presented.

9.3 The sub-panel resolved to recommend the draft subject overview report to the main panel, and agreed that chair's action would be taken to make any necessary edits or amendments.

10. Any other business

- 10.1 No other business was discussed. The chair thanked members for their contributions and hard work throughout the assessment phase and declared the meeting closed.