



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 30: Meeting 2

5 February 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Clare Anderson
Ken Arnold
Paul Betts
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Catherine Cubitt
Anne Curry (Deputy chair)
Margot Finn
Laura Gowing
Susan-Mary Grant
Matthew Hilton
Ann Hughes
Mark Jackson
Keith Jeffery
Colin Kidd
Claire Langhamer
Jon Lawrence
Peter Mandler
Sharon Monteith
Jonathan Morris
Paul Nugent
Andrew Pettegree
Robert Ritchie (International adviser)
Catherine Schenk
David Souden
Penny Summerfield
Julian Swann
Jim Tomlinson
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Peter Waldron
Chris Wickham (Chair)
Christopher Williams
John Young

Apologies:

None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the assessment phase of the REF, and all panellists introduced themselves.
- 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 and, where necessary, individuals agreed to update their conflicts of interest after the meeting.

3. Summary of submissions to Unit of Assessment 30

- 3.1. The panel noted the summarised details of the submissions made to the unit of assessment. The chair noted that the panel had received more requests for double-weighting than any other unit of assessment. The majority of the staff for whom clearly defined circumstances had been submitted were early career researchers.

4. Output calibration

- 4.1. The chair explained the rationale for the selection of outputs for calibration, and was gratified to note the degree of consistency of assessment at this early stage which boded well for the coherence of the process.
- 4.2. The panel discussed each of the calibration outputs. They recognised the need to take a balanced view across the assessment criteria and to continue to refer back to criteria. They confirmed that there was a clear expectation that a 4* score is achievable for any type of research output and not reserved for monographs. It was recognised that restrictions are placed on some outputs by the nature of their publication type – eg journal articles with limited wordcounts, and that this needed to be borne in mind when assessing. Equally, it was acknowledged that the location of a publication must have no bearing on its assessment.
- 4.3. The panel reviewed a number of items to determine whether claims for double-weighting should be accepted. Panellists were reminded that decisions must not be based solely on the basis of the HEI request, but that a judgement should be made by reviewing the output and applying the double-weighting criteria. The

panel agreed that if the submitted output was considered to be the equivalent of two single outputs then the double-weighting request was justified and should be accepted.

- 4.4. It was noted that output calibration would continue throughout the assessment process, and panel members would have the opportunity to raise any specific issues at future meetings.

5. Presentation on REF IT systems

- 5.1. The panel stated that they did not feel the presentation would be helpful at this stage. The secretary offered one-to-one assistance to panel members where necessary.

6. Output allocation

- 6.1. The chair stated that it was the intention to assess as much as possible of the submitted material within the sub-panel, and to avoid cross-referring except where necessary. Panel members received paper 6, Cross Referral and Specialist Advice, and noted the arrangements for receiving cross referral advice and their responsibility for recording a score for all outputs submitted to the unit of assessment. To date the number of requests for cross-referral into the sub-panel was very small, but it was anticipated that this might well change.
- 6.2. Allocations of outputs had been based on subject specialisms and all panellists had been arranged into small assessment groups. The chair encouraged panellists to discuss any uncertainties over scores with colleagues in their assessment groupings.
- 6.3. Panel members received paper 5, Conflicts of Interest and were asked to notify the chair or deputy chair of any concerns and these would be considered on a case-by case basis. The chair offered some clarification on what constituted a minor conflict of interest.
- 6.4. The panel received paper 7, Procedural guidance for panels on physical outputs. Some panel members asked for the facility for physical outputs to be collected by courier from institutional addresses to be extended to home addresses, given the large quantities of books concerned. The secretary undertook to make a special case for this sub-panel to the REF Team.

7. Working methods

- 7.1. It was explained that the working methods paper (Paper 8) was intended as a guide for panel members and also to demonstrate the transparency of the process, the consistent approach across the Main Panel, and to reassure the academic community of the integrity of the process.

- 7.2. Panel members were informed that in order to report back to HEIs on the separate elements of the assessment – outputs, impact and environment – the workload would be divided between all panel members in such a way that no single member would have the responsibility for leading across all elements of a single submission. Panel members would be given an early indication of these responsibilities.

8. Audit

- 8.1. The panel received and noted paper 9, Audit.

9. Workplan for panel members

- 9.1. The panel received paper 10, Workplan for panel members and noted the milestone targets for the assessment of outputs.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting (Meeting 3, 19-20 March, Birmingham).



REF Sub-panel 30: Meeting 3, Part 1

19 March 2014

Radisson Blu, Birmingham

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Clare Anderson
Ken Arnold
Martin Bellamy
Paul Betts
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Jean-Claude Bragard
Catherine Cubitt
Anne Curry (Deputy chair)
Martin Davidson
Justin Davis Smith
Margot Finn
Laura Gowing
Susan-Mary Grant
Matthew Hilton
Ann Hughes
Mark Jackson
Colin Kidd
Tim Lomas
Peter Mandler
Sharon Monteith
Jonathan Morris
Paul Nugent
Hilary O'Shea
Andrew Pettegree
Graeme Rosenberg (REF Manager)
Patrick Salmon
Catherine Schenk
David Souden
Rebecca Sullivan
Penny Summerfield
Julian Swann
Jim Tomlinson

Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Peter Wakelin
Peter Waldron
Chris Wickham (Chair)
Christopher Williams
John Young

Apologies:

None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting, particularly the impact assessors joining the sub-panel for the first time, and all panellists introduced themselves. The chair reported that the main business of this meeting was to calibrate impact case studies and templates and that this followed a similar exercise by the Main Panel earlier in the month.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2014.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Impact calibration

- 4.1. The chair explained that the purpose of this exercise was for panel members to reach a common position on the case studies and templates and to talk through convergences and divergences. The panel noted paper 2 which set out the volume of impact case studies and templates submitted to the panel, and outlined the procedure for assessment.
- 4.2. The panel received paper 3 'Guidance to sub-panels on points arising from the impact calibration exercise conducted by Main Panel D' which summarised the views of Main Panel members.
- 4.3. The panel adviser gave a presentation on assessing impact, focussing on threshold criteria, and responded to questions from panel members. On underpinning research panel members were reminded of the need for a clear

relationship between research considered to be of at least 2* quality and the claimed impact.

- 4.4. It was noted that that in some cases more than one HEI may have submitted case studies presenting the same impact. Panel members were urged to read and assess each individually. Panel members were encouraged to use the full range of scores, including .5 scores where appropriate. Panellists were reminded that claims for potential or future impact was not eligible, and must be assessed on the basis of the material presented. Cases should not be penalised where the impact has been unplanned or serendipitous – this is entirely within the rules.
- 4.5. The chair introduced the discussion of a sample of impact case studies and templates for calibration, which all panellists had reviewed in advance of the meeting (papers 4 and 5). The sample included both case studies and templates from across the cluster (including UOA31 Classics and UOA32 Philosophy) which had also been reviewed by the Main Panel. In addition, a range of case studies for UOA30 had been added, to include submitting units of different size and nature, and different types of impact, so as to provide a wide-ranging discussion of the issues which panellists may encounter when assessing the impact items.
- 4.6. The panel discussed each of the case studies in detail and came to an agreed panel score for each one. They noted that these would not be the final scores, but that while the assessors assigned to these cases may be informed by the discussions, they would need to arrive at independent judgements when reviewing their allocated cases. Panel members who were conflicted with specific case studies left the room while these were discussed.
- 4.7. The panel was reminded of the need to assess the impact items holistically and to refer back to the published criteria for reach and significance. The secretary was asked to send panellists an updated workplan showing forthcoming deadlines for impact assessment.

5. Audit

- 5.1. Panellists received a paper on the audit of impact case studies and templates and were asked to identify case studies requiring audit. Audit cases should only be raised where panellists had reason to doubt the claims being made, and where the outcome would make a material difference to the judgement.
- 5.2. The arrangements for raising audit queries and discussing and agreeing scores for impact case studies and templates were discussed. It was noted that wherever possible scores for impact case studies and templates would be agreed by the teams assessing them so that sub-profiles could be confirmed at the next meeting in May.

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting: Meeting 4, Radcliffe House, University of Warwick, Coventry. Days 1 and 2 (13-14 May) – Produce draft impact sub-profiles; Day 3 (15 May) – Discuss scores for 33% of outputs.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There was no other business.



REF Sub-panel 30: Meeting 3, Part 2

20 March 2014

Radisson Blu, Birmingham

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Clare Anderson
Paul Betts
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Catherine Cubitt
Anne Curry (Deputy chair)
Margot Finn
Laura Gowing
Susan-Mary Grant
Matthew Hilton
Ann Hughes
Mark Jackson
Keith Jeffery
Colin Kidd
Claire Langhamer
Jon Lawrence
Peter Mandler
Sharon Monteith
Jonathan Morris
Paul Nugent
Andrew Pettegree
Catherine Schenk
David Souden
Penny Summerfield
Julian Swann
Jim Tomlinson
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Peter Waldron
Chris Wickham (Chair)
Christopher Williams
John Young

Apologies:

None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the output assessors to this second day of the meeting.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. Those who had not attended Day 1 of this meeting reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.

3. Output assessment

- 3.1. The panel received paper 7, Guidance to sub-panels on points arising from the outputs calibration exercise conducted by Main Panel D and its sub-panels.
- 3.2. Panellists reviewed a report of upload activity to date and noted the target date for assessing 33% of outputs.
- 3.3. The panel discussed a number of issues raised by members as a result of their assessments to date. The arrangements for confirming decisions on double-weighting were clarified. Wherever panellists were unable, in their pairs, to accept a double-weighting claim this would be reported formally to the panel. The chair reminded panellists of the importance of consulting with colleagues particularly when recommending that an output be unclassified.
- 3.4. The chair reported that the majority of cross-referrals for assessment, both into and out of the Unit of Assessment (UOA) had now been identified, though it was likely that others may still come forward. He noted that, to date, the volume of cross-referrals out of the UOA exceeded those coming in. The chair confirmed that while panellists should aim to meet the target deadline of one month for assessing cross-referred items, he acknowledged that issues with accessing outputs from the REF warehouse may make this not possible.
- 3.5. On the issue of overlap between outputs submitted by the same individual, the main panel agreed that sub-panels should use their professional judgement to ensure that the outputs in question were assessed in such a way as to enable the greatest credit to be awarded to an institution. Nonetheless, there may be instances where the extent of the overlap was so great that one of the outputs may be graded as 'U'.

4. Calibration of Environment templates

- 4.1. The panel received paper 8: Environment Calibration: approaches to assessing environment, which set out a number of guidance points for panellists to consider when assessing environment templates. Panellists were reminded that the templates should be assessed against the criteria of vitality and sustainability.
- 4.2. The panel adviser explained how the standard data for each submission had been provided, noting that it was intended to inform the sub-panels' assessment of environment and should be considered in the context of the narrative provided in the environment template (REF5), rather than as stand-alone information.
- 4.3. The chair introduced the discussion of a sample of environment templates for calibration, which had been reviewed by panellists in advance of the meeting (Paper 9). The sample included templates from across the cluster (including UOA31 Classics and UOA32 Philosophy).

5. Future meetings

- 5.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting: Meeting 4, Radcliffe House, University of Warwick, Coventry. Days 1 and 2 (13-14 May) – Produce draft impact sub-profiles; Day 3 (15 May) – Discuss scores for 33% of outputs.

6. Any other business

- 6.1. There was no other business.



REF Sub-panel 30: Meeting 4, Part 1

13-14 May 2014

Radcliffe House, Warwick

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Ken Arnold
Martin Bellamy
Paul Betts
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Jean-Claude Bragard
Catherine Cubitt
Anne Curry (Deputy chair)
Martin Davidson
Justin Davis Smith
Margot Finn
Laura Gowing
Susan-Mary Grant
Matthew Hilton
Ann Hughes
Mark Jackson
Colin Kidd
Tim Lomas
Peter Mandler
Jonathan Morris
Paul Nugent
Hilary O'Shea
Andrew Pettegree
Patrick Salmon
Catherine Schenk
David Souden
Rebecca Sullivan
Penny Summerfield
Julian Swann
Jim Tomlinson
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Peter Wakelin
Peter Waldron

Chris Wickham (Chair)
Christopher Williams
John Young

Apologies:

None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting. The chair explained that the main business of this meeting was to reach agreement on the scores for the impact case studies and templates, and provisionally to confirm impact sub-profiles.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (Meeting 3, Part 1)

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2014.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Overview reports and feedback statements

- 4.1. The panel received paper 2, Overview reports and feedback statements: Guidance for panels, and noted that the Main Panel would publish an overview report in early 2015, with contributions from each of the sub-panels. In addition, sub-panels would produce concise feedback statements for each submission, to be provided to the heads of institutions in confidence in January 2015, and the statements would include text for each of the three sub-profiles.
- 4.2. Panel members were provided with fictional examples of feedback statements for reference. They were encouraged to ensure that feedback should be useful to the submitting institutions. Where pertinent an explanation for the award of an unclassified score might be included.

5. Impact assessment

- 5.1. The Impact Assessors gave a short report on the extent and achievement of impact presented in the submissions within each of their sectors.

- 5.2. The panel received paper 3 from the Main Panel, Impact calibration: collated feedback from sub-panels on the calibration of impact case studies and impact templates. This provided clarification on a number of issues including the interpretation of predominance in terms of the quality of 2* research, the location of underpinning research, and the linkage between research and impact.
- 5.3. The panel discussed the arrangements for confirming impact sub-profiles. To ensure parity of comparison, submissions would be considered in batches, banded by size. All case studies provisionally scored below 2* were reviewed by the panel, with conflicted members leaving the room as appropriate.
- 5.4. An impact lead for each submission presented the scores and comments for each institution and individual elements were discussed in detail where required. All conflicted panel members absented themselves from the meeting room when necessary. The impact sub-profile for each of the 83 submissions was confirmed individually.

6. Impact assessors

- 6.1. The chair expressed his and the panel's thanks to the impact assessors for the time and wisdom they had given to the exercise, and the rigour they had brought to the process. The panel reflected on the process as a whole and discussed general issues for inclusion in the feedback to the sector at the end of the exercise.

7. Audit

- 7.1. In addition to audit queries raised by panellists before the meeting, all of which had been resolved, one further audit query was raised on an impact case study. This would be taken forward by the secretary and the allocated panellists would be advised of the outcome and given the opportunity to revise their provisional score. Any consequent amendments would be brought back to the panel for confirmation.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting: Meeting 5, at The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN. Days 1 and 2 (2-3 July) – Produce draft environment sub-profiles; Day 3 (4 July) – Discuss scores for 50% of outputs.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. There was no other business.



REF Sub-panel 30: Meeting 4, Part 2

15 May 2014

Radcliffe House, Warwick

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Clare Anderson
Paul Betts
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Catherine Cubitt
Anne Curry (Deputy chair)
Margot Finn
Laura Gowing
Susan-Mary Grant
Matthew Hilton
Ann Hughes
Mark Jackson
Keith Jeffery
Colin Kidd
Claire Langhamer
Jon Lawrence
Peter Mandler
Sharon Monteith
Jonathan Morris
Paul Nugent
Andrew Pettegree
David Souden
Penny Summerfield
Julian Swann
Jim Tomlinson
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Peter Waldron
Chris Wickham (Chair)
Christopher Williams
John Young

Apologies:

Ken Arnold
Catherine Schenk

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the output assessors to the second part of the meeting. The chair outlined the principal business of the day – to review and discuss scores for 33% of outputs; and to prepare further for the assessment of the environment templates.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (Meeting 3, Part 2)

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 19-20 March 2014.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. Those who had not attended Days 1 and 2 of this meeting reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.

4. Environment

- 4.1. The panel received paper 6 from the Main Panel, Environment calibration: collated feedback from sub-panels on the calibration of environment templates. Panellists were provided with guidance on the use of the standard data, and reminded that this should inform (but not lead) the judgements being made and should be considered in context.
- 4.2. Following the calibration of a number of environment templates at the sub-panel's meeting in March, a further full-panel review of four additional templates was undertaken, with clarification on a number of points and wide-ranging discussion.
- 4.3. The arrangements for environment assessment and a deadline for provisionally agreed scores to be uploaded to the Panel Members' Website were confirmed.

5. Output assessment

- 5.1. The panel noted paper 5, Overview reports and feedback statements. This paper had been reviewed and discussed as paper 2 on Day 1 in the context of feedback

to HE Institutions on impact, and was now considered with respect to institutional feedback on environment and outputs.

- 5.2. The panel discussed particular issues identified by members from their output assessment to date, and reviewed the incidence of double-weighting across submissions, and individual cases where the claim for double-weighting was not considered justified.

6. Audit

- 6.1. There were no specific audit issues to discuss. Audit queries on outputs from panel members had been reported back on an individual basis.

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting: Meeting 5, at The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN. Days 1 and 2 (2-3 July) – Produce draft environment sub-profiles; Day 3 (4 July) – Discuss scores for 50% of outputs.

8. Any other business

- 8.1. There was no other business. The meeting closed at 3.30pm.



REF Sub-panel 30: Meeting 5, Part 1

2-3 July 2014

The Studio, Manchester

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Paul Betts
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Bruce Brown (MP Chair)
Catherine Cubitt
Margot Finn
Laura Gowing
Susan-Mary Grant
Matthew Hilton
Ann Hughes
Mark Jackson
Colin Kidd
Peter Mandler
Jonathan Morris
Paul Nugent
Andrew Pettegree
Catherine Schenk
David Souden
Duncan Shermer (REF team)
Penny Summerfield
Julian Swann
Jim Tomlinson
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Peter Waldron
Chris Wickham (Chair)
Christopher Williams
John Young

Apologies:

Ken Arnold
Anne Curry (Deputy Chair)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting. The main business of this meeting was to reach agreement on the scores for the environment templates, and provisionally to confirm environment sub-profiles. The panel noted apologies from the Deputy chair and the chair reported that he had asked Margot Finn to act as deputy in Anne Curry's absence. The panel supported this arrangement. The chair noted apologies from Peter Mandler for Day 1 but reported that he would attend on Days 2 and 3.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (Meeting 4, Part 1)

2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 13-14 May 2014.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Assessment of environment templates

4.1. All panel members had assessed an allocation of environment templates, together with the associated data for each submission, ahead of the meeting and agreed, in teams of three, the scores for each of the five elements of each template. Many panellists had additionally read others of the statements and the chair had read all, and was broadly in agreement with the scores recorded.

4.2. An environment lead for each submission presented the scores and comments for each HE Institution and individual elements were discussed where required. All conflicted panel members absented themselves from the meeting room when necessary. As with impact assessment, and to ensure parity of comparison, submissions were considered in batches, banded by size. The environment sub-profile for each of the 83 submissions was confirmed individually.

4.3. The panel discussed and confirmed the arrangements for drafting feedback on environment at panel level and to individual institutions.

5. Audit

5.1. No audit queries had been raised on the environment templates.

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. The panel noted the date for the next meeting: Meeting 6, at The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN. The chair confirmed to panellists by email (22 July) that the meeting would be a two-day rather than a three-day meeting, 9-10 September, and that output assessors would attend the full meeting. The focus of the meeting would be to produce draft outputs sub-profiles, produce overall quality profiles and continue feedback and overview reports.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There was no other business.



REF Sub-panel 30: Meeting 5, Part 2

4 July 2014

The Studio, Manchester

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Clare Anderson
Paul Betts
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Bruce Brown (MP Chair)
Catherine Cubitt
Margot Finn
Laura Gowing
Susan-Mary Grant
Matthew Hilton
Ann Hughes
Mark Jackson
Keith Jeffery
Colin Kidd
Claire Langhamer
Jon Lawrence
Peter Mandler
Jonathan Morris
Paul Nugent
Andrew Pettegree
Catherine Schenk
David Souden
Penny Summerfield
Julian Swann
Jim Tomlinson
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Peter Waldron
Chris Wickham (Chair)
John Young

Apologies:

Ken Arnold
Anne Curry (Deputy Chair)
Sharon Monteith
Christopher Williams

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the output assessors to the second part of the meeting. The key items of business for the day were to reflect on the assessment of the environment templates, to sign-off the impact sub-profiles following discussion at Main Panel, and to consider any issues pertaining to output assessment. He further proposed the consideration of an article published in Research Fortnight (11 June) on open access.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (Meeting 4, Part 2)

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 15 May 2014.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. Those who had not attended Days 1 and 2 of this meeting reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and confirmed they were correct.

4. Environment

- 4.1. The panel reflected on the assessment of the environment submissions, and reviewed overall profiles across the UOA, and within the banded groups. Three particular concerns for the sub-panel (and hence for the discipline) were equality and diversity, policies on research leave, and the provision of teaching relief for Early Career Researchers.
- 4.2. On equality and diversity, the panel noted that the focus of HEIs tended to be on gender rather than other protected groups, and considered that it might have been helpful for HEIs to have been required to provide more standard information.

5. Impact

- 5.1. The chair reported a discussion at Main Panel of the impact sub-profiles for the units of assessment in Main Panel D, noting in particular the comments of the

Main Panel user members, and their confirmation of the integrity of the process of assessment.

- 5.2. There was a wide-ranging discussion and panel members confirmed their view that the sub-profiles for the UOA reflected the materials submitted.

6. Output assessment

- 6.1. The panel received Paper 2, Individual staff circumstances, which explained the process undertaken by the panel secretariat to confirm reductions in the number of outputs for assessment for staff submitted with clearly defined and complex circumstances. Panel members supported the recommendations at paragraphs 9-12.
- 6.2. The chair outlined the timetable for the remainder of the assessment process and confirmed the deadline for scoring all outputs, noting that more than 65% had been scored to date. He undertook to follow up with advising panellists on cross-referred items.
- 6.3. The chair proposed arrangements for ongoing calibration between pairs of panellists, with moderation by the chair/deputy.
- 6.4. The panel discussed and agreed the arrangements for drafting feedback on outputs at panel level and to individual institutions.

7. Audit

- 7.1. The secretary reported that a number of audits had been requested by panel members on outputs. These concerned the eligibility of outputs (timing of publication, and incomplete outputs). Outcomes of audits had been reported back to the relevant panel member. A number of audit queries remained outstanding, and the secretary would send details to the relevant panellists on receipt from the Audit team.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. The panel noted the date for the next meeting: Meeting 6, at The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN. The chair confirmed to panellists by email (22 July) that the meeting would be a two-day rather than a three-day meeting, 9-10 September, and that output assessors would attend the full meeting. The focus of the meeting would be to produce draft outputs sub-profiles, produce overall quality profiles and continue feedback and overview reports.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The chair invited Peter Mandler, in his capacity as president of the Royal Historical Society, to present his recently published article 'Six things humanities scholars need to do about open access' (Research Fortnight, 11 June 2014). The panel discussed the article and proposed a formal response to the HEFCE open access policy on open access for the next REF, for sign off by the panel at a meeting in the autumn.
- 9.2. The meeting closed at 13.00.



REF Sub-panel 30: Meeting 6

9-10 September 2014

The Studio, Manchester

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Clare Anderson
Paul Betts
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Bruce Brown (MP Chair)
Catherine Cubitt
Anne Curry (Deputy Chair)
Margot Finn
Laura Gowing
Susan-Mary Grant
Matthew Hilton
Ann Hughes
Mark Jackson
Keith Jeffery
Claire Langhamer
Jon Lawrence
Peter Mandler
Sharon Monteith
Jonathan Morris
Paul Nugent
Andrew Pettegree
Alice Prochaska (International)
Catherine Schenk
David Souden
Penny Summerfield
Julian Swann
Jim Tomlinson
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Peter Waldron
Chris Wickham (Chair)
Christopher Williams
John Young

Apologies:

Ken Arnold

Colin Kidd

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting. The main business of this meeting was to discuss the outputs sub-profiles and confirm the sub-profiles and associated feedback for each element of the assessment, and the overall profiles for each of the submitting HEIs.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (Meeting 5, Parts 1 and 2)

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on 2-4 July 2014.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Assessment

- 4.1. The chair explained the process for confirming outputs sub-profiles and recommended the approach to be taken on the content of feedback statements.
- 4.2. An outputs lead for each submission presented the scores and comments for each HE Institution. All conflicted panel members absented themselves from the meeting room when necessary. The outputs sub-profile for each of the 83 submissions was confirmed individually. Feedback on each of the three elements for each submission was reviewed, and edited by panel members during the meeting or referred back to the lead for amendment.
- 4.3. The panel confirmed the overall profiles for each submission for recommendation to the Main Panel.
- 4.4. The panel confirmed that it had complied with the Main Panel D working methods, Paper 2 (re-issue of the paper discussed by the panel at its meeting in February) which would be published at the end of the exercise.

5. Staff circumstances

- 5.1. The secretary reported the final outcomes of the review of all requests for reductions in the number of outputs to be assessed both for staff with complex circumstances and those with clearly defined circumstances. Across the whole unit of assessment (UOA), there were three cases where an output was deemed to be 'missing' and graded unclassified.

6. Consideration of summary data

- 6.1. The panel adviser provided summary data on the incidence of double weighting requests and their outcomes in the UOA and noted that the Main Panel would undertake an analysis across all of its ten sub-panels. The panel further reviewed comparative data across institutions of different size.

7. Sub-panel response to HEFCE policy on open access and research assessment

- 7.1. Panellists received a draft paper (Paper 3) outlining the panel's proposed response to the HEFCE policy on open access and research assessment. The panel noted and discussed the detail in the paper, and it was agreed that the text would be developed further for confirmation and forwarding to the Main Panel.

8. Sub-panel overview report

- 8.1. The chair introduced his tabled draft sub-panel overview report. The panel commented on the present version of the report suggesting additional material which might helpfully inform the report and its audience. The chair undertook to edit the report and circulate the revised version to panellists ahead of the next meeting.

9. Future meetings

- 9.1. The panel noted the date for the next meeting: Meeting 7, at CCT Venues-Barbican, Aldersgate House, 135-137 Aldersgate Street, EC1A 4JA on Thursday 9 October. The business of the meeting would be to complete feedback on submissions and to complete sub-panel content for overview reports.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. The secretary advised panellists on the arrangements for the return of REF USB pens at the end of the assessment process.

The meeting closed at 15.40.



REF Sub-panel 30: Meeting 7

9 October 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Clare Anderson
Paul Betts
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Bruce Brown (MP Chair)
Catherine Cubitt
Anne Curry (Deputy Chair)
Margot Finn
Laura Gowing
Susan-Mary Grant
Matthew Hilton
Ann Hughes
Mark Jackson
Colin Kidd
Peter Mandler
Jonathan Morris
Paul Nugent
Catherine Schenk
David Souden
Penny Summerfield
Julian Swann
Jim Tomlinson
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Peter Waldron
Chris Wickham (Chair)
Christopher Williams
John Young

Apologies:

Ken Arnold
Keith Jeffery
Claire Langhamer
Jon Lawrence

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists to this, the final meeting of the sub-panel for the assessment phase. He thanked all panel members for their diligence and noted how much he had enjoyed working with every member of the panel. He stressed the need to keep all details of the assessment confidential until published in December.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (Meeting 6)

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on 9-10 September 2014.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Sub-panel overview report

- 4.1. The panel adviser presented summary data for the Unit of Assessment, demonstrating the relative scoring for each of the three elements of assessment for comparable groups of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). She further provided data on the volume and scoring of outputs submitted by type of output, and on the use of the opportunity for HEIs to request double-weighting for outputs.
- 4.2. The panel reviewed the chair's draft sub-panel overview report and had a detailed discussion on the health of the discipline and trends noted in the course of the assessment. The chair stated that he would collate the comments into a draft section for the report and circulate to panellists. Suggestions and recommendations were made on the present draft of the sub-panel report and the chair undertook to make minor revisions to the report to take account of the panellists' comments.

5. Main Panel overview report

- 5.1. The Main Panel chair spoke to his draft overview report. Panellists discussed aspects of the report and made comments and suggestions on the content. These were noted by the Main Panel chair, who thanked the panel for their

conscientiousness during the entire REF exercise and expressed particular thanks to the sub-panel chair for his extremely wise and measured chairing.

6. Review of criteria setting and assessment process

- 6.1. The panel noted that two members had been nominated by the chair to provide the REF team with comments and recommendations on the REF process as a whole. The panel had a wide-ranging discussion, reflecting on its work over the previous four years, including on the timing of the process, selection of staff for submission, weighting of the elements of assessment, and data available to panellists. The panel's representatives agreed to report the views at the forthcoming feedback sessions.

7. Presentation on the conclusion of the REF assessment phase

- 7.1. The panel adviser gave a short presentation on the timetable and format for publishing the results of the REF exercise with a reminder to panellists of their obligations in terms of confidentiality, and details of the administrative arrangements for the conclusion of the assessment phase.

8. Review of profiles for each submitted HEI

- 8.1. The profiles and sub-profiles for all submissions to the Unit of Assessment were displayed for all panellists to view.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. There was no other business. The meeting closed at 16.05.