



## **Sub-panel 25: Meeting 2**

**12-13 February 2014, 10:00-16:30**

**Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead, South Croydon,  
Surrey, CR2 8YA**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Mike Baynham, Paul Connolly, James Conroy, Hazel Crabb-Wyke (REF Team) [agenda item 6 only), Michelle Double (adviser), Julian Elliott, Becky Francis, John Furlong, John Gardner, Harvey Goldstein, Richard Hickman, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David James, Anthony Kelly, John Leach (deputy chair), Jane Martin, Uvanney Maylor, Debra Myhill, Cathy Nutbrown, Jone Pearce (main panel member), Andrew Pollard (chair), Sally Power, David Raffe, Diane Reay, Charlotte Rees, Sue Rossiter (main panel member) [12 February only], Jane Seale, Judy Sebba [13 February only], Teresa Smart, Richard Smith, Richard Thurston, Malcolm Tight, Li Wei.

#### **Apologies:**

Tom Hamilton

#### **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. 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. SP25 Notes on Processes, January 2014**

3.1. The chair introduced paper 25.2.1, 'SP25 notes on processes', and provided an overview of updates made to this document since it was originally conceived and distributed. This paper was made available prior to the meeting and comments from panel members were invited.

3.2. The chair noted that he expected the document to evolve during the assessment period, and that revised versions would be distributed accordingly.

### **4. Output calibration**

4.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair selected and circulated a sample of 20 outputs to 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, from institutions for which no panel member was conflicted. Outputs were selected to represent a range of output types, and spread across sub-fields within the Unit of Assessment (UOA). Prior to the meeting, five of these outputs were considered as part of the Main Panel C (MPC) output calibration exercise, and a further five were discussed as 'outputs of the week' via REF webmail. The remaining outputs would be discussed at the meeting in groups as set out in paper 25.2.1.

4.2. Panellists were asked to submit scores for all 20 outputs to the secretary in advance of the meeting. These were collated into a single table and circulated electronically prior to meeting.

4.3. The chair 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.

4.4. The chair introduced paper 25.2.3, 'updated equality and diversity briefing for panels'. The panel noted that complex individual staff circumstances would be considered by the Equalities and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP), and that the panel will only receive a decision on the appropriate number of outputs to assess in each case. The panel secretariat will provide a recommendation of the number of outputs that may be reduced without penalty as a result of clearly-defined individual staff circumstances to the sub-panel, who will then agree the number of outputs to be assessed in each case.

4.5. The chair reported on the calibration exercise by MPC, which had met on 23 January 2014, and led a discussion on the MPC minute circulated prior to the meeting which 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 chair introduced paper 25.2.2, 'criteria and level definitions', and led a discussion on the distinctive nature of educational research, and whether this should impact on the Sub-Panel's approach to interpreting and applying the criteria set out by MPC. The sub-panel agreed that the criteria would allow them to assess fairly across what is a broad discipline.

4.7. The chair provided an overview of the context of the field of education, and noted that as the REF is a criterion referenced assessment system the assessment process relies on interpretation of those criteria, in relation to international norms, by experts within each field of research.

4.8. The panel discussed the sample of outputs for calibration in their output groups, 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.

4.9. Leaders of the group discussions on outputs fed back to the sub-panel.

4.10. The chair tabled a modified version of the guidance provided by MPC on the application of the criteria, which had been adapted to incorporate suggestions raised in earlier discussion to accommodate the distinct approach required by the field. The panel made final amendments and agreed this document.

4.11. The panel discussed double-weighting statements, identifying issues which might be recommended for discussion by MPC.

4.12. 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 to a panel member or output assessor, and in 10 per cent of cases an additional second reader.

5.2. The chair noted that impact would be allocated to two academic members and one user (by the end of February), and that environment would be allocated to a minimum of two sub-panel members (by the end of April).

5.3. The chair introduced paper 25.2.4, 'cross-referral and specialist advice', and 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.

5.4. The chair reported the agreed working methods for reading and agreeing scores for outputs. Personal spreadsheets should be sorted alphabetically by author name, and worked through in this order.

5.5. The chair noted that the nine-point scale could be used by panel members to score outputs, but that he anticipated half marks to be used in less than five percent of cases. The panel would need to agree a final score for each using the fixed starred quality levels: four star (4\*), three star (3\*), two star (2\*), one star (1\*) and unclassified (U).

## **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.

6.2. The chair noted that additional guidance documents had been published on the panel members' website, and that new reports had been made available to panel members to help members to compare their scores with those of the second assessor and to arrive at an agreed score.

## **7. Audit**

7.1. The chair introduce paper 25.2.5 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 19-20 March 2014. Further information will be sent to panel members via REF webmail.

## **8. Planning and future meetings**

8.1. 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. The panel agreed to assess 25% of outputs prior to the next meeting, with a view to agreeing scores for 100% of outputs at sub-panel meeting 5 on 15-16 July 2014.

8.2. 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.

8.3. The chair noted that the Main Panel C chair would be joining Sub-Panel 25 for its meetings on the 19 March and 16 July 2014.

## **9. Any other business**

9.1. The panel noted concerns about the venue to be passed on to a member of the REF Team to investigate further.

## **REF Sub-panel 25: Meeting 3 (Part 1)**

**19 March 2014**

**Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead, South Croydon,  
Surrey, CR2 8YA**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Mike Baynham, Paul Connolly, James Conroy, Michelle Double (adviser), Julian Elliott, Janet Finch (Main Panel C chair), Becky Francis, John Furlong, John Gardner, Alison Girdwood, Tom Hamilton, Mary Hickson, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David James, Sheila Kearney, Anthony Kelly, John Leach (deputy chair), Antony Luby, Uvanney Maylor, Debra Myhill, Cathy Nutbrown, Andrew Pollard (chair), Sally Power, David Raffe, Diane Reay, Charlotte Rees, Sue Rossiter (main panel member), Jane Seale, Judy Sebba, Teresa Smart, Chris Taylor, Richard Thurston, Malcolm Tight.

#### **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 12-13 February 2014 subject to one amendment.
- 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. SP25 notes on working practices**

4.1. The chair introduced paper 25.3.1, 'SP25 notes on working practices', and provided an overview of any changes affecting the assessment of impact.

4.2. The chair led a discussion on international and contemporary perspectives on the field of education research set out in the annex.

### **5. Guidance on assessing impact**

5.1. The chair introduced paper 25.3.2, 'Initial guidance on assessing impact', which was circulated with meeting papers 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 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, however should be used to establish the veracity of claims, not to supplement the case study with additional information to inform an assessment of quality.

5.3. The chair reported general observations from the Main Panel C (MPC) impact calibration exercise, noting the following key points:

- If a case study fails to meet one of the threshold criteria then it should be graded as Unclassified. An audit query can be raised in any case where there is significant doubt about whether there is sufficient evidence to make this judgement.
- The quality of the underpinning research is a threshold judgement; but the assessment is of the quality of the impact, not of the research. So, in establishing the quality of the underpinning research panel members should take a broad view of the underpinning research to establish that it is predominantly of at least two star quality.
- The research making a distinct and material contribution to the impact is a key factor in making threshold judgements; panel members need to ascertain that the research cited in the case study made such a contribution.

- 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 assessment of Impact Templates should be in terms of the unit's approach, strategy and how conducive these are to achieving impact.

5.4. 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).

5.5. The chair reported general observations from the sub-panels online 'impact of the week' calibration exercise.

5.6. 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. The chair referred to the 'aide memoire' annexed to paper 25.3.2, and stressed that the sub-panel as a whole would be responsible for agreeing scores for impact.

## **6. Calibration of impact case studies**

6.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair selected and circulated a sample of six impact case studies from six 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 case studies were selected to represent a spread across the Unit of Assessment (UOA).

6.2. The chair outlined the aims of the calibration exercise, highlighting that discussion would be used to improve the sub-panel's understanding of the application of the level definitions, and to ensure that the sub-panel was assessing impact according to common standards.

## **7. Breakout into impact groups**

7.1. The chair invited panellists to break into their impact groups to discuss, rank and subsequently score the six case studies circulated as part of the calibration exercise.

## **8. Plenary on issues arising from discussion of case studies**

8.1. The chair invited impact group leads to report on group discussions and rankings. The panel noted the following general issues arising from discussions:

- The maximum number of references to research is indicative.
- Case studies should demonstrate the link between the underpinning research and the impact, and it should be clear to what extent the research cited underpins the impact (although other factors may also have contributed to the impact).



- Researchers in the discipline work extensively with users, and we could reasonably expect this to be reflected in strong impact. The input of user members in assessing impact will be valuable in this process.
- Where dates of publications are post impact, this doesn't automatically mean that the underpinning research itself was carried out after the claimed impact.
- The sub-panel will assess reach and significance holistically.
- A strong case study should clearly demonstrate that research was undertaken at the submitting institution, and who undertook the research.

## **9. Calibration of impact templates**

9.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair selected and circulated a sample of six impact templates from six 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 were selected to reflect the range of submissions to the UOA.

9.2. The chair outlined the aims of the calibration exercise, highlighting that discussion would be used to improve the sub-panel's understanding of the application of the level definitions, and to ensure that the sub-panel was assessing impact according to common standards.

## **10. Breakout into impact groups**

10.1. The chair invited panellists to break into their impact groups to discuss, rank and subsequently score the six templates circulated as part of the calibration exercise.

## **11. Plenary on issues arising from discussion of templates**

11.1. The chair invited impact group leads to report on group discussions and rankings. The panel noted the following general issues arising from discussions:

- Strong submissions are unlikely to contain significant overlap between the impact template and environment template.
- A strong approach to impact should demonstrate continuing professional development with a focus on enabling and incentivising impact.
- Less focussed narratives may be a result of a lack of institutional structures/resources to support their development.
- Institutions which adopted a clear strategy at an early stage resulted in a stronger story.
- The sub-panel should assess a submitted unit's approach and strategy in terms of their capacity to create the conditions for impact of reach and significance.

11.2. A main panel member reported on the NFER strategy and provision report circulated by the sub-panel chair prior to the meeting.

## **12. Impact allocation**

12.1. The chair provided an overview of how impact items had been allocated for assessment. Each impact case study and impact template has been allocated to at least one academic member and one user member or assessor. Larger institutions had also been allocated an additional academic member reader.

12.2. 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. Impact items were reallocated where appropriate to take into account declared conflicts. Academic panel members had also been asked to identify whether or not case studies met the threshold criteria, whether or not it might need cross-referral, and whether there were any potential audit queries.

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

## **13. Audit**

13.1. The chair introduced paper 25.3.3, '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 25.3.2a.

13.2. The sub-panel considered this paper and agreed that the sub-panel chair would provide the audit team with 11-22 case studies (equivalent to 5-10 percent of the total submitted to our UOA) for audit. This list would distinguish between case studies the sub-panel considered high priority for audit, and those that were not high priority for audit.

## **14. Future meetings**

14.1. The chair introduced paper 25.3.4 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The panel noted the days at which impact assessors were required to attend future meetings.

## **15. Any other business**

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

## **REF Sub-panel 25: Meeting 3 (Part 2)**

**20 March 2014**

**Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead, South Croydon,  
Surrey, CR2 8YA**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Mike Baynham, Paul Connolly, James Conroy, Hazel Crabb-Wyke (REF Team) [agenda item 6 only], Michelle Double (adviser), Julian Elliott, Becky Francis, John Furlong, John Gardner, Harvey Goldstein, Tom Hamilton, Richard Hickman, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David James, Sheila Kearney, Anthony Kelly, John Leach (deputy chair), Uvanney Maylor, Debra Myhill, Cathy Nutbrown, Jone Pearce (main panel member), Andrew Pollard (chair), Sally Power, David Raffe, Diane Reay, Charlotte Rees, Jane Seale, Teresa Smart, Richard Smith, Chris Taylor, Richard Thurston, Malcolm Tight, Li Wei.

#### **Apologies:**

Jane Martin

#### **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 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 12-13 February 2014 subject to one amendment.
- 2.2. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals in response to minute 5.3.

#### **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. SP25 notes on working practices**

4.1. The chair introduced paper 25.3.1, 'SP25 notes on working practices', and provided an overview of any changes affecting the assessment of outputs.

4.2. The panel noted that non-English outputs would, where possible, be assessed as usual by a SP25 panellist who combines substantive and linguistic expertise. In other cases, outputs will be allocated to two SP25 panellists to obtain substantive and linguistic expertise. Where linguistic expertise does not exist within SP25, the output will be allocated to a member of SP25 with appropriate substantive expertise and will also be cross-referred to an appropriate sub-panel for specialist advice.

4.3. The chair reported general observations from the 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 noted that the 'SP25 notes on working practices' document had been amended in line with the minutes from the Main Panel C (MPC) discussion on double-weighted outputs. A working group of panel members has agreed to work through claims for double-weighting on a case by case basis. The panel agreed to review the recommendations made by the working group at its forthcoming meetings as they arose in the process of agreeing panel scores for outputs.

4.4. In response to a panel member query, the panel noted that outputs with significant material in common should be assessed in line with the 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012) Part 2C paragraphs 40-41.

4.5. The panel noted a change to ESRC grant assessment panels.

4.6. The panel agreed one amendment to the wording of the document in relation to the use of half marks making it clear that, unlike outputs, half marks would be incorporated into the final sub-profile calculations of impact and environment.

#### **5. Chair and deputy chair's update on the assessment period**

5.1. 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.

5.2. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals both in and out of the sub-panel.

5.3. The chair led a discussion on the assessment of outputs submitted to the sub-panel whose primary research focus lies outside the UOA descriptor. The panel noted that each output should be assessed against the panel criteria, but that where necessary advice could be sought via cross-referral.

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

5.5. The deputy chair provided an update on early patterns of profiles, mean scores, and the emerging range of scores. Panellists were asked to revisit their current scores where appropriate in light of this data.

## **6. Breakout into output groups**

6.1. The chair invited panellists to breakout into their output groups to discuss any discrepancies between scores or general issues which arose during the assessment of outputs.

## **7. Agreeing panel scores for outputs**

7.1. The panel reviewed the proposed scores of all outputs which had been scored by at least one panellist to date. The panel endorsed scores for the following outputs:

- Outputs which had been allocated to one reader and scored a whole number.
- Outputs which had been allocated to two readers and which had been scored the same whole number by both readers.
- Outputs which had been allocated to two readers who had resolved a discrepancy between their scores.

7.2. The chair appointed additional readers where this was deemed necessary.

7.3. 24 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

7.4. Two panellists left the room due to minor conflicts of interest.

7.5. The sub-panel agreed to revisit items which may have been on the borderline between two star levels. The chair stressed that all panel agreed scores would be considered provisional until the end of the assessment phase.

## **8. Audit**

8.1. The chair reported on outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries and data adjustments made by the REF team by referring to papers 25.3.5a and 25.3.5b.

8.2. 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.

## **9. Future meetings**

9.1. The chair introduced paper 25.3.6 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The panel noted an error in the paper in relation to the targets recorded for the assessment of outputs.

9.2. The panel agreed that it would aim to endorse panel scores for 66 percent of outputs at the next meeting, with a view to agreeing panel scores for 100 percent of outputs by the end of July.

9.3. The panel noted the days at which outputs assessors were required to attend future meetings.

**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 25: Meeting 4 (Part 1)**

**27 May – 28 May (am only) 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Mike Baynham, Paul Connolly, James Conroy, Michelle Double (adviser), Julian Elliott, John Furlong, John Gardner, Mary Hickson, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David James, Sheila Kearney, Anthony Kelly, Antony Luby, Uvanney Maylor, Debra Myhill, Cathy Nutbrown, Jone Pearce (main panel member), Andrew Pollard (chair), Sally Power (acting deputy chair), David Raffe, Diane Reay, Charlotte Rees, Sue Rossiter (main panel member), Jane Seale, Judy Sebba, Teresa Smart, Chris Taylor, Richard Thurston, Malcolm Tight.

#### **Apologies:**

Becky Francis, Alison Girdwood, Tom Hamilton, John Leach (deputy chair).

#### **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. The panel endorsed the proposal that Sally Power act as deputy chair for the duration of the meeting in John Leach's absence.

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 19-20 March 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. SP25 notes on working practices**

4.1. The chair introduced paper 25.4.2, 'SP25 notes on working practices', and provided an overview of any changes affecting the assessment of impact.

4.2. The chair provided a general overview of the timeframe for the exercise, reporting progress to date, key deadlines and targets for the assessment of impact.

4.3. The panel endorsed the appointment of additional assessors to a selection of impact items for further moderation of scores.

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 impact profiles across the Main Panel based on provisional data collected in mid-April. This data reflected personal scores rather than panel agreed scores.

4.5. The chair led a discussion on international and contemporary perspectives on the field of education research set out in the annex.

4.6. The panel noted that as a discipline with strong traditions of applied work and engagement with policy and practice, education could expect to produce some high quality impact. Evidence of the quality of education research in the UK should be considered against the emerging scoring patterns of the panel, with further calibration at an individual level being considered where interpretations of the criteria were not being applied consistently.

#### **5. Overview reports and feedback statements**

5.1. The chair introduced paper 25.4.3, '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. The panel commented on the scope of the templates to provide useful feedback to submitting HEIs.

5.3. The chair outlined how information would be collated for these reports. Panellists appointed as institutional leads will be responsible for collecting the relevant data for their



respective submissions, and drafting the initial content of the feedback reports for consideration by the sub-panel as a whole. The chair noted that as this was the last meeting at which impact assessors would be in attendance, it would be particularly important to capture their views.

## **6. Audit**

6.1. The chair introduced paper 25.4.4, 'audit of impact case studies'. This document provides 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 have been passed to the relevant panellists in order to inform their assessments of impact.

## **7. Breakout into impact groups**

7.1. The chair invited panellists to break into their impact groups to resolve outstanding scores and to identify impact items or issues for further discussion and resolution.

## **8. Agree scores for impact (non-conflicted HEIs)**

8.1. The chair invited panellists to report on the scoring of impact items for non-conflicted HEIs. Panel members presented a rationale for any discrepancies in scoring.

8.2. The sub-panel endorsed agreed scores and agreed actions to be taken to complete or moderate outstanding items.

## **9. Review emerging impact sub-profiles**

9.1. The panel reviewed the emerging impact sub-profiles of non-conflicted HEIs. The panel endorsed the data presented, but noted that this limited sample was not representative of the discipline as a whole.

## **10. Agree scores for impact (conflicted HEIs)**

10.1. The chair invited panellists to report on the scoring of impact items for the remaining, conflicted HEIs. Panel members presented a rationale for any discrepancies in scoring.

10.2. The sub-panel endorsed agreed scores and agreed actions to be taken to complete or moderate outstanding items.

10.3. 21 panel members left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

## **11. Panel review**

11.1. The chair provided an update on progress, in particular on the additional allocations made in relation to moderating assessments.

11.2. The panel noted that the scores endorsed in this meeting would be presented as provisional recommendations to the main panel.

## **12. Plenary discussion of impact**

12.1. The chair led a discussion of the distinct role of user members in the assessment of impact. The panel noted the following points:

- The content of impact templates (REF 3a) might have been placed in the environment statements (REF 5).
- Institutions were able to demonstrate strong impact, despite institutional support being less pronounced.
- Due to the weighting of impact, the process of assessing this element had to be particularly robust and defensible.
- The underpinning research and corroborating sources are key to the richness and complexity of impact case studies (REF 3b), and should all be routinely accessed and reviewed as part of the assessment process in future exercises.
- HEIs would benefit from a more detailed breakdown of impact sub-profiles.

## **13. Confirmation and completion of outstanding scores for impact**

13.1. The chair invited panellists to report on the scoring of any outstanding impact items. The sub-panel endorsed agreed scores.

13.2. 15 panel members left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

## **14. Endorse impact sub-profiles**

14.1. The panel reviewed and endorsed all draft impact sub-profiles based on scores agreed in the meeting. Sub-profiles were anonymised for this exercise.

## **15. Future meetings**

15.1. The chair introduced paper 25.4.6 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The panel noted that impact assessors aren't required to attend any future meetings, and thanked them for their valuable contribution to the exercise.

## **16. Any other business**

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

## **REF Sub-panel 25: Meeting 4 (Part 2)**

**28 May (pm only) – 29 May 2014**

**Ettington Chase, Banbury Road, Ettington,**

**Stratford-upon-Avon, CV37 7NZ**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Mike Baynham, Paul Connolly, James Conroy, Michelle Double (adviser), Julian Elliott, John Furlong, John Gardner, Harvey Goldstein, Richard Hickman [29 May only], Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David James, Sheila Kearney, Anthony Kelly, Uvanney Maylor, Jane Martin, Debra Myhill, Cathy Nutbrown, Jone Pearce (main panel member), Andrew Pollard (chair), Sally Power (acting deputy chair), David Raffe, Diane Reay, Charlotte Rees, Graeme Rosenberg (REF team) [28 May only], Sue Rossitor (main panel member), Jane Seale, Teresa Smart, Richard Smith, Chris Taylor, Richard Thurston, Malcolm Tight, Li Wei.

#### **Apologies:**

Becky Francis, Tom Hamilton, John Leach (deputy chair).

#### **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. The panel endorsed the proposal that Sally Power act as deputy chair for the duration of the meeting in John Leach's absence.

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 19-20 March 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. SP25 notes on working practices**

4.1. The chair introduced paper 25.4.2, 'SP25 notes on working practices', and provided an overview of any changes affecting the assessment of outputs.

4.2. The chair provided a general overview of the timeframe for the exercise, reporting progress to date, key deadlines and targets for the assessment of outputs.

4.3. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals both in and out of the sub-panel.

4.4. The chair noted that recommendations on double-weighting had been made by a sub group of panel members on the basis of the supporting statements provided by submitting HEIs. Panel members were invited to challenge these recommendations should they feel the output itself demonstrated extended scale and scope to merit double-weighting in line with the criteria listed in the 'Assessment framework and guidance on submissions' (REF 02.2011), part 3, paragraphs 123-126.

4.5. The panel discussed the annex on national, international and REF comparisons.

4.6. 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 profiles across the Main Panel based on provisional data collected in mid-April. This data reflected personal scores rather than panel agreed scores.

4.7. The chair provided an overview of scoring patterns, which were anonymised and circulated to the panel in advance of the meeting. The panel endorsed the emerging profiles, however, it also approved the principle of further moderation should further analysis of scoring patterns warrant this. Panellists were invited to revisit their current scores where appropriate in light of this data.

#### **5. Overview reports and feedback statements**

5.1. The chair introduced paper 25.4.3, '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. The panel commented on the scope of the templates to provide useful feedback to submitting HEIs.

5.3. The chair outlined how information would be collated for these reports. Panellists appointed as institutional leads will be responsible for collecting relevant data for their respective submissions, and drafting the initial content of the feedback reports for consideration by the sub-panel as a whole.

## **6. Breakout into output groups**

6.1. The chair invited panellists to breakout into their output groups to discuss any discrepancies between scores or general issues which arose during the assessment of outputs.

## **7. Agreeing panel scores for outputs**

7.1. The panel reviewed the proposed scores of all outputs. It endorsed scores for all outputs for which an agreed score had been recommended by one or more assessors as appropriate.

7.2. The panel appointed additional readers to outputs which had originally been allocated to a sole assessor, and were at risk of receiving an unclassified grade.

7.3. The panel endorsed the appointment of further additional readers where this was deemed necessary.

7.4. 22 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

7.5. One panellist left the room due to a minor conflict of interest.

7.6. The chair stressed that all panel agreed scores would be considered provisional until the end of the assessment phase. The sub-panel agreed to revisit items as appropriate.

7.7. The panel agreed to review its scoring patterns in light of progress at the meeting, and endorsed the proposal that additional items be allocated for further moderation.

## **8. Audit**

8.1. The chair reported on outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries and data adjustments made by the REF team by referring to paper 25.4.5. This document provides an anonymised overview of the types of audit queries raised and the outcomes.

8.2. 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.

## **9. Future meetings**

9.1. The chair introduced paper 25.4.6 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets.

9.2. The panel agreed that it would aim to endorse panel scores for 100 percent of outputs at the next meeting.

9.3. The panel noted the day on which outputs assessors were required to attend future meetings.

#### **10. Environment calibration**

10.1. The chair outlined how the panel would approach environment calibration ahead of the next meeting. The panel endorsed these proposals.

#### **11. Any other business**

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

## **REF Sub-panel 25: Meeting 5**

**15-16 July 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Mike Baynham [agenda items 1-8 only], Paul Connolly, James Conroy, Michelle Double (adviser), Julian Elliott, Janet Finch (Main Panel C) [agenda item 12 only], Becky Francis, John Furlong, John Gardner, Harvey Goldstein [agenda items 1-8 only], Richard Hickman [agenda items 1-8 only], Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David James, Anthony Kelly, John Leach (deputy chair), Jane Martin [agenda items 1-8 only], Uvanney Maylor, Debra Myhill, Cathy Nutbrown, Andrew Pollard (chair), Sally Power, David Raffe, Diane Reay, Charlotte Rees [agenda items 1-11 only], Jane Seale, Teresa Smart [agenda items 1-8 only], Richard Smith, Richard Thurston, Malcolm Tight, Li Wei [agenda items 1-8 only].

#### **Apologies:**

Tom Hamilton

#### **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 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 27-29 May 2014.

2.2. The chair noted that there were no matters arising, but drew attention to the need for institutional leads to continue to gather any relevant data for feedback statements.

#### **3. Conflicts of interest**

3.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest and noted that, despite a clerical error in the formatting of the paper, 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 noted one newly arisen conflict and agreed to treat this as a major conflict from this point onwards. This approach is consistent with how the sub-panel treated a similar conflict arising at an earlier meeting. The REF team have subsequently been informed.

3.3. 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. SP25 notes on working practices**

4.1. The chair introduced paper 25.5.2, 'SP25 notes on working practices', and noted that no significant changes had been made to this document since the last meeting.

4.2. The chair provided a general overview of the timeframe for the exercise, reporting progress to date, key deadlines and targets for the assessment of outputs and environment.

4.3. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals both in and out of the sub-panel.

4.4. The panel discussed the annex on national, international and REF comparisons.

4.5. The chair provided an overview of scoring patterns within the sub-panel. Panellists were invited to revisit their personal scores where appropriate in light of this data. The sub-panel endorsed additional analysis of individuals' scoring patterns by the exec group, who would take further action where deemed necessary.

4.6. 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.

4.7. The chair reminded the sub-panel of their obligations to maintain the confidentiality and security of information they generate and have access to throughout the REF process.

#### **5. Breakout into output groups**

5.1. The chair invited panellists to breakout into output groups to discuss discrepancies between scores and general issues which arose during the assessment of outputs.

#### **6. Agreeing panel scores for outputs**



6.1. The sub-panel reviewed agreed scores for outputs where personal scores had changed in light of ongoing moderation, and agreed scores for all other outputs where personal scores were available.

6.2. The panel appointed additional readers to outputs which had originally been allocated to a sole assessor, and were at risk of receiving an unclassified grade.

6.3. The panel endorsed the appointment of further additional readers where this was deemed necessary.

6.4. The sub-panel noted that all outputs submitted more than once to the same unit of assessment would receive the same score in each submitting institution's profile, and that the exec group would monitor this and revisit panel scores at the next meeting where appropriate.

6.5. 25 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

6.6. Two panellists left the room due to minor conflicts of interest.

6.7. The chair stressed that all panel agreed scores would be considered provisional until the end of the assessment phase. The sub-panel agreed to revisit items as appropriate.

## 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 25.5.3. 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. Sub-panel overview report

8.1. The chair led a 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 discussed further at the next meeting.

## 9. Individual Staff Circumstances

9.1. The secretariat introduced paper 25.5.4. 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.

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

9.3. The sub-panel endorsed the processes and recommendations for 408 individuals with clearly-defined circumstances and 54 individuals with complex circumstances as outlined in paper 25.5.4. Two outstanding cases for individuals with clearly-defined circumstances will be addressed at the next meeting.

9.4. Two panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

## **10. Environment Calibration**

10.1. The sub-panel noted paper 25.5.5 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.

10.2. The chair led a plenary discussion of environment templates selected for a calibration exercise. These templates were circulated to the sub-panel and discussed via REF webmail in advance of the meeting. The aim of the exercise was to develop a common understanding of the star levels; not to agree specific scores for the environment templates in the calibration sample. Templates were selected from institutions for which no panel member was conflicted.

10.3. The sub-panel noted that environment templates had been allocated to sub-groups of sub-panel members. Templates will be scored blind and any differences discussed in advance of the next meeting. The sub-panel aims to endorse scores for environment at meeting 6.

## **11. Impact audit activity**

11.1. 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-panel chairs in due course and further action taken where necessary.

11.2. The chair provided details of an audit of the assessment of impact templates undertaken by the sub-panel chair and deputy chair (taking into account conflicts of interest) as part of an ongoing process to promote the consistent application of assessment criteria. As part of this process, a subset of templates were identified where an amendment to the score was proposed and the sub-panel were invited to consider these. The sub-panel endorsed amendments where it felt this was appropriate, and agreed to revisit other templates where it felt that further review was required before ratifying scores. Scores for these templates would be reviewed at the next meeting.

11.3. 12 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

## **12. Review emerging sub-profiles**

12.1. The panel secretariat displayed emerging sub-profiles (output and impact elements) for all submissions based on panel agreed scores to date. The sub-panel used this opportunity to identify any initial notable strengths or weaknesses in the profiles which could contribute to institutional feedback reports.

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

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

12.4. 20 panel members left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

### **13. Overview and feedback reports**

13.1. The sub-panel noted that the REF team had provided guidance on producing this data, as well as templates for collecting relevant information. This was presented as paper 25.4.3 at meeting 4.

13.2. 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.

13.3. 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. Where relevant, feedback should also reflect the language of the submission itself.

13.4. The sub-panel noted that the secretariat would collate information from feedback leads to be discussed and supplemented at the next the meeting.

### **14. Future meetings**

14.1. The chair introduced paper 25.5.6 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets. The sub-panel noted that output assessors were not required to attend any future meetings, and thanked them for their contributions to this exercise.

14.2. The sub-panel noted that its next meeting would take place on the 9-10 September 2014 in The Felbridge Hotel & Spa, London Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 2BH.

**15. Any other business**

15.1. The sub-panel accepted the resignation of a sub-panel member and thanked them for their work to date. The sub-panel agreed that any outstanding work would be reallocated.

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



## **REF Sub-panel 25: Meeting 6**

**9-10 September 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Paul Connolly, James Conroy, Michelle Double (adviser), Julian Elliott, Becky Francis, John Furlong, John Gardner, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David James, Anthony Kelly, John Leach (deputy chair), Uvanney Maylor, Debra Myhill, Cathy Nutbrown, Andrew Pollard (chair), Sally Power, Diane Reay, Charlotte Rees, Jane Seale, Richard Thurston, Malcolm Tight.

#### **Apologies:**

David Raffe.

#### **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 16-17 July 2014.

2.2. The sub-panel noted that the two clearly-defined cases which had been pending the outcome of audit queries at the last meeting had now been considered and a recommendation made.

#### **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.

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.

3.3. The chair reminded the sub-panel of their obligations to maintain the confidentiality and security of the information they generate and have access to throughout the REF process.

#### **4. SP25 notes on working practices**

4.1. The chair introduced paper 25.6.2, 'SP25 notes on working practices', and noted that no significant changes had been made to this document since the last meeting.

4.2. The chair provided a general overview of the timeframe for the exercise, reporting progress to date, key deadlines and targets for the assessment of outputs and environment.

4.3. The chair provided an update on cross-referrals both in and out of the sub-panel.

4.4. The chair provided an update from Main Panel C. The chair noted that at the last Main Panel C meeting the panel discussed and were satisfied with how Sub-Panel 25 has operationalised the working methods set out in the 'panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012).

#### **5. Breakout into output groups**

5.1. The sub-panel noted that there was no need to breakout into output groups as discrepancies in output scores had been resolved prior to the meeting.

#### **6. Agreeing panel scores for outputs**

6.1. The sub-panel reviewed agreed scores for outputs where personal scores had changed in light of ongoing moderation, and agreed scores for all other outputs where personal scores were available.

6.2. The panel endorsed the appointment of additional readers where this was deemed necessary.

6.3. The sub-panel noted that all outputs submitted more than once to the same unit of assessment would receive the same score in each submitting institution's profile, and that the exec group would monitor this and revisit panel scores at the next meeting where appropriate.

6.4. 18 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

6.5. One panellist left the room due to a minor conflict of interest.

6.6. The chair stressed that all panel agreed scores would be considered provisional until the end of the assessment phase. The sub-panel agreed to revisit items as appropriate.

## **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 25.6.3. 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. Moderation of impact templates**

8.1. The sub-panel endorsed amendments to a subset of impact templates which had been identified as part of an earlier moderation exercise.

8.2. The sub-panel were asked to comment further on the proposed panel agreed scores for impact case studies where appropriate.

8.3. 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.

## **9. Breakout into environment groups**

9.1. 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.

## **10. Agree panel scores for environment**

10.1. The sub-panel noted in 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.

10.2. The sub-panel endorsed panel scores for environment templates for all submissions.

10.3. 19 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

## **11. Review of provisional overall profile for Sub-Panel 25**

11.1. The sub-panel reviewed the overall profile and sub-profiles for outputs, impact and environment for Sub-Panel 25 based on provisional panel agreed scores to date.

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

## **12. HEI feedback statements**

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

12.2. One panel member left the room due to a major conflict of interest.

## **13. Sub-panel section of Main Panel C overview report**

13.1. The chair referred to paper 25.6.4 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.

## **14. Drafting of HEI feedback statements**

14.1. The chair referred to paper 25.6.5. 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.

14.2. 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.

## **15. Summary of submissions for Main Panel C overview report**

15.1. The chair referred to paper 25.6.6 and led a plenary discussion of the draft summary of submissions for Education which was circulated to the sub-panel for consideration.

## **16. Future meetings**



16.1. The chair introduced paper 25.6.7 outlining future meeting dates, key tasks, deadlines and targets.

16.2. The sub-panel noted that its next meeting would take place with revised timings on the 7 October 2014 in the Radisson Blu, 12 Holloway Circus Queensway, B1 1BT.

**17. Any other business**

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

## **REF Sub-panel 25: Meeting 7**

**7 October 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Paul Connolly, James Conroy, Michelle Double (adviser), Julian Elliott, Becky Francis, John Furlong, Jennifer Hulin (secretary), David James, Anthony Kelly, John Leach (deputy chair), Uvanney Maylor, Debra Myhill, Cathy Nutbrown, Andrew Pollard (chair), Sally Power, Diane Reay, Charlotte Rees, Jane Seale, Richard Thurston, Malcolm Tight.

#### **Apologies:**

David Raffe, John Gardner.

#### **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 9-10 September 2014.

2.2. 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.

2.3. 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. SP25 notes on working practices**

4.1. The chair introduced paper 25.7.2, 'SP25 notes on working practices', and noted that the document served as a record of how the Sub-Panel had operationalised the working methods set out in the 'panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012).

4.2. The chair invited panel members to comment on the document. The sub-panel noted that details of its working methods will be provided in the sub-panel and main panel sections of the overview report.

## **5. Outputs**

5.1. The sub-panel noted that discrepancies in output scores had been resolved prior to the meeting.

5.2. The sub-panel reviewed agreed scores for outputs where personal scores had changed in light of ongoing moderation, and agreed scores for all other outputs where personal scores were available.

5.3. 10 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

5.4. The chair reported on outcomes of panel-instigated audit queries and data adjustments made by the REF team by referring to paper 25.7.3. 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. Impact**

6.1. The sub-panel reviewed agreed scores for a sub-set of impact case studies where personal scores had changed in light of ongoing moderation.

## **7. Environment**

7.1. The sub-panel reviewed agreed scores for a sub-set of environment templates where personal scores had changed in light of ongoing moderation. The sub-panel noted that any proposed amendments to scores had been discussed and agreed in advance by the environment groups.

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

## **8. Overview of SP25 outcomes**

8.1. The chair reported on audit activity which had taken place both within and across the main panels.

8.2. The sub-panel were presented with emerging sub-profile data for Sub-Panel 25 based on panel agreed scores to date. Data for a sub-set of other sub-panels in MPC was anonymised and presented for comparison.

8.3. The sub-panel noted the distribution of submissions by size across the Main Panel. It noted that it had by far the highest proportion of small submissions (fewer than 15 FTE category A staff submitted). The sub-panel agreed that data should be presented weighted by FTE and in unweighted form, if quality profiles were not to be misrepresented.

## **9. Main Panel C subject overview report**

9.1. The chair led a plenary discussion of the draft subject overview report discussed by Main Panel C at their last meeting, presented as paper 25.7.5. 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. Sub-Panel section of the overview report**

10.1. The chair introduced paper 25.7.6 containing draft content for the sub-panel section of the overview report.

10.2. The chair invited panel members to breakout into groups to discuss the content of the report focussing on specific sub-fields in the discipline.

## **11. Sub-Panel section of the overview report (plenary)**

11.1. The chair led a plenary discussion of the draft content for the sub-panel section of the overview report. The discussion covered all elements of the submissions (including outputs, impact and environment).

11.2. The sub-panel endorsed the draft content and agreed that further amendments would be made by chair's action before being recommended to the main panel.

## **12. Institutional sub-profiles and HEI feedback statements**

12.1. 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.

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:

Aberdeen (University of)  
Anglia Ruskin University  
Bath Spa University

Bedfordshire (University of)  
Birmingham (University of)  
Birmingham City University  
Bishop Grosseteste University  
Bolton (University of)  
Brighton (University of)  
Bristol (University of)  
Brunel University  
Cambridge (University of)  
Canterbury Christ Church University  
Cardiff University  
Chester (University of)  
Cumbria (University of)  
Derby (University of)  
Dundee (University of)  
Durham (University of)  
East Anglia (University of)  
East London (University of)  
Edge Hill University  
Edinburgh (University of)  
Exeter (University of)  
Glasgow (University of)  
Glasgow Caledonian University  
Goldsmiths' College  
Greenwich (University of)  
Huddersfield (University of)  
Hull (University of)  
Institute of Education  
King's College London  
Lancaster University  
Leeds (University of)  
Leeds Metropolitan University  
Leicester (University of)  
Lincoln (University of)  
Liverpool Hope University  
Liverpool John Moores University  
London Metropolitan University  
Loughborough University  
Manchester (University of)  
Manchester Metropolitan University  
Newcastle upon Tyne (University of)  
Newman University  
Northampton (University of)  
Nottingham (University of)  
Nottingham Trent University  
Open University

Oxford (University of)  
Oxford Brookes University  
Plymouth (University of)  
Queen's University Belfast  
Reading (University of)  
Roehampton University  
Sheffield (University of)  
Sheffield Hallam University  
Southampton (University of)  
St Mary's University College  
Staffordshire University  
Stirling (University of)  
Stranmillis University College  
Strathclyde (University of)  
Sunderland (University of)  
Sussex (University of)  
Ulster (University of)  
University College London  
Warwick (University of)  
West London (University of)  
West of England, Bristol (University of the)  
West of Scotland (University of the)  
Winchester (University of)  
Wolverhampton (University of)  
Worcester (University of)  
York (University of)  
York St John University

12.3. 18 panellists left the room due to major conflicts of interest.

12.4. The sub-panel resolved to recommend the overall quality profile for each of the submissions listed above to the main panel for agreement.

12.5. The sub-panel discussed in plenary the feedback statements of all submissions for which nobody present at the meeting was conflicted.

12.6. The sub-panel endorsed recommendations for changes to the draft content and agreed that further amendments would be made via the REF webmail system and subsequently by chair's action before being recommended to the main panel.

### **13. Any other business**

13.1. 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.

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