



## **REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 1b**

**6 December 2013, 10am**

**Radisson Blu, Birmingham**

### **Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Michael	Basker	
Mike	Baynham	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Theo	Hermans	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Florence	Myles	
Hilary	Owen	
Richard	Parish	
Nicholas	Saul	
David	Shepherd	
Jane	Stuart-Smith	
Gregory	Toner	
Isabel	Torres	
Marilyn	Vihman	
Bencie	Woll	
Janet	Zmroczek	

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting of the sub-panel and provided an update on changes to the membership, specifically additional output assessors, specialist advisers, impact assessors and sub-panel members appointed since the last meeting of the sub-panel.
- 1.2. Apologies for absence were received from Robert Dunbar, Ann Hallamore Caesar, Martin McLaughlin and Bencie Woll.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

## **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed the register of declared major conflicts of interest. Members were requested to update their major conflicts of interest, as appropriate, via the panel members' website (PMW).

## **3. Outputs calibration**

- 3.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair, deputy chair and two additional members of the sub-panel had selected and circulated a sample of eight outputs to members and output assessors to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. The outputs selected were representative of the disciplines covered by the sub-panel and had been published within the REF publication period. The outputs used in the calibration exercise were from authors ineligible for submission to the REF based on geographical location.
- 3.2. The chair outlined the aims of the calibration exercise, highlighting that the key objective was to develop a common understanding of what constituted assessment at the various star levels and to agree initial working methods, building on the published panel criteria, in relation to output assessment.
- 3.3. The sub-panel considered a summary paper on output calibration (paper 02) which provided an analysis of initial assessments of the selected outputs, alongside commentary from the output selector on reasons for selection and assessment level. The sub-panel considered how far members had reached a consensus on each output and discussed where scores diverged or members considered the output was borderline between star levels. Through this discussion the sub-panel reached a consensus on the score for each output and highlighted the reasons for those scores, with reference to the level descriptors.

**4. Output allocation**

- 4.1 The chair detailed the process by which members would receive submission data and be notified of their initial output reading list. The chair confirmed the principles and working methods to be employed in the allocation of outputs to members, noting that draft allocations would be made available in early 2014.

**5. Future meetings**

- 5.1 The panel adviser outlined the meeting schedule for the sub-panel and key milestones for the assessment process, noting that a detailed project plan would be brought to the next meeting for consideration by the sub-panel.

**6. Date of next meeting**

- 6.1 The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 29 January 2014, to be held at the Grand Connaught Rooms, London.

## REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 2

29 January 2014, 10am

Grand Connaught Rooms, London

### Minutes

#### Present:

Michael	Basker	
Mike	Baynham	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Robert	Dunbar	
Frank	Finlay	
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Ann	Hallamore Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Theo	Hermans	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	
Florence	Myles	
Hilary	Owen	
Richard	Parish	
Nicholas	Saul	
David	Shepherd	
Jane	Stuart-Smith	
Gregory	Toner	
Isabel	Torres	
Marilyn	Vihman	
Anthonya	Visser	International adviser Items 1-5 only
Bencie	Woll	

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel and introduced new members and the international adviser. Apologies for absence were received from Charles Forsdick. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

## **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

## **3. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting 1b held on 6 December 2013 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

## **4. Summary of submissions**

- 4.1 The panel received a paper providing summary data on the volume of submissions to SP28 when compared to the return for RAE2008. This showed a small decrease in the number of outputs returned to the submission and a reduction in the number of submissions (due to the merger of sub-panels). The number of submitted outputs had decreased more than the number of submitted FTEs. This could be taken as evidence that colleagues who by being an Early Career Researcher or having individual staff circumstances have a reduced number of outputs were returned by institution.

## **5. Output calibration**

- 5.1 Nine members left the meeting on account of major conflicts of interest during the discussion of this item.
- 5.2 Prior to the meeting, the chair had selected and circulated a sample of eight outputs to members and output assessors which were considered as part of a second calibration exercise. The chair outlined the aims of this exercise highlighting that the outputs had been selected to establish the principles for the assessment of items that were potentially more challenging to assess and for the consideration of requests from HEIs for outputs to be double-weighted.
- 5.3 The panel gave particular consideration to items that were potentially on the threshold of the REF definition of research; outputs that were on the boundaries of the panel's expertise; data collections; edited/co-edited volumes; and outputs which overlapped with other outputs or with outputs submitted to RAE2008.

- 5.4 Panel members had submitted comments prior to the meeting referencing the guidance provided by Main Panel D (MPD) on quality levels (paper 04). The panel discussed the particular outputs and reached a consensus on the principles for reaching an assessment for each, with reference to the published quality level descriptors. In the case of double-weighted outputs the panel reached a consensus on the principles for accepting cases submitted by institutions, with reference to the REF criteria for double-weighted outputs. The chair would feedback the results of the calibration exercise, and the principles agreed by the panel to MPD.
- 5.5 During the day, invited members of the panel met with members of SP29 to discuss the outcome of cross-panel calibration exercises in respect of creative writing and linguistics.

## **6. Output allocation**

- 6.1 The chair confirmed that the allocation of outputs was almost complete. Additional readers would be allocated to ensure that a minimum of 25% of outputs were double-read. Impact templates, case studies and environment templates would be allocated shortly. The panel noted papers providing procedural guidance on minor conflicts of interest (paper 06), cross-referral of outputs (paper 07) and obtaining physical outputs from the REF warehouse (paper 08).

## **7. Working methods**

- 7.1 The panel confirmed the working methods for the order in which outputs should be read to ensure that scores could be confirmed at future meetings to meet key milestones. Working methods were discussed and agreed for confirming scores for outputs that were double-read and/or had been cross referred; for monitoring and recording minor conflicts of interest and for the use of comments fields by sub-profile leads.
- 7.2 The chair outlined the principles for selecting impact case studies and environment templates for MPD and panel calibration exercises. It was noted that the same sample set of case studies would be calibrated by each sub-panel cluster within MPD.

## **8. IT presentation**

- 8.1 The panel secretary gave a presentation on REF IT systems. This included the use of personal spreadsheets; reading lists; REF webmail and data security.

**9. Project plan: key milestones**

- 9.1 The panel secretary outlined the meeting schedule for the panel and milestones for the assessment process. The panel was asked to note the assessment deadlines and milestones across the exercise. Guidance on the assessment and calibration of impact case studies and template would be circulated to members ahead of the next meeting.

**10. Audit**

- 10.1 The chair outlined the process for raising audit queries. It was further noted that guidance relating particularly to the audit of impact would be circulated to members ahead of the next meeting.

**11. Date of next meeting**

- 11.1 The dates of the next meeting were confirmed as below, noting that the meeting would take place over two days at separate venues:

12 March: CCT Venues Smithfield (with impact assessors in attendance)

13 March: CCT Venues Barbican (with impact assessors in attendance in the morning, and output assessors in attendance in the afternoon).

- 11.2 Part one of the meeting would cover impact calibration, assessment and audit queries, whilst part two would cover environment and discussion of output assessment to date.

## REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 3

12-13 March 2014

CCT Venues Smithfield (day one);

10am

### Minutes

#### Present:

Michael	Basker	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Anthony	Cond	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Robert	Dunbar	
Frank	Finlay	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy-chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Dominic	Gray	
Ann	Hallamore Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Meirion	Jones	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	
Florence	Myles	
Richard	Parish	
Danuta	Reah	
Nicholas	Saul	
David	Shepherd	
Jane	Stuart-Smith	
Gregory	Toner	



Isabel	Torres
Marilyn	Vihman
Janet	Zmroczek

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel and introduced the impact assessors who were attending for the first time. There were no apologies for absence. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

## **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

## **3. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting two held on 29 January 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

## **4. Impact allocation**

- 4.1 The chair rehearsed the principles adopted for the allocation of impact templates and case studies by members, notably that assessment of all impact case studies within a submission would be overseen by an academic member of the sub-panel with individual case studies within a submission being read by two academic members and one impact assessor. Academic readers would be assigned (as far as possible) on expertise in relation to impact type.

## **5. Impact assessment and working methods**

- 5.1 The panel adviser presented the REF slides on assessing impact following which there was an open discussion of the issues around the assessment of impact. In particular the panel considered in detail the threshold criteria and potential audit queries that might support the panel in its assessment.
- 5.2 The chair updated the panel on the outcome of the discussion on assessing impact that had taken place at the last meeting of Main Panel D (MPD). Members were referred to the guidance paper *Impact calibration: guidance to sub-panels on points arising from the impact calibration exercise* which was tabled at the meeting; this summarised the key issues and points from the MPD discussion.
- 5.3 The panel agreed principles for the assessment of impact with reference to both the REF guidance and the guidance provided by Main Panel D. The panel also confirmed the working methods for panellists to come to a collectively agreed

score for each impact case study and template and the working methods by which the panel would approve (at meeting four) the assessment of all case studies and templates underpinning the quality profile.

## **6. Impact case studies calibration**

- 6.1 In advance of the meeting all panellists involved in the assessment of impact had undertaken a calibration exercise and had returned scores and comments which were considered anonymously at the meeting.
- 6.2 The chair rehearsed the methodology for the selection of the case studies and templates noting that the panel had been asked to calibrate items selected for cluster calibration within MPD in addition to those selected for sub-panel calibration. The items selected for sub-panel calibration had taken account, as far as possible, of conflicts of interest.
- 6.3 The chair introduced the discussion of the main panel and sub-panel calibrated items with panellists contributing their views on each item and their rationale for the score they had given. During the discussion summary data for each case study and template was projected. Through the discussion of each item, the panel reached a consensus on the principles for the assessment of different types of impact with reference to the REF guidance documents. It was agreed that a paper summarising the key issues raised in the discussion would be circulated to members following the meeting. It was noted that further guidance on the assessment of creative writing items had been requested from the chair of Sub-panel 29.
- 6.4 During the discussion four panellists left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

## **7. Impact audit**

- 7.1 The sub-panel noted the REF guidance document on the audit of impact case studies (Paper 07: *Audit of impact case studies*). The chair rehearsed the process for prioritising queries that would be put forward to the REF team, highlighting that only those queries that would make a material difference to the assessment of a case study would be put forward. The chair confirmed the process should the number of queries raised fall above or below the 5-10 per cent threshold required.

## **8. Impact next steps**

- 8.1 The chair highlighted the work that was required in respect of impact assessment before the next meeting. The panel noted the dates by which impact scores needed to be uploaded to the panel members' website, including a mid-way review point to enable MPD to be updated of progress with impact assessment.

**9. Next meeting**

- 9.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place 20-22 May at Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon. Impact assessment would be considered on days one and two of this meeting.

## REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 3

12-13 March 2014

CCT Venues Barbican (day two);

10am

### Minutes

#### Present:

Michael	Basker	
Mike	Baynham	(afternoon only)
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Robert	Dunbar	
Frank	Finlay	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy-chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Ann	Hallamore Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Theo	Hermans	(afternoon only)
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Meirion	Jones	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	
Florence	Myles	
Hilary	Owen	(afternoon only)
Richard	Parish	
Nicholas	Saul	
David	Shepherd	
Jane	Stuart-Smith	
Gregory	Toner	

Isabel Torres  
Marilyn Vihman

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

## **2. Apologies for absence**

- 2.1 There were no apologies for absence for the morning session.

## **3. Environment allocation**

- 3.1 The chair rehearsed the principles adopted for the allocation of environment templates. Each template would be read by two academic members of staff, taking account of conflicts of interest, it being noted however that all panel members were required to read all the environment templates in detail to contribute to the assessment discussion.

## **4. Environment calibration**

- 4.1 The chair introduced the item on environment calibration. In advance of the meeting panellists had returned scores and comments which were considered anonymously at the meeting. The chair informed the panel that Main Panel D (MPD) had not yet undertaken its calibration on environment and would report back to a future meeting. Panellists were invited to raise any specific issues they had encountered with the assessment of environment.
- 4.2 The chair rehearsed the methodology for the selection of templates for the environment calibration exercise noting that the panel had been asked to calibrate templates selected for cluster calibration within MPD in addition to templates selected for sub-panel calibration. Templates had been selected taking account of conflicts of interest. The chair led the discussion on MPD calibrated items from outside of the sub-panel and sub-profile leads presented the summary of assessments for the sub-panel calibrated items. During the discussion summary data for each environment template was projected alongside the assessment criteria.
- 4.3 During the discussion of the items the panel agreed the principles for the assessment of environment with reference to the assessment criteria. The panel confirmed the working methods for panellists to come to a collectively agreed score for each environment template and the working methods by which the panel would approve (at meeting five) the assessment of all templates underpinning the quality profile.

## **5. Next steps**

- 5.1 The chair highlighted the next steps that panellists would have to take in respect of environment before meeting five noting the deadlines for raising audit queries and for uploading scores to the Panel members' website. The panel discussed and agreed the working methods for readers to agree scores in advance of the meeting and for the confirmation of scores by the panel.

### **Afternoon meeting**

## **6. Introduction**

- 6.1 The chair welcomed output assessors to the afternoon session of the meeting.

## **7. Apologies for absence**

- 7.1 Apologies for absence were received from Bencie Woll.

## **8. Register of interests**

- 8.1 Output assessors reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

## **9. Output assessment**

- 9.1 The panel noted the MPD guidance paper on the assessment of outputs which was tabled at the meeting. The panel reviewed progress with the scoring of outputs noting that around 15 per cent of outputs had now been assessed by readers. The chair thanked the panel for its progress with output assessment. The panel considered some data analyses in relation to the assessment of outputs. The panel discussed and confirmed the working methods for agreeing scores at panel level and for raising issues with assessment encountered by panellists for further consideration by the panel.
- 9.2 The panel confirmed the method for allocating additional readers to ensure that 25 per cent of outputs would be double read.

## **10. Audit**

- 10.1 There were no items to be discussed in relation to audit.

## **11. Next steps**

- 11.1 The chair outlined the work that panellists were expected to complete in respect of outputs, impact and environment before meetings four and five.

## **12. Next meeting**

- 12.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place at Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon:
- 20 May (part one): produce impact draft profiles
  - 21 May (part one): produce impact draft profiles
  - 22 May (part two): discuss scores for 33 per cent of outputs

## REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

20 - 21 May 2014

Ettington Chase, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon

10am

### Minutes

#### Present:

Michael	Basker	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Anthony	Cond	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Robert	Dunbar	
Frank	Finlay	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy-chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Dominic	Gray	
Ann	Hallamore Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Meirion Prys	Jones	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	



Florence	Myles
Richard	Parish
Nicholas	Saul
David	Shepherd
Jane	Stuart-Smith
Amy	Thompson
Gregory	Toner
Isabel	Torres
Marilyn	Vihman
Janet	Zmroczek

In attendance: Bruce Brown, chair of Main Panel D (MPD) joined the meeting at various times throughout the day.

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel including impact assessors.
- 1.2. The chair updated members on changes to panel membership since the previous meeting including the appointment of Amy Thompson as an impact assessor to replace a colleague who had resigned from the exercise for personal reasons.
- 1.3. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, namely to consider scores for 100% of impact and approve institutional impact sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.
- 1.4. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

## **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

## **3. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting three (part one) held on 12-13 March 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

#### **4. Feedback reports**

- 4.1 The panel noted a draft guidance paper from the REF team which outlined the requirements in terms of feedback reports; these would include an overview report from each main panel with contributions from each of the sub-panels and a feedback statement for each submission which would be provided to the head of institution in January 2015.
- 4.2 The chair highlighted the feedback statement template and examples of feedback reports which were included in the paper. The panel confirmed the process and timescale for drafting feedback reports for both impact and environment.

#### **5. Impact assessment**

- 5.1 The chair fed back to the panel on the points of discussion from Main Panel D (MPD) on the assessment of impact. Members were referred to the paper Impact calibration: collated feedback from sub-panels on the calibration of impact case studies and impact templates (paper 02) which summarised the key points that had been considered by MPD.
- 5.2 The panel noted that there were 192 impact case studies and 56 impact templates for which scores needed to be confirmed. The panel secretary projected slides which detailed panel progress with scoring impact to date.
- 5.3 The chair rehearsed the process for confirming sub-profiles at the meeting and for draft feedback to be returned. The panel agreed the working methods for agreeing scores for items that were still awaiting the outcome of audit queries.
- 5.4 The panel discussed issues that had been encountered in respect to the assessment of impact; these included the link between the impact and the underpinning research, claims for future impact and use of quantitative data. The panel reached a consensus on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria. Following this the panel divided into breakout groups to consider impact case studies thematically, and to ensure consistency of assessment across the piece. The groups were invited to consider whether any scores required amendment in the light of the discussion. The secretariat updated agreed scores for items as required.
- 5.5 The panel held a plenary session following the breakout period to consider revised scores for impact case studies. During the review of scores 27 panellists left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

#### **6. Audit**

- 6.1 The chair updated the panel with respect to the number and progress of audit queries raised on impact case studies, noting that queries has been raised where

it was considered the outcome would make a material difference to the assessment of the item. Most queries raised related to requests for further information regarding the threshold criteria, in particular the employment dates of staff who undertook the underpinning research and verification of dates for the underpinning research and/or impact. A number of requests for corroborating evidence were also raised. There was currently one audit request outstanding.

## **7. Review of day one**

- 7.1 The chair reviewed the progress that the panel had made with impact on day one and confirmed the order of business for day two.

## **8. Impact assessment cont.**

- 8.1 The panel held breakout groups to consider impact templates and any remaining impact case studies. The secretariat updated agreed scores as required.

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

- 9.1 The chair confirmed the process for confirming sub-profiles taking account of conflicts of interest. The sub-profile lead presented the rationale for the scores that had been given for impact case studies and impact templates for each submission. The secretariat projected the resultant sub-profiles which were then reviewed and agreed by the panel. During the review of sub-profiles, 27 panellists left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 9.2 Following the plenary session the panel recommended the sub-profiles for all submissions to the main panel for approval. The user members confirmed that the process of assessment that the panel had followed had been robust and reflective of the published assessment criteria.

## **10. Next steps**

- 10.1 The chair reminded members of the process for confirming scores for items with outstanding audit queries and the deadlines for returning draft feedback statements to the panel secretary. The chair also outlined the agenda for day three (part two).

## **11. Any other business**

- 11.1 The chair thanked the impact assessors for their contribution to the assessment of impact.

## **REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 4 (Part two)**

**20 - 22 May 2014**

**Ettington Chase, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon**

**10am**

### **Minutes**

**Present:**

Michael	Basker	
Mike	Baynham	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Anna	Dickinson	HEFCE policy adviser (items 4-6)
Robert	Dunbar	
Frank	Finlay	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy-chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Ann	Hallamore Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Meirion	Prys Jones	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	

Florence	Myles
Hilary	Owen
Richard	Parish
Nicholas	Saul
David	Shepherd
Jane	Stuart-Smith
Gregory	Toner
Isabel	Torres
Marilyn	Vihman
Bencie	Woll

In attendance: Bruce Brown, chair of Main Panel D (MPD) joined the meeting at various times throughout the day.

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel including output assessors, and noted apologies from Theo Hermans. The chair confirmed the key aims and business for the day, and in light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

## **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

## **3. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting three (part two) held on 12-13 March 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

## **4. Feedback reports**

- 4.1 The panel reconsidered the draft REF guidance paper on feedback reports for the benefit of assessors who were attending on day three only. The chair highlighted fictional examples of output feedback statements which were included in the paper.

## **5. Overview of progress**

- 5.1 The secretariat projected summary data illustrating progress towards the scoring of outputs by panellists. This included the overall sub-panel output sub-profile (based on panel agreed scores to date) against the overall MPD output sub-profile; anonymised scoring patterns of panellists; numbers of cross referrals in and out of the panel; the number of panels to which items had been cross referred; and the number of audit queries raised.

## **6. Assessment Issues**

- 6.1 Panel members had been invited to raise any issues they had encountered with the assessment of outputs prior to the meeting. These included overlap with RAE 2008; items submitted twice and outputs that had not been submitted correctly; these were considered by the panel and agreement reached on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria. The panel confirmed the process for agreeing requests for double weighting and noted that the secretariat would consult with the chair to determine the allocation of a reserve output (if a case was rejected).

## **7. Review of scores**

- 7.1 The panel reviewed progress on the scoring of outputs to date and confirmed scores for 32 per cent of outputs.

## **8. Environment Assessment**

- 8.1 The chair fed back on the discussion that had taken place at MPD on the assessment of environment. Members were referred to the paper Environment calibration: collated feedback from sub-panels on the calibration of environment templates (paper 02) which summarised the key points that had been considered by MPD.

## **9. Environment data**

- 9.1 The panel noted the REF guidance paper on the use of environment data (paper 04). The panel adviser presented an environment analyses crib sheet (paper 03) which highlighted the key points to take into account when considering the environment data. The secretariat also presented additional analysis of the environment data which 'banded' data based on standard analyses to aid the panel when comparing data across submissions.

## **10. Audit**

- 10.1 The chair rehearsed the process for raising audit queries on environment templates noting that audits would only be raised where it would make a material difference to the assessment.

## **11. Next steps**

- 11.1 The chair highlighted the work that was required in respect of environment and output assessment before meeting five. The panel noted the dates by which scores needed to be uploaded to the Panel members' website, including a mid-way review point to enable MPD to be updated on assessment progress at its next meeting.

## **12. Date of next meeting**

- 12.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place 2-3 July, The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester.

Day one: produce environment sub-profiles

Day two: discuss scores for 50 per cent of outputs



**REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 5 (Part 1)**  
**02 - 03 July 2014**  
**The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester**  
**10am**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Michael	Basker	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Robert	Dunbar	
Frank	Finlay	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy-chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Ann	Hallamore Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Meirion Prys	Jones	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	
Florence	Myles	
Richard	Parish	
Nicholas	Saul	



David	Shepherd
Gregory	Toner
Isabel	Torres
Marilyn	Vihman

In attendance: Bruce Brown, chair of Main Panel D (MPD), and Duncan Sherman, HEFCE policy adviser, attended at various points throughout the day.

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel, noting that apologies for absence had been received from Jane Stuart-Smith.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, being substantively to consider scores for 100 per cent of environment and approve institutional environment sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

## **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

## **3. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting four held on 20 – 22 May 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

## **4. Impact assessment**

- 4.1 The chair of MPD fed back to the panel the key points of discussion from the main panel on the assessment of impact. MPD recognized that all of its sub-panels had impressively demonstrated the internal integrity of the impact assessment process within each sub-panel, which had been confirmed by the user members of the sub-panels.
- 4.2 It was reported that, as part of the ongoing process of calibration, and given the newness of the impact review process and need to ensure the delivery of fully robust and credible outcomes, the main panel user members had requested that sub-panels review their recommended sub-profiles against MPD contextual data at their next meetings. The sub-panel was therefore shown a number of slides outlining MPD contextual data for impact assessment. The chair invited the sub-

panel to consider whether, in the light of the data presented, further review of impact should be undertaken. The sub-panel noted that in the light of cross-panel calibration, it was reasonable that a number of case studies assessed as borderline be reviewed to ensure parity of assessment across the piece. The panel therefore agreed to undertake some additional work before recommending finalised profiles to the main panel.

- 4.2 The panel chair confirmed that draft impact feedback reports had been drafted for all units of assessment; these would be reviewed by the Exec Group to ensure cross-panel consistency and then returned to institutional sub-profile leads for further revision. Near-final drafts of institutional feedback statements would then be considered by the panel at meeting six, incorporating impact, environment and output feedback statements. The panel were invited to submit comments for inclusion in the sub-panel section of the main panel overview report.

## **5. Environment assessment**

- 5.1 The panel noted that MPD would consider the outcome of panels' assessment of environment at its meeting in July and would feedback to panels, via chairs, following this meeting.
- 5.2 The panel noted that there were 56 environment templates for which scores needed to be confirmed. The panel secretary verbally confirmed progress with panel scoring to date. The chair rehearsed the process for confirming sub-profiles at the meeting and for draft feedback to be returned.
- 5.3 The panel held a plenary session to discuss generic issues that had been encountered in respect to the assessment of environment; these included the use of quantitative data in informing the assessment of templates; environment narrative; and specific issues relating to collaboration. The panel reached a consensus on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria.
- 5.4 Following this, the panel divided into breakout groups to consider environment templates by size and subject type of submission, and to ensure consistency of assessment across the piece. The groups were invited to consider whether any scores required amendment in the light of the discussion. The secretariat updated agreed scores for items as required.
- 5.5 The panel held a plenary session following the breakout period to consider scores for environment templates. The sub-profile lead presented the rationale for the scores that had been given for environment templates for each submission in turn. Panellists reviewed whether any of the scores required amendment in light of the issues discussed under 5.3. During the discussion 28 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

## **6. Audit**

- 6.1 The chair confirmed that one audit query had been raised on environment to confirm that the submitted template was complete.

## **7. Review of environment template scores and sub-profiles**

- 7.1 The chair confirmed the process for confirming sub-profiles taking account of conflicts of interest. Panellists were requested to review their draft feedback on the rationale for assessment to the secretariat, within three weeks of the meeting, for use in the drafting of institutional feedback reports.
- 7.2 The panel considered in plenary the resultant sub-profiles for each submission in turn. The panel recommended the sub-profiles for all submissions to the main panel for approval. During the discussion of scores and review of sub-profiles, 28 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

## **8. Conclusion to part one**

- 8.1 The chair thanked members for the work that they had undertaken in respect of the assessment of environment and confirmed the business for part two, namely to review scores for 50 per cent of outputs.



**REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 5 (Part 2)**  
**02 – 03 July 2014**  
**The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester**  
**10am**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Michael	Basker	
Mike	Baynham	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Frank	Finlay	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy-chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Ann	Hallamore	
	Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Meirion	Prys Jones	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	
Florence	Myles	
Hilary	Owen	

Richard	Parish
Nicholas	Saul
David	Shepherd
Gregory	Toner
Isabel	Torres
Marilyn	Vihman
Bencie	Woll

In attendance: Bruce Brown, chair of Main Panel D (MPD) joined the meeting at various times throughout the day.

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel including output assessors. Apologies for absence had been received from Robert Dunbar, Theo Hermans and Jane Stuart-Smith.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, namely to review scores for 50 per cent of outputs.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

## **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

## **3. Staff circumstances**

- 3.1 The panel noted the paper on individual staff circumstances (paper 02:*Individual staff circumstances*) which outlined the decisions made in relation to staff circumstances for the panel.
- 3.2 The chair outlined the three types of circumstance that staff could be returned with i.e. 'none', where the member of staff would be returned with four outputs; 'complex', where a member of staff might have circumstances where they would qualify for a reduction of outputs based on the protected characteristics; and 'clearly defined' where a member of staff would qualify for a reduction of outputs having had period(s) of maternity leave; part time working within the assessment period or for being an early career researcher (ECR).

- 3.3 Complex circumstances had been reviewed by the Equalities and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) who had made a recommendation on the number of outputs to be reduced. No missing outputs were recorded subject to the outcome of two outstanding audit queries.
- 3.4 The secretariat had reviewed all clearly defined circumstances and determined that with the exception of four cases which were subject to outstanding audit queries, all should be accepted and that there were no missing outputs.

#### **4. Output assessment**

- 4.1 The secretariat projected summary data illustrating progress towards the scoring of outputs to date. This included the emerging sub-panel output sub-profile (based on panel agreed scores to date) against the overall MPD output sub-profile; anonymised scoring patterns; numbers of cross referrals in and out of the panel; and the number of cross referrals to specialist advisers.
- 4.2 The panel were reminded of the process for agreeing claims for double weighting and reviewed cases where the claims had been rejected to ensure full sub-panel agreement. It was noted that the panel considered that institutions had been conservative in their approach and had only submitted items where they were confident that the request for double weighting would be accepted. The panel agreed the process for chasing outstanding advice for items cross referred to other panels.
- 4.3 The secretariat had cross referenced output titles to identify where the same output had been submitted within a submission or across multiple submissions. The secretariat would inform all readers via email to facilitate discussion on an agreed score.
- 4.4 The panel were reminded of the process for returning items to the REF warehouse once they had been assessed.
- 4.5 The panel reviewed progress on the scoring of outputs to date and confirmed assessment for 46 per cent of outputs.

#### **5. Audit**

- 5.1 The chair confirmed the number of audit queries raised to date and the number of data adjustments which had been made as a result. The panel noted that the REF team had undertaken a 'data comparison of research outputs audit' in order to verify the eligibility of outputs submitted to the REF. The panel noted that all outputs selected for audit were verified.
- 5.2 It was noted that the REF audit exercise was carried out based on digital object identifiers (DOIs) and that panellists should continue to raise audits where they had concerns.

## **6. Next steps**

- 6.1 The chair highlighted the work that was required in respect of output assessment and feedback reports before meeting six. The panel noted the dates by which scores needed to be uploaded to the Panel members' website, including a mid-way review point to enable the Exec Group to review progress.

## **7. Date of next meeting**

- 7.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place 15-17 September at the Radisson Blu, Edinburgh:
- Consider and confirm scores for 100 per cent outputs
  - Produce draft output sub-profiles
  - Produce overall quality profiles
  - Begin feedback and overview reports

**REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 6 (Part 1)**

**15-17 September 2014**

**The Radisson Blu, Edinburgh**

**Minutes**

**Present:**

Michael	Basker	
Mike	Baynham	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Robert	Dunbar	
Frank	Finlay	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy-chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Ann	Hallamore	
	Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Theo	Hermans	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	
Florence	Myles	
Hilary	Owen	



Richard	Parish
Nicholas	Saul
David	Shepherd
Jane	Stuart-Smith
Gregory	Toner
Isabel	Torres
Marilyn	Vihman
Bencie	Woll

In attendance: Bruce Brown, chair of Main Panel D (MPD) attended at various points throughout the day.

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting. There were no apologies for absence.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive item being to approve institutional output sub-profiles for recommendation to the Main Panel.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

## **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1 The sub-panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

## **3. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting five held on 2-3 July 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

## **4. Feedback from MPD**

- 4.1 The chair of MPD fed back the key points from the last meeting of the main panel. MPD recognised that all of its sub-panels had undertaken a robust assessment of impact and environment noting that the sub-profiles for these elements of the assessment were relatively higher than emerging output sub-profiles.

- 4.2 MPD had noted that there had been variable practice on the part of submitting institutions across the main panel with respect to requests for double-weighting for outputs. Some sub-panels had expressed their surprise at the small volume of double-weighting requests received, particularly in the light of the criteria permitting a reserve item and the numbers of outputs that would likely have met the criteria for double-weighting.

## **5. Staff circumstances**

- 5.1 The sub-panel noted a revised paper on individual staff circumstances (paper 02 Individual staff circumstances). This confirmed the outcome of four outstanding audit queries, namely that no missing outputs have been recorded for staff submitted with clearly defined circumstances. It also confirmed the outcome of two outstanding audit queries for staff submitted with complex circumstances, namely that no missing outputs have been recorded.
- 5.2 The sub-panel approved the recommendation that for 406 staff, (with clearly defined circumstances) an appropriate number of outputs have been submitted and no missing outputs were recorded (250 ECR cases are included in this recommendation). It was further noted that following the Equalities and Diversity Advisory Panel meetings it was confirmed that there were no missing outputs for staff submitted with complex circumstances.

## **6. Output assessment**

- 6.1 The sub-panel noted that MPD would consider the outcome of panels' assessment of outputs at its meeting in September and would feedback to sub-panels, via chairs, following this meeting.
- 6.2 Panellists raised any issues that they had encountered with the assessment of outputs. Issues included: overlap between items; items published on institutional repositories within the REF publication period but with a journal publication date outwith the period; and double-weighting. During the discussion of double-weighting, eight panellists left the room on account of conflicts of interest. The sub-panel reached a consensus on the assessment of these items with reference to the assessment criteria.
- 6.3 The sub-panel secretary verbally confirmed progress with scoring to date, noting that 99 per cent of outputs now had panel agreed scores. The chair rehearsed the process for confirming sub-profiles at the meeting, noting that there were 56 output sub-profiles for which scores needed to be confirmed.
- 6.4 The sub-panel held a break out session in order for panellists to confirm agreed scores for the 1% of items where an agreed score had not been entered.

- 6.5 A plenary session was held following the breakout period to consider scores for outputs. The HEI lead introduced the submission and sub-profile for each institution in turn and gave a brief rationale for the scores awarded including outputs awarded an unclassified grade. During the discussion of this item, 32 panellists left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 6.6 The sub-panel recommended all output sub-profiles (subject to three items which had still to be scored) to MPD for approval.
- 6.7 The secretariat projected a series of slides detailing summary data. These included the distribution of output types across quality levels; the overall output sub-profile against the overall output sub-profile in MPD; and the distribution of double-weighted items across quality levels.
- 6.8 The chair confirmed that draft institutional output feedback had been returned for most units of assessment. Panellists were invited to forward any outstanding feedback statements to the panel secretary. These would then be reviewed by the Exec Group to ensure cross-panel consistency.

## **7. Audit**

- 7.1 The panel secretary confirmed that the audit team had conducted two further REF instigated audits: (i) a sample of outputs that were submitted to the REF2014 as pending publication; and (ii) outputs that were shown in CrossRef to have a 2014 publication date. It was noted that all audited outputs had been verified.

## **8. Review of day one**

- 8.1 The chair reviewed the progress that the sub-panel had made with output assessment on day one and confirmed the order of business for day two.

## **Meeting Day 2**

### **9. Sub-panel overview report**

- 9.1 The chair thanked panellists for their contributions to date to the sub-panel overview report.
- 9.2 The sub-panel divided into breakout groups, arranged by subject discipline, to consider items for inclusion in the sub-panel overview report. The lead for each group fed back in plenary the key points of the discussion to further inform the sub-panel overview report.

9.3 The sub-panel further divided into breakout groups to discuss more generic points for inclusion in the overview report. The lead for each group fed back in plenary the key points of the discussion.

9.4 It was agreed that the chair would incorporate the key points arising from the discussion groups into the draft sub-overview report. The final version of the report would be considered at meeting seven.

## **10. A.O.B**

10.1 The chair reported that she had received a letter from the Director (Research, Education and Knowledge Exchange) at the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) requesting that each sub-panel nominate two panel members to attend two feedback sessions to reflect the panel experience of the REF. The panel confirmed the nominations.

## **11. Conclusion to part one**

11.1 The chair thanked members for the work that they had undertaken in respect of output assessment and in particular the output assessors who had now completed their work for the REF. The chair confirmed the business for part two, namely to confirm institutional overall quality profiles for recommendation to the main panel.

**REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 6 (Part 2)**

**15-17 September 2014**

**The Radisson Blu, Edinburgh**

**Minutes**

Michael	Basker	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Robert	Dunbar	
Frank	Finlay	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy-chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Ann	Hallamore	
	Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Meirion Prys	Jones	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	
Florence	Myles	
Richard	Parish	
Nicholas	Saul	
David	Shepherd	

Jane	Stuart-Smith
Gregory	Toner
Isabel	Torres
Marilyn	Vihman

In attendance: Bruce Brown, chair of Main Panel D (MPD) attended at various points throughout the day.

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting. There were no apologies for absence.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive item being to consider institutional quality profiles for recommendation to the main panel.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

## **2. Working methods**

- 2.1 The sub-panel confirmed that it had adhered to the outlined working methods in conducting its assessment of submissions as detailed in the paper *Main and sub-panel working methods* (paper 01).

## **3. Impact assessment**

- 3.1 The chair reported that following the request from MPD (reported at the last meeting of the sub-panel) that recommended sub-profiles be reviewed in the light of contextual data from MPD, the chair and deputy-chair had reviewed case studies assessed as borderline between two quality levels to ensure parity of assessment across the piece. The chair and deputy-chair recommended a small number of amendments to assessment as a result of this exercise. The sub-panel considered the revised scores and recommended to the main panel the resultant revised impact sub-profiles, subject to approval by the impact assessors.

## **4. Environment assessment**

- 4.1 The chair reported that Environment sub-profiles were approved in principle by the main panel at its last meeting. It was noted that MPD recognized that all of its sub-panels had undertaken a robust assessment of environment templates within each sub-panel.

## **5. Confirmation of overall sub-profiles**

- 5.1 The secretariat projected the overall quality profile and output, impact and environment sub-profiles for each institution together with draft feedback statements. Results and feedback for each HEI was considered in turn in plenary. During the discussion 28 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 5.2 The sub-panel signed-off the overall sub-profiles and recommended them to the main panel for approval.
- 5.3 The chair confirmed that near-final drafts of institutional feedback statements incorporating outputs, impact and environment would be returned to institutional sub-profile leads for further revision. Final drafts of institutional feedback statements would then be considered by the sub-panel at meeting seven.

## **6. Next steps**

- 6.1 The chair highlighted the work that was required in advance of meeting seven namely the review of feedback statements and the sub-panel overview report.

## **7. Next meeting**

- 7.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place at CCTV Venues, Smithfield, London, on 10 October to:
  - Complete feedback on submissions
  - Complete sub-panel content for overview reports

**REF Sub-panel 28: Meeting 7**  
**10 October 2014**  
**CCT Venues-Smithfield, London**  
**Minutes**

**Present:**

Michael	Basker	
Kersti	Börjars	Sub-panel chair
Bruce	Brown	Chair, MPD
Lucille	Cairns	
Jenny	Cheshire	
Peter	Davies	
Sioned	Davies	
Robert	Dunbar	
Geri	Echue	Audit and data verification officer (am only)
Frank	Finlay	
Charles	Forsdick	Deputy-chair
Simon	Gaunt	
Andrew	Ginger	
Ann	Hallamore Caesar	
Stephen M.	Hart	
Diana	Holmes	
Jerry	Hunter	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Adam	Ledgeway	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Marjorie	Lorch	
Martin	McLaughlin	
Florence	Myles	
Richard	Parish	
Nicholas	Saul	



David	Shepherd
Jane	Stuart-Smith
Gregory	Toner
Isabel	Torres
Marilyn	Vihman
Janet	Zmroczek

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the final meeting of the sub-panel. Apologies were received from Jerry Hunter.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive item being to review and provide comment on the Main Panel D (MPD) and Sub-panel 28 overview report.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

## **2. Register of interests**

- 2.1 Panellists reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

## **3. Minutes of previous meeting**

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting six held on 15 – 17 September 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

## **4. Audit**

- 4.1 The chair confirmed that there were no outstanding items to report on audit.

## **5. Feedback from MPD**

- 5.1 The chair fed back the key points from the last meeting of the main panel. Sub-panel recommended output sub-profiles were considered by the main panel, with sub-panel chairs invited to briefly present the key assessment issues encountered across the sub-panels. All profiles had been approved including those of Sub-panel 28, subject in a few cases to a small number of final output scores to be agreed.

## **6. Submissions**

- 6.1 The chair updated the sub-panel on progress with drafting of institutional feedback, noting that the Exec Group had reviewed all drafts and general editorial changes had been made in consultation with sub-panel members to ensure consistency of language.
- 6.2 The secretariat projected in alphabetical order the final agreed profiles for all submissions to UOA 28; these included the overall quality profile and output, impact and environment sub-profiles. The chair reminded members of their responsibilities with regards to confidentiality.
- 6.3 The sub-panel considered draft institutional feedback in plenary. During the discussion of this item 28 members of the panel left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 6.4 It was agreed that feedback statements would be revised in light of the sub-panel discussion and near-final drafts should be forwarded to the panel secretary within one week of the meeting. It was further agreed that the Exec Group would make minor editorial changes as a result of feedback from the REF team on content and tone to ensure consistency of style, as far as possible, across MPD. The sub-panel approved the Exec Group to take Chair's action to approve final versions of the feedback statements.

## **7. Overview reports**

- 7.1 The sub-panel received the draft composite MPD and Sub-panel 28 overview reports (paper two). It was noted that a template for the sub-panel overview report had been devised by the main panel to ensure consistency, with common subject material set out in the main panel report and amplified where appropriate in the sub-panel reports. It was noted that the reports would be read by a wide audience including submitting institutions, Research Councils UK and European Research Councils.
- 7.2 The sub-panel considered both overview reports. The secretariat noted recommendations for editorial changes or amendments to ensure that the sub-panel report contained relevant reflections on the discipline and any particular deviation in the data from the main panel averages or quartile data were adequately explained.
- 7.3 During the discussion, the panel adviser projected a number of data slides which had been presented to the main panel. These included quartile charts; MPD overall profiles for submissions to RAE 2008 and REF 2014; MPD overall profiles; MPD profiles for items that had been double-weighted; and MPD profiles for items flagged as interdisciplinary by the submitting HEI.

- 7.4 The sub-panel noted that the final version of sub-panel reports would be subject to editorial changes up until the point at which all of the sub-panels had met and the main panel report was finalised. The sub-panel approved the chair to take action on behalf of the sub-panel to approve the final version of the report.

## **8. Publication of results**

- 8.1 The panel adviser projected a number of slides from the REF team which detailed the timeframe for the publication of results; the results website; comparative data to be published; and general advice on speaking to the media.
- 8.2 The chair of MPD reminded the panellists of the confidentiality of the assessment process. It was noted that all assessment material should be destroyed or returned to the REF team by 30 November 2014, including submissions data, information generated by panels and any personal notes.

## **9. A.O.B**

- 9.1 The chair of MPD thanked the chair, deputy chair, panel members and the secretariat for the work they had undertaken in respect of the REF exercise.