



## **REF Sub-panel 27: Meeting 2**

**29 January 2014**

**Grand Connaught Rooms, London**

### **Minutes**

**Present:**

Marilyn Booth  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-Panel Chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
William Gould  
Simon Green  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Carole Holden  
Nicola Jones  
Jo Lakey (Sub-Panel Secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Naomi Standen  
Elizabeth Teague  
Anthonya Visser  
Brian Ward  
Joanna Weinberg  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel Adviser)

**Apologies:**

Sylvia Chant  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy Sub-Panel Chair)

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

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

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

1.3 The chair explained the composition of the sub-panel. Members include research users, an international member (who is a member of the Main Panel and works across the sub-panels) and specialist output assessors. Additional specialist assessors would be sought where necessary.

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

2.1 The feedback from the previous sub-panel meeting to the Main Panel was approved. It was noted that an additional day had been added to the May meeting in order to have time for additional calibration.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

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

## **4. Housekeeping**

4.1 The sub-panel adviser presented a set of summary statistics on the sub-panel submission and gave a brief presentation on the IT systems. The REF admin team were available on-site to give individual assistance to sub-panel members.

## **5. Feedback from Main Panel Meeting**

5.1 The sub-panel noted papers 02a.2014 and 02b.2014.

5.2 The chair explained the role of the main panel in relation to governance and its relationship with sub-panels. He also explained the role of sub-panel clusters and that SP27 is clustered with SP28, SP29 and SP33. The chairs will meet to discuss issues, share best practice, and to refer key issues to the main panel.

## **6. Output calibration**

6.1 The sub-panel had been sent a set of outputs for calibration and discussed each output in turn.

6.2 The chair referred the sub-panel to the Panel Criteria document for the grade definitions.

6.3 The main panel had identified several issues which needed to be addressed when assessing outputs:

*Whether an item meets the REF definition of research*

*Boundary issues*

*Authorial contribution*

*Eligibility*

*Overlap*

6.4 The sub-panel discussed the issues above, in particular the issue of boundaries. It was agreed that Area Studies covered a wide range of research and the sub-panel welcomed interdisciplinary work.

6.5 The sub-panel discussed the eight calibration outputs in turn, and reached a consensus on the score which could be given to each. One output was chosen for referral to the main panel for calibration.

6.6 The sub-panel agreed that the calibration exercise had been valuable and that an ongoing process of calibration would be helpful.

6.7 The sub-panel also discussed six examples of double-weighting requests. Members of the sub-panel left the room where conflicted institutions were discussed.

## **7. Output allocation and identifying items for cross-referral**

7.1 The sub-panel noted papers 03a.2014 and 03b.2014.

7.2 The chair informed the sub-panel that allocations were underway and that all outputs would shortly be allocated to two readers.

7.3 Members were asked to note the deadline for cross-referral requests and to inform the executive group if any of their allocated outputs required cross-referral.

## **8. Audit**

8.1 The sub-panel noted paper 04.2014.

8.2 Members were reminded to refer any audit queries to the sub-panel secretary.

## **9. Future Meetings**

9.1 The sub-panel discussed paper 05a.2014 which allocated two sub-panel members to each institutional submission to maintain an overview of progress towards institutional profiles and to lead on writing the feedback statement for each institution.

9.2 It was agreed that all members of the sub-panel would read all environment and impact templates.

9.3 The sub-panel noted paper 05b.2014. The chair explained that following the main panel meeting, some reallocation of impact case studies would be necessary.

9.4 Two impact case studies and two impact templates were chosen for referral to the main panel for calibration. The chair informed the sub-panel that impact case-study calibration would take place at the next meeting, which would include feedback from the cluster and main panel meetings.

9.5 The sub-panel noted paper 05c.2014, showing the timeline of meetings and expected milestones.

## **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 27: Meeting 3**

**12<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> March 2014**

**CCT Venues, Smithfield/ Barbican**

### **Minutes**

**Day 1 – 12<sup>th</sup> March 2014**

#### **Present:**

Marilyn Booth  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
Simon Green  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Nicola Jones  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Gurharpal Singh  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel Adviser)

#### **Apologies:**

Sylvia Chant  
Máiréad Nic Craith

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

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

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

1.3 The chair gave an overview of the two day meeting, which would cover impact calibration, environment calibration and outputs.

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

2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 29 January 2014, were approved.

2.2 It was agreed that a list of agreed actions would be circulated to the sub-panel following each meeting.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

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

## **4. Housekeeping**

4.1 The chair informed the sub-panel that some changes would be made to the allocation of sub-panel members to each institutional submission to maintain an overview of progress towards institutional profiles and to lead on writing the feedback statement for each institution. The final list would be circulated to members.

## **5. Feedback from Main Panel Meeting**

5.1 The chair updated the sub-panel on the discussions at the recent main panel meeting, and where appropriate, gave comments from the main panel during the discussions.

## **6. Impact Calibration**

### **a. Threshold criteria**

6.1 The sub-panel adviser gave a short presentation about threshold decision making for impact case studies. He answered queries about threshold judgements and advised sub-panel members to raise audit queries if a case study could be awarded an unclassified grade.

### **b. Auditing impact case studies**

6.2 The sub-panel noted paper 06d.2014 which outlined the procedures and timescales for raising audit queries arising from impact case studies.

6.3 The sub-panel noted the procedures and timescales for raising audit queries arising from impact case studies.

**c. Impact case studies**

6.4 The sub-panel had been sent a set of impact case studies for calibration and discussed each case study in turn.

6.5 Papers 06a.2014, 06b.2014, 06c.2014 and 06e.2014 were used to facilitate the discussion.

6.6 For each calibration case study, the sub-panel discussed whether the threshold criteria had been satisfied, and considered how each demonstrated that the criteria of significance and reach.

6.7 The sub-panel did not agree a grade for each case study, but discussed issues which were useful to bear in mind when assessing case studies.

6.8 Following the plenary session, the sub-panel discussed impact case studies in smaller groups.

6.9 The sub-panel noted a paper on Impact Calibration which was tabled.

**d. Impact Templates**

6.10 The sub-panel had read a set of impact templates for calibration and discussed each in turn.

6.11 The sub-panel discussed a range of issues arising from the impact templates and agreed that the calibration exercise had been valuable.

6.12 The sub-panel discussed and agreed the process for assessing impact templates and the format of the next meeting.

## **Day 2 – 13<sup>th</sup> March 2014**

### **Present:**

Marilyn Booth  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
William Gould (Output assessor)  
Simon Green  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi (Output assessor)  
Naomi Standen (Output assessor)  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Joanna Weinberg (Output assessor)  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel Adviser)

### **Apologies:**

Sylvia Chant  
Nicola Jones  
Máiréad Nic Craith

## **7. Environment**

7.1 The sub-panel were reminded of the criteria for assessing environment, contained within paper 07a.2014.

7.2 The sub-panel chair drew members' attention to the data which had been provided alongside the environment templates, which would be used to inform the assessment made about each institution's environment.



7.3 The sub-panel adviser explained how the environment profiles would be calculated using half-grades and explained the definition of an unclassified grade.

7.4 The sub-panel had read a set of environment templates for calibration and discussed these in groups, using paper 07b.2014 to facilitate the discussion.

7.5 In plenary, the sub-panel discussed issues which had arisen in the group discussion and the profiles which had been produced as a result.

7.6 It was agreed to use the same process to discuss and agree environment profiles as had been agreed for impact templates the previous day.

7.7 There was some discussion about funding concentration and the implications of environment profiles. The sub-panel were reminded that the environment profile represented 15% of the overall profile and would be combined with output and impact profile to produce the final institutional profile. The sub-panel chair stressed that assessment needed to be made on the basis of the submission, and the extent to which the criteria had been met, rather than on the basis of potential funding.

## **8. Outputs**

### **a. Feedback from the main panel meeting**

8.1 A paper on output calibration from the main panel was tabled and points within it dealing with double weighting, overlap and edited collections were discussed.

8.2 The sub-panel chair confirmed that scores suggested by other panels through cross-referral were advisory rather than definitive.

### **b. Calibration**

8.3 The sub-panel adviser presented some data on sub-panel progress with scoring outputs, the emerging grade profile and sub-panel members' mean scores and standard deviation. The sub-panel were reminded that these scores had not yet been reconciled between first and second readers, and therefore the data presented at the next meeting would be more informative.

8.4 Sub-panel members agreed that it would be helpful to have an idea of the emerging grade profiles from other sub-panels within main panel D if these could be made available.

8.5 The sub-panel discussed emerging issues with output assessment in groups.

## **9. Future Meetings**

9.1 A list of groups for the next meeting would be circulated to the sub-panel. Scores for impact templates would be agreed in group discussions and then approved by the full sub-panel in plenary.

9.2 Members were reminded to upload scores for all impact case studies in advance of the next meeting.

9.3 Members were reminded to upload their personal spreadsheets to the panel members' website regularly.

## **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 27: Meeting 4**

**20 – 22 May 2014**

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

### **Part 1– 20 - 21 May 2014**

#### **Day 1 – 20 May 2014**

##### **Present:**

Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Sylvia Chant  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
Simon Green  
William Gould  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Nicola Jones  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel Adviser)

##### **Apologies:**

Marilyn Booth

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

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

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

1.3 The chair gave an overview of the two part, three day meeting, at which provisional impact sub-profiles and panel-agreed scores for 33% of outputs should be recommended to the main panel.

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

2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 12 – 13 March 2014, were approved.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

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

3.2 The sub-panel were reminded that whilst discussing institutional sub-profiles, members with conflicts of interest would be required to leave the room.

## **4. Housekeeping**

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

## **5. Feedback from Main Panel D**

5.1 The chair updated the sub-panel on the discussions at the recent main panel meeting, where the emerging impact sub-profiles were discussed. He stressed that the data for that meeting was based on a small sample, and involved unreconciled, individual scores.

5.2 The data discussed at main panel level indicated that scoring in sub-panel 27 was largely in line with the main panel as a whole.

## **6. Panel overview reports**

6.1 The sub-panel noted paper 08.2014 which contained guidance on the feedback statements which would be sent to HEIs.

6.2 The sub-panel discussed the feedback reports and agreed that it was important that these should be helpful to submitting institutions, focusing on the positive elements of submissions, but also giving constructive feedback on weaknesses where appropriate.

6.3 Members were reminded that feedback reports to both the subject area and individual HEIs were a collective responsibility and were asked to update the chair on areas of excellence. This would help the research community as well as the chair of the main panel.

## **7. Impact calibration**

7.1 The chair explained that he considered it useful to have a short impact calibration exercise to re-focus sub-panel members before scores for impact templates and impact case studies were agreed.

7.2 The sub-panel discussed six impact templates which had been given a divergent set of scores.

## **8. Impact templates**

8.1 The sub-panel split into three groups to discuss grades for impact templates. Each group discussed up to eight institutions.

8.2 The sub-panel reported agreed scores to the sub-panel secretary for recording and uploading to the panel members' website.

8.3 During the group discussions, any member with a conflict of interest with the institution being discussed left the room.

## **9. Impact case studies**

9.1 The sub-panel then split into three different groups to discuss grades for impact case studies. Each group discussed between 21 and 26 case studies.

9.2 The sub-panel reported agreed scores to the sub-panel secretary for recording and uploading to the panel members' website.

9.3 During the discussions, any member with a conflict of interest with the institution being discussed left the room.

## **Day 2 – 21 May 2014**

### **Present:**

Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Sylvia Chant  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
Simon Green  
William Gould  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Nicola Jones  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel Adviser)

### **Apologies:**

Marilyn Booth

## **10. Audit**

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

10.2 The sub-panel secretary followed up on unresolved audit queries, and all those which had been raised before the meeting were resolved.

## **11. Impact case studies**

11.1 The sub-panel resumed their group discussions of impact case studies.

## **12. Discuss and approve draft impact sub-profiles**

12.1 The sub-panel reconvened in plenary to discuss the draft impact sub-profiles, comprising aggregated scores from the impact template and impact case studies for each HEI.

12.2 The HEI lead introduced each impact sub-profile, commenting on how the profile was reached and giving any points for feedback to the HEI. Members who had read parts of the HEI's submission also provided comments.

12.3 The sub-panel discussed those HEIs where there were no conflicts of interest first.

12.4 Fourteen Members left the room when they had a conflict of interest with the HEI under discussion.

12.5 The sub-panel agreed that there was evidence of impressive engagement with users in the submissions to SP27 which had produced some outstanding examples of impact.

12.6 An audit query had arisen for one case study during the sub-panel's discussions, the result of which could make the case study ineligible for submission. It was agreed that the audit query result would be sent to the two readers, and they would inform the chair if the case study was in fact ineligible, in which case the case study would receive an unclassified score.

12.7 The sub-panel agreed to recommend the draft impact sub-profiles to the main panel.

12.8 It was agreed that members would send comments on individual impact elements to HEI leads by 28 May 2014. HEI leads would provide the sub-panel executive group with feedback on institutional impact submissions by 4 June 2014.

12.9 The chair thanked the sub-panel for their hard work preparing the impact sub-profiles, particularly the user members who had made a distinct and valuable contribution.

## **Part 2 – 22 May 2014**

### **Present:**

Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Sylvia Chant  
Anna Dickinson (REF team)  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
Simon Green  
William Gould  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Nicola Jones  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Naomi Standen (Output assessor)  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Joanna Weinberg [for part of the meeting]  
Michael Wykes (Sub-panel adviser)

### **Apologies:**

Marilyn Booth

## **13. Output reconciliation and grading**

13.1 The sub-panel adviser presented data on output scoring to date, showing individual members' scoring averages and standard deviation.

13.2 The sub-panel discussed issues which had arisen during the process of reading and reconciling output scores.



13.3 The sub-panel spent some time reconciling scores for outputs to try to meet the 33% target.

13.4 Members were reminded that in cases where two readers were unable to come to an agreement of a score, the sub-panel chair or deputy sub-panel chair should be contacted to moderate.

13.5 Members were also reminded to alert the sub-panel chair if they had assessed an output with a double-weighting request which they felt was not justified.

#### **14. Report provisional scores for 33% of outputs**

14.1 The sub-panel agreed to recommend scores for 26.8% of outputs to the main panel.

14.2 The sub-panel were asked to continue to reconcile scores to allow 33% of scores to be reported to the next main panel meeting.

#### **15. Future meetings**

15.1 The sub-panel discussed the next meeting, at which the environment profiles would be agreed. The chair reminded members of the criteria, and provided some feedback from the main panel.

15.2 The chair explained that the sub-panel would follow the same procedure for agreeing environment templates score as they had for impact templates, and the same HEI leads would be responsible for drafting the feedback on environment.

15.3 It was agreed that members would complete a score sheet for each environment template in their group and send these via webmail to the sub-panel secretary by 18 June 2014.

#### **16. A.O.B.**

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



## **REF Sub-panel 27: Meeting 5**

**30 June – 1 July 2014**

**The Palace Hotel, Oxford Street Manchester, M60 7HA  
Manchester**

### **Part 1 – 30 June 2014**

#### **Present:**

Marilyn Booth  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Sylvia Chant  
Simon Dixon  
Kirsten Drotner (Main panel D international member)  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
William Gould  
Simon Green  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel adviser)

#### **Apologies:**

Nicola Jones  
Lutz Marten

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

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

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

1.3 The chair gave an overview of the two part, two day meeting, at which the sub-panel would complete the assessment of environment and recommend 50% of output scores to the main panel.

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

2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 20 – 22 May 2014, were approved, with one correction to the attendance.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

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

3.2 The sub-panel were reminded that whilst discussing institutional sub-profiles, members with conflicts of interest would be required to leave the room.

## **4. Housekeeping**

4.1 Members were reminded that the September meeting, in Edinburgh, coincided with the referendum and that it was essential to book accommodation, via the panel members' website, promptly.

## **5. Feedback from Main Panel D**

5.1 The chair updated the sub-panel on the discussions at the recent main panel meeting. Draft minutes had been circulated as paper 09.2014.

5.2 The main panel had discussed emerging impact sub-profiles and sub-panels were invited to review sub-profiles in light of the contextual data from the main panel at their next meeting.

5.4 The sub-panel adviser presented a set of slides showing main panel contextual data on impact sub-profiles.

5.3 The sub-panel agreed that they were confident in the impact sub-profiles, which had been agreed following a robust process and reflected the wide range of diverse and high quality impacts submitted.

## **6. Equality and Diversity**

6.1 The sub-panel secretary presented paper 10.2014 which outlined recommendations for individual staff circumstances, and explained any instances where the criteria for output reductions had not been met.

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

## **7. Progress on output scoring**

7.1 The sub-panel adviser presented data on output scoring to date, showing individual members' scoring averages and standard deviation.

7.2 Data was also presented showing that the sub-panel's reading had been broadly in keeping with the types of outputs submitted, meaning that the books had not all been left until the end of the assessment.

7.3 In order to meet scoring targets, the sub-panel were asked to upload scores for 100% of outputs by 1 September 2014.

## **8. Environment assessment**

8.1 The sub-panel split into three groups to discuss grades for environment statements. Each group discussed between 7 and 8 statements.

8.2 The sub-panel reported agreed scores to the sub-panel secretary for recording and uploading to the panel members' website.

8.3 The sub-panel used the standard analyses to inform the assessment of the environment statements, and made reference to the guidance and criteria.

## **Part 2 – 1 July 2014**

### **Present:**

Marilyn Booth  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Sylvia Chant  
Simon Dixon  
Kirsten Drotner (Main panel D international member)  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
William Gould  
Simon Green  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel adviser)

### **Apologies:**

Nicola Jones  
Lutz Marten  
Naomi Standen (Output assessor)  
Joanna Weinberg (Output assessor)

## **8. Environment assessment**

8.4 The sub-panel reconvened in plenary to discuss the draft environment sub-profiles for each HEI.

8.5 The HEI lead introduced each environment sub-profile, commenting on how the profile was reached and giving any points for feedback to the HEI. Members of the discussion groups also provided comments.

8.6 The sub-panel discussed those HEIs where there were no conflicts of interest first.

8.7 Thirteen members left the room when they had a conflict of interest with the HEI under discussion.

8.8 It was agreed that any changes to environment scores should be agreed in groups via REF webmail, and communicated to the executive group no later than 11 July 2014.

8.9 It was further agreed that feedback statements should be sent to the sub-panel secretary no later than 31 July 2014.

## **9. Output grading and reconciliation**

9.1 The sub-panel adviser presented emerging profile data for outputs.

9.2 The sub-panel agreed to recommend scores for 51% of outputs to the main panel.

9.3 It was agreed that decisions on double-weighting requests should be made by 15 July 2014.

9.4 Members were reminded that scores for 100% of outputs needed to be uploaded to the panel members' website by 1 September 2014.

## **10. Future meetings**

10.1 The sub-panel discussed the next meeting when members would look at the profiles for all submissions and discuss feedback statements.

## **11. A.O.B.**

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



## **REF Sub-panel 27: Meeting 6**

**17 – 19 September 2014**

**Radisson Blu Edinburgh, 80 High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1TH**

### **Minutes**

**Day 1 – 17 September 2014**

**Present:**

Marilyn Booth  
Bruce Brown (Main panel D chair)  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Sylvia Chant  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
William Gould  
Simon Green  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Nicola Jones  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Naomi Standen (Output assessor)  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel adviser)

**Apologies:**

Joanna Weinberg (Output assessor)

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

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

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

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

2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 30 June – 1 July 2014, were approved.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

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

3.2 The sub-panel were reminded that whilst discussing institutional quality profiles, members with conflicts of interest would be required to leave the room.

## **4. Housekeeping**

4.1 Members were reminded to bring their USB pens to the next meeting for collection by the sub-panel secretary. If members were unable to attend the next meeting they were asked to return their USB pens to the REF team by post once they had concluded their assessment.

4.2 Members were reminded to return all books and hard copy outputs to the warehouse once they had finished assessing them.

4.3 Members had been asked to remove a pdf from their USB pens, and were reminded to email the admin team to confirm that this had been done.

## **5. Audit**

5.1 There was one outstanding audit query on an output, which had been raised shortly before the meeting. The sub-panel agreed that the output score would be agreed by chair's action.

## **6. Feedback from Main Panel D**

6.1 The chair updated the sub-panel on the discussions at the recent main panel meeting where environment had been discussed.

6.2 The sub-panel adviser presented a set of slides showing main panel contextual data on environment.



## **7. Feedback reports**

7.1 The sub-panel discussed the draft feedback paragraphs for each HEI.

7.2 The sub-panel discussed those HEIs where there were no conflicts of interest first.

### **Day 2 – 18 September 2014**

#### **Present:**

Marilyn Booth  
Bruce Brown (Main panel D chair)  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
William Gould  
Simon Green  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Nicola Jones  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Graeme Rosenberg (REF Manager)  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Naomi Standen (Output assessor)  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel adviser)

#### **Apologies:**

Sylvia Chant  
Joanna Weinberg (Output assessor)

## **7. Feedback reports**

7.3 The sub-panel continued the discussion of feedback paragraphs for each HEI.

7.4 Fourteen members left the room when they had a conflict of interest with the HEI under discussion.

7.5 In a small number of cases, in light of the points raised in the feedback, it was agreed that the sub-panel members originally allocated to assess an environment template might wish to discuss their scores and make recommendations to the executive group of any appropriate changes. A small number of changes to environment scores were subsequently agreed.

## **8. Recommend overall quality profiles to the main panel**

8.1 The sub-panel reviewed the overall quality profiles for each HEI.

8.2 Fourteen members left the room when they had a conflict of interest with the HEI under discussion.

8.3 The sub-panel resolved to recommend the draft quality profiles to the main panel.

## **Day 3 – 19 September 2014**

### **Present:**

Marilyn Booth  
Bruce Brown (Main panel D chair)  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Sylvia Chant  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
Simon Green  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel adviser)

### **Apologies:**

William Gould  
Nicola Jones  
Naomi Standen (Output assessor)  
Joanna Weinberg (Output assessor)

## **9. Sign off 100 per cent of output scores**

9.1 Members had the opportunity during the meeting to reconcile output scores. (The chair would contact those who were absent to give them the same opportunity.)

9.2 The sub-panel resolved to recommend 99.65 per cent of output scores to the main panel. An audit query, delayed cross-referral advice and difficulty accessing one hard copy output meant that the last few remaining outputs would be approved by chair's action.

9.2 Sub-panel members agreed that scores had been arrived at via a process in which they had confidence.

#### **10. Preliminary discussion of subject overview report**

10.1 The chair had circulated a set of notes to the sub-panel for consideration in advance of the meeting.

10.2 Members were asked to suggest points for inclusion in the overview report.

10.3 It was agreed that any further suggestions would be emailed to the chair in advance of the next meeting.

#### **11. Future meetings**

11.1 The sub-panel discussed the next meeting when members would recommend the HEI feedback and subject overview report to the main panel.

#### **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 27: Meeting 7**

**8 October 2014**

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

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Marilyn Booth  
Bruce Brown (Main panel D chair)  
Lynne Brydon  
Tony Chafer  
Sylvia Chant  
Simon Dixon  
Jane Duckett  
Paul Furlong  
Peter Gatrell (Sub-panel chair)  
Natascha Gentz  
Robert Gleave  
William Gould  
Simon Green  
Faye Hammill  
Alison Harcourt  
Susan Hodgett (Deputy sub-panel chair)  
Carole Holden  
Nicola Jones  
Jo Lakey (Sub-panel secretary)  
Lutz Marten  
Emma Murphy  
Martin Myant  
Ian Neary  
Máiréad Nic Craith  
Gurharpal Singh  
Zahia Smail Salhi  
Elizabeth Teague  
Brian Ward  
Michael Wykes (Sub-Panel adviser)

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the sub-panel to the final meeting and thanked them for taking part.

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

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

2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 17 – 19 September 2014, were approved, with minor amendments.

## **3. Conflicts of interests**

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

## **4. Housekeeping**

4.1 The sub-panel adviser presented a set of slides which outlined the timetable for the release of results, and procedures to follow at the end of the assessment.

4.2 Members were reminded of the confidentiality of the assessment process, and that they should only comment on information which would be publicly available.

4.3 Members were reminded to destroy all hand-written notes pertaining to the assessment before the publication of the results on 18 December.

4.3 The sub-panel secretary collected members' USB pens for returning to the REF team.

## **5. Audit**

5.1 There were no outstanding audit queries.

## **6. Feedback from Main Panel D**

6.1 The chair updated the sub-panel on the discussions at the recent main panel meeting where quality profiles had been discussed.

## **7. Feedback on submissions**

7.1 The sub-panel reviewed the quality profiles for each HEI in turn. HEI feedback had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting (respecting conflicts of interest).

7.2 Five members left the room when discussion was necessary on feedback for conflicted HEIs.

7.3 The sub-panel confirmed recommended output, impact and environment sub-profiles and an overall quality profile for each of the following submissions to SP27, based in each case on its full and final assessment of the complete submission, made in accordance with the published criteria and working methods:

Aston University  
University of Bath  
University of Birmingham  
University of Cambridge  
University of Chester  
University of East Anglia  
University of Edinburgh  
University of Exeter  
University of Glasgow  
University of the Highlands and Islands  
London Metropolitan University  
London School of Economics and Political Science  
Loughborough University  
University of Nottingham - American and Canadian studies  
University of Nottingham - Contemporary Chinese studies  
University of Oxford  
University of Portsmouth  
School of Oriental and African Studies  
University of Sheffield  
University of Sussex  
University College London  
University of Westminster  
University of Wolverhampton

7.4 The sub-panel resolved to recommend the quality profiles for each of the submissions listed above, as set out in the panel spreadsheet, to the main panel for agreement.

## **8. Draft main panel overview report**

8.1 The draft main panel overview report had been circulated to the sub-panel in advance of the meeting (paper 11.2014).

8.2 The sub-panel discussed the draft main panel overview report and resolved to feedback suggestions to the main panel via the sub-panel chair.

## **9. Subject overview report**

9.1 The draft subject overview report had been circulated to the sub-panel in advance of the meeting (paper 11.2014).

9.2 The sub-panel discussed the draft subject overview report in detail.

9.3 The sub-panel agreed that the document would be circulated to the sub-panel for final comments before being submitted to the main panel.

9.4 It was agreed that members would feed back any comments on the overall REF process to the three members who were attending the REF overview meetings at the end of November.

9.5 The sub-panel resolved to recommend the subject overview report to the main panel.

## **10. Any other business**

10.1 There being no further business the chair thanked members for their contributions and hard work during the REF assessment period and declared the meeting closed.