

## **REF Sub-panel 26: Meeting 2**

**5 February 2014**

**CCT Venues - Barbican, London**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Cara Aitchison (Sub-panel chair), Mary Allison, Kathleen Armour, Bill Baltzopoulos (Deputy-chair), Chris Cooper, José González-Alonso, Lew Hardy, John Horne, Barrie Houlihan, Andrew Jones, Katy McKen (Panel adviser), Marie Murphy, Nanette Mutrie, Clair Thrower (Panel secretary), John Tribe, Fred Yeadon.

#### **Apologies:**

No apologies were received.

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed existing and new members of the sub-panel to the meeting, noting that the new members had been recruited in response to the outcome of the survey of submission intentions. Each member of the sub-panel and secretariat introduced themselves briefly.
- 1.2. The chair reported that one user member had had to resign from the sub-panel, which had temporarily increased workload of other panellists, but that the main panel was supportive of the need to recruit a replacement.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

#### **2. Conflicts of interest**

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed paper 1, the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it to be correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record of major interest were needed in future, panellists should record them on the panel members' website (PMW).
- 2.2. The sub-panel noted paper 2, and agreed to notify the panel secretary by webmail of any minor conflicts of interest relevant to the allocation of outputs.

- 2.3. The sub-panel discussed the REF confidentiality arrangements, and noted that only information in the public domain should be discussed outside the sub-panel.

### **3. Output calibration**

- 3.1. The chair reported the findings of the output calibration exercise undertaken by the main panel, which included the following points:

- The exercise had focused on the characteristics of the assessment criteria.
- Outputs had not been given a score.
- Each output had been assigned to a rapporteur from a different sub-panel to lead the discussions.

- 3.2. The chair reviewed the work that the sub-panel had done in preparation for the meeting, summarised in paper 3, namely reading and scoring 17 outputs chosen from HEIs with no conflicted sub-panel members. Lead rapporteurs commented on their assessment of the outputs, followed by plenary discussion during which the following points were noted:

- i. All outputs submitted are expected to meet the REF definition of research, stated in Annex C of 'Assessment framework and guidance on submissions' (REF02.2011). They should also meet the generic requirements for submission laid out in Part 3 section 2 of 'guidance on submissions' and Part 1 of 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF01.2012), paragraphs 40 to 53.
- ii. The sub-panel should revisit the guidance on assessing outputs in Part 2C, section C2 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF01.2012), and in particular the guidance in paragraph 71 on the interpretation of generic level definitions for outputs.
- iii. That the full range of marks should be used in scoring outputs, from 4\* to Unclassified. The use of half marks during the assessment by individual members had been agreed by Main Panel C, but that the final outcome for each output must be an integer in the range 4 to 0, 0 being equivalent to 'unclassified'.
- iv. If an output did not meet the definition of research, or fell below the standard required for 1\* quality, it should be graded 'unclassified'.
- v. The criteria of originality, significance and rigour could be demonstrated differently within and between different types of outputs.
- vi. The sub-panel had received a large proportion of co-authored work, which should be assessed according to the arrangements in Section C2, paragraphs 42 to 49 of the 'panel criteria'. In particular, once the sub-panel was satisfied that the author submitting the output had made a "substantial research contribution" to it, the output should be assessed as a whole.

- vii. Some impact assessors would also be involved in the assessment of a small number of outputs, and that the chair and deputy chair would work through a form of calibration analysis with them beforehand.

#### **4. Lunch**

#### **5. Output allocations and minor conflicts**

- 5.1. The chair reported that the initial output allocation process had been completed and panellists' personal spreadsheets and reading lists were available. The sub-panel noted that there was some initial un-evenness in the distribution of workload, and that the chair and deputy chair were working to even it out by reallocating outputs and later in the assessment, would consider it in the allocation of impact and environment loads.
- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed the gap left by the departure of a user member who had taken up a post overseas. It was agreed that a replacement should be sought as soon as possible, to cover impact and one subject area which had received more outputs than anticipated.
- 5.3. The chair reported that where duplicate outputs had been identified, they had been allocated to the same pair of assessors, but that others were expected to emerge during the assessment. The sub-panel agreed to forward details to the panel secretary if any others were found.
- 5.4. The sub-panel discussed further the proposed treatment of minor conflicts of interest, and agreed that the panel secretary should keep a separate register.

#### **6. Impact calibration exercise**

- 6.1. The chair summarised the approach to be taken in the assessment of impact:
  - i. A main panel impact calibration exercise would be undertaken, assessing both impact case studies and templates.
  - ii. A further sub-panel calibration involving both elements would be undertaken by the sub-panel, informed by the results of the main panel calibration. The sub-panel exercise would be arranged in four broad groupings, each of which was requested to provide a case study and impact template to be considered for the main panel calibration by **14 February**.
- 6.2. Moving on from impact, the sub-panel discussed the assessment of environment, and agreed that panellists should read the templates broadly relating to their areas of expertise. Lead and second readers would be allocated by the chair and deputy chair to co-ordinate the assessment of each one.

- 6.3. The sub-panel noted that although the environment element was not scheduled to be discussed until September, a calibration discussion should be incorporated into one of the earlier meetings.

## **7. Audit and data verification**

- 7.1. The sub-panel noted paper 4, and agreed to send any potential output audit queries to the panel secretary.
- 7.2. Further, it noted that impact case studies requiring audit should be identified as soon as possible and by the end of the March meeting at the latest.

## **8. Cross-referral and specialist advice**

- 8.1. The sub-panel noted paper 5, and agreed to forward candidates for cross-referral to the panel secretary by 14 February.
- 8.2. The chair observed that a very limited number of foreign language outputs had been submitted to the sub-panel, but that appropriate expertise would be found to assess it.

## **9. REF IT systems**

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

## **10. Items for information**

- 10.1. The sub-panel noted paper 6, physical outputs.
- 10.2. The chair explained that an updated equality briefing paper was expected to be made available on the guidance section of the PMW shortly.
- 10.3. The sub-panel noted paper 7, schedule of future meetings. A member requested a summary of actions required and associated milestones, and the chair agreed to provide a set of instructions as soon as possible.

- 10.4. The sub-panel noted that in preparation for the meeting starting on 17 March, each panellist should sort their personal spreadsheet outputs tab on author name, and start reading at the beginning of the alphabet. The chair agreed to communicate a target proportion of scores to be agreed by both assessors, in advance of the next meeting.
- 10.5. The sub-panel confirmed that agreed scores for the relevant proportion of outputs would be uploaded to the PMW by **10 March**.

**11. Any other business**

- 11.1. A member requested early confirmation of start and proposed end times for meetings, to assist in making travel arrangements conveniently and economically.

## **REF Sub-panel 26: Meeting 3 (Part 1)**

**17 March 2014**

**The Studio - Birmingham**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Cara Aitchison (Sub-panel chair), Mary Allison, Kathleen Armour, Bill Baltzopoulos (Deputy chair), Chris Cooper, José González-Alonso, Lew Hardy, John Horne, Barrie Houlihan, Andrew Jones, Katy McKen (Panel adviser), Hugh Montgomery (arrived late morning), Marie Murphy, Nanette Mutrie, Clair Thrower (Panel secretary), John Tribe, Fred Yeadon.

#### **Apologies:**

No apologies were received.

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the second meeting of the assessment phase, and expressed her thanks for the work that had been done since the last meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

#### **2. Minutes**

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

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

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

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

#### **4. Audit and data verification**

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

#### **5. Assessment of outputs**

- 5.1. The sub-panel discussed the proposed timeline which had been circulated prior to the meeting, and agreed that the milestones were appropriate. The chair proposed the addition of a new item relating to the assessment of the research environment, and agreed to circulate a revised timetable after the meeting.
- 5.2. The chair reported the progress that had been achieved in allocating outputs, and explained that any imbalance in workload would be addressed in the allocation of impact and environment items.
- 5.3. The sub-panel discussed options for assessing outputs which had been submitted more than once to the Unit of Assessment (UOA), noting the guidance in paragraphs 42 to 45 of Part 2C, section C2 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF01.2012) that co-authored outputs were eligible to be listed in the REF submission by any individual who had made a substantial research contribution to it.
- 5.4. The chair reported that a large number of cross-referred items had been received from SP19 relating to tourism, and would be added to reading lists in due course.

#### **6. Review of assessment to date**

- 6.1. The chair presented an analysis of the scores so far agreed, and the sub-panel discussed the issues they had encountered in assessing the material. The following points were noted:
  - i) The sub-panel should refer closely to the guidance on assessing outputs in Part 2C, section C2 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF01.2012), and in particular the guidance in paragraph 71 on the interpretation of generic level definitions for outputs.
  - ii) That the full range of marks should be used in scoring outputs, from 4\* to Unclassified. The use of half marks during the assessment had been agreed by Main Panel C, but that the final outcome for each output must be an integer in the range 4 to 0, 0 being equivalent to 'unclassified'.
- 6.2. That guidance had been circulated from main panel C to assist in the assessment of outputs, particularly in relation to the treatment of double weighting.

#### **7. Applying the criteria in assessment of outputs**

- 7.1. The sub-panel reviewed the guidance on interpreting generic level definitions for assessing outputs in paragraph 71 of Part 2C, section C2 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF01.2012), and agreed an approach to applying the criteria of 'significance' and 'rigour'.

## **8. Agreeing a methodology for assessing Environment**

- 8.1. The sub-panel agreed that an environment calibration should be undertaken, and that it should be incorporated into the agenda for the July meeting.

## **9. Any other business**

- 9.1. There being no further business, the chair thanked members for their contributions and declared part 1 of the meeting closed.



## **REF Sub-panel 26: Meeting 3 (Part 2)**

**18 March 2014**

**The Studio - Birmingham**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Cara Aitchison (Sub-panel chair), Mary Allison, Kathleen Armour, Bill Baltzopoulos (Deputy chair), Chris Cooper, José González-Alonso, Lew Hardy, Mary Hickson, John Horne, Barrie Houlihan, Andrew Jones, Katy McKen (Panel adviser), Hugh Montgomery, Marie Murphy, Nanette Mutrie, Sharon Orrell, Sue Rossiter, Clair Thrower (Panel secretary), John Tribe, Fred Yeadon.

#### **Apologies:**

No apologies were received.

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the meeting, in particular the impact assessors who were in attendance for their first meeting of the assessment phase, and invited all present to introduce themselves briefly.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

#### **2. Minutes**

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

#### **3. Conflicts of interests**

- 3.1. The sub-panel reviewed paper 2, the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed it was correct. It was agreed that if changes to the record of major interest were needed in future, panellists should record them on the panel members' website (PMW).
- 3.2. The sub-panel agreed that, in alignment with the approach taken by the main panel, for the purpose of impact calibration during which no final scores would be

agreed, attendees with conflicts of interest need not leave the room but would not participate in the discussion.

#### **4. Impact briefing**

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

#### **5. Impact calibration: Case studies**

- 5.1. The chair summarised the work that the sub-panel had done in preparation for the meeting, namely to review and assign draft scores to a set of impact case studies. A nominated member of the sub-panel led a discussion of each case study in turn noting any issues and queries that had arisen during their individual review of the items. The range of scores awarded was compared across each case study, and the sub-panel reached a consensus to awarding quality levels in the future assessment.

#### **6. Impact calibration: Templates**

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

#### **7. Audit and data verification**

- 7.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel that a paper concerning the audit and data verification of impact had been presented at the previous meeting.
- 7.2. The sub-panel noted guidance from the main panel that any case study which would potentially be scored as 'unclassified' should be discussed by the whole sub-panel.
- 7.3. The sub-panel agreed an initial list of case studies requiring audit, and noted that further queries should be raised in good time for the next meeting.

**8. Any other business**

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

## **REF Sub-panel 26: Meeting 4 (Part 1)**

**20-21 May 2014**

**Radisson Blu Edinburgh**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Cara Aitchison (Sub-panel chair), Mary Allison, Kathleen Armour, Bill Baltzopoulos (Deputy chair), Chris Cooper, Janet Finch (Main Panel C chair, day 2), José González-Alonso, Lew Hardy, John Horne, Barrie Houlihan, Steve Ingham, Andrew Jones, Katy McKen (Panel adviser), Hugh Montgomery, Marie Murphy, Nanette Mutrie, Sharon Orrell, Sue Rossiter, Clair Thrower (Panel secretary), John Tribe, Fred Yeadon.

#### **Apologies:**

No apologies were received.

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the third meeting of the assessment phase, and expressed her thanks for the work that had been done since the last meeting. The chair welcomed Dr Steve Ingham of the English Institute of Sport, who had recently joined the sub-panel as an output assessor.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

#### **2. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.
- 2.2. The chair explained that all other matters arising were covered by subsequent items on the current agenda.

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

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

#### **4. Chair's update**

- 4.1. The chair gave a brief update of some administrative matters, including the newly revised REF expenses policy.

#### **5. Update on Main Panel C impact assessment**

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

#### **6. Assessment of impact templates**

- 6.1. The chair summarised the preparatory work that had been done by the sub-panel in assessing impact templates, in accordance with 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012) Part 2C section C3. She confirmed that, in accordance with paragraph 115 of Part 1 of the Panel criteria, each impact template had been assessed by groups of three panellists, each group including at least one academic member and one user member. It was noted that where possible, allocations of impact template and environment templates were the same.
- 6.2. The sub-panel discussed the guidance that had been provided by the main panel, following its impact calibration exercise, and agreed an approach to allocating scores on the half mark scale. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the criteria level definitions for impact given in 'Assessment framework and guidance on submissions' (REF02.2011), table A3.
- 6.3. The panel adviser presented an analysis of the raw scores that had been collated ahead of the meeting. Each template was discussed in turn, and in the light of the prior discussion, final scores were agreed.
- 6.4. According to the running order presented in paper 3, the sub-panel discussed the submissions in turn, during which 20 attendees left the meeting as appropriate to their major or minor conflicts of interest.
- 6.5. The outcomes were recorded in the panel spreadsheet and uploaded to the Panel members' website (PMW).

#### **7. Audit and data verification - impact**

- 7.1. The secretary gave a verbal report on the impact audits that had been requested at the last meeting.

#### **8. Assessment of impact case studies**

- 8.1. The chair summarised the task of recording scores for the 128 case studies, and outlined the order in which they would be discussed.
- 8.2. The chair then led a discussion of the various issues panellists had encountered

in their reading of the impact case studies and reminded everyone of the thresholds that had to be passed before a case study should be judged eligible.

- 8.3. The chair summarised the process by which each case study had been allocated, noting that each group of assessors had included at least one user member or impact assessor. One panellist from each group was invited to give a brief overview of each case study, with contributions from the other members. Scores were recommended, and agreed by the sub-panel.
- 8.4. Case studies were assessed in the order set out in paper 4, starting with those where no major conflicts of interest existed. Finally the sub-panel went on to agree a score for each case study for submissions with which panellists had conflicts of interest (during which 20 attendees left the room at appropriate points), using the same process.
- 8.5. The sub-panel agreed a small number of additional audit queries to be followed up after the meeting.

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

- 9.1. The sub-panel reviewed the resulting overall sub-profile for impact, noting that the half marks were split equally between the nearest integer scores.

## **10. Any other business**

- 10.1. There being no further business, the chair thanked members for their contributions and declared part 1 of the meeting closed.

## **REF Sub-panel 26: Meeting 4 (Part 2)**

**22 May 2014**

**Radisson Blu Edinburgh**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Cara Aitchison (Sub-panel chair), Mary Allison, Kathleen Armour, Bill Baltzopoulos (Deputy chair), Chris Cooper, Stuart Fancy (observer, part), José González-Alonso, Lew Hardy, John Horne, Barrie Houlihan, Andrew Jones, Keith McDonald (observer, part), Katy McKen (Panel adviser), Marie Murphy, Nanette Mutrie, Clair Thrower (Panel secretary), John Tribe, Fred Yeadon.

#### **Apologies:**

No apologies were received.

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the meeting, and in particular the chair of Main Panel C, and the observers from the Scottish Funding Council.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

#### **2. Minutes**

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.
- 2.2. The chair explained that all other matters arising were covered by subsequent items on the current agenda.

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

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

#### **4. Chair's update**

- 4.1. The chair gave a verbal update on a number of issues that had arisen since the last meeting, including:

- i) The publication of a revised expenses policy.
- ii) A reminder to panellists to record receipt of cross-referral advice in their personal spreadsheets.
- iii) The status of deliveries from the REF warehouse, and a reminder to panellists to record any outputs passed to other panellists on their reading lists.
- iv) A brief forward look to the environment calibration which was planned for the July meeting.

## **5. Audit and data verification - outputs**

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

## **6. Review of sub-panel scoring pattern to date**

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

## **7. Assessment of outputs**

- 7.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest, and accordingly 16 attendees left the room at the relevant points in the proceedings.
- 7.2. In plenary format, the sub-panel reviewed the scores that had been agreed by the allocated panellists, and recorded agreed panel scores for each.
- 7.3. Requests for double-weighting were evaluated when the output was discussed. The chair referred to the guidance provided by the main panel, and reiterated the distinction between judgements about the quality of an output and the double-weighting claim, in accordance with the provisions of Part 2C, paragraph 52 of 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012).

## **8. Review of emerging sub-profiles by submission**

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



**9. Overview reports and feedback statements**

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

**10. Any other business**

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

## **REF Sub-panel 26: Meeting 5**

**17-18 July 2014**

**CCT Venues, Barbican, London**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Cara Aitchison (Sub-panel chair), Kathleen Armour, Bill Baltzopoulos (Deputy chair), Janet Finch (Main Panel C chair, day 2), José González-Alonso, Lew Hardy, John Horne, Barrie Houlihan, Andrew Jones, Vicky Jones (REF team, HEFCE, day 1), Katy McKen (Panel adviser), Marie Murphy, Nanette Mutrie, Clair Thrower (Panel secretary), John Tribe, Fred Yeadon.

#### **Apologies:**

Apologies were received from Mary Allison and Chris Cooper.

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the fourth meeting of the assessment phase, and expressed her thanks for the work that had been done since the last meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

#### **2. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.
- 2.2. The chair explained that all other matters arising were covered by subsequent items on the current agenda.

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

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

#### **4. Chair's update**

- 4.1. The chair summarised the principal items of business of the meeting, being to

progress scoring of outputs in line with the target for percentage of agreed scores requested by Main Panel C.

## **5. Audit and data verification - outputs**

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

## **6. Review of sub-panel scoring pattern to date**

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

## **7. Assessment of outputs**

- 7.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest, and accordingly 14 attendees left the room at the relevant points in the proceedings.
- 7.2. In plenary format, the sub-panel reviewed the scores that had been agreed by the allocated panellists, and recorded agreed panel scores for each.
- 7.3. Requests for double-weighting were evaluated when the output was discussed. The chair referred to the guidance provided by the main panel, and reiterated the distinction between judgements about the quality of an output and the double-weighting claim, in accordance with the provisions of Part 2C, paragraph 52 of 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012).

## **8. Review of emerging sub-profiles by submission**

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

## **9. Environment calibration**

- 9.1. The chair thanked the sub-panel for their work in preparation for this item, which had involved the assessment of a small number of environment templates from non-conflicted HEIs.
- 9.2. Following an initial workshop session working in pairs, the sub-panel discussed the environment templates in turn in plenary, noting any issues and queries that had arisen during their individual review of the items. The range of scores awarded was compared across each template, and the sub-panel reached a consensus to awarding quality levels in the future assessment.

- 9.3. A final plenary session explored any further issues which had arisen during discussion.

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

- 10.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the briefing paper (paper 4) prepared by the REF team presented at the previous meeting, about the process for agreeing feedback statements for HEIs, and for collating the sub-panel's contributions to the main panel overview report.
- 10.2. The sub-panel agreed to work in pairs focussing on particular submissions.

## **11. Individual staff circumstances**

- 11.1. The sub-panel noted paper 5, a briefing paper prepared by the REF team outlining the background to the individual staff circumstances arrangements.
- 11.2. The secretary presented an overview of the process by which individual staff circumstances had been evaluated, and confirmed that audits had been raised as necessary.
- 11.3. The sub-panel noted that all 'complex' individual staff circumstances had been reviewed by the Equality and Diversity Panel (EDAP), and the outcomes recorded in the panel spreadsheet. A minority of cases had not been accepted, and accordingly EDAP had awarded 'unclassified' grades to the 'missing' outputs.
- 11.4. The secretariat proposed that the majority of 'clearly defined' cases were accepted, which was agreed by the sub-panel. Where an 'unclassified' grade was proposed, the secretary explained the reasoning behind the recommendation. The sub-panel agreed all recommendations.

## **12. Any other business**

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

## **REF Sub-panel 26: Meeting 6**

**24-25 September 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Cara Aitchison (Sub-panel chair), Mary Allison, Kathleen Armour, Bill Baltzopoulos (Deputy chair), Scott Carson (DELNI, day 2), Chris Cooper, Janet Finch (Main Panel C chair, day 1), José González-Alonso, Lew Hardy, John Horne, Barrie Houlihan, Andrew Jones, Katy McKen (Panel adviser), Marie Murphy, Nanette Mutrie, Clair Thrower (Panel secretary), John Tribe, Fred Yeadon.

#### **Apologies:**

No apologies were received.

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the sixth meeting of the assessment phase, and expressed her thanks for the work that had been done since the last meeting.
- 1.2. The chair summarised the principal items of business, being to finalise items outstanding in the assessment of outputs and impact; perform the environment assessment and to make progress with the feedback reports.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

#### **2. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.
- 2.2. The chair explained that all other matters arising were covered by subsequent items on the current agenda.

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

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

#### **4. Audit and data verification - outputs**

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

#### **5. Review of sub-panel output scoring pattern to date**

- 5.1. The panel adviser presented an analysis of the emerging outputs sub-profile, compared to the status at the previous meeting and also the current overall main panel profile. The sub-panel confirmed its confidence in the results that had been recorded, and noted that the few items remaining to be settled were unlikely to result in any significant alterations.

#### **6. Assessment of outputs**

- 6.1. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest, and accordingly 16 attendees left the room at the relevant points in the proceedings.
- 6.2. In plenary format, the sub-panel reviewed the few outstanding scores that had been agreed by the allocated panellists, and recorded agreed panel scores for each.
- 6.3. The final request for double-weighting was evaluated. The chair referred to the guidance provided by the main panel, and reiterated the distinction between judgements about the quality of an output and the double-weighting claim, in accordance with the provisions of Part 2C, paragraph 52 of 'Panel criteria and working methods' (REF 01.2012). The sub-panel reached a decision, which was recorded in the panel spreadsheet.
- 6.4. The sub-panel reviewed the decision-making process for each output that had been awarded an 'unclassified' score, and agreed that the outcomes had been appropriate.
- 6.5. The sub-panel noted a number cases where co-authored outputs had been submitted more than once, both within the same submissions and by different HEIs. Each set of duplicate items was checked to ensure that the same rating had been applied to all members of the set.

#### **7. Assessment of impact**

- 7.1. The subpanel noted that satisfactory responses to all audit queries on impact case studies had been received, allowing final scores to be agreed for each one.
- 7.2. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest, and accordingly two attendees left the room at the relevant points in the proceedings.

- 7.3. The sub-panel reviewed the resultant impact profile for the entire UOA, and compared it to the emerging main panel profile, noting that the applied nature of the discipline could have influenced the sub-panel's scoring patterns.
- 7.4. With reference to a request received from the main panel, the sub-panel reviewed a sub-set of impact scores, and in the light of its discussions, made what adjustments it considered appropriate.

## **8. Assessment of environment**

- 8.1. The chair commended the sub-panel's preparatory work undertaken in the light of the results of the environment calibration exercise carried out at the previous meeting. She reported that the majority of environment scores had been agreed by the allocated panellists ahead of the meeting and recommended endorsement by the sub-panel.
- 8.2. The sub-panel concluded its assessment of the research environment templates. In plenary format, the sub-panel reviewed the scores proposed for each submission in turn, starting with those where no major conflicts of interest existed.
- 8.3. The chair reminded the sub-panel of the arrangements for the treatment of conflicts of interest, and accordingly 16 attendees left the room at appropriate points.
- 8.4. The sub-panel noted that all the metric data available had been evaluated in conjunction with the narratives and the two had been interpreted together.
- 8.5. A final plenary session explored any further issues which had arisen during discussion, which the chair noted for inclusion in the subject overview report as appropriate.

## **9. Review and signoff of sub-profiles**

- 9.1. The panel adviser displayed a report prepared by the REF team, presenting an anonymised analysis of the sub-profiles. In accordance with guidance received from the main panel, the sub-panel also viewed the quality profiles of each submission in turn, in plenary format. No discussion was held.

## **10. Overview reports and feedback statements workshop**

- 10.1. The chair outlined the purpose of the feedback statements, being to give HEIs constructive comments that conveyed more than an articulation of the overall and sub-profile percentages. The sub-panel noted the guidance that had been received at the previous meeting. In a wide-ranging discussion, the sub-panel agreed a list of conventions to be used, to ensure that feedback given was appropriate and consistent.
- 10.2. The sub-panel then worked through feedback for a sample of submissions in plenary session, before working informally on draft feedback statements.
- 10.3. The chair noted that some constructive comments had been received on the first draft of the overview report, and invited further comments by the 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2014.

## **11. Preparation for the final meeting**

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

## **12. Any other business**

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



## **REF Sub-panel 26: Meeting 7**

**15 October 2014**

**CCT Venues – Smithfield, London**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Cara Aitchison (chair), Kathleen Armour, Bill Baltzopoulos (deputy chair), Chris Cooper, José González-Alonso, Lew Hardy, John Horne, Barrie Houlihan, Andrew Jones, Katy McKen (panel adviser), Marie Murphy, Nanette Mutrie, Graeme Rosenberg (REF manager), Clair Thrower (panel secretary), John Tribe, Fred Yeadon.

#### **Apologies:**

Apologies were received from Mary Allison.

#### **1. Introduction and competence to do business**

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the final meeting of the assessment phase, and expressed her thanks for the work that had been done since the last meeting.
- 1.2. The chair summarised the principal items of business, being to finalise items outstanding in the assessment of environment; and sign off the feedback and overview reports.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

#### **2. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 2.1. The minutes of the previous meeting (paper 1) were agreed as an accurate record.
- 2.2. The chair explained that all other matters arising were covered by subsequent items on the current agenda.

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

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

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

#### **4. Chair's update**

- 4.1. The Chair gave a brief update to the sub-panel following the main panel meeting on October 1<sup>st</sup> and noted that the main panel had had its first opportunity to compare results of the environment assessment across all the sub-panels.

#### **5. Assessment of impact**

- 5.1. The sub-panel confirmed its confidence in the impact scores recorded.

#### **6. Assessment of environment**

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

#### **7. Review and signoff of sub-profiles**

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

7.3.2. Each submission had been assessed against the published criteria for UOA16 (including in cases where parts of submissions have been cross-referred to other sub-panels for advice) and according to the published procedures.

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

## **8. Feedback statements**

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

## **9. Overview report**

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

## **10. Feedback to the REF team on the REF process**

10.1. The chair sought views of the sub-panel on the way the REF process had been managed, and the sub-panel discussed both positive and negative points to be fed back to the REF team.

## **11. Information for sub-panel members post assessment**

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

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

## **12. Arrangements for finalising documentation**

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

## **13. Any other business**

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