



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 35: Meeting 2

4 February 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Grand Connaught Rooms, London

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Tim Bergfelder
Stephen Bottoms
Karen Boyle
Jeanice Brooks
Michael Clarke
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Amanda Glauert
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
Miguel Mera
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Henry Stobart
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Sarah Whatley
Matthew Wright

Apologies:

Stella Hall
Stephanie Jordan

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel members introduced themselves to the group and 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. Register of interests

- 2.1. The secretary thanked the panel for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest. 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 SP35

- 3.1 The panel reviewed the summary of submission data.

4. Output allocation

- 4.1 The secretary outlined the principles behind the allocation of outputs to panellists. Outputs were allocated by the chair who drew on expertise from the deputy and other colleagues to ensure the appropriate allocation of outputs across all disciplines covered by the sub-panel. The allocation took into consideration conflicts of interest, the challenges posed by interdisciplinary outputs, relevant expertise and, as far as possible, aimed to ensure an even workload.
- 4.2 The secretary 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.

Action: Sub-panel 35 members and output assessors

- 4.3 The secretary confirmed arrangements for ordering physical outputs from the REF warehouse and passing between panellists. Panellists were reminded that printing and physical outputs may take up to one week to arrive after the order is placed. Panellists were reminded to plan their ordering of physical outputs in batches in line with their reading order so ensure scoring targets are met.

A number of panel members requested whether physical outputs could be collected from their home addresses rather than institutional addresses. The panel secretary and adviser confirmed that the current arrangements only permit collection from institutions, however bearing in mind practicalities for one

particular panel member the adviser agreed to explore whether exceptions could be made to this rule.

Action: Adviser

- 4.4 Panel members enquired whether costs for printing and telephone calls would be reimbursed. The adviser agreed to take this query to the REF team.

Action: Adviser

- 4.5 The chair reported that the REF warehouse would be willing to provide a printed version of the full submission (excluding outputs) to panellists if required. All panellists confirmed that they would like to receive the printed version. The chair agreed to contact the REF warehouse with this request.

Action: Sub-panel chair

5. Audit

- 5.1 The panel adviser outlined the Main Panel D paper on Audit and encouraged panellists to raise audit queries as soon as possible.
- 5.2 The panel adviser informed the meeting that the EDAP team and panel secretariat were currently involved in auditing staff circumstances although the panel were encouraged raise audit queries on staff if they had particular concerns.
- 5.3 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 to the accuracy of information or eligibility of an item or individual. In cases where a an output is likely to be 'Unclassified' without further information an audit query can be raised to request this information from the HEI.
- 5.4 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. Deadlines for audit requests will be shown on the SP35 key milestones report.

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.

6. Outputs calibration

- 6.1 Prior to the meeting, the sub-panel chair had selected and circulated a sample of 17 outputs to the members and output assessors, to be used for the sub-panel's initial calibration exercise. All outputs in the calibration process 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 the intention to develop a common understanding of the star levels and to agree a robust and fair process. The panellists were directed to the quality level criteria table appended to the MPD working methods paper.

6.3 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

6.4 Panel members had submitted their scores and comments to the secretary prior to the meeting. Comment were circulated to the panel members who broke out into smaller groups to consider how they had reached a consensus on each output and discuss particular outputs where scores diverged or members considered the output was borderline 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.

6.5 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: sub-panel members and assessors

6.6 Panel members with doubts over the validity of double-weighting requests should inform the chair or deputy.

Action: sub-panel members and assessors

6.7 One member of the sub-panel absented themselves from discussions of outputs from the institution with which they had conflicts of interest.

7. Working methods

7.1 The chair outlined an update to the Working Methods paper and announced that the full updated version was now available on the panel members' website.

7.2 The chair announced that a new panel spreadsheet would be released in the coming days taking account of further conflicts of interest and allocating remaining outputs, impact and environment.

7.3 The chair requested that when attending the forthcoming Secretariat meeting, the secretary and adviser ask the REF team to provide templates for drawing up HEI quality sub-profiles as soon as possible to avoid duplication of effort.

8. Project plan

8.1 The chair outlined the project plan and highlighted key deadlines and milestones.

9. Future meetings

9.1 26-27 March 2014

Date: 26 March 2014
Time: 9.30 am – 4.30 pm
Venue: Mercure Cardiff Holland House Hotel and Spa, Cardiff
Agenda: Impact calibration, assessment issues and audit queries
Attending: Sub-panel members & impact assessors

Date: 27 March 2014
Time: 9.30 am – 4.30 pm
Venue: Mercure Cardiff Holland House Hotel and Spa, Cardiff
Agenda: Environment calibration and outputs to date
Attending: Sub-panel members (all day) output assessors (am only)

10. Any other business

10.1 The chair and deputy requested that the adviser make a request to the REF manager to fund travel expenses to support panellists to attend a single venue to assess multi-channel acoustic work. A number of outputs will require this specialist equipment which takes a considerable amount of time to set up and is only available at a few institutions across the country. This would save a significant amount in postage and courier costs and a considerable amount of time in the assessment process.

10.2 There being no further business the meeting closed.



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 35: Meeting 3 (Part 1)

26 March 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Mercure Holland Park, Cardiff

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Stephen Bottoms
Jeanice Brooks
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Anna Dickinson (REF team)
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Phil George
Amanda Glauert
Betsy Gregory
Sally Groves
Stella Hall
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Stephanie Jordan
Penny King
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
Andrew Miller
James Moy (international)
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Katherine Zeserson

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel members introduced themselves to the group and 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 chair deferred discussion of the previous meeting until part 2 of meeting 3 as output assessors would be in attendance.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The secretary thanked the panel for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest. 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

- 4.1. Prior to the meeting the sub-panel chair and deputy had selected and circulated to SP35 members a sample of seven impact templates and 12 impact case studies from UoA35 and other units of assessment in Main Panel D Cluster 3. 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.
- 4.2. The chair outlined the aims of this calibration exercise, highlighting the intention to develop a common understanding of the 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. Panellists were requested to revisit the impact sections of *REF02.2011 Guidance on Submissions* to ensure a clear understanding of the requirements.

Action: Sub-panel members and impact assessors

- 4.3. The panel adviser outlined the approach to impact assessment including the judgements on eligibility criteria, audit queries and the use of half marks to reflect the balance of quality in two adjacent star ratings.
- 4.4. Panel members had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The secretary had collated these scores and comments into a report which the panel used to as a basis for calibration discussions. The panel broke into small groups to discuss the impact items, particularly issues around eligibility and agree

scores. Through this discussion the panel agreed an approach to scoring each item.

- 4.5. The chair stated that all impact statements and case studies had been allocated to groups of three reviewers comprising academic and user members. In most cases the first two reviewers will agree a score for each item, with the third reader taking on the role of moderating assessor as required, where there are problems agreeing scores. 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 will a 'lead assessor' will be nominated who will be responsible for uploading agreed scores and 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.

5. Impact next steps

- 5.1. The panel adviser reiterated of 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 14 – 28 cases for sub-panel 35. The panel adviser informed the sub-panel that the deadline for raising impact audit queries would be Monday 7 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.
- 5.2. 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 Friday 11 April. The chair informed the sub-panel that all impact scores and comments should be uploaded by Monday 28 April to allow reports to be produced in time for the meeting on 6-8 May where draft impact sub-profiles will be agreed.

Action: Sub-panel members and impact assessors

- 5.3. Any items failing threshold judgements will be graded 'unclassified'. All unclassified items will be discussed at the next sub-panel meeting in May.

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. Date: 6 & 7 May 2014
 Time: 10:00 – 17: 00
 Venue: Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon
 Agenda: Agree draft impact sub-profiles
 Attending: Sub-panel members & impact assessors

 Date: 8 May 2014
 Time: 10:00 – 16:30
 Venue: Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon
 Agenda: Discuss 33% outputs scored to date
 Attending: Sub-panel members & output assessors

7. Any other business

7.1. Annual leave

The meeting discussed potential issues with panellists' availability during the impact assessment phase since it will include Easter and a bank holiday weekend. The panel secretary offered to create a shared annual leave calendar where panellists' annual leave could be recorded.

Action: Panel secretary

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

REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 35: Meeting 3 (Part 2)

27 March 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Mercure Holland Park, Cardiff

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Tim Bergfelder
Stephen Bottoms
Karen Boyle
Jeanice Brooks
Michael Clarke
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Amanda Glauert
Stella Hall
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Stephanie Jordan
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
Miguel Mera
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Henry Stobart
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Sarah Whatley
Matthew Wright

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed the output assessors to the meeting 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 meeting approved the minutes from the previous meeting as a true and accurate record.

3. Output assessment

- 3.1. The chair and secretary reported on the progress of cross-referrals in and out of the sub-panel. The chair thanked the sub-panel for their prompt responses in assessing incoming outputs.
- 3.2. The chair outlined the method for agreeing panel scores once outputs have been reviewed, scored and marked agreed by both assessors. Any discrepancies will be revisited by the chair and/or deputy. The chair reminded panellists that they are welcome to revisit earlier scores at any time and consider revising them if necessary as part of an on-going calibration process. Panellists were requested to inform the sub-panel executive group if any earlier agreed scores are amended to ensure the amendment is reflected in the final panel agreed score.
- 3.3. The meeting sub-panel broke into small groups to discuss shared issues on outputs.
- 3.4. The chair reported outcomes of the recent Main Panel D output calibration meeting to the sub-panel. Including issues around the assessment of poetry collections or curated exhibitions where pre-census period work may be included along with post-2008 work. In this case it was agreed that the earlier work would not need to be discounted if it formed part of the whole curatorial aspect of the work occurring within the census period.
- 3.5. 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. Panellists were reminded to indicate their decision on double-weighting requests on their personal spreadsheet so that it can be approved at panel level once uploaded.
- 3.6. The meeting discussed issues arising from varying output types selected by HEI where there was no corresponding output type available within the REF2 form, for example editing a special edition of a journal. The chair and deputy advised

panellists to look within the 300 words for further clarification of the HEIs intention. If it was clear that the HEI was submitting the collection for assessment then it should be treated as such, however if the HEI have submitted only one chapter / article then it is that which should be assessed. If the output is still unclear following reading of the 300 word narrative panellists are requested to contact the sub-panel executive group to discuss raising an audit query.

- 3.7. The chair confirmed that outputs published via institutional repositories are eligible, however in many cases there will not have been a peer review process so it will be important to assess the output's rigour in other ways.
- 3.8. The deputy chair reminded panellists that audit queries can be used to request HEI to provide further copies of any evidence within a physical output that are faulty or in an incompatible format.
- 3.9. The chair requested that once all the outputs from each HEI have been assessed one or two short sentences of feedback on areas of strength and performance of ECRs should be sent to the panel secretary so support the writing of institutional feedback at the end of the process.

Action: sub-panel members and output assessors

4. Environment

- 4.1. 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. As part of a robust process, 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.
- 4.2. The chair outlined the timescales for environment assessment. Draft environment sub-profiles will be agreed by the sub-panel on at Meeting 4 on 8 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 Tuesday 20 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

- 4.3. 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 directed panellists to the definition of impact for the purposes of the REF2014 assessment. Panellists were requested to revisit the impact sections of *REF02.2011 Guidance on Submissions* to ensure a clear understanding of the requirements.

Action: Sub-panel members

- 4.4. Panel members had submitted their scores to the secretary prior to the meeting. The secretary displayed the collated scores and the panel broke into small groups to consider how far members had reached a consensus on each output. The sub-panel reformed to discuss the selected environment templates and reached a consensus on the score for each item.

5. Project plan and key milestones

- 5.1. The chair outlined the project plan and highlighted key deadlines and milestones

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. Date: 6 & 7 May 2014
Time: 10:00 – 17: 00
Venue: Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon
Agenda: Agree draft impact sub-profiles
Attending: Sub-panel members & impact assessors

Date: 8 May 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: Selsdon Park Hotel, South Croydon
Agenda: Discuss 33% 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 35: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

6 & 7 May 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Selsdon Park Hotel, Croydon

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Stephen Bottoms
Jeanice Brooks
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Phil George
Amanda Glauert
Betsy Gregory
Sally Groves
Stella Hall
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Stephanie Jordan
Penny King
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
Andrew Miller
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Duncan Shermer (REF team)
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Katherine Zeserson

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting with one amendment.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The secretary thanked the panel for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest. 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 and deputy had prepared some sample draft feedback on impact which they shared with the sub-panel. 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 and a 'lead assessor' was agreed for each institution.
- 4.3. Lead assessors agreed to submit a few sentences of draft feedback on impact by Friday 16 May via their personal spreadsheets.

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 all 84 impact templates and 186 of the 197 impact case studies. The sub-panel had generated 22 audit queries on impact which represented approximately 8% of impact items submitted to sub-panel 35. Of these audit queries 19 were complete with outcomes still outstanding for three queries. The

meeting agreed that where audit queries had not been completed that provisional scores would be agreed by the sub-panel with the final score to be entered as a chair's action.

- 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 sub-panel broke out into smaller groups to re-visit all impact items which had been graded 'Unclassified' and to discuss borderline and contentious cases. The sub-panel reconvened and held plenary discussions on these cases and arrived at panel agreed scores.
- 5.5. The sub-panel discussed cases where an audit query had not been resolved as an individual corroborating source had not responded to a request. The panel were advised by the member of the REF team that the panel secretary should contact the HEI concerned to ask for an alternative source of corroboration.
- 5.6. 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 79 HEIs and recommended to Main Panel D. Provisional scores and sub-profiles were agreed for the remaining 5 HEIs pending the outcome of audit queries. The chair will confirm these sub-profiles following discussion with the allocated assessing trios.

Action: Chair

- 5.7. 24 panellists left the meeting room during discussions of impact items from institutions with which they had a conflict of interest.

6. Future meetings

- 6.1.

Date:	8 July 2014
Time:	10:00 – 17:00
Venue:	Radisson Blu Edinburgh, 80 High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1TH
Agenda:	Produce draft environment sub-profiles
Attending:	Sub-panel members only
Date:	9 July 2014
Time:	09:00 – 16:30
Venue:	Radisson Blu Edinburgh, 80 High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1TH
Agenda:	Discuss 50% outputs scored to date
Attending:	Sub-panel members & output assessors

7. Any other business

- 7.1. The chair thanked the impact assessors for their very valuable input to the impact assessment phase.
- 7.2. There being no further business the meeting closed.



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 35: Meeting 4 (Part 2)

8 May 2014, 10.00 – 16.30

Selsdon Park Hotel, Croydon

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Tim Bergfelder
Stephen Bottoms
Karen Boyle
Jeanice Brooks
Michael Clarke
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Amanda Glauert
Stella Hall
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Stephanie Jordan
Miguel Mera
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Henry Stobart
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Sarah Whatley

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the output assessors to the meeting and outlined the day's agenda.

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting with one amendment.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The secretary thanked the sub-panel for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest. 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 introduced the REF team's paper on overview reports and outlined the process for gathering feedback on outputs.
- 4.2. The sub-panel agreed to produce feedback on outputs to institutions on an on-going basis once all outputs in each institution had been assessed. The chair emphasised the importance of preparing feedback throughout the process to ensure accurate and consistent reporting. Feedback should include references to particular areas of strength and the language of the REF criteria should be used as far as possible. The panel secretary agreed to send tables of criteria from REF guidance publications to sub-panel members and output assessors.

Action: panel secretary

- 4.3. The sub-panel broke out into smaller groups to discuss contentious issues, including double-weighting requests and unclassified outputs, and returned for plenary discussions.
- 4.4. The sub-panel discussed cases where outputs had been scored as 'unclassified'. Panellists agreed to provide a short explanation after the word 'agreed' in the comment field on their personal spreadsheets when outputs are scored as 'unclassified' in future.

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. The panel adviser gave a short presentation on using environment data analyses to support the assessment of environment templates.
- 6.2. The chair and deputy chair had allocated all environment templates to pairs of assessors. The meeting agreed that following discussion of environment scores by assessing pairs only one panellist would be required to upload the agreed score. All contentious issues and unclassified cases will be discussed at the next meeting.
- 6.3. 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 queries 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 9 June so that SP35 progress can feed into the Main Panel D report. Scoring of all environment templates should be complete by 1 July in advance of the next meeting.

7. Future meetings

- 7.1.

Date:	8 July 2014
Time:	10:00 – 17:00
Venue:	Radisson Blu Edinburgh, 80 High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1TH
Agenda:	Produce draft environment sub-profiles
Attending:	Sub-panel members only
Date:	9 May 2014
Time:	09:00 – 16:30
Venue:	Radisson Blu Edinburgh, 80 High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1TH
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 35: Meeting 5 (Part 1)

8 & 9 July 2014, Day 1. 10.00 – 17.00; Day 2. 9.00 – 11.00

Radisson Hotel, Edinburgh

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Stephen Bottoms
Jeanice Brooks
Bruce Brown
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Amanda Glauert
Stella Hall
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Stephanie Jordan
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the output assessors to the meeting and outlined the day's agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-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. Register of interests

- 3.1. The secretary thanked the sub-panel for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest. 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

- 4.1. The chair gave a short report on the recent meeting of Main Panel D where the impact assessment across all sub-panels under Main Panel D was reviewed. The Chair of Main Panel D was confident that the process had operated thoroughly and fairly.

Following a review of the draft sub-profiles generated by each sub-panel the main panel considered that it would be useful for sub-panels to revisit scores to ensure that the appropriate balance of scoring was reflected in the sub-profile. To this end the chair and deputy chair had invited the three user members to revisit all impact items to recalibrate scores where necessary in line with the REF2014 criteria. Following guidance from the sub-panel members, the user members undertook this exercise, and the sub-panel confirmed the final sub-profile.

Panellists were requested to generate a new spreadsheet following the meeting to see if any of their allocated items had been re-scored in light of the recalibration. In these cases panellists were requested to use the new impact sub-profiles when producing feedback to institutions.

5. Environment assessment

- 5.1. The chair thanked all panellists for their hard work in delivering the environment assessment on time and outlined the process for discussing, amending and agreeing environment scores.
- 5.2. The meeting discussed issues arising from a selection of environment templates, representing a broad range of institution types, where there were no conflicts of interest within the sub-panel.
- 5.3. The sub-panel broke into small groups to discuss and agree environment scores concentrating on borderline scores and contentious issues.

- 5.4. The sub-panel reconvened to confirm and endorse environment scores and sub-profiles for each institution in turn. The panel secretary projected scores for all environment items from each institution. These were briefly discussed and panel agreed scores and draft environment sub-profiles were confirmed by the sub-panel for 84 HEIs and recommended to Main Panel D. The sub-panel agreed that all environment scores would be subject to a final review at the September sub-panel meeting.

20 panellists left the meeting room during discussions of environment submissions from institutions with which they had a conflict of interest.

6. Future meetings

Date: 9 & 10 September 2014
Time: Day 1: 10:00 – 17:00, Day 2: 09:00 – 17:00
Venue: The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN
Agenda: Produce draft output sub-profiles & produce overall quality profiles
Attending: Sub-panel members and output assessors

Date: 11 September 2014
Time: 09:00 – 16:30
Venue: The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN
Agenda: 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 35: Meeting 5 (Part 2)

9 July 2014, 11.00 – 16.30

Radisson Hotel, Edinburgh

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Tim Bergfelder
Stephen Bottoms
Karen Boyle
Jeanice Brooks
Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)
Michael Clarke
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Amanda Glauert
Stella Hall
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Stephanie Jordan
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
Miguel Mera
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Henry Stobart
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Sarah Whatley
Matthew Wright

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The sub-panel chair welcomed the output assessors to the meeting and outlined the agenda.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-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. Register of interests

- 3.1. The secretary thanked the output assessors for updating their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest and reminded all panellists 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. 489 cases of clearly-defined circumstances had been submitted by institutions were reviewed by the panel secretariat. 487 of these were judged to have met the criteria and no missing outputs were recorded. For two staff, the criteria for output reduction were not satisfactorily met, and for each of these individuals the secretariat recommended that one missing output was recorded. The sub-panel approved this recommendation.
- 4.2. The panel adviser reported on the recommendation of the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) who had not yet completed their review of complex staff circumstances. Currently there were potentially three missing outputs for this sub-panel. The recommendation will be made to the chair of Main Panel D for approval once the review is completed.
- 4.3. The chair thanked the secretariat for reviewing the clearly-defined circumstances submitted to the sub-panel.

5. Output assessment

- 5.1. The chair congratulated and thanked the sub-panel for their hard work in exceeding the target of recording panel scores for 50% of outputs.

- 5.2. The sub-panel discussed issues around the patchy provision of 300 word statements and the varied quality of explanation for evidence portfolios. The chair agreed to raise this issue in the overview report at the end of the process.

Action: Chair

- 5.3. The adviser projected a slide showing the sub-panel's scoring broken down by output type.
- 5.4. The sub-panel broke out into smaller groups to allow time for panellists to meet face-to-face to discuss and agree scores for outputs.
- 5.5. The panel secretary met briefly with each assessor to confirm scores where discrepancies had been identified on the sub-panel spreadsheet.

6. Project plan and key milestones

- 6.1. The secretary outlined the project plan and highlighted the forthcoming deadline of **Friday 29 August 2014** when 100% of outputs should have agreed scores. Panellists were reminded to agree and upload scores regularly.

Action: sub-panel members and output assessors

7. Future meetings

- 7.1. Date: 9 & 10 September 2014
Time: Day 1: 10:00 – 17:00, Day 2: 9:30 – 17:00
Venue: The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN
Agenda: Produce draft output sub-profiles & produce overall quality profiles
Attending: Sub-panel members and output assessors

Date: 11 September 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: The Studio, 51 Lever Street, Manchester, M1 1FN
Agenda: 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 35: Meeting 6 (Part 1)

9 – 10 September 2014, Day 1. 10.00 – 17.30; Day 2. 9.00 – 12.30

The Studio, Manchester

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Tim Bergfelder
Stephen Bottoms
Karen Boyle
Jeanice Brooks
Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)
Michael Clarke
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Amanda Glauert
Stella Hall
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Stephanie Jordan
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
Miguel Mera
James Moy (international adviser)
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Henry Stobart
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)
Sarah Whatley
Matthew Wright

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1 The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting as an accurate record.

3. Register of interests

- 3.1. The chair reminded panellists to update their entries on the register of declared major conflicts of interest should their circumstances have changed. Sub-panel members agreed to inform the sub-panel chair, deputy and secretary by webmail of any minor conflicts that emerge.

4. Output assessment

- 4.1. The chair thanked all the panellists for their dedication and hard work in delivering agreed scores for 100% of eligible outputs on time. The sub-panel broke out into small groups to discuss final output scores and feedback to institutions. 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. Following recalibration discussions within the break-out groups a small number of adjustments were made to output scores. The panel secretary generated the final output quality sub-profile report.
- 4.3. The panel secretary projected the output quality sub-profiles. The sub-panel confirmed and endorsed output quality sub-profiles for all 84 institutions and recommended them to Main Panel D. The sub-panel discussed the quality of outputs from each institution and agreed to provide comments on specific subject areas to the nominated lead assessor for the feedback report.

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

5. Working methods

- 5.1 The panel adviser circulated 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.

6. Feedback to the discipline

- 6.1 The sub-panel reviewed and discussed the sub-panel 35 overview report and highlighted issues to be raised in the feedback to the REF team.

7. Future meetings

Date: 21 October 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: CCT Venues-Smithfield, London, EC1A 9PT
Agenda: Complete feedback on submissions
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 35: Meeting 6 (Part 2)

10 & 11 September 2014, Day 1. 13.30 – 17.00; Day 2. 9.00 – 16.30

The Studio, Manchester

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Stephen Bottoms
Jeanice Brooks
Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Amanda Glauert
Stella Hall
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Stephanie Jordan
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
James Moy (international)
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting as an accurate record.

3. Overall quality sub-profiles & feedback to institutions

- 3.1. The chair thanked all the panellists for their dedication and hard work in delivering agreed scores for all elements of the assessment outputs on time.
- 3.2. 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.

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

- 3.3. The sub-panel broke into small groups to work on feedback to institutions and reconvened to add contributions to the feedback report.

4. Future meetings

Date: 21 October 2014
Time: 10:00 – 16:30
Venue: CCT Venues-Smithfield, London, EC1A 9PT
Agenda: Complete feedback on submissions
Attending: Sub-panel members only

5. Any other business

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



REF Main Panel D/Sub-panel 35: Meeting 7

21 October 2014

10.00 - 16.30

CCT Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

Robert Adlington
Michael Alcorn
Paul Allain
Stephen Bottoms
Jeanice Brooks
Bruce Brown (Main panel chair)
Martin Clayton
Maria Delgado (Sub-panel chair)
Nicola Dibben
Kate Dorney
Christopher Fox
Maggie Gale
Amanda Glauert
Stella Hall
Neil Heyde
Alison Honnor (secretary)
Paul Hughes
Stephanie Jordan
Simon McVeigh (deputy chair)
James Moy (international)
Robin Nelson
Sita Popat
Adrienne Scullion
Sarah Street
Elizabeth Westlake (adviser)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting

- 2.1. The sub-panel approved the minutes of the previous meeting as an accurate record.

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. Minor adjustments

- 4.1. The chair informed the sub-panel of minor adjustments made to two environment section scores. Following a final review of the environment assessment two small anomalies were detected and slightly amended scores were agreed by the sub-panel chair, deputy and assessing panellists. The sub-panel endorsed these two adjustments and recommended them to Main Panel D.

5. Publication of results

- 5.1. 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.

6. Feedback to institutions

- 6.1. The sub-panel reviewed a sample of feedback to institutions and offered a number of amendments. All feedback to institutions was then allocated for review by small groups, taking into account conflicts of interest.
- 6.2. Following the break-out session the sub-panel reconvened for a plenary discussion. The secretary agreed to make the changes as indicated by the break-out groups.

Action: Secretary

- 6.3. The sub-panel approved any further amendments as required at the discretion of the sub-panel executive group.

7. Sub-panel reports

- 7.1. The sub-panel reviewed and amended the draft Main Panel D overview report.

- 7.2. The sub-panel reviewed the draft overview report for Sub-panel 35 and the secretary and adviser recorded their amendments.

8. Feedback to REF team

- 8.1. The sub-panel discussed feedback to the REF team and agreed to pass comments to the representatives at the REF user group which is due to meet in November.

9. Concluding remarks

- 9.1. The sub-panel chair thanked the sub-panel members, deputy-chair, adviser and secretary for all their hard work during the assessment process.
- 9.2. The sub-panel gave a vote of thanks to the sub-panel chair and deputy.
- 9.3. The Chair of Main Panel D expressed his thanks, and those of the REF team, to all members of Sub-panel 35 for their hard work and dedication in delivering the assessment.
- 9.4. Quality profiles and sub-profiles for all submissions to UoA35 were made available for those panellists who wished to view them.
- 9.5. There being no further business the meeting closed.