

REF Sub-panel 11: Meeting 1b

Wednesday 8 January 2014

CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Andrew Adamatzy | Edwin Hancock |
| David Benyon | Alexandra Poulouvassilis |
| Alan Burns | Tom Rodden |
| Anthony Cohn | Stan Scott |
| Ingemar Cox | Qiang Shen |
| Jon Crowcroft | Morris Sloman (deputy chair) |
| Lesley Dinsdale (adviser, acting secretary) | Iain Stewart |
| Alan Dix | Joseph Sventek |
| Anthony Finkelstein | Christopher Taylor |
| Steve Furber (chair) | John Tucker |
| Carlo Ghezzi (main panel international member) | Bonnie Webber |

Nigel Shadbolt attended the meeting by Skype video link.

Apologies:

Marta Kwiatkowska
Tom McCutcheon
Madeline McKerchar (secretary)

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda. He reported that Ursula Martin had resigned from the panel, and welcomed new member John Tucker who had replaced her. He also welcomed Alan Dix to his first meeting in addition to two new output assessors, Edwin Hancock and Ingemar Cox, and the attendance at the meeting of Carlo Ghezzi, international adviser appointed to Main Panel B.

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

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. The panel reviewed the current register of its declared major conflicts of interest. The chair reminded panellists to register any new major conflicts of interest as they arise through the panel members' website (PMW). He noted that the output allocation would be reviewed in light of the recently declared conflicts of interest.
- 2.2. The panel discussed the circumstances that could constitute a minor conflict of interest. It was agreed that panellists should notify the executive group of such interests, and that in each case the chair would decide what effect the minor interest should have on a panel member's participation in the assessment.

3. Output calibration

- 3.1. Thec reminded panellists that 20 outputs had been selected for the calibration exercise, 10 of which had also been used for the Main Panel B exercise. Outputs had been selected in order to avoid any major conflicts of interest. He noted that for each of the 20 outputs panellists had been asked to provide separate scores for originality, significance and rigour plus an overall score, all on the 12 point scale.
- 3.2. Panellists were advised that the aims of the calibration exercise were to: develop a common understanding of the star levels; agree specific scores for the outputs in the calibration sample; and to form a consensus on how outputs could be assessed equitably.
- 3.3. The chair reminded the panel that provided it was satisfied that the author had made a substantial research contribution to the output, no further regard would be taken of the author's contribution in assessing the quality of the output.
- 3.4. Panellists were instructed to disregard any citation data provided by the institution in the additional details and reminded that the only admissible citation data was that which had been provided to them by HEFCE sourced from the Scopus database.
- 3.5. The scores for each output in the calibration sample were reviewed and discussed with reference to the characteristics of the quality levels provided in the criteria document and how these might be applied to determine a final score for outputs where scores diverged or panellists considered that the output was on the borderline between star levels. Through this discussion the panel agreed a score for each output.

- 3.6. The chair reported the key points from the Main Panel B calibration exercise which had taken place on 7 January 2014. Panellists noted the relevant main panel agreed scores and the reasons for any differences with those agreed by the sub-panel.
- 3.7. The panel also reviewed the score profile for each panellist and the chair recommended that a few panellists should recalibrate their scores slightly to produce a better alignment with those agreed by the panel.
- 3.8. Panellists were instructed that the agreed scores must be discarded following the calibration and the outputs must be assessed in the same way as all other outputs.

4. Output allocation arrangements

- 4.1. The chair reported that the allocation had been made using software developed by the optimising and scheduling group from the University of Nottingham. He highlighted that:
 - a. The software had allocated outputs to reviewers using a matching process between the ACM code for each output and the reviewers' expertise.
 - b. Major conflicts of interest had been avoided.
 - c. Each individual output had been allocated to three assessors, with outputs spread over pairs of assessors to give points for calibration of their scores.
 - d. The allocation would be adjusted manually to take account of any minor conflicts of interest.
- 4.2. The chair advised panellists on how to approach their output assessment to ensure that the same 20 per cent of outputs would be scored by the next meeting and 50 per cent by the subsequent meeting, in line with the main panel's requirements.
- 4.3. Panellists were asked to review their allocation and to inform the executive group of any further major or minor conflicts of interest.

5. IT systems briefing

- 5.1. The secretary presented an overview of the IT systems provided to support the assessment processes, including arrangements for access to outputs, the use of spreadsheets, and mechanisms for recording and reviewing assessment scores. The panel discussed the practical arrangements for the use of the IT systems.

6. Future meetings

- 6.1. The meeting schedule was received. It was noted that the the main purpose of the next meeting would be to review the first 20 per cent of outputs and that the meeting would take place on Wednesday 29 January in CCT Venues-Smithfield, central London.
- 6.2. The executive group agreed to circulate detailed plans in due course.

7. Any other business

- 7.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 11: Meeting 2

Wednesday 29 January 2014

CCT Venues-Smithfield, London

Minutes

Present:

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Andrew Adamatzy | Madeline McKerchar (Secretary) |
| David Benyon | Alexandra Poulouvasilis |
| Alan Burns | Tom Rodden |
| Anthony Cohn | Stan Scott |
| Ingemar Cox | Sir Nigel Shadbolt |
| Jon Crowcroft | Qiang Shen |
| Lesley Dinsdale (Adviser) | Morris Sloman (Deputy Chair) |
| Alan Dix | Iain Stewart |
| Anthony Finkelstein | Joseph Sventek |
| Steve Furber (Chair) | Christopher Taylor |
| Edwin Hancock | John Tucker |
| Marta Kwiatkowska | Bonnie Webber |

Apologies:

Tom McCutcheon

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda, noting that the main item of business was to review the output assessment to date.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed, subject to some minor textual emendations (SP11.2.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct (SP11.2.2).
- 3.2. The Chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.
- 3.3. Panellists noted that further guidance on major and minor conflicts was now available on the panel members' website and that they would be prompted to regenerate their spreadsheets should their allocation change due to minor conflicts of interest.

4. Update on cross-referrals

- 4.1. The Chair advised panellists that outputs would only be cross-referred in exceptional circumstances where the panel had determined that it did not have the appropriate expertise to reach a robust judgement. It was noted that currently one small group of outputs had been identified for cross-referral where the methodology used fell within the scope of another unit of assessment.
- 4.2. The panel noted that guidance on the cross-referral process was available on the panel members' website, but that in the first instance they should contact the Chair and Secretary to discuss any potential cross-referrals.
- 4.3. The Chair reported that requests for SP11 to provide advisory scores for several outputs had been received from SP9: Physics and SP35: Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts. The Panel agreed to accept the incoming cross-referrals.
- 4.4. A list of the languages in which panellists would be willing to accept cross-referrals from cognate disciplines was recorded for information.

5. Proposal for a normalisation process

- 5.1. Professor Taylor presented a proposal for a process to normalise panellists' scores, which would correct for any systematic variations in panellists' calibration of the output quality levels.
- 5.2. The panel thanked Professor Taylor for his presentation and approved the use of the proposed methodology, having noted that it was systematic and robust.

6. Review of output scores

- 6.1. The Chair reported that interim scores had been recorded for the first 17 per cent of outputs.
- 6.2. The panel reviewed profiles for each of the assessor's scores to date in comparison with the whole submission.
- 6.3. The Secretary agreed to circulate updated assessor analysis report each week during the output assessment period.
- 6.4. Panellists were advised that a new report had been issued which would enable them to see other panellists' scores for outputs that they had scored. It was agreed that panellists should review their scores where there was a high degree of divergence for a particular output, since this might suggest differences in fundamental interpretation of the output rather than differences in calibration. In such cases it was agreed that panellists should contact each other to discuss the reasons for their scores and then decide whether to change their scores.
- 6.5. It was agreed that an hour should be set aside at the next meeting for panellists to discuss outliers, although panellists were encouraged to discuss such cases before the meeting if possible.
- 6.6. Panellists were reminded to use the Main Panel grade level definitions and supplementary guidance to assess outputs and were encouraged to use the full range of scores.
- 6.7. Panellists noted that outputs should only be graded as 'unclassified' if they fell below the quality levels described in the criteria or if they did not meet the definition of research used for the REF.
- 6.8. The panel discussed how to assess various types of outputs. They acknowledged that accepted methodologies differed across the scope of the unit of assessment, but were reminded that the criteria stated that 'the purpose of the assessment of research outputs was to assess the quality of original research reported'.
- 6.9. Attention was particularly drawn to the following guidance on review articles 'sub-panels will accept the submission of review articles only where they contain a significant component of unpublished research or new insight. Such outputs will be judged only on original research or new insights reported' (*Panel criteria and working methods*, REF 01.2012, Part 2b, paragraph 34).

7. Update on individual staff circumstances

- 7.1. Panellists noted that the Secretary would review the submitted information on clearly defined individual staff circumstances to check compliance with the criteria. They noted that she would bring proposed decisions to future meetings and that consequently panellists did not need to raise audit queries on staff circumstances.
- 7.2. It was noted that the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel would review all submitted information on complex staff circumstances in confidence and would report the decisions to the Chair in April.

8. Audit briefing

- 8.1. The Adviser presented a summary of the audits that the REF team and Secretariat would undertake and gave a brief introduction to panel-instigated audits.
- 8.2. Panellists were advised that all audit requests should be submitted via the Secretary and that further guidance on audit and data verification was now available on the panel members' website.
- 8.3. It was noted that the outcomes of audit requests would be a standing item on future agendas.

9. Preparation for impact assessment

- 9.1. The Chair briefed panellists on plans for the impact case study calibration exercise and the rationale for the allocation of impact case studies. He suggested that each case study and template should be assigned to one panel member (who had assessed outputs from that submission and would also review the HEI's environment template) and two Impact Assessors. It was agreed that the case studies and impact templates would be allocated as early as possible to give panellists and Impact Assessors time to read ahead of the meetings where they would be discussed.
- 9.2. Panellists were advised that a briefing paper on assessing impact would be circulated shortly and that, while the impact assessment would not get fully underway until after Meeting 4, they would need to review the calibration sample in advance and look at their allocated case studies to identify any minor conflicts of interest, general issues for discussion at the meeting or audit queries.

10. Project plan and future meetings

- 10.1. A project plan that outlined the business for forthcoming meetings and what needed to be done between meetings was received and reviewed (SP11.2.3).
- 10.2. The Chair asked the panellists who had been allocated outputs for which double-weighting had been requested to review these requests in relation to the guidance (*'Panel criteria and working methods'*, REF 01.2012, Part 2b, paragraphs 46-51) and to bring recommendations to the next meeting.
- 10.3. The panel approved the project plan and noted the deadlines for various tasks. In particular it was noted that they should have uploaded 50 per cent of their output scores by 26.03.14 and the remaining 50% by 26.05.14.

11. Any other business

- 11.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 11: Meeting 3
Tuesday 1 April 2014
CCT Venues-Barbican, London

Minutes

Present:

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Andrew Adamatzy | Madeline McKerchar (Secretary) |
| David Benyon | Alexandra Poulouvassilis |
| Alan Burns | Tom Rodden |
| Anthony Cohn | Stan Scott |
| Jon Crowcroft | Sir Nigel Shadbolt |
| Lesley Dinsdale (Adviser) | Qiang Shen |
| Alan Dix | Morris Sloman (Deputy Chair) |
| Anthony Finkelstein | Iain Stewart |
| Steve Furber (Chair) | Joseph Sventek |
| Marta Kwiatkowska | Christopher Taylor |
| Tom McCutcheon | John Tucker |

Ingemar Cox and Edwin Hancock attended for items 1-8.

Michael Burke, Leonard Fass, Ian Ritchie and Hugh Varilly attended for item 9.

Apologies:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Muffy Calder (item 9 only) | Bonnie Webber |
| Keith Jeffery (item 9 only) | Matthew Willis (item 9 only) |
| Jonathan Legh-Smith (item 9 only) | |

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the agenda, noting that the main items of business were to review the output assessment to date and to receive a briefing on impact assessment.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP11.3.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct (SP11.3.2).
- 3.2. The Chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings and for raising any further minor conflicts with the Panel Executive Group.

4. Update on cross-referrals

- 4.1. The Chair reported that no further outputs had been cross-referred by SP11 to other sub-panels. However, in addition to those noted at the last meeting, requests for SP11 to provide advisory scores for cross-referred outputs had been received from a substantial number of other sub-panels. The panel agreed to accept the incoming cross-referrals.

5. Audit

- 5.1. The Secretary reported that all but one of the audit requests received to date had been resolved satisfactorily and agreed to follow-up the outstanding query (SP11.3.3).
- 5.2. Panellists were reminded to submit any further audit requests via the Secretary.

6. Review of output scores

- 6.1. The Chair reported that interim scores had been recorded for the first 34 per cent of outputs, although many panellists had scored a far higher percentage of their outputs. A new deadline was agreed by which all panellists should have scored at least 50 per cent of their outputs so that the emerging profile could be reported at the next Main Panel meeting.
- 6.2. The panel discussed the challenges involved in scoring various types of output and established some general principles. The panel also agreed to refer a sample of these outputs to the International Member for his advice.
- 6.3. The panel agreed *nem con* that Christopher Taylor should be given access to the full dataset to enable him to run the normalisation algorithm.

- 6.4. Panellists were reminded of the deadline for uploading the final 50 per cent of outputs scores and were asked to raise any remaining audit queries as soon as possible.

7. Report on individual staff circumstances

- 7.1. Panellists noted that the secretariat had reviewed all cases for staff submitted with clearly-defined circumstances, with the exception of those where the HEIs were subject to full audits by the REF team (SP11.3.4).
- 7.2. The Secretary reported that the majority of cases were straightforward but that a number of audit queries had been raised where insufficient information had been provided to confirm that the criteria had been met.
- 7.3. The Secretary agreed to present recommendations for all clearly-defined staff circumstance cases at the next meeting.

8. Future meetings and updated project plan

- 8.1. An updated version of the project plan was received and approved and the work for completion by the next meeting was noted (SP11.3.5).
- 8.2. The panel noted that the next meeting would be held from 3-5 June 2014 in Wotton House, Dorking and that the meeting would be in two parts: 3-4 June for output assessors and 5 June for impact assessors.

9. Impact assessment briefing

- 9.1. The Chair welcomed the impact assessors to their first meeting of the panel. He reported that Paul Woolman had resigned from the panel and thanked Leonard Fass for agreeing to join the panel at short notice.
- 9.2. The Adviser gave a detailed presentation on impact assessment to supplement the briefing paper, which contained full information on the assessment process and relevant extracts from other guidance documents (SP11.3.6).
- 9.3. The panel noted the timetable for impact assessment and the scoring scale to be used. Panellists also discussed various scenarios relating to the threshold judgements, assessment questions and audit process.
- 9.4. The Chair reported that the impact allocation had been finalised and that each impact template had been allocated for review to one impact assessor and two

panel members, whereas each impact case study had been allocated to two impact assessors and one panel member. He reminded panellists to raise any minor conflicts of interest or candidates for audit at the earliest opportunity.

- 9.5. Panellists were advised that materials for the calibration exercise would be circulated shortly. It was noted that the calibration sample would include ten case studies and two templates. The deadline for assessing the calibration sample was also noted.

10. Any other business

- 10.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 11: Meeting 4 (Part 1: outputs)

Tuesday 3 June – Wednesday 4 June 2014

Wotton House, Dorking

Minutes

Present:

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Andrew Adamatzy | Madeline McKerchar (secretary) |
| David Benyon | Alexandra Poulouvassilis |
| Alan Burns | Tom Rodden |
| Anthony Cohn | Stan Scott |
| Ingemar Cox | Nigel Shadbolt |
| Jon Crowcroft | Qiang Shen |
| Lesley Dinsdale (adviser) | Morris Sloman (deputy chair) |
| Alan Dix | Iain Stewart |
| Anthony Finkelstein | Joseph Sventek |
| Steve Furber (chair) | Christopher Taylor |
| Edwin Hancock | John Tucker |
| Marta Kwiatkowska | Bonnie Webber |
| Tom McCutcheon | |

There were no apologies.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and noted that the main items of business were to agree scores for the final 50 per cent of outputs and to agree draft output sub-profiles.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP11.4.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct (SP11.4.2).
- 3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Cross-referrals

- 4.1. A list of all incoming and outgoing cross-referral requests was received and noted (SP11.4.3).
- 4.2. The chair reported that a further 12 outputs had recently been cross-referred from SP34 (Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory) and that he would liaise with panellists to allocate these outside the meeting.

5. Audit

- 5.1. A report was received and noted that summarised both the outcomes of the panel-instigated audits and data adjustments made by the REF team and those of the secretariat's in-depth review of clearly defined staff circumstances (SP11.4.4).
- 5.2. The panel agreed to approve the recommended decisions for the clearly defined staff circumstance cases submitted to Unit of Assessment 11 and noted the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel's decisions for the complex staff cases.

6. Review of output scores

- 6.1. The process used to normalise panellists' scores, and the assumptions underlying this process, were described and the outcomes reviewed.
- 6.2. The panel was satisfied that the normalisation process had corrected any systematic variations in panellists' calibration of the output quality levels and thanked Professor Taylor for his work.
- 6.3. Panellists discussed outputs where there was a large score discrepancy to see if the differences could be resolved.
- 6.4. The panel discussed and agreed the thresholds for grade boundaries and the process for generating final scores for each output.

7. Agreement of draft output sub-profiles

- 7.1. Twenty five attendees left the room for the discussion of draft output sub-profiles for institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 7.2. The chair outlined the findings of the Main Panel's review of output sub-profiles at the 50 per cent mark.
- 7.3. Draft sub-profiles were reviewed for each submission in turn, plus the Unit of Assessment as a whole, during which the reasons for any unclassified outputs were noted and panellists were invited to make any observations for note in the overview and feedback reports.
- 7.4. The panel gave careful consideration to the grade boundaries and it was noted that the international member had reviewed a sample of outputs on the three to four star border. This gave further confidence to the panel's judgement that the grade boundaries were appropriate.
- 7.5. Panellists noted the checks that had been carried out on the data and agreed that the process used to arrive at the final scores was robust.
- 7.6. The panel, for its part, approved the all the draft sub-profiles except one which had a number of outstanding scores, and agreed to commend them to the Main Panel.

8. Overview and feedback reports

- 8.1. Guidance on the requirements for overview reports and feedback statements was received and consideration was given to how responsibility for drafting the statements should be divided (SP11.4.5).

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The chair thanked the panellists for their hard work throughout the output assessment process and, in particular, the output assessors Ingemar Cox and Edwin Hancock, for their contribution to the panel.

REF Sub-panel 11: Meeting 4 (Part 2: impact)

Thursday 5 June 2014

Wotton House, Dorking

Minutes

Present:

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Andrew Adamatzy | Madeline McKerchar (secretary) |
| David Benyon | Alexandra Poulouvassilis |
| Michael Burke | Ian Ritchie |
| Alan Burns | Tom Rodden |
| Muffy Calder | Stan Scott |
| Anthony Cohn | Nigel Shadbolt |
| Jon Crowcroft | Qiang Shen |
| Lesley Dinsdale (adviser) | Morris Sloman (deputy chair) |
| Alan Dix | Iain Stewart |
| Leonard Fass | Joseph Sventek |
| Anthony Finkelstein | Christopher Taylor |
| Steve Furber (chair) | John Tucker |
| Keith Jeffery | Hugh Varilly |
| Marta Kwiatkowska | Bonnie Webber |
| Jonathan Legh-Smith | Matthew Willis |
| Tom McCutcheon | |

Peter Costigan (main panel user member) attended for items 1-4. Graeme Rosenberg (REF manager) attended as an observer for part of the meeting.

There were no apologies.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular the impact assessors and main panel user member.
- 1.2. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main items of business were to carry out the impact calibration exercise, ensure that all reviewers were ready for the impact assessment process and to confirm the list of impact audit queries to be raised.

1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP11.4.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1. The panel confirmed that the register of its declared major conflicts of interest was correct (SP11.4.2).

3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Impact calibration

4.1. The chair reported that the sample of ten case studies and four templates which had been circulated to panellists and impact assessors in advance of the meeting for the calibration exercise had been selected to avoid conflicts of interest and to represent a spread of the disciplines and institutions represented within the Unit of Assessment.

4.2. Two of the case studies had also been used for the Main Panel calibration exercise and the scores that the Main Panel had awarded these case studies were noted.

4.3. Panellists were advised that the aims of the calibration exercise were to: develop a common understanding of the star levels and to form a consensus on how impact case studies and templates could be assessed equitably.

4.4. Profiles for each of the reviewers were projected so that panellists were aware of their calibration in relation to that of other panellists and the panel as a whole.

4.5. The scores for each case study and template were reviewed and discussed with reference to the characteristics of the quality levels provided in the criteria document and how these might be applied to determine a final score where scores diverged or panellists considered that the case study was on the borderline between star levels. Through this discussion the panel agreed a score for each case study and template.

- 4.6. Panellists were instructed that the calibration scores must be discarded following the exercise and the case studies and templates assessed afresh by the reviewers.

5. Impact allocation and assessment preparation

- 5.1. The chair reminded panellists to let the executive group know as soon as possible if they felt conflicted with any of their allocated case studies or templates so that they could be reallocated.
- 5.2. An earlier deadline for uploading impact scores was agreed to allow time for panellists to discuss the scores before the next meeting.
- 5.3. The panel noted the scoring scale to be used for the impact assessment process.

6. Cross-referrals

- 6.1. The chair reported that no case studies or templates had been cross-referred and that no cross-referral requests had been received from other sub-panels.

7. Audit

- 7.1. A list of queries raised by panellists before the meeting was received and noted (SP11.4.6).
- 7.2. The adviser reminded panellists of the threshold judgements and audit process and asked them to raise any further candidates for audit with the secretariat at the earliest opportunity.

8. Future meetings and updated project plan

- 8.1. An updated version of the project plan was received and approved (SP11.4.7).
- 8.2. The panel noted the work for completion by the next meeting, and in particular the earlier deadline for uploading the impact scores.
- 8.3. It was noted that the next meeting would be held from 9-10 July 2014 at The Studio in Manchester.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The chair reported that the environment template allocation would be made live before 30 June 2014 and that each template would be assigned to three readers, two of whom would also have been assigned the impact template for that institution. Panellists noted that the first reviewer would be expected to act as the lead for that template.

REF Sub-panel 11: Meeting 5
Wednesday 9 -Thursday 10 July 2014
The Studio, Manchester

Minutes

Present:

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Andrew Adamatzy | Madeline McKerchar (secretary) |
| David Benyon | Alexandra Poulouvassilis |
| Michael Burke | Ian Ritchie |
| Alan Burns | Tom Rodden |
| Muffy Calder | Stan Scott |
| Anthony Cohn | Nigel Shadbolt |
| Jon Crowcroft | Qiang Shen |
| Lesley Dinsdale (adviser) | Morris Sloman (deputy chair) |
| Alan Dix | Robert Sorrell (main panel user member) |
| Leonard Fass | Iain Stewart |
| Anthony Finkelstein | Joseph Sventek |
| Steve Furber (chair) | Christopher Taylor |
| Keith Jeffery | John Tucker |
| Marta Kwiatkowska | Bonnie Webber |
| Jonathan Legh-Smith | Matthew Willis |
| Tom McCutcheon | Val Wooff (incoming panel secretary) |

Hugh Varilly attended for items 6-11 (except 9).

Claire Thompson (Department for Employment and Learning) and Stuart Fancey (Scottish Funding Council) attended as observers for part of the meeting.

Apologies were received from John Tucker.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Val Wooff who will act as panel secretary for the remaining meetings.

1.2. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main items of business were to complete the assessment of impact, produce draft impact sub-profiles, and prepare for the assessment of environment.

1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP11.5.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1. The panel received and noted the register of its declared major conflicts of interest (SP11.5.2).

3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Update on output profiles

4.1. Four attendees left the room for discussion of submissions with which they had a major conflict of interest.

4.2. The chair reported that panellists' scores had now been received for all outputs and that accordingly adjustments had been made to a number of output sub-profiles. The panel approved the approach used to make these adjustments.

4.3. The panel reviewed the profiles of all submissions that had been affected by the recently received scores and agreed to approve the changes and to commend the resulting profiles to the Main Panel.

4.4. It was noted that the outcome of one last complex staff circumstance case had not yet been formally approved, but that the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel had not recommended that any outputs should be unclassified for this case.

5. Impact audit outcomes

5.1. A list of the queries raised by reviewers was received and noted (SP11.5.3).

6. Review of impact scores

- 6.1. The panel discussed all case studies where there was a concern that the threshold criteria had not been met to ensure that a consistent approach had been applied.
- 6.2. Panellists discussed case studies and templates where there was a large score discrepancy to see if the differences could be resolved.
- 6.3. The process used to adjust for calibration differences, and the assumptions underlying this process, were described and the outcomes reviewed. The panel was satisfied that this process had corrected any systematic variations in panellists' calibration and thanked Christopher Taylor for his work.
- 6.4. The panel reviewed the overall profile for the Unit of Assessment and gave careful consideration to the emergent grade boundaries. The main panel user member confirmed that the panel's assessment process had been robust.

7. Production of impact sub-profiles

- 7.1. Thirty three attendees left the room for the discussion of draft impact sub-profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 7.2. Draft sub-profiles were reviewed for each submission in turn and panellists were invited to make any observations for note in the overview and feedback reports.
- 7.3. The panel, for its part, approved all the draft sub-profiles and agreed to commend them to the Main Panel.

8. Overview and feedback reports

- 8.1. Guidance on the requirements for overview reports and feedback statements was received and noted (SP11.5.4).
- 8.2. The panel discussed the expectations and how responsibility for drafting the reports should be divided.

9. Environment allocation and assessment preparation

- 9.1. The adviser and deputy chair gave presentations on environment assessment and the use of environment data to supplement the briefing paper, which contained full information on the assessment process and relevant extracts from the published guidance (SP11.5.5).

- 9.2. The panel noted the timetable and criteria for environment assessment plus the scoring scale to be used.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. The chair thanked the impact assessors for their valuable contribution to the panel. The panel also noted that this was the secretary's last meeting before starting maternity leave.

- 10.2. Panellists noted the work for completion by the next meeting, which would be held from 16-17 September in the Radisson Blu, Edinburgh.

11. Any other business

- 11.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 11: Meeting 6
Tuesday 16th – Wednesday 17th September 2014
Radisson Blu, Edinburgh

Minutes

Present:

| | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Andrew Adamatzy | Alexandra Poulouvassilis |
| David Benyon | Tom Rodden |
| Alan Burns | Stan Scott |
| Anthony Cohn | Nigel Shadbolt |
| Jon Crowcroft | Qiang Shen |
| Lesley Dinsdale (adviser) | Morris Sloman (deputy chair) |
| Alan Dix | Iain Stewart |
| Anthony Finkelstein | Joseph Sventek |
| Steve Furber (chair) | Christopher Taylor |
| Marta Kwiatkowska | Bonnie Webber |
| Tom McCutcheon | Val Wooff (panel secretary) |

Graeme Rosenberg (REF Manager) attended as an observer for part of the meeting.

Apologies were received from John Tucker.

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main items of business were to complete the assessment of environment, review and recommend to the main panel draft environment and overall profiles and develop feedback for Main Panel B and individual submissions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP11.6.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

- 3.1. The panel received and noted the register of its declared major conflicts of interest (SP11.6.2).
- 3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Audit Update

- 4.1 An oral report on audit activities was received.
 - The REF team had carried out a sample-based audit of outputs submitted as 'pending' and outputs with a 2014 date of publication across all submissions. No data adjustments had been required in SP11 as a result of this.
 - An audit of REF4a and 4b data against the relevant data submitted to HESA returns had also been carried out. An adjustment to the REF4b income in one submission was reported.

5. Update on impact profiles

- 5.1. The chair reported that an adjustment on one impact score had affected one submission and the overall sub-profile.
- 5.2. The panel reviewed the profile of the submission that had been affected by the change and overall sub-profile and agreed to commend the resulting profiles to the Main Panel.
- 5.3. The chair reported that, subject to a further check for consistency across the sub-panels by the main panel user members, the main panel had approved the draft impact profiles presented at its last meeting.

6. Review of environment scores

- 6.1. Panellists discussed environment templates where scores had not been agreed prior to the meeting.

7. Production of environment sub-profiles and feedback

- 7.1. Thirty six attendees left the room for the discussion of draft environment sub-profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.

- 7.2. Draft sub-profiles were reviewed for each submission in turn and panellists were invited to make any observations for note in the feedback statements to HEIs.
- 7.3. The panel, for its part, approved all the draft sub-profiles and agreed to commend them to the Main Panel.
- 7.4. Guidance on the requirements for environment feedback statements was received and noted (SP11.6.3).
- 7.5. The panel discussed the expectations and how responsibility for drafting the statements should be divided.

8. Review of draft overall submission profiles

- 8.1. Thirty six attendees left the room for the discussion of draft overall profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.
- 8.2. The sub-panel reviewed the draft overall profiles for each submission and agreed to recommend these to the main panel.

9. Overview reports

- 9.1. The panel received guidance on the structure and content of the Main Panel B overview report (SP11.6.4).
- 9.2. Points made by panel members were recorded for inclusion in the main and sub-panel sections of the report.
- 9.3. Points from each of the sub-panels would be collated and considered at the next main panel meeting on 30th September.

10. Future meetings

- 10.1. Panellists noted the work for completion by the next meeting, which would be held on 15th October 2014 at The Studio, Manchester.

11. Any other business

- 11.1. There was no other business.

REF Sub-panel 11: Meeting 7
Wednesday 15th October 2014
The Studio, Lever Street, Manchester

Minutes

Present:

| | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Andrew Adamatzy | Tom Rodden |
| David Benyon | Stan Scott |
| Alan Burns | Nigel Shadbolt |
| Anthony Cohn | Qiang Shen |
| Jon Crowcroft | Morris Sloman (deputy chair) |
| Lesley Dinsdale (adviser) | Iain Stewart |
| Alan Dix | Christopher Taylor |
| Anthony Finkelstein | John Tucker |
| Steve Furber (chair) | Bonnie Webber |
| Marta Kwiatkowska | Val Wooff (panel secretary) |
| Alexandra Poulouvasilis | |

Apologies were received from Tom McCutcheon and Joseph Sventek

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.
- 1.2. The agenda was introduced and the panel noted that the main item of business was to review feedback for Main Panel B and individual submissions.
- 1.3. In the light of the attendance the panel confirmed its competence to do business.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

- 2.1. The Minutes of the previous meeting were received and confirmed (SP11.7.1).

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1. The panel received and noted the register of its declared major conflicts of interest. Additional conflicts were noted. (SP11.7.2).

3.2. The chair reminded panellists of the protocol for declaring and handling conflicts of interest during meetings.

4. Report from Main Panel B

4.1 The chair gave an oral report on the recent meeting of Main Panel B.

4.2 It was noted that Main Panel B had accepted all recommendations from the sub-panel.

5. Review of Feedback to HEIs

5.1. Thirty five attendees left the room for the discussion of draft sub-profiles from institutions with which they had major conflicts of interest.

5.2. Panellists discussed a sample of feedback statements to HEIs on outputs, impact and environment. Comments were noted.

5.3. General principles for editing feedback statements in this large and diverse unit of assessment were agreed.

5.4. It was agreed that the panel executive would edit the statements and sub-panel members were invited to make further suggestion, where appropriate, in the light of the discussion.

5.5. The panel executive will circulate the final draft of the feedback statements to sub-panel members prior to submitting them to the REF team.

6. Overview report

6.1 The sub-panel reviewed the previously circulated draft of the sub-panel's contribution to the Main Panel B overview report. (SP11.7.3)

6.2 Points made by sub-panel members were recorded for inclusion in the main and sub-panel sections of the report.

6.3 It was agreed the sub-panel executive would edit the sub-panel section and provide an updated draft for consideration at the next Main Panel B meeting.

7. Reflections on the REF process

- 7.1. The sub-panel reviewed the previously circulated draft of the sub-panel's feedback on the REF process (SP11.7.4).
- 7.2. Points made by sub-panel members were recorded for inclusion.
- 7.3. It was agreed that the comments would be provided to the sub-panel representatives at the feedback meetings organised by HEFCE.

8. Results timetable

- 8.1. A brief presentation covering the timetable for the announcement of the REF2014 results and actions for panel members towards the end of the assessment period was given.
- 8.2. Panel members were reminded of the need to maintain confidentiality and were advised on how to respond to any enquiries they may receive on the assessment process and results.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The chair thanked all members of the sub-panel for their contribution to the REF assessment and commended the secretariat for their support.
- 9.2. The deputy chair thanked the chair for his commitment throughout the assessment process.