

REF Sub-panel 31: Meeting 2

5 February 2014, 10am

Grand Connaught Rooms, London

Minutes

Present:

Roderick	Beaton	
Barbara E.	Borg	
George	Boys-Stones	
Leslie	Brubaker	
Catharine	Edwards	
Robert	Fowler	
Lin	Foxhall	
Bruce	Gibson	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
David	Langslow	Deputy-chair
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Robin	Osborne	Sub-panel chair
Robert	Parker	
Jonathan G. F.	Powell	
Robert	Ritchie	International Adviser Items 1-6 only
Maria	Wyke	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel and introduced new members and the International adviser. Apologies were received from Mark Humphries and Hilary O'Shea. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Register of interests

- 2.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.
- 2.2 Members were invited to review their output allocations and to notify the chair or deputy-chair of any minor conflicts of interest, copying in the panel secretary.

3. Summary of submissions

- 3.1 The panel received a paper providing summary data on the volume of submissions to SP31 compared to the return for RAE2008. This showed a small decrease in the number of outputs returned; a small reduction in the number of submissions; and fewer FTE staff members returned.

4. Main Panel and Sub-panel working methods

- 4.1 The panel received and noted a paper on main panel and sub-panel working methods and ongoing calibration (paper 03). This outlined the decisions taken by Main Panel D (MPD) in respect of roles of the chair and sub-profile leads and readers. It also outlined the process for the calibration of outputs, impact and environment by MPD.
- 4.2 Working methods were discussed and agreed in relation to confirming panel scores for outputs; for monitoring and recording minor conflicts of interest and for the use of comments fields by sub-profile leads.

5. Output allocation

- 5.1 The chair confirmed that the initial allocation of outputs was complete. The panel received a paper detailing the panel's approach to the allocation of outputs, which was based on specialism and expertise (paper 04). The panel noted papers providing procedural guidance on minor conflicts of interest (paper 05), cross-referral of outputs (paper 06) and obtaining physical outputs from the REF warehouse (paper7).

6. Output calibration

- 6.1 Two panel members left the room on account of major conflicts of interest during the discussion of this item.
- 6.2 Prior to the meeting, the chair had selected and circulated a sample of six outputs to members which were considered as a calibration exercise. The chair outlined the aims of this exercise highlighting that the outputs had been selected to establish the principles for the assessment of items that reflected a range of output types and disciplinary area, drawing on the research interests and expertise of panel members. The chair had also selected six outputs for the consideration of requests from HEIs for outputs to be double-weighted.
- 6.3 The panel gave particular consideration to items that were potentially on the threshold of the REF definition of research; outputs that were on the boundaries of the panel's expertise; co-authored items; edited/co-edited volumes; and outputs which overlapped with other outputs or with outputs submitted to RAE2008.

- 6.4 Panel members had submitted comments prior to the meeting referencing the guidance provided by MPD on quality levels (paper 08). The panel discussed the particular outputs and reached a consensus on the principles for reaching an assessment for each, with reference to the published quality level descriptors. In the case of double-weighted outputs, the panel reached a consensus on the principles for accepting cases submitted by institutions, with reference to the REF criteria for double weighted outputs. The chair would feedback the results of the calibration exercise and the principles agreed by the panel to MPD.

7. Environment

- 7.1 The panel received a paper detailing the panel's approach to the allocation of environment templates (paper 10). Templates had been allocated to a lead and second reader, drawn from academic panellists and taking account of declarations of interest.

8. Environment calibration

- 8.1 Prior to the meeting, the chair had selected two environment templates for all panellists to read, review and assess. The templates were chosen taking account of declarations of interest and to reflect a small and a large submission. The chair outlined the aims of the exercise, noting that the templates had been chosen to establish the principles for the assessment of environment in line with the published REF criteria for assessing environment.
- 8.2 Prior to the meeting, lead assessors had submitted comments and scores against each element of the environment templates chosen for calibration. The panel discussed the five components of the particular templates, and reached a consensus on the principles for reaching an assessment for each, with reference to the published quality level descriptors.

9. IT presentation

- 9.1 Panel members were invited to contact the panel secretary regarding any queries concerning REF IT systems including the use of personal spreadsheets; reading lists; REF webmail and data security.

10. Project plan: key milestones

- 10.1 The chair outlined the meeting schedule for the panel. The panel was asked to note the assessment deadlines and milestones across the exercise. Guidance on the assessment and calibration of impact case studies and templates and further calibration of environment templates would be circulated to members ahead of the next meeting.

11. Audit

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

12. Date of next meeting

- 12.1 The date of the next meeting was confirmed as below:

19 March: Radisson Blu, 12 Holloway Circus Queensway, Birmingham

- 12.2 The meeting would cover impact calibration, assessment and audit queries, environment and discussion of output assessment to date.

REF Sub-panel 31: Meeting 3

19 March 2014

Radisson Blu, Brimingham

10am

Minutes

Present:

Roderick	Beaton	
Barbara E.	Borg	
George	Boys-Stones	
Leslie	Brubaker	
Melvin	Cooley	(for items 1 – 8 only)
Catharine	Edwards	
Robert	Fowler	
Lin	Foxhall	
Bruce	Gibson	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
David	Langslow	Deputy-chair
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Robin	Osborne	Sub-panel chair
Hilary	O'Shea	(for items 1 – 6 only)
Robert	Parker	
Jonathan G. F.	Powell	
Peter	Stothard	(for items 1- 8 only)
Richard	Woff	(for items 1 – 8 only)
Maria	Wyke	

Present:

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel and introduced the impact assessors who were attending for the first time. Apologies for absence were received from Mark Humphries. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting two held on 5 February 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Impact allocation

- 4.1 The deputy-chair rehearsed the principles adopted for the allocation of impact templates and case studies by members notably that all impact case studies within a submission would be read by four assessors including at least one impact assessor; impact assessors would act as sub-profile leads for each submission; the sub-profile lead would read the impact template and at least one impact case study for each submission.

5. Impact assessment and working methods

- 5.1 The panel adviser presented the REF slides on assessing impact following which there was an open discussion of the issues around the assessment of impact. In particular the panel considered in detail the threshold criteria and potential audit queries that might support the panel in its assessment.
- 5.2 The chair updated the panel on the outcome of the discussion on assessing impact that had taken place at the last meeting of Main Panel D (MPD). Members were referred to the guidance paper *Impact calibration: guidance to sub-panels on points arising from the impact calibration exercise* (Paper 06) which summarised the key issues and points from the MPD discussion.
- 5.3 The panel agreed the principles for the assessment of impact with reference to both the REF assessment guidance and the guidance provided by MPD. The panel also confirmed the working methods for panellists to come to a collectively agreed score for each impact case study and template and the working methods by which the sub-panel would approve (at meeting four) the assessment of all case studies and templates underpinning the quality profile.

6. Impact case studies calibration

- 6.1 In advance of the meeting, all panellists involved in the assessment of impact had undertaken a calibration exercise and had returned scores and comments which were considered anonymously at the meeting.

6.2 The chair rehearsed the methodology for the selection of the case studies and templates for the exercise noting that the panel had been asked to calibrate outputs selected for cluster calibration within MPD in addition to those selected for sub-panel calibration. The items selected for sub-panel calibration had taken account of conflicts of interest.

6.3 The chair introduced the discussion of the main panel and sub-panel calibrated items with panellists contributing their views on each item and their rationale for the scores they had given. During the discussion summary data for each case study and template was projected. Through the discussion of each item, the panel reached a consensus on the principles for the assessment of different types of impact with reference to the REF guidance documents.

7. Impact audit

7.1 The sub-panel noted the REF guidance document on the audit of impact case studies (Paper 08: *Audit of impact case studies*). The chair rehearsed the process for prioritising queries to be put forward to the REF team, highlighting that only those queries that would make a material difference to the assessment of a case study or impact template would be put forward. The chair confirmed the process should the number of queries raised fall above or below the 5-10% threshold required.

8. Impact next steps

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

9. Environment allocation

9.1 The chair rehearsed the principles adopted for the allocation of environment templates. Each template would be assessed by two academic members of staff, taking account of conflicts of interest, it being noted however, that all panel members were required to read all the environment templates in detail to contribute to the assessment discussion. Panellists were reminded to notify the chair and panel secretary of any minor conflicts of interest.

10. Environment calibration

10.1 The chair introduced the item on environment calibration. In advance of the meeting, panellists had returned scores and comments which were considered anonymously at the meeting. The chair informed the panel that MPD had not yet undertaken its calibration on environment and would report back to a future

meeting. Panellists were invited to raise any specific issues they had encountered with the assessment of environment.

- 10.2 The chair rehearsed the methodology for the selection of templates for the environment calibration exercise noting that the panel had been asked to calibrate templates selected for cluster calibration within MPD in addition to templates selected for sub-panel calibration. Templates had been selected taking account of conflicts of interest. The chair led the discussion on MPD calibrated items from outside of the sub-panel and sub-profile leads presented the summary of assessments for the sub-panel calibrated items.
- 10.3 During the discussion of the items the panel agreed principles for the assessment of environment with reference to the published quality level descriptors. The panel confirmed the working methods for panellists to come to a collectively agreed score for each environment template and the working methods by which the panel would approve (at meeting five) the assessment of all templates underpinning the quality profile.
- 10.4 During the discussion of this item, one member left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

11. Next steps

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

12. Output assessment

- 12.1 The panel noted the MPD guidance paper on the assessment of outputs. The panel reviewed progress with the scoring of outputs noting that around 7 per cent of outputs had now been scored. The panel discussed and confirmed the working methods for agreeing scores at panel level and for raising issues with assessment encountered by panellists for further consideration by the panel.

13. Audit

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

14. Next steps

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

15. Next meeting

15.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place at Radcliffe House, University of Warwick, Coventry:

14 May (part one): produce impact draft profiles

15 May (part one): confirm scores for 33% environment draft profiles; discuss scores for 33% of outputs.



REF Sub-panel 31: Meeting 4

14 - 15 May 2014

Radcliffe House, University of Warwick, Coventry

10am

Minutes

Present:

Roderick	Beaton	
Barbara E.	Borg	
George	Boys-Stones	
Leslie	Brubaker	
Melvin	Cooley	(for day one only)
Catharine	Edwards	
Robert	Fowler	
Lin	Foxhall	(for day one only)
Bruce	Gibson	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
David	Langslow	Deputy-chair
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Robin	Osborne	Sub-panel chair
Hilary	O'Shea	(for items 1 – 11 only)
Robert	Parker	
Jonathan G. F.	Powell	
Peter	Stothard	(for day one only)
Richard	Woff	(for day one only)
Maria	Wyke	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel including impact assessors, noting that there were no apologies for absence. The chair updated members on changes to panel membership since meeting three, noting that Professors Gillian Clark and Jillian Harries had been appointed as output assessors and would be

invited to attend meeting five to replace a panellist who had resigned from the exercise due to personal reasons.

- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, namely to consider scores for 100 per cent of impact and approve institutional impact sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.

- 1.3. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting three held on 19 March 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Feedback reports

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

5. Impact assessment

- 5.1 The chair fed back to the panel on point of discussion from Main Panel D (MPD) on the assessment of impact. Members were referred to the paper Impact calibration: collated feedback from sub-panels on the calibration of impact case studies and impact templates (paper 03) which summarised the key points that had been considered by MPD.
- 5.2 The panel noted that there were 59 impact case studies and 22 impact templates for which scores needed to be confirmed. The panel secretary projected slides which detailed panel progress with scoring impact to date.
- 5.3 The panel discussed issues that they had encountered with the assessment of impact; these included links between the underpinning research and the impact

claimed, dates for the underpinning research and poorly written case studies. The panel reached a consensus on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria.

6. Audit

- 6.1 The chair updated the panel with respect to the number and progress of audit queries raised on impact case studies, noting that queries had been raised only where it was considered that the outcome would make a material difference to the assessment. All queries raised were to request corroborating evidence. It was noted that there were no outstanding audit queries.

7. Review of impact scores and sub-profiles

- 7.1 The chair confirmed the process for confirming sub-profiles taking account of conflicts of interest. Panellists were requested to send draft feedback on the rationale for assessment to the secretariat within two weeks of the meeting, for use in the drafting of institutional feedback reports.
- 7.2 The sub-profile lead presented the rationale for the scores that had been given for impact case studies for each submission in turn. Panellists reviewed in plenary whether any of the scores required amendment in light of the issues discussed under 5.4. The panel considered the assessments for impact templates in the same manner. During the discussion 15 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 7.3 Following the conclusion of the round-table discussion on assessment of individual case studies and templates, the panel considered in plenary the resultant sub-profiles for each submission in turn. The panel recommended the sub-profiles for all submissions to the main panel for approval. During the discussion of scores and review of sub-profiles, 15 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 7.4 In recommending the sub-profiles to the main panel the user members confirmed that the process of assessment that the panel had followed had been robust and reflective of the published assessment criteria.
- 7.5 Following the confirmation of sub-profiles the panel considered points of feedback to be passed to MPD for consideration as part of the main panel overview report.

8. Conclusion to day one

- 8.1 The chair thanked the impact assessors for the work that they had undertaken in respect of the assessment of impact.

9. Day Two

- 9.1 The chair welcomed members to the meeting, noting that apologies for day two had been received from Lin Foxhall.
- 9.2 The chair outlined the key aims of the meeting namely to review scores for 33 per cent of outputs and to consider scores for environment templates assessed to date.
- 9.3 In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

10. Environment Assessment

- 10.1 The chair fed back on the discussion that had taken place at MPD on the assessment of environment. Members were referred to the paper Environment calibration: collated feedback from sub-panels on the calibration of environment templates (paper 04) which summarised the key points that had been considered by MPD.
- 10.2 The panel noted the REF guidance paper on the use of environment data (paper 04). The panel adviser presented an environment analyses crib sheet (paper 05) which highlighted the key points to take into account when considering the environment data. The secretariat also presented some additional analysis of the environment data which 'banded' data based on the standard analyses to aid the panel when comparing data across submissions.

11. Review of environment scores and sub-profiles

- 11.1 The chair confirmed the process for considering environment sub-profiles for a small number of environment templates which had been selected to take account of conflicts of interest.
- 11.2 The sub-profile lead presented the rationale for the draft scores that had been given for each environment template, and the panel considered these in turn in plenary. The panel reviewed the resultant sub-profiles and recommended these to the main panel for approval. During the discussion of scores and review of sub-profiles, one panel member left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

12. Output assessment

- 12.1 The secretariat projected summary data illustrating progress towards the scoring of outputs to date. This included the overall sub-panel output sub-profile (based on panel agreed scores to date) against the overall MPD output sub-profile; anonymised scoring patterns; numbers of cross referrals in and out of the panel;

the number of panels to which items had been cross referred; and the number of audit queries raised.

- 12.2 Panellists had been invited to raise any issues they had encountered with the assessment of outputs prior to the meeting; these included the assessment of 'unusual' items. These were considered by the panel and agreement reached on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria. The panel confirmed the process for agreeing requests for double weighting. Panellists were invited to review whether any scores required amendment in light of the issues discussed.
- 12.3 As part of the on-going calibration of assessment, panellists were requested to each nominate a selection of outputs to be double-read. The sub-panel would reflect on the outcome of this calibration exercise at the next meeting.
- 12.4 The panel reviewed progress on the scoring of outputs to date and confirmed assessment for 26 per cent of outputs.

13. Audit

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

14. Next steps

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

15. Date of next meeting

- 15.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place 30 June and 1 July at the Radisson Edwardian, Manchester
 - Day one: produce environment sub-profiles
 - Day two: discuss scores for 50% of outputs



REF Sub-panel 31: Meeting 5 (Part 1)

30 June – 01 July 2014

Radisson Edwardian, Manchester

10am

Minutes

Present:

Roderick	Beaton	
Barbara E.	Borg	
George	Boys-Stones	
Leslie	Brubaker	
Catharine	Edwards	
Robert	Fowler	
Lin	Foxhall	
Bruce	Gibson	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
David	Langslow	Deputy-chair
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Robin	Osborne	Sub-panel chair
Robert	Parker	
Jonathan G. F.	Powell	
Maria	Wyke	

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

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel. Apologies for absence were received from Hilary O'Shea.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, namely to consider scores for 100% of environment and approve institutional environment sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.

- 1.3. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting four held on 14 – 15 May 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Impact assessment

- 4.1 The chair of MPD fed back to the panel the key points of discussion from the main panel on the assessment of impact. MPD recognised that all of its sub-panels had undertaken a rigorous and robust assessment of impact case studies and templates.
- 4.2 The chair confirmed that draft impact feedback reports had been written for all units of assessment; these would be reviewed by the Exec Group to ensure cross-panel consistency. Near-final drafts of institutional feedback statements would then be considered by the panel at meeting six, incorporating impact, environment and output feedback statements.

5. Environment assessment

- 5.1 The panel noted that MPD would consider the outcome of panels' assessment of environment at its meeting in July and would feedback to panels, via chairs, following this meeting.
- 5.2 The panel noted that there were 22 environment templates for which scores needed to be confirmed, including eight templates which had been considered at meeting four. The panel secretary verbally confirmed progress with panel scoring to date.
- 5.3 The panel discussed generic issues that they had encountered with environment assessment since meeting four. These included templates that had not referenced all areas of activity being undertaken; small numbers of completions given the size of the unit; and strategies that had not been clearly articulated. The panel reached a consensus on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria.

6. Audit

- 6.1 The chair confirmed that no audit queries had been raised on environment.

7. Review of environment template scores and sub-profiles

- 7.1 The chair confirmed the process for confirming sub-profiles taking account of conflicts of interest. Panellists were requested to review their draft feedback on the rationale for assessment to the secretariat, within two weeks of the meeting, for use in the drafting of institutional feedback reports.
- 7.2 The sub-profile lead presented the rationale for the scores that had been given for environment templates for each submission in turn. Panellists reviewed in plenary whether any of the scores required amendment in light of the issues discussed under 5.3. During the discussion 14 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 7.3 Following the conclusion of the round-table discussion on assessment of individual case studies and templates, the panel considered in plenary the resultant sub-profiles for each submission in turn. The panel recommended the sub-profiles for all submissions to the main panel for approval. During the discussion of scores and review of sub-profiles, 14 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

8. Conclusion to day one

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

REF Sub-panel 31: Meeting 5 (Part 2)

30 June – 01 July 2014

Radisson Edwardian, Manchester

10am

Minutes

Present:

Roderick	Beaton	
Barbara E.	Borg	
George	Boys-Stones	
Leslie	Brubaker	
Gillian	Clark	
Catharine	Edwards	
Robert	Fowler	
Lin	Foxhall	
Bruce	Gibson	
Jill	Harries	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
David	Langslow	Deputy-chair
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Robin	Osborne	Sub-panel chair
Robert	Parker	
Jonathan G. F.	Powell	
Maria	Wyke	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel including Gillian Clark and Jill Harries who were attending for the first time. Apologies for absence were received from Hilary O'Shea.

- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, namely to review scores for 50 per cent of outputs.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Staff circumstances

- 3.1 The panel noted the paper on individual staff circumstances (paper 02:Individual staff circumstances) which outlined the decisions made in relation to staff circumstances for the panel.
- 3.2 The chair outlined the three types of circumstance that staff could be returned with i.e. 'none', where the member of staff would be returned with four outputs; 'complex', where a member of staff might have circumstances where they would qualify for a reduction of outputs based on the protected characteristics; and 'clearly defined' where a member of staff would qualify for a reduction of outputs having had period(s) of maternity leave or part time working within the assessment period or for being an Early Career Researcher.
- 3.3 Complex circumstances had been reviewed by the Equalities and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) who had made a recommendation on the number of outputs to be reduced. No missing outputs were recorded.
- 3.4 The secretariat had reviewed all clearly defined circumstances and determined that with the exception of two cases which were subject to outstanding audit queries, all should be accepted and that there were no missing outputs.
- 3.5 The panel noted that one member of staff had been submitted with three outputs (without any circumstances outlined); the missing output would be awarded a 'U'.

4. Output assessment

- 4.1 The secretariat projected summary data illustrating progress towards the scoring of outputs to date. This included the emerging sub-panel output sub-profile (based on panel agreed scores to date) against the overall Main Panel D output sub-profile; anonymised scoring patterns; numbers of cross referrals in and out of the panel; and the number of panels to which items had been cross referred.
- 4.2 Panellists had been invited to raise any issues they had encountered with the assessment of outputs prior to the meeting; these included the assessment of

double-weighted edited volumes where it was difficult to determine whether the author had made a substantial contribution; exhibitions and working papers. These were considered by the panel and agreement reached on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria. The panel were reminded of the process for agreeing requests for double-weighting. Panellists were invited to review whether any scores required amendment in light of the issues discussed.

- 4.3 As part of the on-going calibration of assessment, panellists had each nominated a selection of outputs to be double-read. The panel considered that this had been a useful exercise. Panellists were reminded to request second readers where it was felt that additional expertise would be valuable to the assessment of the output.
- 4.4 The panel reviewed items marked as unclassified and reviewed cases where the claims for double weighting had been rejected. The panel also agreed the process for confirming outstanding advice for items cross referred to other panels.
- 4.5 The secretariat had cross referenced output titles to identify where the same output had been submitted within a submission or across multiple submissions. The secretariat would inform all readers via email to facilitate discussion on an agreed score.
- 4.6 Panellists were reminded of the process for returning items to the REF warehouse once they had been assessed.
- 4.7 The panel reviewed progress on the scoring of outputs to date and confirmed assessment for 45 per cent of outputs.

5. Audit

- 5.1 The chair confirmed the number of audit queries raised to date. The REF team had undertaken a 'data comparison of research outputs' audit in order to verify the eligibility of outputs submitted to the REF. The panel noted that all outputs selected for audit were verified.

6. Next steps

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

7. Date of next meeting

7.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place 18 and 19 September at the Radisson Blu, Edinburgh:

Consider and confirm scores for 100 per cent outputs

Produce draft output sub-profiles

Produce overall quality profiles

Begin feedback and overview reports

REF Sub-panel 31: Meeting 6 (Part 1)

18 – 19 September 2014

The Radisson Blu, Edinburgh

Minutes

Present:

Roderick	Beaton	
Barbara E.	Borg	
George	Boys-Stones	
Leslie	Brubaker	
Gillian	Clark	(am only)
Catharine	Edwards	
Robert	Fowler	
Lin	Foxhall	
Bruce	Gibson	
Jill	Harries	(am only)
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
David	Langslow	Deputy-chair
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Robin	Osborne	Sub-panel chair
Robert	Parker	
Jonathan G. F.	Powell	
Robert	Ritchie	International adviser (am only)
Graeme	Rosenberg	REF manager (pm only)
Antonya	Visser	International adviser
Maria	Wyke	

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

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting. Apologies for absence were received from Hilary O'Shea.

- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive item being to approve institutional overall sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.

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

2. Register of interests

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

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting five held on 30 June – 1 July 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Staff circumstances

- 4.1 The sub-panel noted a revised paper on individual staff circumstances (paper 02 *Individual staff circumstances*). This confirmed the outcome of two outstanding audit queries, namely that two missing outputs had been recorded for staff submitted with clearly defined circumstances.
- 4.2 The sub-panel approved the recommendation that for 102 staff submitted with clearly defined circumstances, an appropriate number of outputs had been submitted in 100 cases and for two cases missing outputs would be recorded. (61 early career researcher cases were included in this recommendation).

5. Feedback from MPD

- 5.1 The chair fed back the key points from the last meeting of the main panel. It was noted that MPD recognised that all of its sub-panels had undertaken a robust assessment of impact and environment noting that the sub-profiles for these elements of the assessment were relatively higher than emerging output sub-profiles.
- 5.2 MPD had noted that there had been variable practice on the part of submitting institutions across the main panel with respect to requests for double weighting for outputs. Some sub-panels had expressed their surprise at the small volume of double weighting requests received, particularly in the light of the criteria permitting a reserve item and the numbers of outputs that would likely have met the criteria for double weighting.

6. Output assessment

- 6.1 The sub-panel noted that MPD would consider the outcome of panels' assessment of outputs at its meeting in September and would feedback, via sub-panel chairs, following this meeting.
- 6.2 Panellists raised any issues that they had encountered with the assessment of outputs. These included output eligibility; duplicate outputs; double-weighting; and overlap. During the discussion one panellist left the room on account of conflicts of interest. The sub-panel reached a consensus on the assessment of these items with reference to the assessment criteria.
- 6.3 The sub-panel secretary verbally confirmed progress with scoring to date, confirming that 100 per cent of outputs now had panel agreed scores. The chair rehearsed the process for confirming sub-profiles at the meeting, noting that there were 22 output sub-profiles for which scores needed to be confirmed.
- 6.4 The secretariat projected individual scoring profiles. The sub-panel reviewed and considered the rationale for differences between high and low scoring profiles and confirmed that it was assured that the assessment had been robust.
- 6.5 The sub-panel reviewed output sub-profiles in plenary. The HEI lead introduced the submission and sub-profile for each institution in turn and gave a brief rationale for the scores awarded. During the discussion of this item 16 panellists left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 6.6 The sub-panel signed-off the output sub-profiles and recommended them for approval to MPD.
- 6.7 The secretariat projected a series of slides detailing summary data. These included the distribution of output types across quality levels; the overall output sub-profile against the overall output sub-profile in MPD; and the distribution of double-weighted items across quality levels.

7. Overview report

- 7.1 The chair thanked members for their contributions to the draft sub-panel overview report. The draft section on outputs was considered by the sub-panel in plenary and it was agreed that the chair would incorporate the key points arising from the discussion and circulate a revised version of the report for further review before part two of the meeting.
- 7.2 The chair thanked the output assessors for the work that they had undertaken in respect of the REF.

8. Audit

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

9. Feedback

- 9.1 The chair confirmed that draft output, impact and environment institutional feedback statements had been returned for all units of assessment. All statements had been reviewed by the Exec Group to ensure cross-panel consistency.

10. Confirmation of overall sub-sub-profiles

- 10.1 The secretariat projected the overall quality profiles and output, impact and environment sub-profiles for each institution together with draft feedback statements. These were reviewed in turn by the sub-panel in plenary. During the discussion 14 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 10.2 The sub-panel confirmed that all quality profiles should be recommended to the main panel for approval.

11. A.O.B

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

12. Conclusion to part one

- 12.1 The chair thanked members for the work that they had undertaken in respect of output and overall assessment and confirmed the business for part two, namely to further consider the draft sub-panel overview report.

REF Sub-panel 31: Meeting 6 (Part 2)

18-19 September 2014

The Radisson Blu, Edinburgh

Minutes

Present:

Roderick	Beaton	
Barbara E.	Borg	
George	Boys-Stones	
Leslie	Brubaker	
Catharine	Edwards	
Robert	Fowler	
Lin	Foxhall	
Bruce	Gibson	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
David	Langslow	Deputy-chair
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Robin	Osborne	Sub-panel chair
Robert	Parker	
Jonathan G. F.	Powell	
Robert	Ritchie	International adviser
Maria	Wyke	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting. Apologies for absence were received from Hilary O'Shea.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive item being to further consider the draft sub-panel overview report.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Working methods

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

3. Sub-panel overview report

- 3.1 The sub-panel reviewed the overview report which had been revised following part one of the meeting. It was agreed that the chair would further revise the paper, in particular the sections on impact and environment, to incorporate key points raised during the discussion of the report. A revised, near-final draft would be circulated to panel members for further review in advance of meeting seven.

4. Next steps

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

5. Next meeting

- 5.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place at CCTV Venues-Barbican, London, on 9 October to:
- Complete feedback on submissions
 - Complete sub-panel content for overview reports

REF Sub-panel 31: Meeting 7
9 October 2014
CCT Venues-Barbican, London
Minutes

Present:

Roderick	Beaton	
Barbara E.	Borg	
George	Boys-Stones	
Bruce	Brown	(Chair MPD)
Leslie	Brubaker	
Catharine	Edwards	
Robert	Fowler	
Lin	Foxhall	
Bruce	Gibson	
Vicky	Jones	(REF deputy manager)
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
David	Langslow	Deputy-chair
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Robin	Osborne	Sub-panel chair
Robert	Parker	
Jonathan G. F.	Powell	
Maria	Wyke	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the final meeting of the panel. Apologies for absence were received from Hilary O'Shea.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive item being to review and provide comment on the Main Panel D (MPD) and Sub-panel 31 overview report.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting six held on 18 – 19 September 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Audit

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

5. Feedback from MPD

- 5.1 The chair fed back the key points from the last meeting of the Main Panel, noting that the main panel had reviewed outstanding impact and environment profiles that were not fully signed off at the last panel meeting. Final output sub-profiles were considered by the Main Panel and sub-panel chairs were asked to speak to any assessment issues encountered by their sub-panels. All sub-profiles were approved by the main panel, including those of Sub-panel 31, subject in a few cases to a small number of final scores to be agreed.
- 5.2 The sub-panel adviser projected a number of data slides which had been presented to the Main Panel. These included quartile 'whisker' charts which showed 4* overall profiles, 4* output profile data, 4* impact profile data and 4* environment profile data.

6. Submissions

- 6.1 The chair updated the panel on progress with the drafting of institutional feedback. It was noted that all feedback had been reviewed by the Panel Exec and general editorial changes had been made to ensure consistency of language and to take account of feedback from the REF team on content and tone. The sub-panel approved the Panel Exec to take Chair's action on behalf of the sub-panel in making further minor editorial changes as necessary and to approve final versions.
- 6.2 The secretariat projected in alphabetical order the final agreed profiles and feedback statements for all submissions to Sub-panel 31; these included the overall quality profile and output, impact and environment sub-profiles. Conflicts of interest were not observed on this occasion. The chair reminded members of their responsibilities with regard to confidentiality.

7. Overview reports

- 7.1 The sub-panel noted the draft composite MPD and Sub-panel 31 overview reports (paper two). A template for the sub-panel overview reports had been devised by the Main Panel to ensure consistency, with common subject material set out in the Main Panel report and amplified where appropriate in the sub-panel reports.
- 7.2 The sub-panel considered both overview reports recommending editorial changes or amendments to ensure that the sub-panel report contained relevant reflections on the discipline and any particular deviation in the data from the Main Panel averages or quartile data were explained.
- 7.3 During the discussion, the panel adviser projected a number of slides including MPD overall profiles for submissions to RAE 2008 and REF 2014; MPD overall profiles; MPD profiles for items that had been double-weighted; and MPD profiles for items flagged as interdisciplinary by the submitting HEI.
- 7.4 It was noted that the final version of sub-panel reports would be subject to editorial changes up until the point at which all of the sub-panels had met and the Main Panel report was finalised. The sub-panel approved the Chair to take chair's action on behalf of the sub-panel in amending and signing off the final version of the report.

8. Publication of results

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

9. Contributions to feedback

- 9.1 The sub-panel held a round table discussion on feedback to HEFCE on the REF exercise as a whole, which would be used to inform the feedback sessions that were scheduled to take place later in the year.

10. A.O.B

- 10.1 The chair thanked panellists and the secretariat for the hard work they had undertaken in respect of the REF exercise. The sub-panel in turn, thanked the chair for his leadership throughout the exercise.