

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 2

29 January 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Grand Connaught Rooms, London

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
David Bradshaw
Kate Chedgzoy
Thomas Corns
Hilary Fraser
Abdulrazak Gurnah
Robert Hampson
Martin Halliwell
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Lesley Jeffries
Vivien Jones
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
Philip Martin
John McGavin
Fiona Robertson
Jeremy Smith
David Trotter
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

Apologies:

Sharon Monteith

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel members introduced themselves to the group and the sub-panel chair outlined the day's agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Sub-panel members agreed to update their details on the PMW with any further major conflicts of interest after the meeting and to inform the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of any minor conflicts that emerge from their allocation.

3. Summary of submissions to SP29

- 3.1 The panel reviewed the summary of submission data.

4. Output allocation

- 4.1 The chair outlined the principles behind the allocation of outputs to panellists. Outputs were allocated by the chair (and deputy-chair where there was a conflict) to panellists taking into consideration conflicts of interest, relevant expertise and, as far as possible, to ensure an even workload.
- 4.2 The chair outlined the process for cross-referral and requests for specialist advice. In addition to HEI requests for cross-referral, panellists agreed to notify the chair of further requests for cross-referral or reallocation within the sub-panel where outputs were beyond their expertise. Since the deadline for cross-referral requests is 30 April 2014, panellists were requested to review their allocations and raise cross-referral with the panel chair or deputy as soon as possible.

Action: Sub-panel 29 members and output assessors

- 4.3 The chair confirmed arrangements for ordering physical outputs from the REF warehouse and passing between panellists. Panellists were reminded that printing and physical outputs may take up to one week to arrive after the order is placed. The chair reminded panellists to plan their ordering of physical outputs in batches in line with their reading order so ensure scoring targets are met.

5. Working with REF spreadsheets

- 5.1 The panel secretary gave a short presentation on using personal spreadsheets.

6. Outputs calibration

- 6.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair and deputy had selected and circulated a sample of eight outputs to the SP29 members and output assessors to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise with a further six outputs to be used in a joint calibration exercise between sub-panels 28 and 29. A member of sub-panel 28 attended part of the meeting in order to jointly calibrate creative writing outputs. All outputs in the calibration process were selected to represent a spread of output types, a variety of institutions and to offer a range of potential issues for discussion.
- 6.2. The chair outlined the aims of this calibration exercise, highlighting the intention to develop a common understanding of the star levels and to agree a robust and fair process.
- 6.3. The chair reported on the calibration exercise by MPD, which had met on 27 January 2014, and covered the following issues:
 - The main issues involved in deciding on outputs that were on the borderline between star levels
 - Feedback on the outputs that had been in the main panel calibration sample
 - Proposals on how the sub-panels should continue to calibrate their assessments beyond this initial exercise.
- 6.4. Panel members had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The secretary displayed these and the panel considered how far members had reached a consensus on each output. The panel discussed the particular outputs where scores diverged or members considered the output was borderline between star levels. Other issues raised and discussed by the sub-panel included: individual contribution in multi-authored outputs, eligibility criteria, overlap with previous publications or between outputs, the nature of originality in creative outputs and accounting for the particular publication culture for poetry outputs.

Through this discussion the panel reached a consensus on the score for each output and highlighted the reasons for those scores, with reference to the level descriptors.

- 6.5. Panellists discussed the range of expertise in creative outputs available within sub-panel 29. Panel secretary recorded panellists' expertise in drama, poetry and fiction for the chair to use when re-allocating outputs within the sub-panel and for cross-referrals and requests for advice from sub-panel 28.

Action: Panel secretary

- 6.6 The meeting agreed that in some cases formal cross-referral may not be needed between sub-panels if a quick piece of advice was being sought. However it was agreed, in order to recognise increased workloads, that items should be formally

cross-referred in all cases where substantial amounts of reading would be required.

- 6.7 The chair outlined the process for assessing outputs where there is a request for double-weighting and stressed that the decision on double-weighting is entirely separate from judgement on quality. The chair reminded the panel that double-weighting can only be credited to individual outputs where requested by the HEI, and in most cases a reserve output had been submitted in the event that a double-weighting request was refused. Panellists were informed that decisions on double-weighting should be based on both the HEI request and the substantial nature of the output itself. The chair directed the panellists to Panel Criteria and Working Methods, Part 2D, paragraphs 63-70 for guidance.

It was decided not to review double-weighted outputs at this meeting due to time constraints and the availability of physical outputs. The chair and deputy will circulate a selection of double-weighted outputs by webmail for panellists to look at outside of this meeting.

Action: Chair / deputy-chair

- 6.8 Members did not hold any conflicts of interest with the outputs discussed.

7. Working methods

- 7.1 The chair outlined an update to the Working Methods paper and announced that the full updated version was now available on the panel members' website.
- 7.2 The chair announced that allocation of impact case studies and templates and environment templates was underway and that soon afterwards a plan for providing feedback to HEIs would be made. Case studies and templates for impact and environment will be allocated to groups of three assessors, comprising two sub-panel members and one impact assessor and panellists will be notified by REF webmail. There will be a calibration process for impact at the next meeting in March where environment will also be discussed. Panellists should have read one third of their allocation by the meeting on 12 & 13 March 2014.
- 7.3 The meeting discussed multi-authored outputs. The chair directed panellists to make a judgement on whether an individual contributed to the output and once satisfied, to score the output on its quality and not the level of contribution of the individual. For multi-authored outputs with double-weighting requests, the panellist should be satisfied that the contribution of the individual researcher is indeed sufficiently significant to affect their ability to submit four outputs. Panellists are requested to refer to Panel Criteria and Working Methods, paragraph 67 for detailed clarification.

8. Audit

- 8.1 The panel adviser outlined the Main Panel D paper on Audit and encouraged panellists to raise audit queries as soon as possible. The panel adviser informed the meeting that the EDAP team and panel secretariat were currently involved in auditing staff circumstances although the panel were encouraged to raise audit queries on staff if they had particular concerns.
- 8.2 One panel member raised a query regarding making judgements on outputs with incomplete or illegible PDFs. The panel adviser suggested that this should be raised as an audit query so that the relevant HEI would be requested to submit a complete version.
- 8.3 Panellists were reminded that the audit process should not be used to gain new information. Requests for audit should be made where a panellist has doubts to the accuracy of information or eligibility of an item or individual. In cases where an output is likely to be 'Unclassified' without further information an audit query can be raised to request this information from the HEI.
- 8.4 The panel adviser informed the meeting that a detailed paper on audit of impact cases studies with checklists would be available very soon. As there would be limited time available for the impact assessment phase, panellists were reminded that a quick review of threshold judgements should be made on impact case studies first so that major concerns can be prioritised for audit.

It was reported that the REF team anticipate auditing 5 – 10% of impact case studies. Whilst the bulk of these are expected to be generated by sub-panels, a further random audit will be carried out by the REF team until 5 – 10% of case studies have been checked.

9. Project plan

- 9.1 The chair outlined the project plan and highlighted key deadlines and milestones.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. 12-13 March 2014 – two venues:

Date: 12 March 2014
Time: 10.00 am – 4.30 pm
Venue: CCT Venues Smithfield, London
Agenda: Impact calibration, assessment issues and audit queries
Attending: Sub-panel members & impact assessors

Date: 13 March 2014
Time: 10.00 am – 4.30 pm
Venue: CCT Venues Barbican, London
Agenda: Impact calibration, environment calibration and outputs to date
Attending: Sub-panel members (all day) impact assessors (am only) & output assessors (pm only)

11. Any other business

- 11.1. The chair announced two newly appointed impact assessors who will shortly join the sub-panel.
- 11.2. There being no further business the meeting closed.

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 3 (Part 1)

12 March 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

CCT Venues Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Abigail Appleton
Emma Bennett
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
Ali Bowden
Martin Halliwell
Robert Hampson
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Vivien Jones
Alice King-Farlow
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
Robyn Marsack
Philip Martin
Clare Matterson
John McGavin
Susie Nicklin
Christine Riding
Fiona Robertson
Jeremy Smith
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel members and impact assessors introduced themselves to the group and the sub-panel chair outlined the day's agenda.

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed with one amendment.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct. Sub-panel members agreed to update their details on the PMW with any further major conflicts of interest after the meeting and to inform the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of any minor conflicts that emerge from their allocation.

4. Impact assessment and calibration

- 4.1. Prior to the meeting the sub-panel chair and deputy had selected and circulated to SP29 members a sample of four impact templates and 12 impact case studies from UoA29 and other units of assessment in Main Panel D Cluster 1. These impact items were used for the sub-panel's calibration exercise. All items in the calibration process were selected to represent a spread of impact types, a variety of institutions and to offer a range of potential issues for discussion, avoiding conflicts of interest as far as possible.
- 4.2. The chair outlined the aims of this calibration exercise, highlighting the intention to develop a common understanding of the star levels and to agree a robust and fair process. The chair directed panellists to the definition of impact for the purposes of the REF2014 assessment. Panellists were requested to revisit the impact sections of *REF02.2011 Guidance on Submissions* to ensure a clear understanding of the requirements.

Action: Sub-panel members and impact assessors

- 4.3. The chair outlined the timescales for impact assessment and informed the panellists of the importance of regularly uploading scores and comments to the PMW. Panellists were requested to ensure uploads of impact scores would be up-to-date by the mid-point of the impact assessment phase on Friday 11 April. The chair informed the sub-panel that all impact scores and comments should be uploaded by Wednesday 14 May to allow reports to be produced in time for the meeting on 21 -22 May where draft impact sub-profiles will be agreed.

Action: Sub-panel members and impact assessors

- 4.4. Panellists were requested to inform the sub-panel executive group of any impact items where scores cannot be agreed so that a moderating assessor can be allocated. Particularly problematic items should also be raised with the sub-panel executive group so that they can be scheduled for discussion at the May meeting.

Action: Sub-panel members and impact assessors

- 4.5. Panel members had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The secretary displayed these and the panel considered how far members had reached a consensus on each item. The panel discussed the particular items with issues around eligibility and those where scores diverged. Through this discussion the panel reached a consensus on the score for each item.
- 4.6. The sub-panel highlighted difficulties for assessing trios to discuss impact items and agree scores without meeting up, particularly given the volume of statements and case studies and the amount of time allocated to the process. The panel adviser informed the sub-panel that they would be reimbursed for telephone calls with the appropriate documentation and that Skype and webmail could also be used. The chair suggested that the panel adviser contact the REF Manager to request reimbursement of travel costs so that each trio would be able to meet once during the process to discuss and agree scores for their allocations.

Action: Panel adviser

- 4.7. The chair informed the meeting that all impact statements and case studies had been allocated to groups of three reviewers comprising two academic members and one user member. The chair outlined the roles and responsibilities of user members and sub-panel members, in particular the role of the academic assessors to make the judgement on whether underpinning research is predominantly of 2* quality (user members will not be expected to do this).
- 4.8. Each trio will nominate a 'lead assessor' who will be responsible for gathering feedback to accompany each institution's impact sub-profile. The chair informed the sub-panel that feedback should not address individual case studies but should report in more general terms. The format for impact feedback has not yet been announced by the REF team and more information is expected to be available in the coming weeks.
- 4.9. The meeting discussed the use of 'half marks' for impact to reflect cases where elements of two star ratings were identified but neither predominated, ie a case study with some elements of 2* and some of 3* should be scored at 2.5*.
- 4.10. The panel adviser reiterated details of the threshold criteria for impact case studies and outlined the process for raising audit queries on all impact items. It is anticipated that 5 – 10% of impact items will be audited which equates to 14 – 28 cases for sub-panel 29. The panel adviser informed the sub-panel that the deadline for raising impact audit queries would be Monday 14 April to allow sufficient time for HEIs to respond and for items to be discussed and scores agreed by the sub-panel before draft sub-profiles are agreed in May.
- 4.11. Any case studies failing threshold judgements will be graded 'unclassified'. All unclassified items will be discussed at the next sub-panel meeting in May.

- 4.12. The meeting discussed impact in relation to public engagement and dissemination of research. The chair reminded the sub-panel that case studies need to identify a change or benefit brought about by public engagement, as public engagement itself is not impact.
- 4.13. The sub-panel observed the wide range of responses by HEIs to 'indicative word counts' with some strictly adhering to the limits whilst others were more flexible in their approach. The sub-panel felt this might be addressed in future REF exercise.
- 4.14. Two panellists left the room during discussion of impact items because of potential conflicts of interest.

5. Future meetings

- 5.1 Date: 21-23 May 2014
 Time: 10.00 am – 4.30 pm
 Venue: Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon, CV37 7NZ
 Agenda: Agree draft impact sub-profiles, discuss 33% of outputs scored to date, discuss progress on environment assessment.
 Attending: Sub-panel members (days 1 - 3) impact assessors (days 1 & 2 only) & output assessors (day 3 only)

6. Any other business

- 6.1. There being no further business Meeting 3 (Part 1) closed.

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 3 (Part 2)

13 March 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

CCT Venues Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
David Bradshaw
Kate Chedgzoy
Thomas Corns
Hilary Fraser
Abdulrazak Gurnah
Martin Halliwell
Robert Hampson
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Lesley Jeffries
Vivien Jones
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
Philip Martin
John McGavin
Sharon Monteith
Fiona Robertson
Jeremy Smith
David Trotter
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel members and output assessors introduced themselves to the group and the sub-panel chair outlined the day's agenda.

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

2. Environment calibration

- 2.1. The panel adviser introduced a paper on approaches to assessing environment and guided panellists to look for vitality and sustainability as indicators of excellence in environment templates. Panellists were reminded to read the environment template in conjunction with the statistical data on staff, students and income. All environment templates will be assessed by at least two panellists.
- 2.2. The chair outlined the timescales for environment assessment. Draft environment sub-profiles will be agreed by the sub-panel on at Meeting 4 on 30 June 2014 and panellists should aim to upload their agreed scores to the PMW at least one week before this date. Panellists were requested to ensure uploads of environment scores are up-to-date by the mid-point of the environment assessment phase on Thursday 15 May. The chair informed the sub-panel that all audit queries relating to environment templates should be raised by 1 June 2014.

Action: Sub-panel members

- 2.3. The chair outlined the aims of environment calibration exercise, highlighting the intention to develop a common understanding of the star levels and to agree a robust and fair process. The chair directed panellists to the definition of environment for the purposes of the REF2014 assessment. Panellists were requested to revisit the environment sections of *REF02.2011 Guidance on Submissions* to ensure a clear understanding of the requirements.

Action: Sub-panel members

- 2.4. Panel members had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The secretary displayed these and the panel considered how far members had reached a consensus on each item. The panel discussed the selected environment templates and reached a consensus on the score for each item.

3. Introduction and register of interests

- 3.1 The chair welcomed output assessors who had joined the meeting for this section and reminded all panellists to notify the sub-panel executive group should any further major or minor conflicts of interest emerge from their allocated outputs.

4. Output assessment

- 4.1. The chair reported on problems with the IT systems which had recently been fixed. Any panellists still experiencing problems recording or uploading scores and comments should contact the panel secretary or the REF admin team. The chair requested that panellists upload their scores regularly so that the sub-panel executive group are able to monitor progress.

- 4.2. Panellists were reminded to check their REF Webmail accounts regularly. All panellists should receive notification of incoming Webmail in a daily message to their institutional email. The chair suggested that all panellists should turn off the 'sort by conversation' feature of the Webmail app as there was a risk that unread emails could become 'lost' in long email conversation threads.
- 4.3. The meeting discussed the assessment of outputs with requests for double-weighting. The chair reminded panellists that decision on whether or not to accept these requests should be based on assessment of the output, using the 100 word request as a guide. Should panellists have any doubt about accepting double-weighting requests, they should discuss the case with their assessing partner and inform the sub-panel executive group. The sub-panel discussed issues raised by double-weighting requests on multi-authored works. The chair suggested that if the nature of the individual's double-weighted contribution is not made clear in the 100 word double-weighting request then an audit query should be raised to ascertain from the HEI the individual's actual contribution to the work.
- 4.4. The chair reported back from the recent meeting of Main Panel D where collections (including poetry and curatorial practice) combining pre-census material with material from the current period were discussed. It had been agreed that where the material as a whole could demonstrate a clear and coherent research argument that would be damaged by the removal of pre-2008 material, and a good proportion of the material had been published during the current assessment period, it would not be necessary to discount the pre-2008 material.
- 4.5. The chair reported on Main Panel D decision on the approach to assessing outputs where there was a significant overlap. In this case it was agreed that strongest or most substantial output should be scored first and the weaker output assessed on only material that is different from the first scored. This approach aims to make decisions most favourable to institutions and not simply to assess in chronological order.
- 4.6. The meeting discussed the criteria for verifying that outputs were in the public domain. The chair informed the sub-panel that publication on an open access institutional repository does constitute 'in the public domain'. Where panellists are unsure if an output has been published they should raise an audit query through the sub-panel executive group.
- 4.7. The meeting discussed the cross-referrals process for outputs. The chair informed the sub-panel that cross-referral requests can seek a particular piece of advice and do not necessarily need to request a suggested score.
- 4.8. The meeting discussed the assessment of non-standard outputs, including software and databases, as HEIs had taken very different approaches in the presentation of these items. The sub-panel agreed that in some cases cross-referral of this type of item would be necessary.

5. Audit

- 5.1. The adviser informed the meeting of the process of raising audit queries on outputs and confirmed that the sub-panel secretariat were carrying out the audit of staff with clearly defined circumstances.

6. Project plan and key milestones

- 6.1. The chair informed the meeting that by the next meeting of the 33% of outputs should have scores **agreed by the sub-panel**. In order to make provide up-to-date reports for the next meeting panellists were requested to upload all scores to date by **Monday 12 May**.

Action: Sub-panel members and output assessors

7. Future meetings

- 7.1 Date: 21-23 May 2014
 Time: 10.00 am – 4.30 pm
 Venue: Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon, CV37 7NZ
 Agenda: Agree draft impact sub-profiles, discuss 33% of outputs scored to date, discuss progress on environment assessment.
 Attending: Sub-panel members (days 1 - 3) impact assessors (days 1 & 2 only) & output assessors (day 3 only)

8. Any other business

- 8.1. There being no further business Meeting 3 (Part 2) closed.



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

21 & 22 May 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Abigail Appleton
Emma Bennett
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
Ali Bowden
Peter Florence
Martin Halliwell
Robert Hampson
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Vivien Jones
Alice King-Farlow
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
Robyn Marsack
Philip Martin
John McGavin
Susie Nicklin
Christine Riding
Fiona Robertson
Jeremy Smith
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

Apologies:

Clare Matterson

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the sub-panel members and impact assessors and outlined the two day agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting with the correction of two typographic errors.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The secretary thanked the panel for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest. Sub-panel members agreed to update their details on the PMW with any further major conflicts of interest after the meeting and to inform the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of any minor conflicts that emerge from their allocation.

4. Feedback process

- 4.1. The panel adviser outlined the REF team's paper on overview reports and outlined the process for gathering feedback on impact.
- 4.2. The chair emphasised the importance of preparing feedback throughout the process to ensure accurate and consistent reporting. The sub-panel were advised to use the language of the criteria descriptors in the REF guidance publications.
- 4.3. The sub-panel were advised that a 'lead assessor' would be nominated for each institution who would be responsible for providing feedback on impact. Lead assessors would be required to submit a few sentences of draft feedback on impact by Friday 5 June to the panel secretary.

Action: Impact lead assessors

5. Impact assessment

- 5.1. The panel secretary informed the sub-panel of progress on assessing and agreeing scores by panellists. All impact items had been assessed by at least two academic panel members and one user member with agreed scores uploaded for all 89 impact templates and 96% of impact case studies. The sub-panel had generated 50 audit queries on impact which represented approximately 13.5% of impact items submitted to sub-panel 29. Almost all of audit queries had been completed before the meeting. It was agreed that where audit queries had

not been completed, provisional scores would be agreed by the sub-panel in the meeting, with the final score to be entered as a chair's action.

- 5.2. The secretary outlined the protocols for agreeing scores for impact items and confirming draft impact sub-profiles. This included methods for ensuring relevant panellists were absented from the meeting room during discussion of institutions for which they had conflicts of interest.
- 5.3. The chair thanked all panellists for their hard work in delivering the impact assessment on time.
- 5.4. The sub-panel discussed a selection of contentious impact templates and case studies, including items which had been scored as 'unclassified', where panellists had been unable to agree a score and where responses to audit queries had not been resolved.
- 5.5. The sub-panel broke out into smaller groups to re-visit further borderline and contentious cases. The sub-panel reconvened and held plenary discussions on these cases and arrived at panel agreed scores.
- 5.6. The panel secretary projected scores for all impact items from each institution. These were briefly discussed and panel agreed scores and draft impact sub-profiles were confirmed by the sub-panel for 87 HEIs and recommended to Main Panel D. Provisional scores and sub-profiles were agreed for the remaining 2 HEIs pending the outcome of audit queries. The chair will confirm these sub-profiles following discussion with the allocated assessing trios.

Action: Chair

- 5.7. 24 panellists left the meeting room during discussions of impact items from institutions with which they had a conflict of interest.
- 5.8. The impact user assessors provided feedback on the process, and confirmed their confidence in its being robust and fair.
- 5.9. The main panel chair who observed the meeting confirmed that the process had been robust and fair.

6. Future meetings

Date: 30 June 2014
Time: 10:00 – 17:00
Venue: The Palace Hotel, Oxford Street Manchester, M60 7HA
Agenda: Produce draft environment sub-profiles
Attending: Sub-panel members only

Date: 1 July 2014
Time: 09:00 – 16:30
Venue: The Palace Hotel, Oxford Street Manchester, M60 7HA
Agenda: Discuss 50% outputs scored to date
Attending: Sub-panel members & output assessors

7. Any other business

- 7.1. The chair thanked the impact assessors for their valuable input during the impact assessment phase.
- 7.2. There being no further business the meeting closed.

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 4 (Part 2)

23 May 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Ettington Chase, Stratford-upon-Avon

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
David Bradshaw
Kate Chedgzoy
Thomas Corns
Hilary Fraser
Abdulrazak Gurnah
Martin Halliwell
Robert Hampson
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Lesley Jeffries
Vivien Jones
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
Philip Martin
John McGavin
Sharon Monteith
Fiona Robertson
David Trotter
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the output assessors to the meeting and outlined the day's agenda.

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The secretary thanked the sub-panel for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest. Sub-panel members agreed to update their details on the PMW with any further major conflicts of interest after the meeting and to inform the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of any minor conflicts that emerge from their allocation.

4. Output assessment

- 4.1. The chair introduced the REF team's paper on overview reports and outlined the process for gathering feedback on outputs.
- 4.2. The sub-panel agreed to produce feedback on outputs to institutions on an on-going basis once all outputs in each institution had been assessed. A lead assessor (to be agreed between the assessing pairs) will provide feedback for institutions to the panel secretary on a MS Word document.

Action: sub-panel members & output assessors

- 4.3. The chair emphasised the importance of preparing feedback throughout the process to ensure accurate and consistent reporting. Feedback should include references to particular areas of strength and the language of the REF criteria should be used as far as possible.
- 4.4. The chair reminded panellists that by the next meeting 50% of outputs should have agreed scores. These should be uploaded by Monday 23 June to allow time for the production of reports for the meeting.

Action: sub-panel members & output assessors

- 4.5. The panel discussed the demanding schedule and agreed that it would be helpful to ensure larger monographs and scholarly editions were prioritised at this stage. The sub-panel were reminded that agreed scores for all outputs should be uploaded by Friday 29 August to allow time for reports to be produced for the penultimate sub-panel meeting in September.

Action: sub-panel members & output assessors

- 4.6. The sub-panel discussed outputs with requests for double-weighting. Panellists were reminded to type “Y” in the DW column for all cases where requests were accepted so that reserve outputs would be removed from their reading lists.

Action: sub-panel members & output assessors

- 4.7. The chair thanked panellists for their hard work in giving advice to other sub-panels through cross-referral and requested that where possible responses should continue to be returned within four weeks of the request. Panellists were reminded that cross-referred outputs are accessible via reading lists by clicking ‘cross-referred’. Ideally advice on cross-referred outputs should be sent to the appropriate panellist via Webmail using the original cross-referral email to ensure the correct parties are informed. The chair reminded panellists that the language of the criteria should be used when providing advice.
- 4.8. The sub-panel broke out into smaller groups to allow time for panellists to meet face-to-face to discuss and agree scores for outputs.
- 4.9. The sub-panel were shown an anonymised table of panellists’ scoring profiles and anonymised table of HEI draft output quality sub-profiles (for HEIs with over 80% of outputs scored). The meeting discussed the importance of rigour and robustness in the assessment process.

5. Project plan and key milestones

- 5.1 The chair outlined the project plan and highlighted forthcoming deadlines.

6. Environment

- 6.1. The meeting discussed feedback from Main Panel D paper on the environment calibration exercise across the main panel.
- 6.2. The panel adviser gave a short presentation on using environment data analyses to support the assessment of environment templates.
- 6.3. Panellists were asked to raise any audit queries by 10 June to allow sufficient time for HEIs to respond and for the item to be assessed. There is no quota for audit queries on environment templates and it is not expected that a large amount of queries will be generated.
- 6.4. Panellists were asked to upload their latest scores on 30 May so that SP29 progress can feed into the Main Panel D report. Scoring of all environment templates should be complete and uploaded by 23 June in advance of the next meeting.

7. Future meetings

7.1. Date: 30 June 2014
 Time: 10:00 – 17:00
 Venue: The Palace Hotel, Oxford Street Manchester, M60 7HA
 Agenda: Produce draft environment sub-profiles
 Attending: Sub-panel members only

 Date: 1 July 2014
 Time: 09:00 – 16:30
 Venue: The Palace Hotel, Oxford Street Manchester, M60 7HA
 Agenda: Discuss 50% outputs scored to date
 Attending: Sub-panel members & output assessors

8. Any other business

8.1. There being no further business the meeting closed.



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 5 (Part 1)

30 June & 1 July 2014

Day 1. 10.00 – 17.00; Day 2. 9.00 – 11.00

The Palace Hotel, Manchester

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
Martin Halliwell
Robert Hampson
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
John McGavin
Fiona Robertson
Jeremy Smith
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

Apologies:

Vivien Jones
Philip Martin

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the sub-panel members and impact assessors and outlined the two day agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The chair thanked the panel for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest. Sub-panel members agreed to update their details on the PMW with any further major conflicts of interest after the meeting and to inform the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of any minor conflicts that emerge from their allocation.

4. Impact assessment

- 4.1. The chair gave a short report on the recent meeting of Main Panel D where the impact assessment across all sub-panels under Main Panel D was reviewed. The Chair of Main Panel D was confident that the process had operated thoroughly and fairly.

Following a review of the sub-profiles generated by each sub-panel the main panel considered that it would be useful for sub-panels to revisit scores to ensure that the appropriate balance of scoring was reflected in the sub-profile. To this end the chair and deputy chair had reviewed all impact items and had made a small number of adjustments. The sub-panel approved this action.

Panellists were requested to generate a new spreadsheet following the meeting to see if any of their allocated items had been re-scored. In these cases panellists were requested to use the new impact sub-profiles when producing feedback to institutions.

- 4.2. The meeting discussed feedback to institutions on impact and were reminded that their feedback should explain the institutions impact sub-profile and use the language of the REF criteria. Panellists were asked to submit their revised feedback to institutions on impact to the secretary by 15 July 2014.

5. Environment assessment

- 5.1. The chair thanked all panellists for their hard work in delivering the environment assessment on time and outlined the process for discussing, amending and agreeing environment scores.
- 5.2. The chair directed the sub-panel to the REF team document on feedback to institutions for advice on drawing up feedback on environment. Panellists were requested to submit their draft feedback reports by Tuesday 15 July.

- 5.3. The sub-panel broke into small groups to discuss and agree environment scores concentrating on borderline scores and contentious issues.
- 5.4. The sub-panel reconvened to confirm and endorse environment scores and sub-profiles for each institution in turn. The panel secretary projected scores for all environment items from each institution. These were briefly discussed and panel agreed scores and draft environment sub-profiles were confirmed by the sub-panel for 87 HEIs and recommended to Main Panel D.

All 16 panellists left the meeting room during discussions of environment submissions from institutions with which they had a conflict of interest.

6. Future meetings

Date: 15 & 16 September 2014
Time: Day 1: 10:00 – 17:00, Day 2: 9:30 – 17:00
Venue: Radisson Blu Edinburgh, 80 High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1TH
Agenda: Produce draft output sub-profiles & produce overall quality profiles
Attending: Sub-panel members and output assessors

Date: 17 September 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: Radisson Blu Edinburgh, 80 High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1TH
Agenda: Begin feedback and overview reports
Attending: Sub-panel members only

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There being no further business the meeting closed.



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 5 (Part 2)

1 July 2014, 11.00 – 16.30

The Palace Hotel, Manchester

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
David Bradshaw
Kate Chedgzoy
Thomas Corns
Kirsten Drotner (international adviser)
Hilary Fraser
Abdulrazak Gurnah
Martin Halliwell
Robert Hampson
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Lesley Jeffries
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
John McGavin
Sharon Monteith
Fiona Robertson
Jeremy Smith
David Trotter
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

Apologies

Vivien Jones
Philip Martin

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the output assessors to the meeting and outlined the day's agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The secretary thanked the sub-panel for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest. Output assessors agreed to update their details on the PMW with any further major conflicts of interest after the meeting and to inform the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of any minor conflicts that emerge from their allocation.

4. Staff circumstances

- 4.1. The panel adviser outlined the paper on the review of individual staff circumstances. 749 cases of clearly-defined circumstances had been submitted by institutions were reviewed by the panel secretariat. All of these were judged to have met the criteria and therefore the secretariat recommended that no unclassified outputs would be recorded. The sub-panel approved this recommendation.
- 4.2. The panel adviser reported on the recommendation of the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) who had identified one missing output following their review of complex staff circumstances. This recommendation will be made to the chair of Main Panel D for approval.

5. Output assessment

- 5.1. The chair congratulated and thanked the sub-panel for their hard work in exceeding the target of recording panel scores for 50% of outputs .
- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed issues around double-weighting. The sub-panel felt that there had been some misinterpretation of the rules around double-weighting which had resulted in lower scores as a result. The chair agreed to raise this issue in the overview report at the end of the process.

Action: Chair

- 5.3. The meeting discussed issues around multi-authored outputs. It was agreed that where the extent of an author's research contribution was not evident in the output or clearly explained by an institution then an audit query should be raised to ascertain this information. As long as a satisfactory contribution is identified then neither the amount of contribution or number of authors should affect the score.
- 5.4. The sub-panel broke out into smaller groups to allow time for panellists to meet face-to-face to discuss and agree scores for outputs.
- 5.5. The panel secretary met briefly with each assessor to confirm scores where discrepancies had been identified on the sub-panel spreadsheet.
- 5.6. The chair thanked the panellists for addressing the outputs cross-referred into sub-panel 29 and reminded panellists that responses should be returned within 4 weeks of the request. In some cases cross-referrals from sub-panel 29 had not yet been received and panellists were reminded to follow up these requests where necessary. Panellists were requested to contact the panel secretary with details of any particularly late cross-referrals so that they could be followed up with the executive group of the relevant panel.
- 5.7. The sub-panel discussed the approach to output assessment and agreed that double-reading was essential to the process. The international member confirmed that the output assessment had been a fair and robust process.

6. Project plan and key milestones

- 6.1. The chair outlined the project plan and highlighted the forthcoming deadline of **Friday 29 August 2014** when 100% of outputs should have agreed scores. Panellists were reminded to agree and upload scores regularly.

Action: sub-panel members and output assessors

7. Future meetings

Date: 15 & 16 September 2014
Time: Day 1: 10:00 – 17:00, Day 2: 9:30 – 17:00
Venue: Radisson Blu Edinburgh, 80 High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1TH
Agenda: Produce draft output sub-profiles & produce overall quality profiles
Attending: Sub-panel members and output assessors

Date: 17 September 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: Radisson Blu Edinburgh, 80 High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1TH
Agenda: Begin feedback and overview reports
Attending: Sub-panel members only

8. Any other business

8.1. There being no further business the meeting closed.



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 6 (Part 1)

15 – 16 September 2014

Day 1. 10.00 – 17.00; Day 2. 9.00 – 13.00

Radisson Blu, Edinburgh

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
David Bradshaw
Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)
Kate Chedgzoy
Thomas Corns
Hilary Fraser
Abdulrazak Gurnah
Martin Halliwell
Robert Hampson
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Lesley Jeffries
Vivien Jones
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
Philip Martin
John McGavin
Sharon Monteith
Fiona Robertson
Jeremy Smith
David Trotter
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the sub-panel members and output assessors to the meeting and outlined the day's agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The chair reminded panellists to update their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest should their circumstances have changed. Sub-panel members agreed to inform the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of any minor conflicts that emerge.

4. Output assessment

- 4.1. The chair thanked all the panellists for their dedication and hard work in delivering agreed scores for 100% of eligible outputs on time. The sub-panel broke out into small groups to discuss final output scores and feedback to institutions. Panellists were invited to confirm that they were satisfied that all scores were correct and to inform the panel secretary of any necessary amendments.
- 4.2. Following recalibration discussions within the break-out groups a small number of adjustments were made to output scores. The panel secretary generated the final output quality sub-profile report.
- 4.3. The panel adviser gave a short presentation on the analysis of output types submitted to UoA29.
- 4.4. The meeting discussed the preparation of feedback on outputs to institutions which is due for completion and sign-off at the next meeting in October. The chair reminded the sub-panel to use the language of the REF working methods and assessment criteria documents in all feedback. The sub-panel were also reminded that feedback should provide an explanation of the quality sub-profile and should not be used to give advice to institutions on how their profile might have been improved.
- 4.5. The panel secretary projected the output quality sub-profiles for all 84 institutions for the panel to confirm and endorse. The sub-panel discussed the quality of outputs from each institution and the lead assessor agreed to provide comments for the feedback report by 29 September.

Action: Lead assessors

28 panellists absented themselves from the meeting room during discussion of output sub-profiles for institutions where they had declared a conflict of interest.

- 4.6. The sub-panel endorsed the output quality sub-profiles for all 84 submitting institutions and recommended them to the Main Panel D.

5. Subject overview report

- 5.1. The sub-panel discussed the draft subject overview report and suggested a number of amendments to the text. The chair agreed to make these amendments before the report is signed off at the next meeting.

Action: Chair

- 5.2. The sub-panel agreed that it would be helpful to include a comment on the uneven use of double-weighting requests across the UoA29 in the subject overview report rather than try to address each issue on a case-by-case basis in the feedback to institutions.

6. Future meeting

Date: 17 October 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: CCT Venues-Smithfield, London, EC1A 9PT
Agenda: Complete feedback on submissions
Attending: Sub-panel members only

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There being no further business the meeting closed.

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 6 (Part 2)

16 – 17 September 2014

Day 1. 14.00 – 17.00; Day 2. 10.00 – 16.30

Radisson Blu, Edinburgh

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)
Martin Halliwell
Robert Hampson
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Vivien Jones
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
Philip Martin
John McGavin
Fiona Robertson
Jeremy Smith
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the sub-panel members and outlined the agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting as an accurate record.

3. Working methods

- 3.1. The panel adviser circulated the paper on Main Panel D working methods which had been agreed and adopted at meeting 2. The sub-panel confirmed that they had followed the working methods as set out at the beginning of the process.

4. Overall quality sub-profiles & feedback to institutions

- 4.1. The chair thanked all the panellists for their dedication and hard work in delivering agreed scores for all elements of the assessment outputs on time.

The panel secretary projected overall quality profiles and sub-profiles for outputs, impact and environment for each institution. The sub-panel endorsed the overall quality profiles and recommended them to Main Panel D.

20 panellists absented themselves from the meeting room during discussion of output sub-profiles for institutions where they had declared a conflict of interest.

- 4.2. The sub-panel broke into small groups to work on feedback to institutions and reconvened to add contributions to the feedback report.

5. Future meeting

Date: 17 October 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: CCT Venues-Smithfield, London, EC1A 9PT
Agenda: Complete feedback on submissions
Attending: Sub-panel members only

6. Any other business

- 6.1. The sub-panel discussed issues around the assessment phase which should form part of the feedback report to the REF team.
- 6.2. The chair informed the sub-panel that the REF team required two members from each sub-panel to form a user group and invited interested parties to express an interest directly after the meeting. User members would also be invited.

Action: Sub-panel members

- 6.3. There being no further business the meeting closed.

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 29: Meeting 7

17 October 2014

10.00 – 16.30

CCT Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Jane Aaron
Linda Anderson
Dinah Birch (Sub-panel chair)
Elleke Boehmer
Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)
Martin Halliwell
Robert Hampson
Ann Heilmann
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Susan Hunston
Vivien Jones
Edward Larrissy
Clare Lees
Willy Maley
Philip Martin
John McGavin
Fiona Robertson
Jeremy Smith
Greg Walker (deputy chair)
Patricia Waugh
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the sub-panel members to the meeting and outlined the day's agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The chair reminded panellists of the importance of updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest even at this late stage. Sub-panel members agreed to inform the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of any further conflicts of interest.

4. Minor adjustment

- 4.1. The chair informed the sub-panel of a single data adjustment made by the EDAP team following a bulk audit of staff data. One individual, having been identified as appearing within two submissions with an FTE greater than one, was removed from one submission following arbitration by the REF team between the two submitting institutions.

5. Publication of results

- 5.1. The adviser gave a short presentation on the timetable for the announcement of the outcomes of the assessment. The sub-panel were reminded about the continued importance of confidentiality and discussed the level of detail that could be divulged about the assessment process following announcement of results.
- 5.2. The sub-panel noted that since the output assessors and impact assessors were no longer involved at this stage of the process, it would be helpful if information about confidentiality could be communicated to these groups after the meeting.

Action: Sub-panel chair

6. Feedback to institutions

- 6.1. The sub-panel reviewed a sample of the feedback that had been edited by the SP29 executive group and approved the inclusion of any further amendments as required at the chair's discretion.

7. Overview report

- 7.1. The sub-panel reviewed and discussed the draft Main Panel overview report.
- 7.2. The sub-panel reviewed the draft overview report for Sub-panel 29 and the panel secretary recorded their amendments.

8. Concluding remarks

- 8.1. The sub-panel chair thanked the sub-panel, deputy-chair, adviser and secretary for all their hard work during the assessment process.
- 8.2. The sub-panel gave a vote of thanks to the sub-panel chair.
- 8.3. The Chair of Main Panel D expressed his thanks, and those of the REF team, to all members of Sub-panel 29 for their hard work and dedication in delivering the assessment.
- 8.4. Quality profiles and sub-profiles for all submissions to UoA29 were displayed for all panellists to view.
- 8.5. There being no further business the meeting closed.