



Sub-panel 34: Meeting 2

4 February 2014

Grand Connaught Rooms, London

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Oriana Baddeley
Naren Barfield
Tim Benton
Tracy Bhamra
Sandy Black
Anne Boddington (Deputy chair)
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Stephen Boyd Davis
Christopher Breward
Brendan Cassidy
Rachel Cooper
Colin Cruise
Juan Cruz
Stephen Dixon
Paul Greenhalgh (Chair)
Beth Harland
Deborah Howard
Liz James
Jake Kaner
Judith Mottram
James Moy (International adviser)
Stephen Partridge
James Roddis
Irit Rogoff
Emma Rose
Paul Seawright
Penny Sparke
Peter Stewart
Christopher Townsend
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Sue Walker
Evelyn Welch

Apologies:

Michael Horsham
Catherine Karkov
Nigel Llewellyn

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting, particularly those joining the sub-panel for the first time following their appointments as output assessors, and all panellists introduced themselves. The chair announced that one member, Deyan Sudjic, had resigned from the panel and that he, the chair, would take this to the REF Manager and investigate the options for covering the work allocated to him.
- 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 or, where necessary, agreed to update their conflicts of interest on the Panel Members' Website after the meeting.
- 2.2. The deputy chair stressed the importance of making any changes to declarations of interest as soon as possible as this had implications for work allocation and workloads.

3. Summary of submissions to unit of assessment 34

- 3.1. The panel received paper 1, Summary of submissions to UOA34. They noted a small number of multiple submissions, and the relatively small number of requests for double-weighting.

4. Output calibration

- 4.1. The chair explained the rationale for the selection of outputs for calibration, noting the need to recognise and explore the extraordinary breadth of material submitted to the unit of assessment.
- 4.2. Twelve of the outputs in the calibration exercise, which included a number for which a double-weighting request had been made, were discussed in detail.
- 4.3. The wide-ranging discussion highlighted the issues to be addressed during the assessment, including questions around emergent issues and new genres, the definition of research and eligibility of outputs.

- 4.4. On double-weighting, panellists were reminded that decisions must not be based solely on the basis of the HEI request, but that a judgement should be made by reviewing the output and applying the double-weighting criteria. Double-weighting concerned the research input to an item submitted for assessment. The judgement of its quality (the assessed score for an output) is separate from the decision on double weighting.
- 4.5. Panellists were reminded that they must only assess the material submitted, and that the quality of the research was to be assessed and not the location of its publication. Where panellists had concerns, for example about an author's contribution to an output, there was an opportunity to raise an audit query.
- 4.6. The exercise was about finding excellence, and all outputs would be assessed according to the published criteria. The calibration sample included a number of items which prompted discussion on eligibility and overlap, particularly where submitted outputs related to lengthy projects of many years' duration, and the extent to which these included new material which was eligible for the current exercise.
- 4.7. It was noted that portfolios were not available at this stage of the process, and that this had hampered full consideration of some of the items selected, however it was stressed that calibration would continue throughout the assessment period.

5. Brief presentation on REF IT systems

- 5.1. The secretary gave a short presentation on the REF IT systems, highlighting issues of particular significance for panel members.

6. Output allocation

- 6.1. All outputs had been allocated to two readers based on subject expertise and taking account of declared 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.
- 6.2. The chair anticipated a significant number of cross-referrals into the panel, but hoped that the panel would be able to assess as much as possible of the submitted material within the panel, and to avoid cross-referring out 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.

- 6.3. The panel received paper 7, Procedural guidance for panels on physical outputs.

7. Working methods

- 7.1. The panel adviser explained that the working methods paper (Paper 8) was intended as a guide for panel members and also to demonstrate the transparency of the process, the consistent approach across the Main Panel, and to reassure the academic community of the integrity of the process.
- 7.2. Panel members were informed that in order to report back to HEIs on the separate elements of the assessment – outputs, impact and environment – the workload would be divided between all panel members in such a way that no single member would have the responsibility for leading across all elements of a single submission. Panel members would be given an early indication of these responsibilities.

8. Audit

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

9. Workplan for panel members

- 9.1. The panel received paper 10, Workplan for panel members.
- 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 revised workplan, with a deadline for the scores to be returned, and details of the impact calibration exercise.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting (Meeting 3, 25-26 March).

11. Any other business

- 11.1. Panel members agreed that their contact details should be shared. The secretary was asked to produce a report and circulate this to the membership.

Sub-panel 34: Meeting 3, Part 1

25 March 2014

Mercure Cardiff Holland House Hotel, Cardiff

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Oriana Baddeley
Naren Barfield
Tim Benton
Sandy Black
Anne Boddington (Deputy chair)
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Stephen Boyd Davis
Christopher Breward
Morven Cameron
Nick Capaldi
Brendan Cassidy
John Cole
Rachel Cooper
Colin Cruise
Juan Cruz
Stephen Dixon
Paul Greenhalgh (Chair)
Beth Harland
Deborah Howard
Jacky Klein
Judith Mottram
James Moy (International adviser)
Paula Murray
James Roddis
Irit Rogoff
Emma Rose
Paul Seawright
Penny Sparke
Peter Stewart
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Sue Walker
Evelyn Welch

Apologies:

Michael Horsham
Nigel Llewellyn
Stephen Partridge

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting, particularly the impact assessors joining the sub-panel for the first time, and all panellists introduced themselves. The chair reported that the main business of this meeting was to calibrate impact case studies and templates and that this followed a similar exercise by the Main Panel earlier in the month.
- 1.2. It was noted that the two 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 (Meeting 2)

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2014.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Impact calibration

- 4.1. The chair explained that the purpose of this exercise was for panel members to reach a common position on the case studies and templates and to talk through convergences and divergences. The panel noted paper 2 which set out the volume of impact case studies and templates submitted to the panel, and outlined the procedure for assessment.
- 4.2. The panel received paper 3 'Guidance to sub-panels on points arising from the impact calibration exercise conducted by Main Panel D' which summarised the views of Main Panel members.

- 4.3. The panel adviser gave a presentation on assessing impact, focussing on threshold criteria, and responded to questions from panel members. On underpinning research panel members were reminded of the need for a clear relationship between research considered to be of at least 2* quality and the claimed impact.
- 4.4. It was noted that that in some cases more than one HEI may have submitted case studies presenting the same impact. Panel members were urged to read and assess each individually. Panel members were encouraged to use the full range of scores, including .5 scores where appropriate. Panellists were reminded that claims for potential or future impact was not eligible, and must be assessed on the basis of the material presented. Cases should not be penalised where the impact has been unplanned or serendipitous – this is entirely within the rules.
- 4.5. Where data such as visitor numbers at museums was presented, this should ideally be contextualised or benchmarked to allow evaluation. If the case is dependent on the data, and not sufficiently contextualised, then this may be an issue for audit or further discussion with the Chair. Judgements are to be made on what is presented, and should not be made on what is missing, or what else might have been done to create impact. For case studies that are dependent on an individual's PhD thesis as the underpinning research, this is eligible where the researcher is a member of staff but also undertaking a PhD and the cited outputs are published work based on the PhD (as distinct from the thesis itself).
- 4.6. The chair introduced the discussion of a sample of impact case studies and templates for calibration, which all panellists had reviewed in advance of the meeting (papers 4 and 5). The sample included both case studies and templates from across the cluster (including UOA35 Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts and UOA36 Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management) which had also been reviewed by the Main Panel. In addition, a range of case studies for UOA34 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.
- 4.7. The panel discussed each of the case studies in detail and came to an agreed panel score for each one. They noted that these would not be the final scores, but that while the assessors assigned to these cases may be informed by the discussions, they would need to arrive at independent judgements when reviewing their allocated cases. Panel members who were conflicted with specific case studies left the room while these were discussed.
- 4.8. The panel was reminded of the need to assess the impact items holistically and to refer back to the published criteria for reach and significance. The secretary was asked to send panellists an updated work plan showing forthcoming deadlines for impact assessment.

5. Audit

- 5.1. Panellists received paper 6 on the audit of impact case studies and templates and were asked to identify case studies requiring audit. Audit cases should only be raised where panellists had reason to doubt the claims being made, and where the outcome would make a material difference to the judgement.
- 5.2. The arrangements for raising audit queries and discussing and agreeing scores for impact case studies and templates were discussed. It was noted that wherever possible scores for impact case studies and templates would be agreed by the teams assessing them so that sub-profiles could be confirmed at the next meeting in May.

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting: Meeting 4, Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead, South Croydon. Days 1&2 (6-7 May) – Produce draft impact sub-profiles; Day 3 (8 May) – Discuss scores for 33% of outputs

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There was no other business.

Sub-panel 34: Meeting 3, Part 2

26 March 2014

Mercure Cardiff Holland House Hotel, Cardiff

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Oriana Baddeley
Naren Barfield
Tim Benton
Tracy Bhamra
Sandy Black
Anne Boddington (Deputy chair)
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Stephen Boyd Davis
Christopher Breward
Bruce Brown (Chair of Main Panel D)
Brendan Cassidy
Rachel Cooper
Colin Cruise
Juan Cruz
Stephen Dixon
Paul Greenhalgh (Chair)
Beth Harland
Deborah Howard
Liz James
Jake Kaner
Catherine Karkov
Judith Mottram
James Moy (International adviser)
James Roddis
Irit Rogoff
Emma Rose
Paul Seawright
Penny Sparke
Peter Stewart
Christopher Townsend
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Sue Walker

Evelyn Welch

Apologies:

Michael Horsham
Nigel Llewellyn
Stephen Partridge

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Conflicts of interest

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

3. Output assessment

- 3.1. The panel received paper 7, Guidance to sub-panels on points arising from the outputs calibration exercise conducted by Main Panel D and its sub-panels.
- 3.2. 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.
- 3.3. On the issue of overlap between items, the Main Panel had agreed that sub-panels should apply their judgement to use whichever approach was most favourable to the submitting institution.
- 3.4. SP34 Panellists reviewed a report of upload activity to date and noted the target date for assessing 33% of outputs.
- 3.5. The panel reviewed a number of portfolios which had been discussed during the initial output calibration. They were reminded of the importance of noting the 300 word statements, where provided, and of applying the published criteria.

- 3.6. Panellists discussed a number of issues raised by members as a result of their assessment to date. The arrangements for confirming decisions on double-weighting were clarified. Wherever panellists were unable, in their pairs, to accept a double-weighting claim this would be reported formally to the panel.

4. Environment calibration

- 4.1. The panel received paper 8: Environment Calibration: approaches to assessing environment, which set out a number of guidance points for panellists to consider when assessing environment templates. Panellists were reminded that the templates should be assessed against the criteria of vitality and sustainability.
- 4.2. The panel adviser explained how the standard data for each submission had been provided, noting that it was intended to inform the sub-panels' assessment of environment and should be considered in the context of the narrative provided in the environment template (REF5), rather than as stand-alone information.
- 4.3. The chair introduced the discussion of a sample of environment templates for calibration, which had been reviewed by panellists in advance of the meeting (Paper 9). The sample included templates from across the cluster (including UOA35 Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts and UOA36 Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management). In addition, a range of templates for UOA34 had been added, to include submitting units of different size and nature, so as to provide a wide-ranging discussion of the issues which panellists may encounter when assessing.
- 4.4. 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.

5. Future meetings

- 5.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting, Meeting 4, Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead, South Croydon) - Days 1&2 (6-7 May) – Produce draft impact sub-profiles; Day 3 (8 May) – Discuss scores for 33% of outputs.

6. Any other business

- 6.1. There was no other business.

Sub-panel 34: Meeting 4, Part 1

6-7 May 2014

Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Oriana Baddeley
Naren Barfield
Tim Benton
Sandy Black
Anne Boddington (Deputy chair)
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Stephen Boyd Davis
Christopher Breward
Bruce Brown (Main Panel chair)
Morven Cameron
Nick Capaldi
Brendan Cassidy
John Cole
Rachel Cooper
Colin Cruise
Juan Cruz
Stephen Dixon
Paul Greenhalgh (Chair)
Beth Harland
Michael Horsham
Deborah Howard
Jacky Klein
Nigel Llewellyn
Judith Mottram
Paula Murray
Stephen Partridge
James Roddis
Irit Rogoff
Emma Rose
Paul Seawright
Penny Sparke

Peter Stewart
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Sue Walker
Evelyn Welch

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 25-26 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. Panel members particularly noted the comments on the use of quantitative data and its contextualisation, and suggested that benchmarking may be helpful in future exercises.
- 5.2. The panel discussed the arrangements for confirming impact sub-profiles. All case studies provisionally scored as unclassified were reviewed by the panel, with conflicted members leaving 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 82 submissions was confirmed individually.

6. Impact assessors

- 6.1. The chair expressed his and the panel's thanks to the sub-panel's impact assessors for the time and wisdom they had given to the exercise, and invited any suggestions and feedback on the process, and comments for general feedback to the sector.

7. Audit

- 7.1. A number of audit queries were raised by panellists on impact case studies and these would be taken forward by the secretary and adviser. Panellists would be advised of the outcomes of the audits and given the opportunity to revise their provisional scores. Any consequent amendments would be brought back to the panel for confirmation.

8. Future meetings

- 8.1. The panel noted the key agenda items for the next meeting: Meeting 5, Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh. Day 1 (8 July) – Produce draft environment sub-profiles; Day 3 (9 July) – Discuss scores for 50% of outputs.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. There was no other business.

Sub-panel 34: Meeting 4, Part 2

8 May 2014

Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Oriana Baddeley
Naren Barfield
Tim Benton
Tracy Bhamra
Sandy Black
Anne Boddington (Deputy chair)
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Stephen Boyd Davis
Christopher Breward
Bruce Brown (Main Panel chair)
Brendan Cassidy
Rachel Cooper
Colin Cruise
Juan Cruz
Stephen Dixon
Paul Greenhalgh (Chair)
Beth Harland
Michael Horsham
Deborah Howard
Nigel Llewellyn
Judith Mottram
Stephen Partridge
James Roddis
Irit Rogoff
Emma Rose
Paul Seawright
Duncan Shermer (REF Team)
Penny Sparke
Peter Stewart
Christopher Townsend
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)

Sue Walker
Evelyn Welch

Apologies:

Liz James
Catherine Karkov

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the output assessors to the second part of the meeting. The chair outlined the principal business of the day – to review and discuss scores for 33% of outputs and undertake further ongoing calibration; 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 25-26 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 allocated panellists.
- 4.3. The secretary reported on the progress on cross-referrals to more than 20 other sub-panels.
- 4.4. The panel was reminded to keep referring back to the published criteria, to look for excellence, and to assess outputs as presented without introducing personal or external knowledge.

- 4.5. The chair explained the role of HEI leads on outputs.

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.
- 5.2. 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 considered in context.
- 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, Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh.. Day 1 (8 July) – Produce draft environment sub-profiles; Day 3 (9 July) – Discuss scores for 50% of outputs.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There was no other business. The meeting closed at 15.15.

Sub-panel 34: Meeting 5, Part 1

8-9 July 2014

Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Oriana Baddeley
Naren Barfield
Tim Benton
Sandy Black
Anne Boddington (Deputy chair)
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Stephen Boyd Davis
Christopher Breward
Bruce Brown (Main Panel chair)
Brendan Cassidy
Rachel Cooper
Colin Cruise
Juan Cruz
Stephen Dixon
Kirsten Drotner (International)
Paul Greenhalgh (Chair)
Beth Harland
Michael Horsham
Deborah Howard
Nigel Llewellyn
Judith Mottram
James Moy (International)
Stephen Partridge
James Roddis
Irit Rogoff
Emma Rose
Paul Seawright
Penny Sparke
Peter Stewart
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)
Sue Walker

Evelyn Welch

Apologies:

None

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting. He 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 6-7 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 or undertook to amend their details on the Panel Members' Website as required.

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.

5. Assessment of environment templates

- 5.1. All panel members had assessed an allocation of environment templates, together with the associated data for each submission, ahead of the meeting and agreed, in teams of two, the scores for each of the five elements of each template. Many panellists had additionally read others of the statements and the chair and deputy had read all (other than those with which they were conflicted) and scored them independently.
- 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 82 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 date for the next meeting: Meeting 6, Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh, 17-19 September. The focus of the meeting would be 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.

Sub-panel 34: Meeting 5, Part 2

8-9 July 2014

Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Oriana Baddeley
Naren Barfield
Tim Benton
Tracy Bhamra
Sandy Black
Anne Boddington (Deputy chair)
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Stephen Boyd Davis
Christopher Breward
Brendan Cassidy
Rachel Cooper
Colin Cruise
Juan Cruz
Stephen Dixon
Kirsten Drotner (International)
Beth Harland
Michael Horsham
Deborah Howard
Liz James
Jake Kaner
Catherine Karkov
Nigel Llewellyn
Judith Mottram
Stephen Partridge
James Roddis
Irit Rogoff
Emma Rose
Paul Seawright
Penny Sparke
Peter Stewart
Christopher Townsend

Alison Vaughton (Secretary)

Sue Walker

Evelyn Welch

Apologies:

Paul Greenhalgh (Chair)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair sent apologies for Day 2 due to another commitment. The deputy chair welcomed the output assessors 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 8 May 2014.

3. Conflicts of interests

- 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 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.
- 4.2. The secretary reported on the progress on cross-referrals, and reminded panel members about confirming the decisions for double weighting claims.
- 4.3. The panel discussed specific issues raised by panel members emerging from the assessment of their allocated outputs.

- 4.4. The deputy chair outlined the timetable for the remainder of the assessment process and confirmed the deadline for scoring all outputs, noting that around 40% of scores had been agreed to date.
- 4.5. The panel discussed and agreed the arrangements for drafting feedback on outputs at panel level and to individual institutions.

5. Audit

- 5.1. The panel confirmed the scores for a number of impact case studies which had been subject to audit following the previous meeting. The results of the audits had been sent to the individual panel members responsible for assessing the items. There remained a number of scores still to be finalised and these would be reported to the next meeting.
- 5.2. The Secretary reported that 26 audits had been raised on outputs. These concerned the eligibility of outputs (including 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.

6. Future meetings

- 8.2. The panel noted the date for the next meeting: Meeting 6, Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh, 17-19 September. The focus of the meeting would be to produce draft outputs sub-profiles, produce overall quality profiles and continue feedback and overview reports.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There was no other business. The meeting closed at 15.20.

Sub-panel 34: Meeting 6
17-19 September 2014
Radisson Blu Hotel, Edinburgh

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Oriana Baddeley
Naren Barfield
Tim Benton
Tracy Bhamra
Sandy Black
Anne Boddington (Deputy chair)
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Stephen Boyd Davis
Christopher Breward
Bruce Brown (Main Panel chair)
Brendan Cassidy
Rachel Cooper
Colin Cruise
Juan Cruz
Stephen Dixon
Paul Greenhalgh (Chair)
Beth Harland
Michael Horsham
Deborah Howard
Liz James
Judith Mottram
Stephen Partridge
James Roddis
Irit Rogoff
Emma Rose
Graeme Rosenberg (REF Manager)
Paul Seawright
Penny Sparke
Peter Stewart
Christopher Townsend
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)

Anthonya Visser (International)
Sue Walker
Evelyn Welch

Apologies:

Jake Kaner
Catherine Karkov
Nigel Llewellyn

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panel members to the meeting. The main business of this meeting was to discuss the outputs sub-profiles and confirm the outputs sub-profiles, and to discuss the sub-panel's 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 8-9 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 of impact

- 4.1. The chair reported that following discussion at Main Panel level and with the sub-panel's user members, the impact sub-profiles for the unit of assessment had been confirmed.

5. Assessment of outputs

- 5.1. The chair explained the process for confirming outputs sub-profiles.
- 5.2. An outputs lead for each submission presented the scores and comments for each HE Institution. Individual items were discussed where required and all cases of unclassified outputs were reviewed. All conflicted panel members absented themselves from the meeting room when necessary. The outputs sub-profile for each of the 82 submissions was confirmed individually.

5.3. The panel discussed draft outputs feedback to individual institutions and undertook to finalise and confirm this at the sub-panel meeting in October.

5.4. 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.

6. Sub-panel overview report

6.1. The panel discussed the key issues for inclusion in the chair's draft sub-panel overview report. The chair undertook to circulate his draft report to panellists ahead of the next meeting.

7. Future meetings

7.1. The panel noted the date for the next meeting: Meeting 7, CCT Venues-Barbican, Aldersgate House, 135-137 Aldersgate Street, London EC1A 4JA, on Wednesday 8 October. The business of the meeting would be to complete feedback on submissions and to complete sub-panel content for overview reports.

The meeting closed at 13.00.



Sub-panel 34: Meeting 7
8 October 2014
CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Confirmed Minutes

Present:

Oriana Baddeley
Naren Barfield
Tim Benton
Tracy Bhamra
Sandy Black
Anne Boddington (Deputy chair)
Jane Boggan (Adviser)
Stephen Boyd Davis
Christopher Breward
Bruce Brown (Main Panel chair)
Brendan Cassidy
Rachel Cooper
Colin Cruise
Juan Cruz
Stephen Dixon
Paul Greenhalgh (Chair)
Beth Harland
Michael Horsham
Deborah Howard
Liz James
Jake Kaner
Catherine Karkov
Judith Mottram
Stephen Partridge
James Roddis
Irit Rogoff
Emma Rose
Paul Seawright
Penny Sparke
Peter Stewart
Alison Vaughton (Secretary)

Sue Walker
Evelyn Welch

Apologies:

Nigel Llewellyn
Christopher Townsend

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed panellists to this, the final meeting of the sub-panel for the assessment phase. He thanked all panellists for their fantastic hard work in assessing the enormous variety of work submitted to the panel and stressed the need to keep all details of the assessment confidential until published in December.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (Meeting 6)

- 2.1. The panel confirmed the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 17-19 September 2014.

3. Conflicts of interest

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

4. Individual staff circumstances

- 4.1. The panel received paper 2, Individual staff circumstances, which recorded the final outcomes of the review of individual staff circumstances for the Unit of Assessment and made recommendations on missing outputs following examination of the cases provided by the submitting HE Institutions (HEIs) and, where appropriate, audit. The paper further reported the results of the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) review of complex circumstances cases and noted the incidences of staff submitted by institutions with fewer than four outputs where no request for reductions was made.
- 4.2. The panel confirmed the recommendations.

5. Confirmation of feedback reports to individual HEIs

- 5.1. The panel worked in small groups to review the feedback statements for HEIs. The groups comprised, in each case, the academic lead panellist for each HEI together with other panellists. All conflicts of interest were taken into account and no panellists had any participation in reviewing or confirming the feedback for the institutions with which they had a conflict.

6. Presentation on the conclusion of the REF assessment phase

- 6.1. 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.

7. Consideration of summary data and confirmation of sub-panel overview report

- 7.1. 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 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.
- 7.2. The panel reviewed the chair's draft sub-panel overview report and reflected on the health of the discipline and trends noted in the course of the assessment. Suggestions and recommendations were made on the present draft and the chair undertook to revise the report taking account of the panellists' comments.

8. Main Panel overview report

- 8.1. The Main Panel chair spoke to his draft overview report. Panellists discussed aspects of the report and made comments and suggestions on the content, which were noted by the Main Panel chair. Panellists were invited to send any further comment to the panel adviser by email. The Main Panel chair expressed his thanks to all the panellists for their commitment and hard work throughout the exercise.

9. Review of profiles for each submitted HEI

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

10. Any other business

- 10.1. The chair thanked the panel for their contributions during the previous four years and closed the meeting at 16.30.