

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 32: Meeting 2

5 February 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

CCT Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia MacDonald
Michael Martin
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
Ian Rumfitt
John Skorupski
Robert Stern
Alison Stone
Raymond Tallis
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

Via Skype:

David Owens (output assessor)

Apologies:

Julian Baggini
Nancy Cartwright
Peter Milne

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. Owing to the late arrival of the sub-panel chair the first part of the meeting was chaired by the deputy chair. The sub-panel members introduced themselves and the deputy chair outlined the agenda and requested the panel to suggest items for discussion.

- 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 SP32

- 3.1 The panel reviewed the summary of submission data.

4. Output allocation

- 4.1 The deputy-chair outlined the principles behind the allocation of outputs to panellists. Outputs were allocated by the chair and deputy-chair to panellists taking into consideration conflicts of interest, relevant expertise and, as far as possible, to ensure an even workload.
- 4.2 The deputy-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.
- 4.3 The deputy-chair confirmed arrangements for ordering physical outputs from the REF warehouse. 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 to ensure scoring targets are met.

5. Working with REF spreadsheets

- 5.1 The panel secretary gave a short presentation on using personal spreadsheets. The sub-panel agreed common use of comments fields on personal and panel spreadsheets. The panel secretary will update the SP32 'Working with REF Spreadsheets' paper to reflect this change.

Action: Panel secretary

- 5.2 A number of panellists expressed concerns with uploading personal spreadsheets to the PMW. This had been raised with the REF team and a

potential solution had been found. Following testing it was agreed that this issue was now resolved.

6. Outputs calibration

- 6.1. Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair had selected and circulated a sample of 15 outputs to groups of members and output assessors with a further two outputs circulated to members and output assessors, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. Outputs 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 that the aim was to develop a common understanding of the star levels and to agree a robust and fair process. The chair reminded the panel that decisions on ratings should be guided by the panel criteria for significance, originality and rigour.
- 6.3. The chair stated that there was a wide range of expertise within the sub-panel so cross-referrals may not be necessary outside of the sub-panel, particularly within the areas of History of Philosophy and History of Science and Medicine. For this reason some further calibration of outputs will be carried out jointly with sub-panel 30 History.
- 6.4. 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.
- 6.5. Panel members had submitted their scores to the chair prior to the meeting and broke up in to clusters to consider how far members had reached a consensus on each output. Groups of panellists gave feedback to the meeting following their break out group discussions and raised issues about particular outputs where scores diverged or members considered the output was border-line between star levels. 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.
- 6.6. The meeting discussed methods of dealing with outputs where there was a significant overlap either within this submission or with earlier work. In cases where the overlap occurs in this submission, the chair directed the panel to assess the content in the earlier work and assess the second output only in the ways it goes beyond the work in the original output. In cases where there is overlap with work published prior to the census period only the element of the

work first published after 01.01.2008 should be assessed (whether or not the previous output was submitted to RAE2008 is not relevant).

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

7 Working methods

- 7.1 The chair outlined the various roles within the sub-panel and announced that leads for institutional sub-profiles would be allocated shortly. This role will not be required at present but will become more demanding as the milestones of 33% and 50% of outputs assessed are reached.

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 and panel secretariat were currently involved in auditing staff circumstances although the panel were encouraged to raise audit queries on staff should they have particular concerns.
- 8.2 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 about 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.
- 8.3 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.

- 8.4 The chair drew the panellists' attention to the deadlines for audit requests, being for impact 7 April 2014, for environment 1 June and an on-going basis for outputs.
- 8.5 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. It was decided not to review double-weighted outputs at this meeting due to time constraints and the availability of physical outputs. The chair requested that a discussion on double-weighted

outputs be added to the agenda for the next meeting and in the meantime panel members should identify outputs with issues around double-weighting.

Action: Panel secretary & panel members

9 Project plan

- 9.1 The chair outlined the project plan and reminded panellists that all impact case studies and templates must be assessed and scores agreed by the meeting on 13-14 May 2014, and that by the next meeting on 20-21 March 2014 at least 25% of case studies should have been assessed. Further information on assessing impact will be issued shortly.

10 Future meetings

6.3. 20-21 March 2014:

Date: 20 March 2014
Time: 10.00 am – 4.30 pm
Venue: Radisson Blu, Birmingham, B1 1BT
Agenda: Impact and environment calibration, assessment issues and audit queries
Attending: Sub-panel members & impact assessors

Date: 21 March 2014
Time: 10.00 am – 4.30 pm
Venue: Radisson Blu, Birmingham, B1 1BT
Agenda: Outputs to date, assessment issues (including double-weighting) and audit queries
Attending: Sub-panel members (all day) output assessors (am only) & user members (optional)

Please note that this is a provisional agenda for the two days, and that environment calibration might be carried out on 21 March in the morning.

11 Any other business

- 11.1 There was no further business.

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 32: Meeting 3 (Part 1)

20 March 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Radisson Blu Hotel, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Julian Baggini
Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Nancy Cartwright
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia Macdonald
Michael Martin
Jon Nuttall
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
Ian Rumfitt
John Skorupski
Robert Stern
Alison Stone
Raymond Tallis
Lizzie Trigg
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. 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 SP232 members a sample of three impact templates and 10 impact case studies from UoA32 and other units of assessment in Main Panel D Cluster 2. 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 threshold criteria and 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.
- 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 Tuesday 15 April.

Action: Sub-panel members and impact assessors

- 4.4. Panel members had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting and the secretary had compiled a report to demonstrate how far members had reached a consensus on each item. The meeting broke into small groups to discuss the items selected for the impact calibration exercise. This was followed by a plenary session where through this discussion the sub-panel reached a consensus on the score for each item.
- 4.5. All impact statements and case studies have 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).
- 4.6. Within each trio the chair will nominate a 'lead assessor' who will be responsible for gathering feedback to accompany each institutions 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.

- 4.7. The panel adviser reiterated 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 7 - 14 cases for sub-panel 32. 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.
- 4.8. Any items failing threshold judgements will be graded 'unclassified'. All unclassified items will be discussed at the next sub-panel meeting in May.
- 4.9. One panellist left the room during discussion of impact items because of potential conflicts of interest.

5. Future meetings

- 5.1
 - Dates: 13-15 May 2014
 - Time: 10.00 am – 5.00 pm
 - Venue: Radcliffe House, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL
 - Agenda: Agree draft impact sub-profiles, discuss 33% of outputs scored to date, discuss progress on environment assessment.
 - Attending: Sub-panel members (days 1 - 2) impact assessors (day 1 & am only 2 only) & output assessors (pm only day 2)

6. Any other business

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

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 32: Meeting 3 (Part 2)

21 March 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Radisson Blu Hotel, Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Julian Baggini
Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Nancy Cartwright
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia Macdonald
Michael Martin
David Owens
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
Ian Rumfitt
John Skorupski
Robert Stern
Alison Stone
Raymond Tallis
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

Apologies:

David Owens

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. 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 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 outlined the scoring system and requested the sub-panel refer to the environment sections of *REF02.2011 Guidance on Submissions* to ensure a clear understanding of the requirements.

Action: Sub-panel members

- 2.3. The chair informed the sub-panel on how to use the REF data analyses to support environment assessment.

- 2.4. The chair confirmed timescales for environment assessment. Draft environment sub-profiles will be agreed by the sub-panel on at Meeting 4 on 2 July 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

- 2.5. Panel members had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The secretary compiled the scores and comments into a report which was distributed to the sub-panel. The sub-panel broke out into small groups to discuss the environment templates selected for the calibration process and reformed to reach a consensus on the score for each item.

3. Output assessment

- 3.1. The chair and sub-panel discussed the assessment of outputs to date.
- 3.2. The chair reported that a number of cross-referrals had been made out of the sub-panel this week and explained the cross-referral mechanism.
- 3.3. 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.
- 3.4. 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.

4. Audit

- 4.1. 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.

5. Project plan and key milestones

- 5.1. 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 13 May**.

Action: Sub-panel members and output assessors

6. Future meetings

- 6.1
- | | |
|------------|---|
| Dates: | 13-15 May 2014 |
| Time: | 10.00 am – 5.00 pm |
| Venue: | Radcliffe House, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL |
| Agenda: | Agree draft impact sub-profiles, discuss 33% of outputs scored to date, discuss progress on environment assessment. |
| Attending: | Sub-panel members (days 1 - 2) impact assessors (day 1 & am only 2 only) & output assessors (pm only day 2) |

7. Any other business

- 7.1. The sub-panel requested that a report be made available to provide an analysis of scores by gender of staff member and by ECR. The adviser offered to find out from the REF team whether this report would be available, otherwise the sub-panel secretariat will look into ways of providing this information.

Action: Sub-panel secretariat

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

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 32: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

14 May 2014, 10.00 – 17.00

15 May 2014, 9.30 – 13.00

Radcliffe House, University of Warwick, Coventry

Minutes

Present:

Julian Baggini
Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Nancy Cartwright
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia Macdonald
Michael Martin
Jon Nuttall
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
Robert Stern
Alison Stone
Raymond Tallis
Lizzie Trigg
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

Apologies:

Ian Rumfitt

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. 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. Feedback process

- 4.1. The chair 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 panel secretary projected some examples of draft feedback on impact for discussion by the sub-panel.
- 4.4. Lead assessors agreed to submit draft feedback on impact for their allocated institutions by Friday 23 May as a MS Word document attached to a Webmail.

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 33 of the 40 impact templates and 89 of the 101 impact case studies. The sub-panel had generated 7 audit queries on impact which represented approximately 5% of impact items submitted to sub-panel 32. All audit queries were complete by the day of the meeting.
- 5.2. The chair thanked all panellists for their hard work in delivering the impact assessment on time.
- 5.3. The chair outlined the process for arriving at panel agreed scores for all impact items and for dealing with conflicts of interest.
- 5.4. 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 40 HEIs and recommended to Main Panel D.

- 5.5. 17 panellists left the meeting room during discussions of impact items from institutions with which they had a conflict of interest.
- 5.6. The chair gave particular thanks to the user members and impact assessors for their extremely valuable input to the impact assessment process.

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. Date: 2 July 2014
Time: 10:00 – 17:00
Venue: The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN
Agenda: Produce draft environment sub-profiles
Attending: Sub-panel members only
- Date: 3 July 2014
Time: 09:00 – 16:30
Venue: The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN
Agenda: Discuss 50% outputs scored to date
Attending: Sub-panel members & output assessors

7. Any other business

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



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 32: Meeting 4 (Part 2)

15 May 2014, 13.00 – 17.00

Radcliffe House, University of Warwick, Coventry

Minutes

Present:

Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Nancy Cartwright
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia Macdonald
Michael Martin
Peter Milne
David Owens
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
Robert Stern
Alison Stone
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

Apologies:

Ian Rumfitt
John Skorupski

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair outlined the 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.

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. Output assessment

- 4.1. The chair outlined the REF team's paper on overview reports and outlined the process for gathering feedback on outputs. The chair emphasised the importance of preparing draft 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. Full feedback reports will be compiled at the end of the process to ensure a uniform approach.
- 4.2. The chair informed the meeting of progress to date which showed that 24% of the 2177 outputs submitted currently had panel scores with 48% of outputs having been assessed and score by at least one panellist. The panel agreed that the target of panel scores for 33% of outputs would be met fairly shortly once second readers uploaded scores and they were agreed between pairs.
- 4.3. The sub-panel discussed prioritising double-weighted outputs and books so that they could be ordered from the warehouse by first readers and assessed and passed on to second readers in a timely manner.

Action: Sub-panel members and output assessors

- 4.4. The sub-panel agreed to look at all requests for double-weighting by mid-July to identify any that would not be accepted so that reserve outputs (where submitted) could be allocated.

Action: Sub-panel members and output assessors

- 4.5. The sub-panel discussed co-authored outputs where an individual researcher's contribution was not clear. The chair advised the sub-panel that in these cases an audit query should be raised to request further information on the significance of the author's contribution.

The chair advised panellists that audit queries should also be used to gain further information on outputs where a significant overlap with earlier material is suspected.

Action: Sub-panel members and output assessors

- 4.6. The chair advised panellists that where outputs have been cross-referred the score should be agreed and uploaded by the allocated panellist acting on the

advice of the advising panellist. It is not necessary to discuss cross-referred outputs with other SP32 panellists.

Action: Sub-panel members and output assessors

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. Lead assessors, in consultation with second readers, will be required to produce some feedback on environment for each of their allocated institutions. It was suggested that an appropriate amount of feedback would be one sentence per section scored.
- 6.2. The chair confirmed that the final allocations of environment templates would be completed during week commencing 19 May
- 6.3. The panel adviser informed the sub-panel that the REF audit team had checked the environment data from submission against HESA records so it is unlikely that further audit would be necessary. However panellists were welcomed to raise audit queries where they have serious concerns. Panellists were asked to raise any audit queries by 6 June to allow sufficient time for HEIs to respond and for the item to be assessed. There is no quota for audit 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 10 June so that SP32 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.
- 6.5. The panel adviser gave a short presentation on using environment data analyses to support the assessment of environment templates and informed the sub-panel that a new spreadsheet was now available showing all HEIs on one sheet. The panel adviser will email this spreadsheet to the sub-panel immediately after the meeting.

Action: Panel adviser

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. Date: 2 July 2014
Time: 10:00 – 17:00
Venue: The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN
Agenda: Produce draft environment sub-profiles
Attending: Sub-panel members only

Date: 3 July 2014
Time: 09:00 – 16:30
Venue: The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN
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 32: Meeting 5 (Part 1)

2 July 2014, 10.00 – 17.00

3 July 2014, 9.00 – 11.00

The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN

Minutes

Present:

Julian Baggini
Bruce Brown (MP chair)
Nancy Cartwright
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia Macdonald
Michael Martin
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
Ian Rumfitt
Robert Stern
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

Apologies:

Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Alison Stone

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. In the absence of the sub-panel chair, the meeting was led by the deputy chair. The deputy chair welcomed sub-panel members and output assessors and outlined the 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.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of declared major conflicts of interest was 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. Environment assessment

- 4.1. The deputy chair directed the sub-panel to the REF team document on feedback to institutions for advice on drawing up feedback to institutions on environment. The main panel chair reminded the sub-panel that feedback should explain environment sub-profiles to provide justification for scores being higher in some areas than others. Feedback should not be used to provide strategic advice. Lead assessors were requested to submit their draft feedback on environment to the panel secretary by Friday 11 July.

Action: Lead assessors

- 4.2. The chair of Main Panel D reminded panellist that the key words to environment assessment were vitality and sustainability and this should be judged separately from the context in which institutions were operating. The sub-panel discussed a number of common issues that had arisen during the environment assessment.
- 4.3. The panel secretary projected scores for all environment items and sub-profiles for each institution for discussion and agreement by the sub-panel.
- 4.4. 15 panellists absented themselves from discussions for institutions where they had registered a conflict of interest. The sub-panel confirmed scores and draft environment sub-profiles for all 40 submitting HEIs and recommended them to Main Panel D.

5. Impact assessment

- 5.1. The main panel chair thanked all panellists for their hard work in delivering the impact assessment. The sub-panel were shown the latest sub-profiles for outputs, impact and environment for sub-panel 32 along with anonymised sub-profiles for all sub-panels in main panel D.

6. Future meetings

Date: 18 September 2014
Time: Day 1: 10:00 – 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: 19 September 2014
Time: 9:00 – 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 32: Meeting 5 (Part 2)

3 July 2014, 11.00 – 17.00

The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN

Minutes

Present:

Nancy Cartwright
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia Macdonald
Michael Martin
Peter Milne
David Owens
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
Ian Rumfitt
John Skorupski
Robert Stern
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

Apologies:

Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Alison Stone

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. In the absence of the sub-panel chair, the meeting was led by the deputy chair. The deputy chair welcomed sub-panel members and output assessors and outlined the 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.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of declared major conflicts of interest was 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. Staff circumstances

- 4.1. The panel adviser outlined the paper on the review of individual staff circumstances. 179 cases of clearly-defined circumstances had been submitted by institutions were reviewed by the panel secretariat. 163 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. There were a further 16 cases where, whilst the correct number of outputs had been submitted, issues around eligibility remained. A decision on whether to raise audit queries with the relevant HEI to request confirmation of independent researcher status was to be made by the sub-panel chair following consultation with the REF team. Should any of these individuals be deemed ineligible they (and their outputs) would be removed from the submission with no further penalty. These cases will be revisited at the next meeting in September.

Action: Panel chair

- 4.3. The panel adviser reported that the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) had identified no missing outputs following their review of complex staff circumstances.

5. Output assessment

- 5.1. The meeting discussed a case where an output had been scored as unclassified as it did not comply with the REF2014 published definition of research. The panel adviser directed panellists to Annex C of the Guidance on Submissions document where the definition can be found.
- 5.2. Panellists were reminded to use their reading lists to let the REF warehouse know when physical outputs are passed on to other panel members.

6. Project plan and key milestones

- 6.1. The deputy chair outlined the project plan and highlighted forthcoming deadlines. Panellists were reminded that all output scores should be agreed and uploaded by Friday 29 August 2014.

Action: SP32 members and output assessors

- 6.2. The deputy chair suggested that in the run up to the end of August deadline, panellists may find it useful to record their holidays on a shared calendar to plan time for scores to be agreed. The sub-panel members and assessors agreed to forward their August holiday plans to the panel secretary.

Action: SP32 members and output assessors

7. Future meetings

Date: 18 September 2014
Time: 10:00 – 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: 19 September 2014
Time: 09:30 – 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 32: Meeting 6 (Part 1)

18 September 2014

10.00 – 16.30

Radisson Blu, Edinburgh

Minutes

Present:

Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)
Nancy Cartwright
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia Macdonald
Michael Martin
Peter Milne
David Owens
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
John Skorupski
Robert Stern
Alison Stone
Raymond Tallis
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

Apologies:

Julian Baggini
Ian Rumfitt

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed sub-panel members and output assessors and outlined the 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.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The chair thanked panellists for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest on the PMW and for notifying the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of minor conflicts. Panellists were requested to continue to inform the sub-panel executive if any new conflicts emerged.

4. Output assessment

- 4.1. The chair thanked the panellists for their dedication and hard work in delivering agreed scores for outputs. 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. The meeting discussed and amended the draft feedback statements on outputs to institutions. These are due for completion and sign-off at the next meeting in October.
- 4.3. The panel secretary projected the output quality sub-profiles for all 40 institutions for the panel to confirm and endorse. The sub-panel discussed the quality of outputs from each institution and confirmed decisions on double-weighting requests and unclassified scores.

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

- 4.4. The sub-panel endorsed the output quality sub-profiles for all 40 submitting institutions and recommended them to the Main Panel.

5. Future meetings

Date: 22 October 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: CCT Venues-Barbican, London, EC1A 4JA
Agenda: Complete feedback on submissions
Attending: Sub-panel members only

6. Any other business

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

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 32: Meeting 6 (Part 2)

19 September 2014

10.00 – 16.30

Radisson Blu, Edinburgh

Minutes

Present:

Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Bruce Brown (main panel chair)
Nancy Cartwright
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia Macdonald
Michael Martin
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
Robert Stern
Alison Stone
Raymond Tallis
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

Apologies:

Julian Baggini
Ian Rumfitt

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Working methods

- 2.1. The sub-panel reviewed 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.

3. Overall quality sub-profiles & feedback to institutions

- 3.1. 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.
- 3.2. The sub-panel reviewed and amended feedback to HEIs on impact and environment.
- 3.3. 15 panellists absented themselves from the meeting room during discussion of output sub-profiles for institutions where they had declared a conflict of interest.

4. SP32 overview report

- 4.1 The sub-panel reviewed and discussed the sub-panel 32 overview report and the panel secretary made amendments to the text as required. The chair will forward the latest version of the overall to the sub-panel to review in advance of the final sign off meeting on 22 October.

Action: chair

5. Future meeting

Date: 22 October 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: CCT Venues-Barbican, London, EC1A 4JA
Agenda: Complete feedback on submissions
Attending: Sub-panel members only

6. Any other business

- 6.1. The chair reported a request from the REF team for two members of the sub-panel to represent SP32 at two forthcoming meetings. Interested parties should contact the chair as soon as possible.

Action: sub-panel members

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



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 32: Meeting 7

22 October 2014

10.00 – 16.30

CCT Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Julian Baggini
Alexander Bird (sub-panel chair)
Bruce Brown (main panel chair)
Nancy Cartwright
Gregory Currie
Nicholas Davey
Katherine Hawley (deputy chair)
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Cynthia Macdonald
Michael Martin
Thomas Pink
Catherine Rowett
Ian Rumfitt
Robert Stern
Alison Stone
Raymond Tallis
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Heather Widdows

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed sub-panel members and 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 sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Conflicts of interest

- 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. Publication of results

- 4.1. 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. Feedback to institutions

- 5.1. The sub-panel reviewed and amended feedback that had been edited by the SP32 executive group. The secretary recorded the amendments suggested by the sub-panel. The sub-panel and approved any further amendments as required at the chair's discretion.
- 5.2. Six panellists absented themselves from the meeting for discussions of feedback to institutions for which they had recorded a conflict of interest.

6. Overview report

- 6.1. The sub-panel gave feedback on the draft Main Panel D overview report. The adviser recorded suggested amendments and comments or feedback to the next main panel meeting.
- 6.2. The sub-panel reviewed and amended the draft overview report for Sub-panel 32.

7. Concluding remarks

- 7.1. The sub-panel chair thanked the sub-panel, deputy-chair, adviser and secretary for all their contribution to the assessment process.
- 7.2. The Chair of Main Panel D expressed his thanks, and those of the REF team, to all members of Sub-panel 32 for their hard work and dedication in delivering a robust assessment process and outcome.
- 7.3. There being no further business the meeting closed.