

REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 2

4 February 2014, 10am

Grand Connaught Rooms, London

Minutes

Present:

First Name	Surname	
Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
Jane	Arthurs	
David	Bawden	
Tim	Bergfelder	(afternoon only)
Karen	Boyle	(afternoon only)
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Chair
David	Hesmondhalgh	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
James	Moy	International adviser for items 1-4
Tim	O'Sullivan	
Peter	Reid	
Karen	Ross	
Elizabeth	Shepherd	
Yvonne	Tasker	
Sue	Thornham	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel and introduced the international adviser. In the light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Summary of submissions

- 3.1 The panel received a paper providing summary data on the volume of submissions to SP36 compared to the return for RAE2008. This showed a small increase in the number of outputs returned to the UOA and a small reduction in the number of submissions made. The number of submitted outputs had increased, as had the number of submitted FTEs; however the number of outputs per person had decreased.

4. Output calibration

- 4.1 Prior to the meeting, the chair had selected and circulated a sample of fourteen outputs to members and output assessors which were considered as part of a calibration exercise. These had been selected to reflect the range of types of outputs submitted to the sub-panel and to highlight examples of potentially challenging outputs to assess. In selecting outputs for the exercise the chair had taken account of the accessibility of outputs, conflicts of interest and panel expertise.
- 4.2 In addition to output calibration, panellists were also asked to consider a selection of cases submitted by institutions for double-weighted outputs.
- 4.3 The panel gave particular consideration to items that were potentially on the threshold of the REF definition of research; outputs that were on the boundaries of the panel's expertise; authorial contribution in relation to co-authored/co-edited volumes; output eligibility; and outputs which overlapped with other submitted outputs or with outputs submitted to RAE2008.
- 4.4 Panel members had submitted scores and comments prior to the meeting referencing the guidance provided by MPD on quality levels (paper 03). The panel discussed the particular outputs and reached a consensus on the principles for reaching an assessment for each, with reference to the published quality level descriptors. In the case of double-weighted outputs the panel reached a consensus on the principles for accepting cases submitted by institutions, with reference to the REF criteria for double-weighted outputs. The chair would feedback the results of the calibration exercise, and the principles agreed by the panel to MPD.

5. IT presentation

- 5.1 The panel secretary gave a presentation on REF IT systems. This included the use of personal spreadsheets; reading lists; REF webmail and data security.

6. Output allocation

- 6.1 The chair confirmed that the allocation of outputs was complete and outlined the principles used in allocating outputs to panellists, noting that all outputs would be double-read.
- 6.2 The panel noted papers providing procedural guidance on minor conflicts of interest (paper 06), cross-referral of outputs (paper 07) and obtaining physical outputs from the REF warehouse (paper 08).

7. Working methods

- 7.1 The panel confirmed its working methods in relation to the order in which outputs should be read to ensure that scores could be confirmed at future meetings to meet key milestones. Working methods were discussed and agreed for outputs that had been cross referred; for monitoring and recording minor conflicts of interest and for the use of comments fields by sub-profile leads.
- 7.2 The chair outlined the principles agreed at Main Panel D (MPD) for selecting impact case studies and environment templates for calibration. It was noted that the same sample set of case studies would be calibrated by each sub-panel cluster within MPD.

8. Audit

- 8.1 The panel received a briefing paper on audit, outlining the audit and data verification procedures which would be carried out by the REF team and those that would be instigated by panels. It was noted that a briefing paper would shortly be produced by the REF team to clarify the principles and circumstances for raising audit queries, and in particular relating to the audit of impact. REF guidance would be circulated to members ahead of the next meeting for reference.

9. Project plan: key milestones

- 9.1 The panel secretary outlined the meeting schedule for the panel and key milestones for the assessment process. Guidance on the assessment and calibration of impact templates, impact case studies, and environment templates would be circulated to members ahead of the next meeting.

10. Date of next meeting

- 10.1 The dates of the next meeting were confirmed as below, noting that the meeting would take place over two days:

26 March: Mercure Cardiff Holland House Hotel and Spa (with impact assessors in attendance)

27 March: Mercure Cardiff Holland House Hotel and Spa (with output assessors in attendance in the afternoon).

- 10.2 Day one of the meeting would cover impact calibration, assessment and audit queries, whilst day two would cover environment and discussion of output assessment to date.

REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 3

26-27 March 2014

Mercure Cardiff Holland House Hotel, Cardiff (day one);

10am

Minutes

Present:

Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
David	Bawden	
Bruce	Brown	Chair MPD (afternoon only)
Samantha	Chadwick	
Anna	Dickinson	HEFCE policy adviser (afternoon only)
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Sub-panel chair
Paul	Goodman	
David	Hesmondhalgh	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
Tim	O'Sullivan	
David	Pearson	
Karen	Ross	
Yvonne	Tasker	
James	Thickett	
Sue	Thornham	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

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

2. Register of interests

- 2.1 The panel reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest. Individuals were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate. Minor conflicts of interest had been raised informally with the Sub-panel chair as they had arisen and panellists had been formally notified of the decision.

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting two held on 4 February 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Impact allocation

- 4.1 The chair rehearsed the principles adopted for the allocation of impact templates and case studies by members i.e. that assessment of all impact case studies within a submission would be overseen by an academic member of the Sub-panel; individual case studies within a submissions would be read by two academic members of staff, and one impact assessor; the academic readers would be assigned based on discipline expertise and impact assessors would be assigned on the basis of who was closest in terms of expertise for the impact type.

5. Impact assessment and working methods

- 5.1 The panel adviser presented the REF slides on assessing impact following which there was an open discussion of the issues around impact, referencing the issues that panellists had previously identified.
- 5.2 The chair informed the panel of the discussion on assessing impact that had taken place at Main Panel D (MPD). The guidance paper from Main Panel D *Impact calibration: guidance to sub-panels on points arising from the impact calibration exercise* (paper 04) was noted.
- 5.3 The chair outlined the work of the sub-profile lead for impact in advance of meeting four. The panel agreed some principles for the assessment of impact with reference to both the REF guidance and the guidance provided by MPD. The panel also confirmed the working methods for panellists to come to a collectively agreed score for each impact case study and template and the working methods

by which the panel would approve the assessment of all case studies and templates underpinning the quality profile at meeting four.

6. Impact case studies calibration

- 6.1 In advance of the meeting all panellists involved in the assessment of impact had undertaken a calibration exercise and had returned scores and comments which were considered anonymously at the meeting.
- 6.2 The chair rehearsed the methodology for the selection of the case studies and templates noting that the panel had been asked to calibrate items selected for cluster calibration within MPD in addition to those selected for sub-panel calibration. The items selected for sub-panel calibration had taken account of conflicts of interest.
- 6.3 The chair introduced the discussion of the MPD and sub-panel calibrated items with panellists contributing their views on each item and their rationale for the score they had given. During the discussion summary data for each case study and template was projected. Through the discussion of each item, the panel reached a consensus on the principles for the assessment of different types of impact with reference to the REF guidance documents.
- 6.4 During the discussion one panellist left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

7. Impact audit

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

8. Impact next steps

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

9. Date of next meeting

- 9.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place 6-8 May at Selsdon Park Hotel, Croydon. Impact assessment would be considered on days one and two of this meeting.

REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 3

26-27 March 2014

Mercure Cardiff Holland House Hotel, Cardiff (day two);

10am

Minutes

Present:

Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
Jane	Arthurs	(afternoon only)
David	Bawden	
Tim	Bergfelder	(afternoon only)
Karen	Boyle	(afternoon only)
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Sub-panel chair
David	Hesmondhalgh	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
James	Moy	International adviser
Tim	O'Sullivan	
Karen	Ross	
Elizabeth	Shepherd	
Yvonne	Tasker	
Sue	Thornham	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel. Apologies were received from Peter Reid. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Environment allocation

- 2.1 The chair rehearsed the principles adopted for the allocation of environment templates. Each template would be read by two academic members of staff, taking account of conflicts of interest. Panellists were reminded to notify the chair and panel secretary of any minor conflicts of interest.
- 2.2 It was noted that all panel members with responsibility for the assessment of environment were required to read all the environment templates. It was further noted that audit queries could be raised where it would make a material difference to the assessment.

3. Environment calibration

- 3.1 The chair introduced the item on environment calibration. In advance of the meeting panellists had returned scores and comments which were considered anonymously at the meeting. The chair informed the panel that Main Panel D (MPD) had not yet undertaken its calibration on environment and would report back to a future meeting. Panellists were invited to raise any specific issues they had encountered with the assessment of environment.
- 3.2 The chair rehearsed the methodology for the selection of templates for the environment calibration exercise noting that the panel had been asked to calibrate templates selected for cluster calibration within MPD in addition to templates selected for sub-panel calibration. Templates had been selected taking account of conflicts of interest. The chair led the discussion on MPD calibrated items from outside of the sub-panel and sub-profile leads presented the summary of assessments for the sub-panel calibrated items. During the discussion summary data for each environment template was projected alongside the assessment criteria.
- 3.3 During the discussion of the items the panel agreed the principles for the assessment of environment with reference to the assessment criteria. The panel also confirmed the working methods for panellists to come to a collectively agreed score for each environment template and the working methods by which the panel would approve the assessment of all templates underpinning the quality profile at meeting five.

4. Next steps

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

Afternoon meeting

5. Introduction

- 5.1 The Chair welcomed output assessors to the afternoon session of the meeting.

6. Apologies for absence

- 6.1 There were no additional apologies for absence.

7. Register of interests

- 7.1 Output assessors reviewed the register of their declared major conflicts of interest and were invited to confirm or update their conflicts of interest as appropriate.

8. Output assessment

- 8.1 The panel noted the MPD guidance paper on the assessment of outputs which was tabled at the meeting. The panel reviewed progress with the scoring of outputs noting that around 10 per cent of outputs had now been scored. The chair thanked the panel for its progress with output assessment. The panel discussed and confirmed the working methods for agreeing scores at panel level and for raising issues with assessment encountered by panellists for further consideration by the panel.
- 8.2 The panel considered and confirmed the principles for the assessment of items that had been submitted to the panel that were beyond the bounds of its published remit.
- 8.3 It was noted that guidance on the assessment of creative writing items had been provided by the chair of Sub-panel 29 and had been circulated prior to the meeting. It was agreed that the chair of Sub-panel 36 would provide further guidance on the assessment of creative outputs.

9. Audit

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

10. Next steps

- 10.1 The chair outlined the work that panellists were expected to complete in respect of outputs, impact and environment before meetings four and five.
- 10.2 It was noted that there was only a very short break (which included the Easter weekend) between meetings three and four when the assessment of all impact case studies and templates was to be confirmed by the panel. Completing the assessment of impact within this timeframe would be challenging.

11. Next meeting

- 11.1 The Chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place at Selsdon Park Hotel, Croydon.
 - 6 May (part one): produce impact draft profiles
 - 7 May (part one): produce impact draft profiles
 - 8 May (part two): discuss scores for 33 per cent of outputs

REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

06 - 08 May 2014

Selsdon Park Hotel, Croydon

10am

Minutes

Present:

Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
David	Bawden	
Bruce	Brown	Chair MPD (items 4 and 5 only)
Samantha	Chadwick	
Duncan	Sherman	HEFCE policy adviser (am on 7 May only)
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Sub-panel chair
Paul	Goodman	
David	Hesmondhalgh	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
David	Pearson	
Karen	Ross	
Yvonne	Tasker	
James	Thickett	
Sue	Thornham	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel including impact assessors. Apologies for absence were received from Tim O'Sullivan.
- 1.2. The chair updated members on changes to panel membership since meeting four and the consequent reallocation of impact templates and case studies, noting that a member of the panel had resigned from the exercise due to personal reasons.
- 1.3. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting (part one) namely to consider scores for 100 per cent of impact and approve institutional sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.
- 1.4. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting three (parts one and two) held on 26-27 March 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Feedback reports

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

5. Impact assessment

- 5.1 The chair informed the panel of the discussion on the assessment of impact that had taken place at MPD. Members were referred to the paper *Impact calibration: collated feedback from sub-panels on the calibration of impact case studies and impact templates (paper 03)* which summarised the key points that had been considered by MPD.

- 5.2 The panel noted that there were 160 impact case studies and 67 impact templates for which scores needed to be confirmed over the course of the meeting. The panel secretary projected slides which detailed panel progress with scoring impact to date. The chair recorded his thanks to the panel on the progress that had been made since meeting three.
- 5.3 The panel agreed the working methods for agreeing scores for items that were still awaiting the outcome of audit queries.
- 5.4 The panel discussed issues that had been encountered with respect to the assessment of impact. These included where the underpinning research was sited; the quality of the underpinning research; and links between the research and the impact claimed. The panel reached a consensus on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria.
- 5.6 In the light of the assessment discussion, the panel were invited to review in breakout groups whether any scores required amendment. The secretariat updated agreed scores for items as required.

6. Audit

- 6.1 The chair updated the panel with respect to the number and progress of audit queries that had been raised on impact case studies, noting that queries had been raised where it was considered that the outcome would make a material difference to the assessment of the outcome. Most queries raised related to requests for further information regarding the threshold criteria, in particular the employment dates of staff who undertook the underpinning research; and verification of dates for the underpinning research and/or impact. A number of requests for corroborating evidence were also raised. It was noted that eight audit requests remained outstanding.

7. Review of impact scores and sub-profiles

- 7.1 The chair confirmed the process for confirming sub-profiles taking account of conflicts of interest. The sub-profile lead presented the rationale for the scores that had been given for impact case studies and impact templates for each submission. The secretariat projected the resultant sub-profiles which were then reviewed and agreed by the panel. During the review of sub-profiles, 15 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest (days one and two).
- 7.2 The panel recommended the sub-profiles for all submissions to the main panel for approval, noting which case studies were still subject to the outcome of outstanding audit queries.
- 7.3 The user members confirmed that the process of assessment that the panel had followed had been robust and reflective of the published assessment criteria.

8. Next steps

- 8.1 The chair reminded members of the process for confirming scores for items with outstanding audit queries and the deadlines for returning draft feedback statements to the panel secretary. The chair also outlined the agenda for part two (day three) of the meeting

9. Any other business

- 9.1 The chair thanked the impact assessors for their contribution to the assessment of impact.

REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 4 (Part two)

06-08 May 2014

Selsdon Park Hotel, Croydon

10am

Minutes

Present:

Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
Jane	Arthurs	
David	Bawden	
Tim	Bergfelder	(items 8 - only)
Karen	Boyle	(items 8 - only)
Bruce	Brown	(am only)
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Sub-panel chair
David	Hesmondhalgh	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
Karen	Ross	
Elizabeth	Shepherd	
Yvonne	Tasker	
Sue	Thornham	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel. Apologies were received from Tim O'Sullivan. The chair rehearsed, for the benefit of assessors not in attendance during part one of the meeting, the changes to panel membership since meeting four and the consequent reallocation of environment templates and outputs.
- 1.2. The chair confirmed the key aims and business for the day, and, in light of the attendance, the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Feedback reports

- 3.1 The panel reconsidered the draft REF guidance paper on feedback reports for the benefit of assessors who were attending on day three only. The chair highlighted fictional examples of output feedback statements which were included in the paper.

4. Overview of progress

- 4.1 The secretariat projected summary data illustrating progress towards the scoring of outputs by panellists. This included the overall sub-panel output sub-profile (based on panel agreed scores to date) against the overall Main Panel D (MPD) impact sub-profile; anonymised scoring patterns of panellists; numbers of cross referrals in and out of the panel; the number of panels to which items had been cross referred; and the number of audit queries raised.

5. Assessment Issues

- 5.1 Panel members had been invited to raise any issues they had encountered with the assessment of outputs prior to the meeting. These included overlap between outputs; co-authored multiple submissions; and the assessment of outputs that had been cross referred to other panels. These were considered by the panel and agreement reached on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria. The panel confirmed the process for agreeing requests for double-weighting.

6. Review of scores

- 6.1 Members were invited to agree any outstanding scores with co-assessors and to review whether any scores required amendment in light of the issues discussed.

The secretariat updated panel agreed scores as required. Subsequent to this, the panel reviewed progress and confirmed scores for 23 per cent of outputs.

7. Environment Assessment

- 7.1 The chair fed back on the discussion that had taken place at MPD on the assessment of environment. Members were referred to the paper Environment calibration: collated feedback from sub-panels on the calibration of environment templates (paper 03) which summarised the key points that had been considered by MPD.

8. Environment data

- 8.1 The panel noted the REF guidance paper on the use of environment data (paper 04). The panel adviser presented an environment analyses crib sheet (paper 04) which highlighted the key points to take into account when considering the environment data. The secretariat also presented additional analysis of the environment data which 'banded' data based on the standard analyses to aid the panel when comparing data across submissions.

9. Audit

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

10. Next steps

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

11. Date of next meeting

- 11.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place 8-9 July at Radisson Blu, Edinburgh:
Day one: produce environment sub-profiles
Day two: discuss scores for 50 per cent of outputs



REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 5 (Part 1)

08 - 09 July 2014

Radisson Blu, Edinburgh

10am

Minutes

Present:

Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
David	Bawden	
Tim	Bergfelder	
Karen	Boyle	
Kirsten	Drotner	International adviser (am only)
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Sub-panel chair
David	Hesmondhalgh	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
Tim	O'Sullivan	
Karen	Ross	
Yvonne	Tasker	
Sue	Thornham	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

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

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel, noting that apologies for absence had been received from Elizabeth Shepherd.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive item being to consider scores for 100 per cent of environment templates and approve institutional environment sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting four held on 6-7 May 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Impact assessment

- 4.1 The chair of MPD fed back to the panel the key points of discussion from the main panel on the assessment of impact. MPD recognized that all of its sub-panels had impressively demonstrated the internal integrity of the impact assessment process within each sub-panel, which had been confirmed by the user members of the sub-panels.
- 4.2 It was reported that, as part of the ongoing process of calibration, and given the newness of the impact review process and need to ensure the delivery of fully robust and credible outcomes, the main panel user members had requested that sub-panels review their recommended sub-profiles against MPD contextual data at their next meetings. The sub-panel was therefore shown a number of slides outlining MPD contextual data for impact assessment. The chair invited the sub-panel to consider whether, in the light of the presented data, further review of impact should be undertaken. The panel determined that further calibration of assessment was necessary, and agreed to consider, in particular, case studies assessed as borderline between two quality levels. It was agreed that given the further review necessary, the sub-panel could not at this stage sign-off institutional sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.
- 4.2 The chair confirmed that draft impact feedback reports had been drafted for all units of assessment; these would be reviewed by the Exec Group to ensure cross-panel consistency. Near-final drafts of institutional feedback statements

would then be considered by the panel at meeting six, incorporating impact, environment and output feedback statements. The panel were invited to submit comments relating in particular to impact assessment, for inclusion in the sub-panel section of the main panel overview report.

5. Environment assessment

- 5.1 The panel noted that MPD would consider the outcome of panels' assessment of environment at its meeting in July and would feedback to panels, via chairs, following this meeting.
- 5.2 The panel noted that there were 67 environment templates for which scores needed to be confirmed. The panel secretary verbally confirmed progress with panel scoring to date. The chair rehearsed the process for confirming sub-profiles at the meeting and for drafting feedback to be returned.
- 5.3 The panel discussed issues that had been encountered with the assessment of environment. These included the use of quantitative data in informing assessment of environment. The panel reached a consensus on how to deal with these with reference to the assessment criteria.
- 5.4 In light of the discussion, the panel were invited to consider environment templates in breakout groups. The secretariat updated scores for templates as required.
- 5.5 The panel held a plenary session following the breakout period to consider the scores for environment templates. The sub-profile lead presented the rationale for the scores that had been given for environment templates for each submission in turn. Panellists reviewed whether any of the scores required amendment in light of the issues discussed under 5.3. During the discussion 17 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

6. Audit

- 6.1 The chair confirmed that one audit query had been raised on environment to confirm that the submitted template was complete.

7. Review of environment template scores and sub-profiles

- 7.1 The chair confirmed the process for confirming sub-profiles taking account of conflicts of interest. Panellists were requested to review their draft feedback on the rationale for assessment to the secretariat, for use in the drafting of institutional feedback reports.
- 7.2 The panel considered in plenary the resultant sub-profiles for each submission in turn. The panel considered the profiles in turn and determined that some further work was necessary before sub-profiles could be recommended to the main panel

for sign-off, in particular, having reviewed some contextual data relating to assessment of each element of environment, the sub-panel wished to review assessment of income, infrastructure and facilities. During the discussion of scores and review of sub-profiles, 17 panel members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

8. Conclusion to day one

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



REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 5 (Part 2)

08 – 09 July 2014

Radisson Blu, Edinburgh

10am

Minutes

Present:

Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
Jane	Arthurs	
David	Bawden	
Tim	Bergfelder	(am only)
Karen	Boyle	(am only)
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Sub-panel chair
David	Hesmondhalgh	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
James	Moy	International adviser (pm only)
Tim	O'Sullivan	
Karen	Ross	
Elizabeth	Shepherd	
Yvonne	Tasker	
Sue	Thornham	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the panel including output assessors. There were no apologies for absence.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, namely to review scores for 50 per cent of outputs.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Staff circumstances

- 3.1 The panel noted the paper on individual staff circumstances (paper 02: Individual staff circumstances) which outlined the decisions made in relation to staff circumstances for the panel.
- 3.2 The chair outlined the three types of circumstance that staff could be returned with i.e. 'none', where the member of staff would be returned with four outputs; 'complex', where a member of staff might have circumstances where they would qualify for a reduction of outputs based on the protected characteristics; and 'clearly defined' where a member of staff would qualify for a reduction of outputs having had period(s) of maternity leave or part time working within the assessment period or for being an early career researcher (ECR).
- 3.3 Complex circumstances had been reviewed by the Equalities and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) who had made a recommendation on the number of outputs to be reduced. All were accepted with the exception of one for which a missing output had been recorded.
- 3.4 It was reported that the secretariat had reviewed all clearly defined circumstances and determined that, with the exception of two cases which were subject to outstanding audit queries, all should be accepted and that there were no missing outputs.

4. Output assessment

- 4.1 Panellists were reminded of the process for returning items to the REF warehouse once they had been assessed.

- 4.2 The chair confirmed the process and deadline for the return of draft output sub-profile feedback.
- 4.3 The secretariat projected summary data illustrating progress towards the scoring of outputs to date. This included the emerging sub-panel output sub-profile (based on panel agreed scores to date) against the overall MPD output sub-profile; anonymised scoring patterns; numbers of cross referrals in and out of the panel; and the number of outputs cross referred to specialist advisers.
- 4.4 The panel were reminded of the process for agreeing claims for double-weighting and reviewed cases where the claims for double-weighting had been rejected. The panel also agreed the process for chasing outstanding advice for items cross referred to other panels.
- 4.5 The secretariat had cross referenced output titles to identify where the same output had been submitted within a submission or across multiple submissions. The secretariat would inform all readers via email to facilitate discussion on an agreed score.
- 4.6 The panel reviewed progress on the scoring of outputs to date and confirmed assessment for 41 per cent of outputs.

5. Audit

- 5.1 The chair confirmed the number of audit queries raised to date from which six data adjustments had been made. The REF team had undertaken a 'data comparison of research outputs' audit in order to verify the eligibility of outputs submitted to the REF. The panel noted that all outputs selected for audit were verified with the exception of one where an output was deemed to be ineligible and a score of unclassified was recorded. It was noted that the REF audit exercise was carried out based on digital object identifiers (DOIs) only and that panellists should continue to raise audits where they had concerns.

6. Next steps

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

7. Date of next meeting

- 7.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place 8-9 September at The Hive, 51 Lever Street, Manchester:
 - Consider and confirm scores for 100 per cent outputs
 - Produce draft output sub-profiles

Produce overall quality profiles
Begin feedback and overview reports

REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 6 (Part 1)
09 - 10 September 2014
The Hive, 51 Lever Street, Manchester

Minutes

Present:

Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
Jane	Arthurs	
David	Bawden	
Karen	Boyle	
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Sub-panel chair
David	Hesmondhalgh	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
Tim	O'Sullivan	
Karen	Ross	
Elizabeth	Shepherd	
Yvonne	Tasker	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

In attendance: Bruce Brown, chair of Main Panel D (MPD); and James Moy, international adviser, attended at various points throughout the day.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting, noting that apologies for absence had been received from Tim Bergfelder and Sue Thornham. It was noted that output assessors would be attending for day one of the two day meeting.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive item being to consider scores for 100 per cent of outputs and approve institutional output sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting five held on 8-9 July 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Impact assessment

- 4.1 The chair reported that the impact assessors had met during the summer to further review impact in the light of the sub-panel agreement that borderline assessed case studies be reviewed to ensure parity of assessment. The impact assessors calibrated assessment against a number of case studies scored by other sub-panels within MPD. During their review, the impact assessors recommended a number of adjustments to scores for impact case studies.
- 4.2 The sub-panel considered the revised sub-profiles resulting from the review by impact assessors, and agreed all impact sub-profiles for recommendation to the main panel.
- 4.3 The chair confirmed that the Exec Group had reviewed draft impact feedback statements for all units of assessment to ensure cross-panel consistency. It was noted that purpose of the statements was to provide informative feedback to assist the institution in understanding the reasons for the profiles it had been awarded.

5. Environment assessment

- 5.1 The chair fed back to the sub-panel the key points of discussion from the main panel on the assessment of environment. MPD recognized that all of its sub-panels had undertaken a robust assessment of environment templates within

each sub-panel. The main panel had noted at its last meeting that sub-panel 36 had not yet reached consensus in recommending the environment sub-profiles for approval.

- 5.2 The sub-panel considered a number of slides outlining MPD contextual data for environment assessment. The chair invited the sub-panel to consider whether, in the light of the presented data, further review of environment should be undertaken. It was determined that further calibration of assessment was necessary; the sub-panel reviewed the templates in turn and considered in particular elements assessed as borderline between two quality levels and assessments relating to income, infrastructure and facilities. A number of adjustments to assessments were recommended following this exercise. The sub-panel considered the resultant institutional sub-profiles, and agreed that all should be recommended to the main panel for approval.
- 5.3 The chair confirmed that draft environment feedback reports had been drafted for all units of assessment; these would be reviewed by the Exec Group to ensure cross-panel consistency.

6. Staff circumstances

- 6.1 The sub-panel noted a revised paper on individual staff circumstances (paper 02 *Individual staff circumstances*). This confirmed the outcome of two outstanding audit queries, namely that no missing outputs have been recorded for staff with clearly defined circumstances within submission to this UOA. The sub-panel approved the recommendation that for 271 staff, (with clearly defined circumstances) an appropriate number of outputs have been submitted and no missing outputs should be recorded. (156 early career researcher cases were included in this recommendation).

7. Output assessment

- 7.1 The chair fed back on the discussion of emerging output profiles from the last MPD meeting. Main panel had noted that there had been variable practice on the part of submitting institutions across the main panel with respect to requests for double-weighting for outputs. Some sub-panels had expressed their surprise at the small volume of double-weighting requests received, particularly in the light of the criteria permitting a reserve item and the numbers of outputs that would likely have met the criteria for double-weighting.
- 7.2 The sub-panel noted that MPD would consider the outcome of panels' assessment of outputs at its meeting in September and would feedback, via sub-panel chairs, following this meeting.
- 7.3 It was further noted that the main panel was surprised at the distribution of output scores and considered that these were unlikely to be reflective of the quality of

work within the field. The sub-panel was invited to review and recalibrate paying particular attention to outputs that were at the boundaries of each grade.

- 7.4 The panel secretary verbally confirmed progress with scoring to date, namely that 98 per cent of outputs now had a panel agreed score. The chair rehearsed the process for confirming sub-profiles at the meeting, noting that there were 67 output sub-profiles for which scores needed to be confirmed.
- 7.5 Panellists raised any issues that they had encountered with the assessment of outputs, and the sub-panel reached a consensus on the assessment of these items with reference to the assessment criteria. Issues included double-weighting; the assessment of practice-led research, and calibration of outputs at the boundaries of quality levels.
- 7.6 The sub-panel held a break out session in order for panellists to confirm agreed scores for the items where the panel agreed score had not been entered, and to review scores for items in the light of earlier discussion.
- 7.7 A plenary session was held following this to consider the output sub-profiles in turn. During this session it was agreed that further work was required with regard to the assessment of outputs at the boundaries of 2* - 3* and 3* - 4*. It was agreed that panellists would review 2* and 3* outputs to determine whether any scores should be adjusted in the light of the sub-panel assessment discussion and calibration. Given the time available at the meeting, panellists were requested to inform the panel secretary of any suggested amendments within 5 days of the meeting. During the discussion of this item, 15 panellists left the room on account of conflicts of interest.
- 7.8 The chair confirmed that draft output feedback reports had been drafted for most units of assessment; the Exec Group would review all feedback to ensure cross-panel consistency. Near final drafts would be circulated in advance of meeting seven. Panellists were invited to forward any outstanding feedback reports to the panel secretary.

8. Audit

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

9. Feedback from Main Panel D

- 9.1 The chair of MPD fed back general comments from the last meeting of the main panel, noting that the main panel was confident of the robustness of the

assessment process and in the range of scores awarded to date across the sub-panels.

10. Sub-panel overview report

- 10.1 The sub-panel divided into two breakout groups to consider feedback for inclusion in the sub-panel overview report. Each group then fed back in a plenary session. It was agreed that the chair and deputy-chair would incorporate comments from the sub-panel into the draft overview report. The draft report would be circulated to members for further review in advance of the next main panel meeting.

11. Conclusion to part one

- 11.1 The chair thanked members for the work that they had undertaken in respect of output assessment and in particular the output assessors who had now completed their work for the REF. The chair confirmed the business for part two, namely to confirm institutional overall quality profiles.



REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 6 (Part 2)
09 - 10 September 2014
The Hive, 51 Lever Street, Manchester
10am

Present:

Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
David	Bawden	
Karen	Boyle	
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Sub-panel chair
David	Hesmondhalgh	
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
Tim	O'Sullivan	
Alice	Prochaska	International adviser (am only)
Karen	Ross	
Elizabeth	Shepherd	
Yvonne	Tasker	
Sue	Thornham	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

In attendance: Bruce Brown, chair of Main Panel D (MPD); and James Moy, international adviser, attended at various points throughout the day.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the meeting, noting that apologies for absence had been received from Tim Bergfelder.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive item being to consider institutional quality profiles for recommendation to the main panel.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the sub-panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Working methods

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

3.0 Institutional overall quality profiles

- 3.1 The secretariat presented a number of slides showing summary data for MPD and for Sub-panel 36 for all assessment elements.
- 3.2 The sub-panel reviewed the overall quality profile for each HEI in turn. During the discussion of this item 17 members left the room on account of conflicts of interest. It was noted that given the outstanding actions in relation to outputs, overall quality profiles could not be finally signed off at this stage.

4. Sub-panel overview report

- 4.1 The sub-panel further considered the key points for inclusion in the sub-panel overview report and in particular subject boundaries and disciplines, and the assessment of impact. The chair rehearsed the process for drafting the report for consideration by main panel.

5. A.O.B

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

6. Next steps

- 6.1 The chair highlighted the work that was required in advance of meeting seven namely the review of feedback statements and the sub-panel overview report to produce near-final drafts.

7. Next meeting

- 7.1 The chair confirmed that the next meeting would take place at the CCTV Venues, Barbican, London on 16 October to:

Recommend output and overall quality profiles to Main Panel
Complete feedback on submissions
Complete sub-panel content for overview reports



REF Sub-panel 36: Meeting 7
16 October 2014
CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

Alison	Adam	Deputy-chair
David	Arnold	
Jane	Arthurs	
David	Bawden	
Bruce	Brown	Chair MPD
Chris	Frost	
Peter	Golding	Sub-panel chair
Rebecca	Lambert	Panel adviser
Justin	Lewis	
Sonia	Livingstone	
Valerie	Lodge	Panel secretary
Graham	Matthews	
Tim	O'Sullivan	
Karen	Ross	
Elizabeth	Shepherd	
Yvonne	Tasker	
Sue	Thornham	
Peter	Willett	
Gillian	Youngs	

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed members to the final meeting of the panel. There were no apologies for absence. The sub-panel noted the resignation of David Hesmondhalgh.
- 1.2. The chair outlined the key aims and business of the meeting, the substantive items being to review and sign off each HEI overall profile and to review and provide comment on the Main Panel D (MPD) and Sub-panel 36 overview report.
- 1.3. In light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Register of interests

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

3. Minutes of previous meeting

- 3.1 The minutes of meeting six held on 8 – 9 September 2014 were confirmed as an accurate and true record.

4. Audit

- 4.1 The chair confirmed that there was nothing to report on audit.

5. Feedback from MPD

- 5.1 The chair fed back the key points from the last meeting of Main Panel D (MPD), noting that the main panel had reviewed outstanding impact and environment profiles that were not fully signed off at the last panel meeting. These were approved, subject in two panels' cases to the approval by impact assessors and/or final sign off by the sub-panel at meeting seven; this included Sub-panel 36.
- 5.2 Final output profiles had been considered by the Main Panel for the first time and the chairs had spoken to any assessment issues. All profiles had been approved, noting that the output sub-profile for Sub-panel 36 had been agreed in principle by the Main Panel subject to formal sign-off by the sub-panel at meeting 7 (see section 6 below).

6. Submissions: sub-profile and feedback review

- 6.1 The secretariat projected data for each HEI in alphabetical order, showing the sub-profiles for output, impact and environment together with the overall profile.

The sub-panel reviewed each in turn, and noted the results of any adjustments to output scores since the last meeting on the sub-profile. Sub-profiles for outputs, impact and environment were considered in turn and signed-off by the sub-panel for recommendation to Main Panel D. Overall quality profiles were also recommended to the Main Panel for approval. During the discussion of this item 17 members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

- 6.2 The sub-panel considered the draft feedback to institutions and established several key principles for the feedback. It was agreed that the Panel Exec would revise the statements in light of the sub-panel discussion, taking account of feedback from the REF team on content and tone to ensure consistency of style, as far as possible, across MPD. The sub-panel approved the chair to take action on behalf of the sub-panel to approve the final version of the feedback. During the discussion of this item 17 members left the room on account of conflicts of interest.

7. Overview reports

- 7.1 The sub-panel noted the draft composite MPD and Sub-panel 36 overview report (paper two). A template for the sub-panel overview reports had been devised by the Main Panel to ensure consistency, with common subject material set out in the Main Panel report and amplified where appropriate in the sub-panel reports. It was noted that the reports would be read by a wide audience including submitting institutions, Research Councils UK and European Research Councils.
- 7.2 The sub-panel considered both overview reports recommending editorial changes or amendments to ensure that the sub-panel report contained relevant reflections on the discipline.
- 7.3 During the discussion of the reports, the panel adviser projected a number of data slides which had been presented to the Main Panel. These included quartile 'whisker' charts; MPD overall profiles for submissions to RAE 2008 and REF 2014; MPD overall profiles; MPD profiles for items that had been double-weighted; and MPD profiles for items flagged as interdisciplinary by the submitting HEI.
- 7.4 The sub-panel noted that the final version of sub-panel reports would be subject to editorial changes up until the point at which all of the sub-panels had met and the Main Panel report was finalised. The sub-panel approved the chair to take action on behalf of the sub-panel to approve the final version of the report.

8. Publication of results

- 8.1 The panel adviser projected a number of slides from the REF team which detailed the timeframe for the publication of results; the results website; comparative data to be published; and general advice on speaking to the media.

- 8.2 The chair of MPD reminded panellists of their responsibilities with respect to confidentiality. The sub-panel noted that all assessment material should be destroyed or returned to the REF team by 30 November 2014, including submissions data, information generated by panels and any personal notes.

9. A.O.B

- 9.1 The chair of MPD and the sub-panel chair thanked all members of the panel for the work they had undertaken in respect of the REF exercise.
- 9.2 The chair of the panel noted he wished to record the gratitude of all members for the diligent, collegial, and efficient support of the sub-panel secretary and adviser throughout the process.