



## **REF Sub-panel 33: Meeting 2**

**29 January 2014**

**Grand Connaught Rooms, London**

### **Confirmed Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Jane Boggan (Adviser)  
George Brooke  
Jeremy Carrette  
David Fergusson (Deputy chair)  
Sarah Foot  
Robin Griffith-Jones  
Elizabeth Harris  
Kim Knott  
Gordon Lynch  
Stephen Pattison  
Christopher Rowland  
Bettina Schmidt  
Janet Soskice  
Steven Sutcliffe  
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)  
Anthony Visser (International adviser)  
Graham Ward  
Joanna Weinberg  
John Wolffe  
Linda Woodhead (Chair)

#### **Apologies:**

Shenaz Bunglawala  
Jonathan Tubb

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

1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the assessment phase of the REF.

- 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 UOA33**

- 3.1. The panel noted the summarised details of the submissions made to the unit of assessment.

## **4. Output calibration**

- 4.1. The chair explained the rationale for the selection of outputs for calibration, noting the need to explore issues around scoring levels, include a variety of genres and subjects and recognising that monographs were not available at this stage of the process.
- 4.2. The panels discussed each of the calibration outputs. The chair noted the wide range of scores recorded by the panel members. For clarification, the chair stressed the need for panel members to assess the output and not the individual and recognised that many panel members would be reading outside their comfort zones at this stage but that outputs would be allocated for assessment by specialism.
- 4.3. Panel members were advised that where they had concerns about materials which may have been published prior to the REF period there was an opportunity to raise an audit query.
- 4.4. The panel reviewed a number of double-weighting statements. They 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.
- 4.5. Panel members were further reminded that the judgement of quality (the assessed score for an output) is separate from the decision on double weighting.

## **5. Presentation on 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 and undertook to circulate some IT tips after the meeting.

## **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.
- 6.2. Following the allocations of outputs to a first reader, second readers would be allocated using pairings determined by the chair and deputy chair (and taking account of conflicts of interest).
- 6.3. It was noted that the small disciplinary area of this unit of assessment would be likely to result in there being a large number of minor conflicts of interest. 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.
- 6.4. No panel members raised concerns about their allocated outputs for assessment.
- 6.5. The panel received paper 7, Procedural guidance for panels on physical outputs.

## **7. Working methods**

- 7.1. The present paper was undergoing revision and once finalised would be made available to panel members on the Panel Members' Website, and would be published at the end of the assessment exercise.
- 7.2. The working methods paper was intended as a guide for panel members and also to demonstrate the transparency of the process and to reassure the academic community of the integrity of the process.
- 7.3. 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. Work plan for panel members**

- 9.1. Following guidance from the Main Panel earlier in the week, the panel was informed that the work plan (Paper 10) would be revised to take account of the new guidance on the calibration of impact, and would be sent to panel members shortly after this meeting.
- 9.2. The panel noted the targets for the assessment of outputs and discussed possible methods for ordering reading to ensure that the target numbers of outputs would be assessed by first and second readers, and an agreed score reached, in time for consideration at Meeting 4. The adviser and secretary would provide a deadline for the scores to be returned and suggest a method of ordering the reading.

## **10. Future meetings**

- 10.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting (Meeting 3, 12-13 March, London).



## **REF Sub-panel 33: Meeting 3, Part 1**

**12 March 2014**

**CCT Venues Smithfield, London**

### **Confirmed Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Jane Boggan (Adviser)  
George Brooke  
Jeremy Carrette  
David Fergusson (Deputy chair)  
Sarah Foot  
Robin Griffith-Jones  
Elizabeth Harris  
Kim Knott  
Gordon Lynch  
Stephen Pattison  
Christopher Rowland  
Bettina Schmidt  
Janet Soskice  
Steven Sutcliffe  
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)  
Graham Ward  
John Wolffe  
Linda Woodhead (Chair)

#### **Apologies:**

Shenaz Bunglawala  
Jonathan Tubb

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting. She 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 the previous week.

- 1.2. It was noted that two of the three user members on the panel were not in attendance, and the chair undertook to contact them urgently following the meeting to arrange to brief them on the outcome of the impact calibration discussions.

- 1.3. In the light of the attendance, and proposed action by the chair, 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 29 January 2014, noting only that Professor Sutcliffe's name had been omitted in error from those attending. The secretary undertook to correct this.

## **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 panel received a tabled paper '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. The chair noted in particular the valuable contributions from the user members on the Main Panel.
- 4.2. The panel adviser gave a presentation on assessing impact, focussing on threshold criteria, and responded to questions from panel members.
- 4.3. The impact case studies provided an opportunity for HEIs to showcase their research and to provide evidence of accountability for public funds. It was noted 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. Cases should not be penalised where the impact has been unplanned or serendipitous – this is entirely within the rules. 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 were not eligible.
- 4.4. 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 3 and 4) . The sample included both case studies and templates from across the cluster (including UOA27 Area Studies, UOA28 Modern Languages and Linguistics and UOA29 English Language and Literature) which had also been reviewed by the Main Panel. In addition, a range of case studies and templates for UOA33 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.

- 4.5. The chair noted that the range of scores recorded by panellists in advance of the meeting appeared to diverge significantly, but that the comments were generally quite similar. 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.
- 4.6. 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.

## **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 however 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, including the role of the impact lead for each submission, 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, Ettington Chase, Banbury Road, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon - Days 1 and 2 (20-21 May) – Produce draft impact sub-profiles; Day 3 (22 May) – Discuss scores for 33% of outputs.

## **7. Any other business**

- 7.1. There was no other business.



## **REF Sub-panel 33: Meeting 3, Part 2**

**13 March 2014**

**CCT Venues Barbican, London**

### **Confirmed Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Jane Boggan (Adviser)  
George Brooke  
Jeremy Carrette  
David Fergusson (Deputy chair)  
Sarah Foot  
Elizabeth Harris  
Kim Knott  
Gordon Lynch  
Stephen Pattison  
Christopher Rowland  
Bettina Schmidt  
Janet Soskice  
Steven Sutcliffe  
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)  
Graham Ward  
Joanna Weinberg  
John Wolffe  
Linda Woodhead (Chair)

#### **Apologies:**

Shenaz Bunglawala  
Robin Griffith-Jones  
Jonathan Tubb

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

- 1.1. The chair introduced the business of Part 2 of the meeting. At the outset, the schedule for the assessment of impact and the role of impact leads were confirmed, and potential case study audits were discussed.



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

## **2. Calibration of Environment templates**

- 2.1. The panel received a tabled paper: 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.
- 2.2. The panel adviser explained how the standard data for each submission had been provided, noting that it was intended to inform the sub-panel's 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.
- 2.3. The chair introduced the discussion of a sample of environment templates for calibration, which had been reviewed by panellists in advance of the meeting. The sample included templates from across the cluster (including UOA27 Area Studies, UOA28 Modern Languages and Linguistics and UOA29 English Language and Literature). Additionally, several further templates for UOA33 had been included to represent a wider sample of submissions to the UOA.
- 2.4. The panel discussed each of the templates 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 templates may be informed by the discussions, they would need to arrive at independent judgements when reviewing their allocated templates.

## **3. Output assessment**

- 3.1. The panel received a tabled paper, Guidance to sub-panels on points arising from the outputs calibration exercise conducted by Main Panel D and its sub-panels.
- 3.2. The panel noted the guidance and decisions of the Main Panel, in particular in relation to issues raised at the previous meeting. On double-weighted items based on an individual's PhD work it was noted that the Main Panel had agreed that cases for double-weighting should not be disallowed on the basis that the output was based on an individual's PhD work, regardless of whether the individual concerned was also an ECR. This was not seen as "double-counting".
- 3.3. 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'.

- 3.4. The chair noted the volume of upload activity for output scoring and reminded panellists of the milestone targets in the circulated work schedule. Panellists raised issues around output assessment and these were addressed as part of ongoing output calibration. The secretary was asked to send panellists an updated work plan showing forthcoming deadlines for outputs and impact assessment.

#### **4. Future meetings**

- 4.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting, Meeting 4, Ettington Chase, Banbury Road, Ettington, Stratford-upon-Avon - Days 1 and 2 (20-21 May) – Produce draft impact sub-profiles; Day 3 (22 May) – Discuss scores for 33% of outputs.

#### **5. Any other business**

- 5.1. There was no other business.



## **REF Sub-panel 33: Meeting 4, Part 1**

**20-21 May 2014**

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

### **Confirmed Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Jane Boggan (Adviser)  
George Brooke  
Bruce Brown (Main Panel chair)  
Shenaz Bunglawala  
Jeremy Carrette  
David Fergusson (Deputy chair)  
Sarah Foot  
Robin Griffith-Jones  
Elizabeth Harris  
Kim Knott  
Gordon Lynch  
Stephen Pattison  
Christopher Rowland  
Bettina Schmidt  
Janet Soskice  
Steven Sutcliffe  
Jonathan Tubb  
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)  
Graham Ward  
John Wolffe  
Linda Woodhead (Chair)

#### **Apologies:**

None

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting. The chair reported 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 12 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. The adviser introduced the paper, noting 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.

## **5. Impact assessment**

- 5.1. 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.
- 5.2. The panel discussed the arrangements for confirming impact sub-profiles. A number of case studies had been identified by panel members in advance of the meeting as requiring further consideration. These were discussed individually and a common view was reached. In addition, all case studies provisionally scored as unclassified were reviewed by the panel. Conflicted members left the room as appropriate.
- 5.3. An impact 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. The impact sub-profile for each of the 33 submissions was confirmed individually.

## **6. Impact assessors**

- 6.1. The chair expressed her and the panel's thanks to the sub-panel's user members for the time and wisdom they had given to this element of the exercise, and each commented on the extent and achievement of impact presented in the submissions they had been involved in assessing. 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. All audit queries raised by panel members on impact case studies ahead of the meeting had been resolved. No further audit queries were raised at the meeting.

## **8. Future meetings**

- 8.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting, Meeting 5, Palace Hotel, Manchester - Day 1 (30 June) – Produce draft environment sub-profiles; Day 2 (1 July) – Discuss scores for 50% of outputs.

## **9. Any other business**

- 9.1. There was no other business.



## **REF Sub-panel 33: Meeting 4, Part 2**

**22 May 2014**

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

### **Confirmed Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Jane Boggan (Adviser)  
George Brooke  
Jeremy Carrette  
Anna Dickinson (REF Team)  
David Fergusson (Deputy chair)  
Sarah Foot  
Elizabeth Harris  
Kim Knott  
Gordon Lynch  
Stephen Pattison  
Christopher Rowland  
Bettina Schmidt  
Janet Soskice  
Steven Sutcliffe  
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)  
Graham Ward  
Joanna Weinberg  
John Wolffe  
Linda Woodhead (Chair)

#### **Apologies:**

Shenaz Bunglawala  
Robin Griffith-Jones  
Jonathan Tubb

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the output assessor 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 13 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. Output assessment**

- 4.1. 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 outputs.
- 4.2. The panel reviewed all individual cases where panellists adjudged that the claim for double-weighting could not be accepted. The panel further reviewed and discussed each output provisionally graded as unclassified and confirmed the opinion of the assessing panellists.
- 4.3. The arrangements for panellists to indicate that scores had been agreed with co-assessors were confirmed.

## **5. Environment**

- 5.1. The panel received paper 6 from the Main Panel, Environment calibration: collated feedback from sub-panels on the calibration of environment templates. The adviser provided guidance on the use of the standard data, reminding panellists that this should inform (but not lead) the judgements being made and be considered in context.
- 5.2. The panel undertook further calibration of two additional environment templates to remind themselves of the criteria to be applied when assessing, and for clarification on a number of points.
- 5.3. The arrangements for environment assessment and a deadline for provisionally agreed scores to be uploaded to the Panel Members' Website were confirmed.

**6. Future meetings**

- 6.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting, Meeting 5, Palace Hotel, Manchester - Day 1 (30 June) – Produce draft environment sub-profiles; Day 2 (1 July) – Discuss scores for 50% of outputs.

**7. Any other business**

- 7.1. There was no other business. The meeting closed at 3.45pm.





## **REF Sub-panel 33: Meeting 5, Part 1**

**30 June – 1 July 2014**

**Palace Hotel, Manchester**

### **Confirmed Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Jane Boggan (Adviser)  
George Brooke  
Bruce Brown (Main Panel chair)  
Jeremy Carrette  
David Fergusson (Deputy chair)  
Sarah Foot  
Elizabeth Harris  
Kim Knott  
Gordon Lynch  
Stephen Pattison  
Christopher Rowland  
Bettina Schmidt  
Janet Soskice  
Steven Sutcliffe  
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)  
John Wolffe  
Linda Woodhead (Chair)

#### **Apologies:**

Shenaz Bunglawala  
Robin Griffith-Jones  
Jonathan Tubb  
Graham Ward

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting. The chair reported that the main business of this meeting was to reach agreement on the scores for the environment templates, and provisionally to confirm environment 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 4, Part 1)**

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 20-21 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. Impact**

- 4.1. 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.
- 4.2. The panel took the opportunity to reflect on the process and to express some thoughts for future exercises, including suggestions for a fuller and richer set of criteria. The panel noted in particular the discipline's long-standing engagement with social and cultural issues, beyond the academic community, and the effect on communities at home and overseas, and the very strong culture of working with external groups and partnerships.

## **5. Assessment of environment templates**

- 5.1. The panel had all 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.
- 5.2. 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. The environment sub-profile for each of the 33 submissions was confirmed individually.
- 5.3. The panel discussed and confirmed the arrangements for drafting feedback on environment at panel level and to individual institutions.

## **6. Audit**

- 6.1. No audit queries had been raised on the environment templates.

**7. Future meetings**

- 7.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting, Meeting 6, Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh, 15-16 September: To produce draft outputs sub-profiles, produce overall quality profiles and continue feedback and overview reports.

**8. Any other business**

- 8.1. There was no other business.



## **REF Sub-panel 33: Meeting 5, Part 2**

**30 June – 1 July 2014**

**Palace Hotel, Manchester**

### **Confirmed Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Jane Boggan (Adviser)  
George Brooke  
Jeremy Carrette  
Kirsten Drotner (Main Panel D, External member)  
David Fergusson (Deputy chair)  
Sarah Foot  
Elizabeth Harris  
Kim Knott  
Gordon Lynch  
Stephen Pattison  
Christopher Rowland  
Bettina Schmidt  
Janet Soskice  
Steven Sutcliffe  
Claire Thompson (Observer - Department for Employment and Learning of Northern Ireland)  
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)  
John Wolffe  
Linda Woodhead (Chair)

#### **Apologies:**

Shenaz Bunglawala  
Robin Griffith-Jones  
Jonathan Tubb  
Graham Ward  
Joanna Weinberg

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

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the second part of the meeting. The main business of this meeting was to discuss progress with output assessment including resolving any issues, and provisionally to confirm around 50% of output scores.

- 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 22 May 2014.

## **3. Output assessment**

- 3.1. 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.
- 3.2. The panel reviewed three cases of outputs scored zero, and confirmed that each should be unclassified.
- 3.3. Panel members were reminded about the process for confirming or declining claims for double weighting, and encouraged to ensure that all requests for advice on cross-referred items were dealt with as a priority.
- 3.4. Panel members raised a number of specific queries about certain types of output and individual items, and these were discussed and resolved.
- 3.5. The panel discussed the arrangements for drafting feedback on outputs at panel level and to individual institutions.

## **4. Audit**

- 4.1. A small 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.

## **5. Future meetings**

- 8.2. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting, Meeting 6, Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh, 15-16 September: To produce draft outputs sub-profiles, produce overall quality profiles and continue feedback and overview reports.

**9. Any other business**

- 9.1. There was no other business.



## **REF Sub-panel 33: Meeting 6**

**15-16 September 2014**

**Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh**

### **Confirmed Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Jane Boggan (Adviser)  
George Brooke  
Bruce Brown (Main Panel chair)  
Jeremy Carrette  
David Fergusson (Deputy chair)  
Sarah Foot  
Elizabeth Harris  
Kim Knott  
Gordon Lynch  
Stephen Pattison  
Christopher Rowland  
Bettina Schmidt  
Janet Soskice  
Steven Sutcliffe  
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)  
Graham Ward  
Joanna Weinberg  
John Wolffe  
Linda Woodhead (Chair)

#### **Apologies:**

Shenaz Bunglawala  
Robin Griffith-Jones  
Jonathan Tubb

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

- 1.1. The chair opened the meeting by welcoming panel members and thanking them for their commitment and hard work during the assessment phase. 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; and to agree the key messages for inclusion in the sub-panel overview report.

- 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 meeting held on 30 June to 1 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 reviewing draft feedback.
- 4.2. An outputs lead for each submission presented a summary of the scores and comments for each HE Institution. All conflicted panel members absented themselves from the meeting room when necessary. All unclassified outputs, which had not been confirmed at earlier meetings of the panel, were discussed, as were incidences where requests for double-weighting were not accepted. The outputs sub-profile for each of the 33 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.
- 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. Consideration of summary data**

- 5.1. The panel adviser provided summary data on scoring profiles by type of output, double-weighting requests and their outcomes in the unit of assessment, and comparative data across institutions of different size.



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

- 6.1. The Main Panel chair reported to the sub-panel on progress with the assessment across the ten sub-panels in Main Panel D and took questions from panellists.
- 6.2. The chair introduced her draft sub-panel overview report. The panel commented on the present version of the report suggesting additional material which might helpfully inform the report. The chair undertook to edit the report and circulate the revised version to panellists ahead of the next meeting.

## **7. Future meetings**

- 7.1. The panel noted the date for the next meeting: Meeting 7, at CCT Venues-Smithfield, Two East Poultry Avenue, Smithfield, EC1A 9PT on Tuesday 21 October. The business of the meeting would be to complete feedback on submissions and to complete sub-panel content for overview reports.

## **8. Any other business**

- 8.1. There was no other business.

The meeting closed at 13.00.

## **REF Sub-panel 33: Meeting 7**

**21 October 2014**

**CCT Venues-Smithfield, London**

### **Confirmed Minutes**

#### **Present:**

Jane Boggan (Adviser)  
George Brooke  
Bruce Brown (Main Panel chair)  
Jeremy Carrette  
David Fergusson (Deputy chair)  
Sarah Foot  
Elizabeth Harris  
Kim Knott  
Stephen Pattison  
Christopher Rowland  
Bettina Schmidt  
Janet Soskice  
Steven Sutcliffe  
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)  
Graham Ward  
John Wolffe  
Linda Woodhead (Chair)

#### **Apologies:**

Shenaz Bunglawala  
Robin Griffith-Jones  
Gordon Lynch  
Jonathan Tubb

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

- 1.1. The deputy chair opened the meeting until the slightly delayed arrival of the chair.
- 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 meeting held on 15-16 September 2014.

## **3. Conflicts of interest**

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

## **4. Presentation on the conclusion of the REF assessment phase**

- 4.1. 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.

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

- 5.1. 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.
- 5.2. The panel reviewed the chair's draft sub-panel overview report and discussed the health of the discipline and trends noted in the course of the assessment. The chair stated that she 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 revisions to the report to take account of the panellists' comments.

## **6. Main Panel overview report**

- 6.1. The Main Panel chair spoke to his draft overview report. Panel members 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 diligence and rigour during the entire REF exercise and expressed his thanks to the sub-panel chair.

## **7. Review of the criteria setting and assessment process**

- 7.1. 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 and including on the selection of staff and research outputs for submission, the arrangements for assessing impact, and data available to panellists. The panel's representatives agreed to report the views at the forthcoming feedback sessions.

**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 chair thanked panel members and the panel Secretary and Adviser for their dedication and hard work throughout the REF process. The meeting closed at 4.00 pm.