



Sub-panel 22: Meeting 2

30 January 2014, 10:00-16:30

Grand Connaught Rooms

61 – 65 Great Queen Street, Central London, WC2B 5DA

Minutes

Present:

Pete Alcock, Judith Allsop, Marian Barnes, Saul Becker, Tim Blackman, Ben Bowling (pm only), Hugh Bochel, Alison Bowes, Michele Burman, Roger Burrows, John Carpenter, Michelle Double (adviser), Nick Ellison, Jane Falkingham, Loraine Gelsthorpe (deputy chair), Barry Goldson, John Hills, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), Ravi Kohli, Geraldine Macdonald, Robert MacDonald, Jane Millar, Julia O'Connor, Judith Phillips, Roger Smith, Peter Squires, Nicky Stanley, Imogen Taylor (deputy chair), Peter Taylor-Gooby (chair), Susan White.

Apologies:

Hilary Graham.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists and outlined the key aims and business of the meeting.
- 1.2. Panellists introduced themselves by stating their names and institutions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel declared their competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

- 2.1. The panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Panel members were reminded to keep the register of interests up to date on the panel members' website.
- 2.2. The panel were invited to declare minor conflicts to the panel secretary as they arose. Adjustments to assessment allocations would be made where necessary.

3. IT systems briefing

3.1. The panel adviser gave a short briefing on the REF IT systems covering:

- USB pens.
- Panel members' website.
- Personal spreadsheets and reading lists.
- REF webmail.

4. Audit

4.1. The chair introduced paper 22.2.1 outlining audit and data verification procedures, drawing particular attention to the procedure for panel instigated audits. The chair invited panel members to submit audit queries to the panel secretary via REF webmail. If the secretary is conflicted with the HEI in question, audit queries should be raised through the panel adviser.

4.2. In response to a query, the sub-panel chair referred to the guidance on co-authored items in the 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012), paragraphs 42-45.

4.3. The chair noted that sub-panels have been asked to produce a list of case studies for audit by the next meeting on 12-13 March. Further information will be sent to panel members via REF webmail.

5. Output calibration

5.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair selected and circulated a sample of 17 outputs to the members and output assessors, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. These were outputs submitted as part of the REF 2014 submission. Outputs were selected to represent outputs spread across sub-fields within the Unit of Assessment (UOA), with a sample of one output from UOA 20: Law and 2 outputs from UOA 23: Sociology. The chair noted that the availability of items as pdfs hindered the sub-panels ability to assess a range of output types.

5.2. The chair introduced paper 22.2.2 and outlined the aims of the calibration exercise, highlighting that the aim was to develop a common understanding of the starred levels; not to agree specific scores for the outputs in the calibration sample.

5.3. The chair referred to the criteria and level definitions in REF 01.2012, Part 2C paragraph 69.

5.4. The chair reported on the calibration exercise by MPC, which had met on 23 January 2014, and covered the following issues:

- The main issues involved in deciding on outputs that were on the borderline between star levels.
 - Feedback on the outputs that had been in the main panel calibration sample, which represented a spread across the UOAs.
 - In order for an output to be given the highest score sub-panels could expect that output to be strong on all three criteria, but that a special case could be made if this wasn't the case.
- 5.5. Panellists were asked to submit their scores to the secretary in advance of meeting. These were collated into a single table and circulated in hard copy at the meeting.
- 5.6. The deputy sub-panel chair led a discussion on research ethics. It was noted that the generic definition of rigour included "... due consideration of ethical issues". (REF01.2012)
- 5.7. The panel discussed the selected outputs, focussing particularly on those outputs where scores diverged or members considered the output was borderline between star levels. Through this discussion the panel highlighted the reasons for discrepancies between scores, with reference to the level descriptors.
- 5.8. The panel welcomed the assessment of a range of research output types, on the understanding that all submitted outputs must embody original research.
- 5.9. The chair led a discussion with criminologists regarding the calibration of criminology outputs across UOAs 20, 22 and 23.
- 5.10. The chair concluded the session by outlining some general principles to be used in the broad interpretation and the practical application of the criteria.
- 5.11. Members of the sub-panel absented themselves from discussions of outputs from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.

6. HEI allocation

- 6.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair allocated an institutional assessor to each submitting institution. This approach will afford assessors an overview of the three elements (outputs, impact and environment) for each submitting institution.

7. Output allocation

- 7.1. The chair provided an overview of the allocation process, highlighting that each output had been assigned a specialist reader and an institutional assessor. Panel members were also informed of provisional workloads.

- 7.2. The chair reported the agreed timeframe for reading and agreeing scores for outputs ahead of the next sub-panel meeting in order to meet main panel targets. Panellists were asked to read and assign scores to a minimum of 25 outputs for which they are named as expert assessor, and a minimum of 25 outputs for which they are named institutional assessor. Panel members should input their scores into their personal spreadsheets and upload this to the panel members' website by Wednesday 5 March 2014.
- 7.3. The chair led a discussion on the proposed working practices for reading and assessing outputs. Guidance was provided on how to agree a score where there was a discrepancy between panellists' scores. The sub-panel agreed that the expert assessor of an output should take overall responsibility for inputting an agreed mark into the 'Comment 1' column of their personal spreadsheet.
- 7.4. The panel discussed double-weighting statements, and agreed that panel members would make a recommendation for outputs they had been allocated. The panel noted that the 15 requests would need to clearly demonstrate how they met the panel criteria for double-weighting, and that the form or medium of an output was not in itself an indicator of this. All reserve items had been allocated and would be reviewed where double-weighting statements are rejected.
- 7.5. The chair invited panellists to identify any outputs for cross-referral and/or specialist advice which they were not able to assess. It was anticipated that this would predominantly be items for which panel members were conflicted, or for which they lacked the relevant language skills to assess. Panellists should pass details to the chair/panel secretary. The panel agreed to approve all cross-referral requests made by submitting institutions.

8. Planning and future meetings

- 8.1. The chair introduced paper 22.2.3 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets.
- 8.2. The panel noted it would be helpful to clarify exactly which meetings required output and impact assessor attendance.
- 8.3. The chair outlined the procedure for the impact calibration exercise, which would be primary item of business on day 1 of the next sub-panel meeting.

9. Any other business

- 9.1.1. No other items were raised. The chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 22: Meeting 3 (Part 1)

12 March 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Pete Alcock, Judith Allsop, Saul Becker, Hugh Bochel, Alison Bowes, Alex Burfitt [agenda items 1-5 only], Michele Burman, John Carpenter, Anna Dickinson (REF team) [agenda items 5-9 only], Michelle Double (adviser), Nick Ellison, Janet Finch (main panel chair), Alison Garnham, Loraine Gelsthorpe (deputy chair), Peter Gilleece [agenda items 5-9 only], Barry Goldson, Hilary Graham, John Hills, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David Johnson, Geraldine Macdonald, Jane Millar, Julia O'Connor, Judith Phillips, Roger Smith, Peter Squires, Kate Stanley, Nicky Stanley, Imogen Taylor (deputy chair), Peter Taylor-Gooby (chair), Bernard Walker, Susan White, Karl Wilding, Teresa Williams (main panel member) [agenda items 5-9 only].

Apologies:

Robert Berkeley, Nicholas Timmins.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists and outlined the key aims and business of the meeting.
- 1.2. Panellists introduced themselves by stating their names and institutions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel declared its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the 30 January subject to one amendment to the list of those present.
- 2.2. The chair noted that any matters arising would be covered by the day's agenda.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Panel members were reminded to keep the register of interests up to date on the panel members' website.
- 3.2. The panel were invited to declare minor conflicts to the panel secretary as they arose. Adjustments to allocations would be made where necessary.

4. Guidance on assessing impact

- 4.1. The chair introduced paper 22.3.1, 'Initial guidance on assessing impact', which was circulated prior to the meeting to aid panellists in their preparation for sub-panel meeting three. An extract from the 'Assessment framework and guidance on submissions' (REF 02.2011) and a web link to FAQs about impact were appended to this document for ease of reference.
- 4.2. The chair provided an overview of the assessment criteria of 'reach and significance' as defined in REF 02.2011 in the context of both impact templates (REF 3a) and impact case studies (REF 3b).
- 4.3. The chair led a discussion of the general characteristics defining the starred levels, and how these criteria should be applied to both REF 3a and REF 3b.
- 4.4. The chair outlined the threshold criteria for REF 3b, highlighting that the sub-panel could request further information, via audit, if it is required to make a threshold judgement.

5. Impact Calibration

- 5.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair selected and circulated a sample of seven impact case studies to panel members and impact assessors, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. These were impact case studies submitted as part of the REF 2014 submission. Impact case studies were selected to represent a sample from across the institutions submitted to the Unit of Assessment (UOA).
- 5.2. The chair outlined the aims of the calibration exercise, highlighting that discussion would be used to develop a common understanding of the starred levels; not to agree specific scores for impact case studies in the calibration sample. The aims of the exercise were to compare assessments across the sub-panel, and between users (acting as expert assessors) and academic sub-panel members (acting as institutional assessors). The exercise would ensure that the sub-panel assess impact according to common standards.

- 5.3. The chair reported general observations from the Main Panel C (MPC) impact calibration exercise.
- 5.4. The chair led a discussion of case studies selected for calibration, during which four panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.
- 5.5. The panel noted the following general points:
- Case studies must be assessed on the basis of the evidence provided in the four pages of the document. Corroborating sources should be used to verify evidence cited in the case study and not to gather further information.
 - The strongest case studies were those which demonstrated a clear causal pathway between research and impact.
 - Panellists should assess impact in the context of the constraints that the researchers were working in, and reach would not be assessed in purely geographic terms.
 - Cases which claimed impact on a single company or organisation, could, in principle, score high on 'reach' if it was clear that the focus of the impact claimed could only be specific to that organisation.
- 5.6. The chair led a discussion of how to apply the criteria as defined in REF 02.2011 to REF 3a, highlighting the following general points:
- Impact templates should outline a clear forward looking strategy.
 - Impact templates should demonstrate an institution's approach to impact, rather than research (which should be demonstrated in REF 5).
- 5.7. The panel agreed to conduct an online calibration of exercise of REF 3a.
- 5.8. Action: sub-panel chair to select and circulate a range of impact templates to include exemplars demonstrating the characteristics of both weak and strong templates. Panellists should return their scores via REF webmail to the panel secretary who will then circulate the scores for information.

6. Impact allocation

- 6.1. The chair provided an overview of how impact items had been allocated. Each impact case study and impact template has been allocated to at least one academic member and one user member or impact assessor.
- 6.2. Impact allocations had been released prior to the meeting, and all panellists had been asked to read through their allocation to identify conflicts of interest and potential audit queries. Impact items were reallocated where appropriate to take into account declared conflicts.

- 6.3. The chair confirmed that panellists should score impact using the nine-point scale.
- 6.4. The panel sought clarification as to how half marks would feed into the calculation of overall sub-profiles.
- 6.5. Action: REF team to provide confirmation of how half marks will be distributed between full star ratings. Outcome to be passed to panellists as and when available.

7. Audit

- 7.1. The chair introduced paper 22.3.2, 'audit of impact case studies'. This document outlined the scope and procedures for auditing impact case studies. Panellists were invited to nominate case studies for audit in advance of the meeting based on their initial reading of impact case studies. Taking into account conflicts of interest, a redacted list of these impact case studies was tabled at the meeting as paper 22.3.2a.
- 7.2. The sub-panel considered this paper and agreed that the sub-panel chair would provide the audit team with 9-19 case studies (equivalent to 5-10 percent of the total submitted to our UOA) for audit. This list will distinguish between case studies the sub-panel considered high priority for audit, and those that are not high priority for audit.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. The chair introduced paper 22.3.3 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The panel noted the days at which impact assessors were required to attend.
- 8.2. The chair noted that the first two days of sub-panel meeting four would be used to agree impact profiles.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. No other items were raised. The chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 22: Meeting 3 (Part 2)

13 March 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Pete Alcock, Judith Allsop, Marian Barnes, Saul Becker, Tim Blackman, Hugh Bochel, Alison Bowes, Ben Bowling, Michele Burman, Roger Burrows, John Carpenter, Michelle Double (adviser), Nick Ellison, Jane Falkingham, Loraine Gelsthorpe (deputy chair), Barry Goldson, Hilary Graham, John Hills, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), Ravi Kohli, Geraldine Macdonald, Robert MacDonald, Jane Millar, Julia O'Connor, Judith Phillips, Roger Smith, Peter Squires, Nicky Stanley, Imogen Taylor (deputy chair), Peter Taylor-Gooby (chair), Susan White.

Apologies:

Robert Berkely.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists and outlined the key aims and business of the meeting.
- 1.2. Panellists introduced themselves by stating their names and institutions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel declared its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the 30 January subject to one amendment to the list of those present.
- 2.2. The chair noted that any matters arising would be covered by the day's agenda.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Panel members were reminded to keep the register of interests up to date on the panel members' website.
- 3.2. The panel were invited to declare minor conflicts to the panel secretary as they arose. Adjustments to allocations would be made where necessary.

4. Chair's update on the assessment period

- 4.1. The chair provided a general overview for the timeframe of assessing outputs, reporting progress to date, key deadlines and targets for the assessment of outputs.
- 4.2. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals both in and out of the sub-panel.
- 4.3. The chair reported general observations from the Main Panel C (MPC) discussion on double-weighting requests. The panel noted that decisions on double-weighting were entirely separate from any assessment of quality. A decision should, in the first instance, be made on the basis of the supporting statement submitted by the HEI. The panel agreed that the assessing readers would recommend whether an item for which double-weighting was requested should be double-weighted.
- 4.4. The chair tabled a list of panellists' mean scores (calculated on their personal scores of outputs to date). The panel noted this information, and agreed that following agenda item 5 it would be helpful to review the mean panel agreed score for comparison.
- 4.5. The chair invited panel members to report on their experiences of assessing outputs to date.
- 4.6. In response to a query regarding the assessment of edited volumes, the chair called attention to the need to assess the editorial and conceptual contribution of an individual, in addition to any single authored elements.

5. Agreeing panel scores for outputs

- 5.1. The panel reviewed the proposed scores of all outputs which had been scored by both allocated readers to date, and endorsed agreed scores for these outputs.
- 5.2. 27 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

6. Audit

- 6.1. The chair reported on outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries and data adjustments made by the REF team by referring to paper 22.3.4a.
- 6.2. Panellists were reminded to raise new audit queries with the panel secretary via REF webmail. If the secretary is conflicted with the HEI in question, audit queries should be raised through the panel adviser.

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. The chair introduced paper 22.3.5 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The panel noted the days at which output assessors were required to attend.
- 7.2. Based on its progress to date, the panel was confident that it would not require two full days to agree panel scores for outputs at its next meeting. The panel therefore agreed that the final day (15 May 2014) of sub-panel meeting four should therefore be cancelled.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. No other items were raised. The chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.



REF Sub-panel 22: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

12-13 May 2014

Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead,

South Croydon, CR2 8YA

Minutes

Present:

Pete Alcock, Judith Allsop, Saul Becker, Hugh Bochel, Alison Bowes, Michele Burman, John Carpenter, Michelle Double (adviser), Nick Ellison, Alison Garnham [12 May only], Loraine Gelsthorpe (deputy chair), Peter Gilleece [12 May only], Barry Goldson, Hilary Graham, John Hills, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David Johnson, Geraldine Macdonald, Jane Millar, Julia O'Connor, Judith Phillips, Roger Smith, Peter Squires, Kate Stanley, Nicky Stanley, Imogen Taylor (deputy chair), Peter Taylor-Gooby (chair), Nicholas Timmins [12 May only], Susan White, Karl Wilding, Teresa Williams (main panel member) [agenda item 7-8 only].

Apologies:

Alex Burfitt, Bernard Walker.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists and outlined the key aims and business of the meeting.
- 1.2. Panellists introduced themselves by stating their names and institutions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel declared its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the 13 March.
- 2.2. The chair noted that there were no matters arising.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Panel members were reminded to keep the register of interests up to date on the panel members' website.
- 3.2. The panel were invited to declare minor conflicts to the panel secretary as they arose. Adjustments to allocations would be made where necessary.

4. Chair's update on the assessment period

- 4.1. The chair provided an overview of the sub-panel's approach to assessing impact, and updated the panel on progress to date.
- 4.2. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals both in and out of the sub-panel.
- 4.3. The chair provided a brief overview of discussions by Main Panel C at their meeting on 24 April. This included the co-ordination of a strategy for the collection of data for the overview reports and feedback statements, and a summary of the impression of emerging impact profiles across the Main Panel based on provisional data collected in mid-April. This data reflected personal scores rather than panel agreed scores.
- 4.4. The chair noted that as a discipline with strong traditions of applied work, social work and social policy could expect to produce some high quality impact.

5. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 5.1. The chair introduced paper 22.4.2, 'Overview reports and feedback statements'. This document explains how an overview report produced by each main panel, with contributions from each of the sub-panels, will be published following the completion of the exercise. It also describes how sub-panels will be asked to produce feedback statements for each submission, which will be provided in confidence to the head of institutions in January 2015. These statements will not be published.
- 5.2. The chair led a brief discussion of what type of data would need to be captured in these reports, in accordance with paper 22.4.2.
- 5.3. The chair outlined how information for these reports would be collated. Panellists appointed as institutional assessors will be responsible for collecting relevant data for their respective submissions.
- 5.4. The chair noted that this is the last meeting at which impact assessors will be in attendance, and that it was important for the appointed institution co-ordinators to capture their views.

6. Agreeing scores for impact (non-conflicted HEIs)

- 6.1. The panel reviewed the proposed scores of all impact items which had been scored by both allocated readers, who presented a rationale for discrepancies in scoring. The panel noted that some personal scores were changed in light of discussions. The panel endorsed agreed scores for all impact items for which scores were available.
- 6.2. Where scores were pending, the panel approved a process for agreeing scores using the REF webmail system. These scores would be presented to and endorsed by the sub-panel at their next meeting.

7. Agreeing scores for impact (conflicted HEIs)

- 7.1. The panel reviewed the proposed scores of all impact items which had been scored by both allocated readers, who presented a rationale for discrepancies in scoring. The panel noted that some personal scores were changed in light of discussions. The panel endorsed agreed scores for all impact items for which scores were available.
- 7.2. Where scores were pending, the panel approved a process for agreeing scores using the REF webmail system. These scores would be presented to and endorsed by the sub-panel at their next meeting.
- 7.3. In one instance, the outcome of an audit query was still pending. The panel agreed a score to cover the likely outcome of the audit.
- 7.4. 24 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

8. Panel recommends draft impact profiles

- 8.1. The panel reviewed scoring patterns as part of ongoing moderation of scores.
- 8.2. The panel reviewed the emerging impact sub-profile based on scores agreed in this meeting. The panel noted that scoring patterns for the impact templates were generally lower than for the case studies. This was felt to be the expected result of units selecting their exemplar case study material. It was also accepted that the organisational structures supporting impact could be expected to be less mature at this stage.
- 8.3. The panel endorsed the emerging impact sub-profile based on scores agreed in this meeting.

9. Audit (impact)

- 9.1. The chair introduced paper 22.4.3, 'audit of impact case studies'. This document provided an anonymised overview of the types of audit queries raised on impact items and the audit outcomes. The specific outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries were passed to the relevant panellists in order to inform their assessments of impact items.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. The chair noted that impact assessors weren't required to attend any future meetings, and thanked them for their participation in the exercise.

11. Any other business

- 11.1. The chair led a discussion of the distinct role of user members in the assessment of impact. The panel explored the idea that there might be scope for more collaboration between user members across sub-panels.
- 11.2. The panel endorsed the use of half marks in the assessment of impact. The panel also thought half marks should be published, in the interests of transparency.
- 11.3. The panel emphasised the need to retain diversity in the criteria for impact for the future assessment of this element.
- 11.4. The chair presented an overview of the criteria for the assessment of environment, referring to the 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012), Part 2C, paragraphs 104-117, and the 'Assessment Framework and guidance on submission' (REF 02.2011), Part 3, paragraphs 165-185.
- 11.5. The panel agreed their approach to the assessment of environment, with a view to completing a calibration exercise at the next meeting.
- 11.6. The chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the impact agenda for this meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 22: Meeting 4 (Part 2)
14 May 2014
Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead,
South Croydon, CR2 8YA

Minutes

Present:

Pete Alcock, Judith Allsop, Marian Barnes, Saul Becker, Tim Blackman, Hugh Bochel, Alison Bowes, Ben Bowling, Michele Burman, Roger Burrows, John Carpenter, Michelle Double (adviser), Nick Ellison, Jane Falkingham, Loraine Gelsthorpe (deputy chair), Barry Goldson, Hilary Graham, John Hills, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), Ravi Kohli, Geraldine Macdonald, Robert MacDonald, Jane Millar, Julia O'Connor, Judith Phillips, Roger Smith, Peter Squires, Nicky Stanley, Imogen Taylor (deputy chair), Peter Taylor-Gooby (chair), Susan White.

Apologies:

Alison Garnham, David Johnson

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists and outlined the key aims and business of the meeting.
- 1.2. Panellists introduced themselves by stating their names and institutions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel declared its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the 13 March.
- 2.2. The chair noted that there were no matters arising.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Panel members were reminded to keep the register of interests up to date on the panel members' website.

- 3.2. The panel were invited to declare minor conflicts to the panel secretary as they arose. Adjustments to allocations would be made where necessary.

4. Chair's update on the assessment period

- 4.1. The chair provided a general overview for the timeframe of assessing outputs, reporting progress to date, key deadlines and targets for the assessment of outputs.
- 4.2. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals both in and out of the sub-panel. A proportion of those outputs cross-referred out have been to language specialists to advise on non-English outputs.
- 4.3. The chair provide an update on the sub-panel's approach to the assessment of duplicate outputs.

5. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 5.1. The chair introduced paper 22.4.2, 'overview reports and feedback statements'. This document explains how an overview report produced by each main panel, with contributions from each of the sub-panels, will be published following the completion of the exercise. It also describes how sub-panels will be asked to produce feedback statements for each submission, which will be provided in confidence to the heads of institutions in January 2015. These statements will not be published.
- 5.2. The chair led a brief discussion of what type of data would need to be captured in these reports, in accordance with paper 22.4.2.
- 5.3. The chair outlined how information on outputs would be collated for these reports. Panellists appointed as institutional assessors will be responsible for collecting relevant data for their respective submissions.

6. Agreeing panel scores for outputs

- 6.1. The panel reviewed the proposed scores of all outputs which had been scored by both allocated readers to date. The panel also revisited agreed scores for outputs where personal scores had changed in light of ongoing moderation. Agreed scores were endorsed for these outputs.
- 6.2. 27 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.
- 6.3. 2 panellists left the room due to minor conflicts of interest.

7. Audit

- 7.1. The chair reported on outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries and data adjustments made by the REF team by referring to paper 22.4.4. This document provided an anonymised overview of the types of audit queries raised on outputs and the outcomes.
- 7.2. Panellists were reminded to raise new audit queries with the panel secretary via REF webmail. If the secretary is conflicted with the HEI in question, audit queries should be raised through the panel adviser.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. The chair introduced paper 22.4.5 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The panel noted the days at which output assessors were required to attend.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. No other items were raised. The chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 22: Meeting 5

8-9 July 2014

The Felbridge Hotel & Spa, London Road, East Grinstead, RH19 2BH

Minutes

Present:

Pete Alcock, Judith Allsop, Marian Barnes, Saul Becker, Tim Blackman, Hugh Bochel, Alison Bowes, Ben Bowling, Michele Burman, Roger Burrows, John Carpenter, Michelle Double (adviser), Nick Ellison, Jane Falkingham, Janet Finch (Main Panel C) [agenda item 7 only], Loraine Gelsthorpe (deputy chair), Barry Goldson, Hilary Graham [agenda items 1 – part of 7 only], John Hills, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), Ravi Kohli, Geraldine Macdonald, Robert MacDonald, Jane Millar, Julia O'Connor, Judith Phillips, Roger Smith, Peter Squires, Nicky Stanley, Imogen Taylor (deputy chair), Peter Taylor-Gooby (chair), Susan White, Karl Wilding.

Apologies:

Alison Garnham, David Johnson

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists and outlined the key aims and business of the meeting.
- 1.2. Panellists introduced themselves by stating their names and institutions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the sub-panel declared its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the 12-13 May.
- 2.2. The chair noted that there were no matters arising.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Panel members were reminded to keep the register of interests up to date on the panel members' website.
- 3.2. The sub-panel were invited to declare minor conflicts to the panel secretary as they arose. Adjustments to allocations would be made where necessary.

4. Chair's update on the assessment period

- 4.1. The chair provided a general overview of the timeframe for assessing outputs, and reported progress to date, key deadlines and targets for the assessment of outputs and environment.
- 4.2. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals both in and out of the sub-panel. A proportion of those outputs cross-referred out have been to language specialists to advise on non-English outputs.
- 4.3. The chair provided an update on the sub-panel's approach to the assessment of duplicate outputs.
- 4.4. The chair provided an update from Main Panel C. The secretariat displayed the following anonymised emerging sub-profile data:
 - Output sub-profiles across the Main Panel based on provisional panel agreed scores collected in June.
 - Impact sub-profiles across the Main Panel based on provisional panel agreed scores collected in June.
 - Profiles for outputs identified as criminology by sub-panels 20, 22 and 23 based on provisional panel agreed scores collected in June.
- 4.5. The chair also provided an overview of individuals' scoring patterns based on anonymised data circulated to sub-panel members prior to the meeting.
- 4.6. The chair led a discussion regarding the possibility of further moderation of output scores.
- 4.7. The sub-panel endorsed additional analysis of individuals' scoring patterns by the exec group, who would take further action where deemed necessary.
- 4.8. The sub-panel noted that all panel agreed scores are provisional, and that individuals could revisit any of their personal scores (where appropriate) up until the point at which they are signed off by the sub-panel as a recommendation to the main panel.

5. Agreeing panel scores for remaining impact items

- 5.1. The sub-panel endorsed agreed scores for any impact items which were not scored at the previous meeting.
- 5.2. The sub-panel noted that impact assessors, user members and academic sub-panel members had resolved any scoring discrepancies in advance of the meeting using the REF webmail system.
- 5.3. 12 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

6. Breakout to discuss personal scores for outputs

- 6.1. Panellists met with relevant individuals to agree proposed sub-panel scores and identify outputs or issues for further discussion and resolution.

7. Agreeing panel scores for outputs

- 7.1. The sub-panel reviewed the proposed scores of all outputs which had been scored by both allocated readers to date. The sub-panel also revisited agreed scores for outputs where personal scores had changed in light of ongoing moderation. Agreed scores were endorsed for these outputs.
- 7.2. 29 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.
- 7.3. 1 panellist left the room due to a minor conflict of interest.

8. Review emerging sub-profiles

- 8.1. The panel secretariat displayed anonymised emerging sub-profiles (output and impact elements) for all submissions based on panel agreed scores to date.
- 8.2. The sub-panel noted that all sub-profiles would remain provisional until signed off by the Main Panel later in the exercise.

9. Audit

- 9.1. The chair reported on outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries and data adjustments made by the REF team by referring to paper 22.5.2. This document provided an anonymised overview of the types of audit queries raised and the outcomes.
- 9.2. Panellists were reminded to raise new audit queries with the panel secretary via REF webmail. If the secretary is conflicted with the HEI in question, audit queries should be raised through the panel adviser.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. The chair introduced paper 22.5.3 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The sub-panel noted the days at which output assessors were required to attend.
- 10.2. The sub-panel noted that its next meeting would take place on the 17-18 September 2014 in The St John's Hotel, 651 Warwick Road, Solihull, B91 1AT.

11. Individual Staff Circumstances

- 11.1. The secretariat introduced paper 22.5.4. This document outlined how individual cases for staff who were returned as having either clearly-defined or complex circumstances that constrained their ability to conduct research during the assessment period have been considered.
- 11.2. The sub-panel endorsed the processes and recommendations for individuals with clearly-defined circumstances and individuals with complex circumstances as outlined in this paper. One outstanding case for an individual with complex circumstances will be addressed at the next meeting.

12. Environment Calibration

- 12.1. The chair led a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of submissions selected for sub-panel's calibration exercise. Environment templates (REF5) were selected from HEIs for which there were no conflicts of interest.
- 12.2. The sub-panel noted paper 22.5.5 which was circulated prior to the meeting. This paper provides details of the calibration exercise, provides guidance to support panels in their use of the REF4 data to inform their assessment of environment, and proposes a process for the assessment of environment to be endorsed by the sub-panel.
- 12.3. The sub-panel endorsed the proposed process for the assessment of environment.

13. Any other business

- 13.1. No other items were raised. The chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 22: Meeting 6
17-18 September 2014
The St John's Hotel, 651 Warwick Road, Solihull, B91 1AT

Minutes

Present:

Pete Alcock, Judith Allsop, Marian Barnes [agenda items 1 – 6 only], Saul Becker, Tim Blackman [agenda items 1 – 6 only], Hugh Bochel, Alison Bowes, Ben Bowling [agenda items 1 – 6 only], Michele Burman, Roger Burrows [agenda items 1 – 6 only], John Carpenter, Michelle Double (adviser), Nick Ellison, Jane Falkingham [agenda items 1 – 6 only], Janet Finch (Main Panel C) [agenda items 10 – 13 only], Loraine Gelsthorpe (deputy chair), Barry Goldson, Hilary Graham, John Hills, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David Johnson, Ravi Kohli [agenda items 1 – 6 only], Geraldine Macdonald, Robert MacDonald [agenda items 1 – 6 only], Jane Millar, Julia O'Connor, Judith Phillips, Roger Smith, Nicky Stanley [agenda items 10-13 only], Imogen Taylor (deputy chair), Peter Taylor-Gooby (chair), Susan White.

Apologies:

Alison Garnham, Peter Squires, Karl Wilding.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists and outlined the key aims and business of the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of attendance the sub-panel declared its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the 8-9 July 2014.
- 2.2. The sub-panel noted that the complex staff circumstances case which had been pending a decision by EDAP at the last meeting had now been considered and a recommendation made.
- 2.3. The chair noted that there were no other matters arising.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Panel members were reminded to keep the register of interests up to date on the panel members' website.
- 3.2. The sub-panel were invited to declare minor conflicts to the panel secretary as they arose. Adjustments to allocations would be made where necessary.

4. Chair's update on the assessment period

- 4.1. The chair provided a general overview of the timeframe for assessing outputs, and reported progress to date, key deadlines and targets for the assessment of outputs and environment.
- 4.2. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals both in and out of the sub-panel. A proportion of those outputs cross-referred out have been to language specialists to advise on non-English outputs.
- 4.3. The chair provided an update on the sub-panel's approach to the assessment of duplicate outputs.

5. Agreeing panel scores for outputs

- 5.1. The sub-panel reviewed the proposed scores of all outputs which had been scored by both allocated readers to date. The sub-panel also revisited agreed scores for outputs where personal scores had changed in light of ongoing moderation. Agreed scores were endorsed for these outputs.
- 5.2. 26 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

6. Audit

- 6.1. The chair reported on outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries and data adjustments made by the REF team by referring to paper 22.6.2. This document provided an anonymised overview of the types of audit queries raised and the outcomes.
- 6.2. Panellists were reminded to raise new audit queries with the panel secretary via REF webmail. If the secretary is conflicted with the HEI in question, audit queries should be raised through the panel adviser.

7. Impact recalibration

- 7.1. The chair reported that Main Panel C had asked each sub-panel chair to consider their sub-panel's processes and, where necessary, to identify actions required to

ensure that their final recommended quality profiles reflect the quality of the material submitted.

- 7.2. The sub-panel reviewed a sample of 76 (about 30 per cent) of the impact case studies and templates, focusing on those where half-mark scores had been agreed. The sub-panel had the advice and support of a user member at the meeting and had discussed the process with the appropriate main panel user member prior to the meeting. In only a handful of cases would the moderating reader have argued for a significant change to the score.
- 7.3. The sub-panel found no evidence that the marks agreed earlier were over or under-generous. It therefore judged there to be no reason to doubt the robustness of the process followed by the sub-panel, or to reconsider the decisions previously recommended in discussions between user and academic readers, supported in many cases by third and in some by fourth readers, and reviewed in plenary session by the whole sub-panel.
- 7.4. The sub-panel were satisfied that there had been a consistent application of the assessment criteria in relation to the assessment of impact, and that the process had been both rigorous and robust. The sub-panel endorsed the panel scores for impact.
- 7.5. 15 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

8. Feedback statements

- 8.1. The chair referred to paper 22.6.3. The sub-panel noted that it was encouraged to highlight notable strengths evident within each aspect of the submission (outputs, impact and environment), but that it may also comment on any notable shortcomings where the panel considers this would be helpful to the institution and is confident that such comments are entirely defensible.
- 8.2. The sub-panel noted that comments should be based solely on the sub-panel's assessment of the evidence presented in the submission (and any subsequent audits), carried out in accordance with the published assessment criteria. The language of the published criteria should be used, rather than alternative terminology. The chair referred to the assessment criteria and level definitions in Annex A of the 'Assessment framework and guidance on submissions' (REF 02.2011). Where relevant, feedback should also reflect the language of the submission itself.
- 8.3. The sub-panel noted that all sub-profile data would remain provisional until signed off by the Main Panel later in the exercise.

9. Overview report

- 9.1. The chair referred to paper 22.6.4 and led a plenary discussion of strengths and weaknesses of sub-fields within the discipline. The sub-panel noted that relevant

information should be passed to the sub-panel chair and content to be recommended to Main Panel C would be agreed at the next meeting.

- 9.2. The chair thanked output assessors for their contributions to date, and welcomed further comments to be incorporated into the overview report.

10. Breakout into environment groups

- 10.1. The chair invited sub-panel members to breakout into environment groups to discuss discrepancies between scores and general issues which arose during the assessment of environment.

11. Agree panel scores for environment

- 11.1. The sub-panel noted in a plenary discussion that environment templates had been allocated to sub-groups of sub-panel members and had initially been scored blind. Discrepancies in the scores were discussed by the sub-groups and resolved.
- 11.2. The sub-panel endorsed provisional scores for environment templates for all submissions.
- 11.3. 21 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

12. Future meetings

- 12.1. The chair introduced paper 22.6.5 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets.
- 12.2. The sub-panel noted that its next meeting would take place on the 22 October 2014 in CCT Venues-Barbican, Aldersgate House, 135-137 Aldersgate Street, EC1A 4JA.

13. Any other business

- 13.1. No other items were raised. The chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 22: Meeting 7
22 October 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Pete Alcock, Judith Allsop, Saul Becker, Hugh Bochel, Alison Bowes, Michele Burman, John Carpenter, Michelle Double (adviser), Nick Ellison, Jane Falkingham, Loraine Gelsthorpe (deputy chair), Barry Goldson, Hilary Graham, John Hills, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David Johnson, Ravi Kohli, Geraldine Macdonald, Jane Millar, Julia O'Connor, Judith Phillips, Nicky Stanley, Imogen Taylor (deputy chair), Peter Taylor-Gooby (chair), Susan White.

Apologies:

Marian Barnes, Tim Blackman, Ben Bowling, Roger Burrows, Alison Garnham, Robert MacDonald, Roger Smith, Karl Wilding.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists and outlined the key aims and business of the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of attendance the sub-panel declared its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the 17-18 September 2014.
- 2.2. The chair reported in relation to minutes 7.1-7.4 that Main Panel C confirmed it was satisfied that there had been a consistent application of the assessment criteria in relation to the assessment of impact, and that the process had been both rigorous and robust.
- 2.3. The sub-panel noted that there were no other matters arising.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest and noted that they were correct. Panel members were reminded to keep the register of interests up to date on the panel members' website.

4. Chair's update on the assessment period

- 4.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of their obligations to maintain the confidentiality and security of the information they have had access to throughout the REF process.
- 4.2. The chair provided an update on progress across Main Panel C.

5. Secretariat update on the end of the assessment period

- 5.1. The secretariat presented information on the publication of results and the confidentiality of assessment material, as well as practical matters relating to the end of the assessment period such as returning USB pens and physical outputs to the warehouse.

6. Outputs

- 6.1. The sub-panel agreed panel scores for outputs where personal scores were now available. The sub-panel noted that discrepancies in output scores had been resolved prior to the meeting.
- 6.2. 5 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.
- 6.3. The sub-panel confirmed that they were satisfied the process for assessing outputs had been robust and endorsed the output quality profiles to be recommended to Main Panel C.
- 6.4. The chair reported on outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries and data adjustments made by the REF team by referring to paper 22.7.2. This document provided an anonymised overview of the types of audit queries raised and the outcomes, which had been passed on to assessors as appropriate.

7. Impact Moderation

- 7.1. The sub-panel reviewed the agreed score for one impact item in light of ongoing moderation.
- 7.2. The sub-panel confirmed that they were satisfied the process for assessing impact had been robust and endorsed the impact and environment quality profiles to be recommended to Main Panel C.

8. Environment Moderation

- 8.1. The sub-panel confirmed that they were satisfied the process for assessing environment had been robust and endorsed the impact and environment quality profiles to be recommended to Main Panel C.

9. Overview report

- 9.1. The chair led a plenary discussion of the draft content for the sub-panel section of the overview report circulated in advance of the meeting as paper 22.7.3.
- 9.2. The sub-panel endorsed the draft content and agreed that further amendments would be made by chair's action.
- 9.3. The sub-panel noted the draft subject overview report discussed by Main Panel C at their last meeting, presented as paper 22.7.4. The sub-panel noted that the content of the report is being developed through an iterative process, during which the main panel would determine which aspects are common to all sub-panels and which are sub-panel-specific.

10. Drafting Feedback Statements

- 10.1. The chair led a plenary discussion of the draft feedback statements provided by the executive group, which had now received comments from the REF team. The sub-panel used this discussion to reinforce broader issues which could be applied to all statements.
- 10.2. The chair referred to paper 22.7.5, which contained additional guidance from the REF Team on how to draft the feedback statements.

11. HEI feedback statements

- 11.1. The panel secretariat displayed institutional quality profiles and draft institutional feedback statements for a sub-set of submissions made to the UOA. The sub-set was made of submissions for which there were few or no conflicts of interest, and contained institutions spanning a range of quality profiles, submission size and institution type. Each panel member presented feedback for at least one institution for which they had been identified as the lead assessor.
- 11.2. The sub-panel discussed in plenary the sub-set of feedback statements, observing conflicts of interest where relevant. Panel members were invited to identify any specific issues on which guidance was required.
- 11.3. 5 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

- 11.4. The sub-panel endorsed recommendations for changes to the draft content and members resolved to revisit and submit their draft feedback statements as necessary in light of discussion. The sub-panel agreed that further amendments could subsequently be made by chair's action.

12. Review overall institutional profiles

- 12.1. The panel secretariat displayed overall institutional profiles (including a breakdown of the outputs, impact and environment sub-profiles) for each of the submissions made to the UOA.
- 12.2. The sub-panel confirmed a recommended 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 for the UOA and as evidenced in the sub-profiles for research outputs, impact and environment:

Anglia Ruskin University
Bath (University of)
Bedfordshire (University of)
Birmingham (University of)
Birmingham City University
Bolton (University of)
Bradford (University of)
Brighton (University of)
Bristol (University of)
Brunel University
Central Lancashire (University of)
Chester (University of)
De Montfort University
Dundee (University of)
Durham (University of)
East Anglia (University of)
East London (University of)
Edge Hill University
Edinburgh (University of)
Glasgow (University of)
Glasgow Caledonian University
Goldsmiths' College
Huddersfield (University of)
Hull (University of)
Keele University
Kent (University of)
Leeds (University of)

Leeds Metropolitan University
Leicester (University of)
Lincoln (University of)
Liverpool (University of)
Liverpool Hope University
Liverpool John Moores University
London Metropolitan University
London School of Economics and Political Science
London South Bank University
Loughborough University
Manchester Metropolitan University
Middlesex University
Northumbria at Newcastle (University of)
Nottingham (University of)
Nottingham Trent University
Open University
Oxford (University of)
Plymouth (University of)
Portsmouth (University of)
Queen's University Belfast
Salford (University of)
Sheffield (University of)
South Wales (University of)
Southampton (University of)
Stirling (University of)
Strathclyde (University of)
Sunderland (University of)
Sussex (University of)
Swansea University
Teesside University
Ulster (University of)
University College London
West of England, Bristol (University of the)
West of Scotland (University of the)
York (University of)

- 12.3. The sub-panel resolved to recommend the overall quality profile for each of the submissions listed above to the main panel for agreement.
- 12.4. 19 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.
- 12.5. The sub-panel as a whole reviewed all of the overall institutional profiles for each of the submissions listed under minute 12.2.
- 12.6. The chair reiterated that sub-panel members have an obligation to maintain the confidentiality and security of this information.

13. Any other business

- 13.1. The chair thanked all panel members and assessors for their contributions.
- 13.2. Panel members expressed their gratitude to the chair and deputy chair for their guidance and leadership throughout the assessment process.
- 13.3. The sub-panel thanked the secretariat for their support during the assessment period.
- 13.4. The chair declared the meeting closed.