



Sub-panel 24: Meeting 2

28-29 January 2014, 10:00-16:30

Grand Connaught Rooms

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

Minutes

Present:

Jo Beall, Barry Bogin, Katrina Brown (deputy chair), Hastings Donnan (chair), Michelle Double (adviser), Brian Durrans, Roy Ellen, Sarah Green, Jennifer Hulin (secretary) Deborah James, Naila Kabeer [28 January only], Susanne Kuechler, Phyllis Lee [28 January only], Ann MacLarnon, Heather Marquette [28 January only], Oliver Morrissey, Laura Rival, Mark Robinson, Bob Simpson, Jonathan Spencer, David Wield, Philip Woodhouse [28 January only].

Apologies:

Naila Kabeer [29 January only]

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 for all of the agenda items covered over both days.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 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. In response to a query the panel referred to 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012), Annex D, paragraph 3b, and noted that a major conflict need only be declared with a previous employer if a panel member was contracted within the REF assessment period.

- 2.3. 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. Chair's update on the assessment period

- 3.1. The chair provided a general overview of the timeframe for the assessment phase, reporting key deadlines and targets. This included an indicative schedule for reading and agreeing scores for outputs, as well as outlining plans for the impact calibration exercise.
- 3.2. The chair noted that Main Panel C chair would be joining Sub-Panel 24 for the following meetings:
- Tuesday 11 March 2014.
 - Friday 11 July 2014.

4. Output calibration

- 4.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair selected and circulated a sample of 20 outputs to the members and output assessors, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. These were outputs submitted as part of the REF 2014 submission. Outputs were selected to represent a range of output types, and spread across sub-fields within the Unit of Assessment (UOA).
- 4.2. The chair reported that outputs would be discussed in priority order, starting with those outputs for which no panel member was conflicted, and alternating between anthropology and development studies.
- 4.3. The chair outlined the aims of the calibration exercise, highlighting that the aim was to develop a common understanding of the star levels; not to agree specific scores for the outputs in the calibration sample.
- 4.4. The chair referenced the generic assessment criteria and the weighting carried by each element of submissions in REF 01.2012.
- 4.5. 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.
 - To be awarded the highest score, the sub-panel should expect the output to be very strong on all three criteria, but not necessarily in equal degrees. If not, a specific case should be made for awarding the highest score.

- Principles to be used in the practical application of the criteria originality, significance and rigour.
- 4.6. The panel discussed the selected outputs, focussing particularly on those outputs where scores diverged or members considered the output was borderline between starred levels. Through this discussion the panel highlighted the reasons for discrepancies between scores, with reference to the level descriptors.
 - 4.7. The panel noted that UOA24 would neither receive nor make use of citation data.
 - 4.8. The panel welcomed the assessment of a range of research output types, on the understanding that all submitted outputs must embody original research.
 - 4.9. The panel recognised that where it was accepted that an individual had made a substantial research contribution to a co-authored output, that output would be judged solely on its merits in line with panel criteria and no further account would be taken of author contribution.
 - 4.10. Panellists were asked to submit their scores to the secretary during the meeting. The secretary collated these and displayed a quality profile of all the scores submitted, demonstrating the range of the following starred levels: four star (4*), three star (3*), two star (2*), one star (1*) and unclassified (U).
 - 4.11. The panel discussed double-weighting statements, identifying issues which might be recommended for discussion by MPC.
 - 4.12. 10 members of the sub-panel absented themselves from discussions of outputs from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.

5. Output allocation

- 5.1. 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.
- 5.2. 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 chair also noted that a number of cross-referral requests had been made by submitting institutions.
- 5.3. The chair reported the agreed working methods and timetable for reading and agreeing scores for outputs.

6. IT systems briefing

6.1. 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.

7. Audit

7.1. The chair introduced paper 24.2.1 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.

7.2. The chair noted that sub-panels have been asked to produce a list of case studies for audit by the next meeting on 10-11 March. Further information will be sent to panel members via REF webmail.

8. Environment calibration

8.1. Prior to the meeting the sub-panel chair selected and circulated a sample of 11 environment templates (REF5) to panel members, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. These were templates submitted as part of the REF 2014 submission. Templates selected represented a spread of sub-fields within the UOA.

8.2. The chair reported that environment templates would be discussed in priority order, starting with those institutions for which no panel member was conflicted, and alternating between anthropology and development studies.

8.3. The chair outlined the aims of the calibration exercise, highlighting that the aim was to develop a common understanding of the star levels; not to agree specific scores for the environment templates in the calibration sample.

8.4. The chair led a general discussion of the assessment criteria of vitality and sustainability, referring to REF 01.2012, Part 2C, paragraph 114, and how to interpret level definitions, referring to the 'Assessment Framework and guidance on submission' (REF 02.2011), Annex A, table A4.

8.5. The panel discussed the selected templates, focussing particularly on those where scores diverged or members considered elements were borderline between star levels. Through this discussion the panel highlighted the reasons for discrepancies between scores, with reference to the level descriptors.

- 8.6. The panel identified a number of issues to raise with MPC.
- 8.7. Members of the sub-panel absented themselves from discussions of environment templates from institutions with which they had conflicts of interest.

9. Planning and future meetings

- 9.1. The chair reported the agreed working practices for reading and assessing outputs, and provided a timeframe for agreeing scores ahead of the next sub-panel meeting in order to meet main panel targets.
- 9.2. The chair outlined the procedure for the impact calibration exercise, which would be the primary item of business on day 1 of the next sub-panel meeting.

10. Any other business

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

REF Sub-panel 24: Meeting 3 (Part 1)

10 March 2014

Grand Connaught Rooms

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

Minutes

Present:

Jo Beall, Barry Bogin, Katrina Brown (deputy chair), Gill Clark, Hastings Donnan (chair), Michelle Double (adviser), Brian Durrans, Roy Ellen, Sarah Green, Jennifer Hulin (secretary) Deborah James, Naila Kabeer, Susanne Kuechler, Ann MacLarnon, Oliver Morrissey, Laura Rival, Mark Robinson, Duncan Shermer (REF Team), Bob Simpson, Jonathan Spencer, David Wield.

Apologies:

None

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 28-29 January 2014.
- 2.2. The chair noted that any matters arising would be covered by the day's agenda.

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 impact, reporting progress to date, key deadlines and targets for the assessment of impact.

5. Guidance on assessing impact

5.1. The chair introduced paper 24.3.1, '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.

5.2. 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).

5.3. The panel adviser briefed the sub-panel on 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. Corroborating sources could also be audited, but should be used to establish the veracity of claims, not to supplement the case study with additional information to inform an assessment of quality.

5.4. The chair reported general observations from the MPC impact calibration exercise.

5.5. 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.

6. Impact Calibration

6.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair selected and circulated a sample of 26 impact templates and case studies from 13 submitting institutions to panel members and impact assessors, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. These were submitted as part of the REF 2014 submission. Impact templates and case studies were selected to represent a spread across sub-fields within the Unit of Assessment (UOA).

6.2. The chair outlined the aims of the calibration exercise, highlighting that discussion would be used to develop a common understanding of the starred levels and to agree provisional scores for impact items in the calibration sample. The exercise would ensure that the sub-panel assesses impact according to common standards.

6.3. The chair led a discussion of templates and case studies selected for calibration, during which six panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

7. Impact allocation

7.1. The chair provided an overview of how impact items had been allocated. Each impact case study and impact template had been allocated to at least one academic member and one user or assessor.

7.2. Impact allocations had been released prior to the meeting, and all panellists had been asked to read through their allocation to identify minor conflicts of interest and potential audit queries. Impact items were reallocated where appropriate to take into account declared conflicts.

7.3. The chair confirmed that impact should be scored using the nine-point scale.

7.4. The chair confirmed that it would be possible to cross-refer impact case studies, but that it was expected this would only be necessary in a minority of cases.

7.5. The chair encouraged panellists to read as many impact items as possible, not just those they had been allocated. The chair emphasised the importance of reading across sub-fields within the UOA.

8. Future meetings

8.1. The chair introduced paper 24.3.3 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. Audit

9.1. The chair introduced paper 24.3.2, '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 24.3.2a.

9.2. The sub-panel considered this paper and agreed that the sub-panel chair would provide the audit team with 4-8 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.

10. Any other business

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



REF Sub-panel 24: Meeting 3 (Part 2)

11 March 2014

Grand Connaught Rooms

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

Minutes

Present:

Jo Beall, Barry Bogin, Katrina Brown (deputy chair), Hastings Donnan (chair), Michelle Double (adviser), Brian Durrans, Roy Ellen, Janet Finch (Main Panel C chair), Sarah Green, Jennifer Hulin (secretary) Deborah James, Naila Kabeer, Susanne Kuechler, Phyllis Lee, Ann MacLarnon, Heather Marquette, Oliver Morrissey, Laura Rival, Mark Robinson, Bob Simpson, Jonathan Spencer, David Wield, Philip Woodhouse.

Apologies:

None

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 28-29 January 2014.
- 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.

4.3. The chair noted that non-English outputs had been allocated within SP24 to panellists with the relevant language skills, with the exception of one output which had to be cross-referred to another sub-panel.

4.4. 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 on double-weighting should, in the first instance, be made on the basis of the supporting statement submitted by the HEI. The panel agreed to discuss double-weighting statements as they arose in the process of agreeing panel scores for outputs.

4.5. The panel noted the agreed working practices for scoring outputs.

4.6. The chair invited panel members to report on their experiences of assessing outputs to date.

4.7. In response to a query regarding the assessment of data sets, the panel agreed that they were required to assess the dataset using the material submitted by the HEI rather than the data itself.

4.8. 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 authored elements

4.9. In response to a query regarding the assessment of outputs with significant material in common, the chair referred to the 'panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012) Part 2C paragraph 41.

4.10. In response to a query regarding outputs published during the REF publication period with significant material in common with an output published prior to 1 January 2008, the chair referred to the 'panel criteria' Part 1 paragraph 44.

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. The chair appointed additional readers where panellists were unable to reconcile a discrepancy between their scores.

5.3. The panel accepted double-weighting requests where the scale and scope was sufficient according to the criteria.

5.4. 15 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 24.3.4a.

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 24.3.5 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The panel agreed that it would aim to endorse panel scores for a minimum of 50 percent of outputs at the next meeting.

7.2. The panel noted the days at which output assessors were required to attend.

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 24: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

20 May 2014 – 21 May 2014 (am only)

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

Minutes

Present:

Jo Beall [agenda item 6 onwards], Barry Bogin, Katrina Brown (deputy chair), Gill Clark [20 May only], Hastings Donnan (chair), Michelle Double (adviser), Brian Durrans, Roy Ellen, Sarah Green, Jennifer Hulin (secretary) Deborah James, Naila Kabeer, Susanne Kuechler, Ann MacLarnon, Oliver Morrissey [agenda item 6 onwards], Laura Rival, Mark Robinson, Mark Robson (Main Panel C) [20 May only], Bob Simpson, Jonathan Spencer, Martin Walsh (Main Panel C), David Wield.

Apologies:

None.

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 10 March.
- 2.2. The chair noted that scores recommended as part of the impact calibration exercise had been noted in the panel spreadsheet. Further discussion could take place regarding these scores during the meeting if necessary.
- 2.3. The chair noted that there were no additional matters arising.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

3.2. The panel was 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 user members would lead the assessment of impact.

5. Overview reports and feedback statements

5.1. The chair introduced paper 24.4.2, '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 24.4.2.

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.

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. In two instances, the panel was unable to recommend a score as cross-referral advice had not been received. The panel agreed to review these two case studies at the next meeting.

7.3. 13 panellists left the room due to major conflicts.

7.4. One panellist left the room due to a conflict of interest identified by the submitting HEI.

8. Panel recommends draft impact profiles

8.1. The panel reviewed scoring patterns as part of ongoing moderation of scores. The panel revisited a number of impact items where a need for further discussion was identified.

8.2. The panel reviewed the emerging impact sub-profile based on scores agreed in this meeting.

8.3. The chair noted that sub-profiles would be made available to institutional assessors to inform the initial drafting of feedback statements.

8.4. The panel endorsed the emerging impact sub-profile based on scores agreed in this meeting.

9. Audit (impact)

9.1. The chair introduced paper 24.4.3, '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 noted the following points:

- The process of assessing impact had been robust and defensible.
- The content of impact templates (REF 3a) might have been better placed in the environment statements (REF 5).
- The need to retain diversity in the criteria for impact for the future assessment of this element.
- The assessment of impact as part of REF could be used as a model internationally.
- The timeframe for eligible research underpinning impact claims could be reviewed ahead of any future exercises.
- HEIs would benefit from a more detailed breakdown of impact sub-profiles.

11.2. The chair thanked members for their contributions and declared the impact agenda for this meeting closed.

REF Sub-panel 24: Meeting 4 (Part 2)

21 May 2014 (pm only) – 22 May 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Jo Beall, Barry Bogin, Katrina Brown (deputy chair), Hastings Donnan (chair), Michelle Double (adviser), Brian Durrans, Roy Ellen, Sarah Green, Jennifer Hulin (secretary) Deborah James, Naila Kabeer, Susanne Kuechler, Phyllis Lee, Ann MacLarnon, Heather Marquette, Oliver Morrissey, Laura Rival, Mark Robinson, Bob Simpson, Jonathan Spencer, Martin Walsh (main panel member) [21 May only], David Wield, Philip Woodhouse.

Apologies:

None.

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 11 March.
- 2.2. The chair reviewed the panel's approach to the following materials as agreed at the last meeting:
 - Datasets.
 - Edited collections.
 - Outputs with material in common.

2.3. The chair noted that decisions on double-weighting should, in the first instance, be made on the basis of the supporting statement submitted by the HEI. However, should the output itself present additional evidence, this can be used to inform the panel's recommendation. The chair stressed that an assessment of the scale and scope of the output was entirely separate from any assessment of quality.

2.4. The chair noted that there were no additional matters arising.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

3.2. The panel was 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 provided an update on the sub-panel's approach to the assessment of duplicate outputs.

4.4. 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 output profiles across the Main Panel based on provisional data collected in mid-April. The chair emphasised that this data was fragmentary, and reflected personal scores rather than panel agreed scores.

5. Overview reports and feedback statements

5.1. The chair introduced paper 24.4.2, '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 24.4.2.

5.3. The chair outlined how information on outputs would be collated for these reports. Panellists appointed as institutional assessors for outputs and environment will be responsible for collecting relevant data for their respective submissions. Only full sub-panel members would be called on to collect this data.

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. Panellists were reminded to keep a record of where they had originally scored using half marks prior to recommending a panel score on the five point scale.

6.3. 15 panellists left the room due to major 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 24.4.4. This document provided an anonymised overview of the types of audit queries raised on outputs and the outcomes. Detailed outcomes of individual audit queries had been passed to the relevant panel members via REF webmail.

7.2. The chair noted that the outcomes of panel instigated audit queries had, and would continue to, inform the assessment of outputs in line with the REF criteria.

7.3. 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 24.4.5 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The panel discussed covering the following key business at the next meeting:

- Reporting and agreeing output scores.
- General roundtable discussion of progress to date.
- Review emerging output profiles.
- Revisit the environment calibration exercise conducted at meeting 2.

8.2. The panel noted the days at which output assessors were required to attend future meetings.

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 24: Meeting 5

10-11 July 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Jo Beall, Barry Bogin, Katrina Brown (deputy chair), Hastings Donnan (chair), Michelle Double (adviser), Brian Durrans, Roy Ellen, Janet Finch (Main Panel C) [agenda item 11 only], Sarah Green, Jennifer Hulin (secretary) Deborah James, Naila Kabeer, Susanne Kuechler, Phyllis Lee (agenda items 1 – 8 only), Ann MacLarnon, Heather Marquette (agenda items 1 – 8 only), Oliver Morrissey, Laura Rival, Bob Simpson, Jonathan Spencer, David Wield, Philip Woodhouse (agenda items 1 – 8 only).

Apologies:

Mark Robinson

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 20-22 May subject to the correction of a typographical error.

2.2. The chair noted that there were no matters arising, but, in accordance with the 'Panel criteria and working methods', drew the sub-panel's attention to its agreed approach to the assessment of datasets, edited collections, and outputs with material in common. The sub-panel also noted that claims for double-weighting would continue to be assessed on a case by case basis.

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 on 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.

4.3. 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.

4.4. The chair led a discussion regarding the possibility of further moderation of impact scores. The sub-panel noted that Main Panel C are conducting an audit of the assessment of impact case studies, the outcome of which would be fed back to sub-panels in due course and further action taken where necessary.

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. Panel agreed scores were endorsed for these outputs.

5.2. 15 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

6. Review emerging sub-profiles

6.1. The panel secretariat displayed anonymised emerging sub-profiles (output and impact elements) for all submissions based on panel agreed scores to date.

6.2. The sub-panel noted that emerging profiles were based on a different proportion of panel agreed scores for each submission.

6.3. The sub-panel noted that all sub-profiles would remain provisional until signed off by the Main Panel later in the exercise.

6.4. The panel secretariat displayed emerging sub-profiles (output and impact elements) for each submission in turn based on panel agreed scores to date.

6.5. 15 panellists left the room due to major 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 24.5.2. 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.

7.2. 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 24.5.3 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The sub-panel noted the days at which output assessors were required to attend.

8.2. The sub-panel noted that its next meeting would take place on the 22-23 September 2014 in Ettington Chase, Banbury Road, Stratford-upon-Avon, CV37 7NZ.

9. Agreeing panel scores for remaining impact items

9.1. The sub-panel endorsed agreed scores for any impact items which had not been scored at the previous meeting pending the receipt of cross-referral advice.

9.2. The sub-panel noted that user members and academic sub-panel members had resolved any scoring discrepancies for these items in advance of the meeting using the REF webmail system.

9.3. 1 panellist left the room due to a major conflict of interest.

10. Individual Staff Circumstances

10.1. The secretariat introduced paper 24.5.4. 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.

10.2. The secretariat anonymised and displayed those circumstances where missing outputs have been recommended and briefly outlined the reasons for these recommendations.

10.3. The sub-panel endorsed the processes and recommendations for 188 individuals with clearly-defined circumstances and 13 individuals with complex circumstances as outlined in paper 24.5.4. One outstanding case for an individual with clearly-defined circumstances will be addressed at the next meeting.

10.4. 4 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

11. Environment Calibration

11.1. The sub-panel noted paper 24.5.5 which was circulated prior to the meeting. This paper provides guidance to support panels in their use of the REF4 data to inform their assessment of environment and directs panellists to the assessment criteria for environment in the 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012) part 2C, paragraphs 105-117.

11.2. The sub-panel presented proposed scores for all those submissions which had not been discussed in its previous calibration exercise.

11.3. 11 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

12. Any other business

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

REF Sub-panel 24: Meeting 6

22-23 September 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Jo Beall, Barry Bogin, Katrina Brown (deputy chair), Hastings Donnan (chair), Michelle Double (adviser), Brian Durrans, Roy Ellen, Sarah Green, Jennifer Hulin (secretary) Deborah James, Naila Kabeer, Susanne Kuechler, Phyllis Lee (agenda items 1 – 6 only), Ann MacLarnon, Heather Marquette (agenda items 1 – 6 only), Oliver Morrissey, Laura Rival, Mark Robinson, Bob Simpson, Jonathan Spencer, David Wield, Philip Woodhouse (agenda items 1 – 6 only).

Apologies:

None

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 10-11 July 2014.

2.2. The sub-panel noted that two clearly-defined individual staff circumstances cases had been undergoing audit at the last meeting. These audits had now been completed and the secretariat presented their recommendations to the sub-panel. Following discussion (during which two panel members left the room due to conflicts of interest) the sub-panel endorsed the recommendations. The secretariat confirmed that no further individual staff circumstances cases remained to be considered.

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 on 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.

4.3. The chair provided an update on duplicate outputs within the sub-panel.

4.4. The chair provided an update on progress across Main Panel C.

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. Panel agreed scores were endorsed for these outputs.

5.2. 15 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 24.6.2. 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.

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. Agree panel scores for environment

7.1. The scores proposed for the environment templates were considered. Following discussion by the sub-panel as a whole, panel scores for all environment templates were endorsed.

7.2. 13 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

8. Moderation of impact

8.1. The chair reported that Main Panel C had conducted an audit of the assessment of impact. The sub-panel noted that MPC was satisfied that there had been a consistent application of the assessment criteria in relation to the assessment of impact.

8.2. The sub-panel endorsed amendments to a small number of impact scores as part of ongoing moderation.

8.3. 3 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

9. HEI feedback statements

9.1. The panel secretariat displayed emerging sub-profiles (output and impact elements based on panel agreed scores to date) and draft institutional feedback statements for a sample of submissions.

9.2. The sub-panel noted the following points in its discussion:

- The purpose of these statements is to provide informative feedback to assist the institution in understanding the reasons for the profiles it has been awarded and should provide a brief comment on each of the three sub-profiles.
- Comments should reflect the sub-panel's assessment of the submissions; they should not seek to provide advice to the institution on its future research strategy.
- 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.
- 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.
- Where the panel considers it would be helpful to the institution and is confident that such comments are entirely defensible, they may also comment on any notable shortcomings in the submission and/or provide a brief explanation of 'unclassified' grades
- Feedback statements will not be published.

9.3. 6 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

10. Overview report

10.1. The chair referred to paper 24.6.4 and led a plenary discussion of strengths and weaknesses of sub-fields within the discipline as represented in the material submitted for assessment. 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

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

11. Future meetings

11.1. The chair introduced paper 24.6.5 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets.

11.2. The sub-panel noted that its next meeting would take place on the 14 October 2014 in CCT Venues-Smithfield, Two East Poultry Avenue, Smithfield, EC1A 9PT.

12. Any other business

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

REF Sub-panel 24: Meeting 7

14 October 2014

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

Minutes

Present:

Barry Bogin, Katrina Brown (deputy chair), Hastings Donnan (chair), Michelle Double (adviser), Brian Durrans, Roy Ellen, Sarah Green, Jennifer Hulin (secretary) Deborah James, Naila Kabeer, Susanne Kuechler, Ann MacLarnon, Oliver Morrissey, Laura Rival, Bob Simpson, Jonathan Spencer, David Wield.

Apologies:

Jo Beall, Mark Robinson.

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 22-23 September 2014.

2.2. The sub-panel 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 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 and reported on audit activity which had taken place across the main panels.

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 physical outputs to the warehouse.

6. Outputs

6.1. The sub-panel agreed a panel score for one output where an audit query had been outstanding at the last meeting but an outcome had since been received.

6.2. The sub-panel reviewed the agreed score for an output in light of ongoing moderation.

6.3. 1 panellist left the room due to a major conflict of interest.

6.4. 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.

6.5. The chair reported on outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries and data adjustments made by the REF team by referring to paper 24.7.2. 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 and environment

7.1. The sub-panel reviewed agreed scores for a sub-set of environment templates in light of ongoing moderation.

7.2. 2 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

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

8. Institutional sub-profiles and HEI feedback statements

8.1. The panel secretariat displayed overall institutional profiles (including a breakdown of the outputs, impact and environment sub-profiles) and draft institutional feedback statements for each of the submissions made to the UOA.

8.2. 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:

Aberdeen (University of)
Brunel University
Cambridge (University of)
Durham (University of)
East Anglia (University of)
Edinburgh (University of)
Goldsmiths' College
Greenwich (University of)
Kent (University of)
Liverpool John Moores University
London School of Economics and Political Science - Anthropology
London School of Economics and Political Science - International development
Manchester (University of) - Anthropology
Manchester (University of) - Development Studies
Open University
Oxford (University of) - Anthropology
Oxford (University of) - International development
Queen Margaret University Edinburgh
Queen's University Belfast
Roehampton University
School of Oriental and African Studies - Development Studies
School of Oriental and African Studies - Social Anthropology
St Andrews (University of)
Sussex (University of)
University College London

8.3. The sub-panel discussed in plenary the feedback statements for all of the above submissions, observing conflicts of interest where relevant.

8.4. 12 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

8.5. The sub-panel endorsed recommendations for changes to the draft content and agreed that further amendments could be made by chair's action.

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 24.7.3.

9.2. The sub-panel endorsed the draft content and agreed that further amendments would be made by chair's action.

9.3. The chair led a plenary discussion of the draft subject overview report discussed by Main Panel C at their last meeting, presented as paper 24.7.4. 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. Review overall institutional profiles

10.1. The sub-panel reviewed institutional profiles and resolved to recommend the overall quality profile for each of the submissions listed under minute 8.2 to the main panel for agreement.

10.2. The chair reiterated that sub-panel members have an obligation to maintain the confidentiality and security of this information.

11. Any other business

11.1. The chair thanked all panel members and assessors for their contributions.

11.2. Panel members expressed their gratitude to the chair and deputy chair for their guidance and leadership throughout the assessment process.

11.3. The sub-panel thanked the secretariat for their support during the assessment period.

11.4. The chair declared the meeting closed.