1 Introduction

1.1 The Research Excellence Framework (REF) is the new system for assessing the quality of research in UK higher education institutions (HEIs). It replaces the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and will be completed in 2014. The primary purpose of the REF is to produce assessment outcomes for each submission made by institutions:

- The funding bodies intend to use the assessment outcomes to inform the selective allocation of their research funding to HEIs, with effect from 2015-16.
- The assessment provides accountability for public investment in research and produces evidence of the benefits of this investment.
- The assessment outcomes provide benchmarking information and establish reputational yardsticks.¹

1.2 Due to the increased concentration and selectivity of the UK’s research funding, the University will need to make strategic decisions about how best to represent its research endeavour to ensure a strong result in terms of both reputation and funding. It is an exercise about the collective; decisions on individual entry are based on the collective good. The University will not therefore automatically equate REF entry with research performance when deciding either time designated for research within departmental workload allocation arrangements or promotion prospects.

1.3 The University’s equality and diversity policy includes the following statement:

“The University of Hull recognises the value and dignity of each individual and acknowledges the adverse effect that any form of discrimination may have on its members, in terms of their career or academic progress and their loss of self-worth.

To this end, the University will aim to ensure that:

a) individuals are treated fairly, with dignity and respect regardless of their age, gender, marital status, transgender status, family circumstances, disability, race, religion or belief, sexual orientation, trade union affiliation, social/economic background, position in the organisation or other inappropriate distinction
b) it affords all students and staff the opportunity to fulfil their potential
c) it promotes an inclusive and supportive environment for students, staff and visitors
d) it implements policies, strategies and action plans aimed at promoting equality of opportunity and eliminating discrimination. These include the action plans from the Race, Disability and Gender Equality Schemes.”

¹ [http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/)
1.4 This Code of Practice supplements the University’s existing equal opportunities policies and relates specifically to how the University of Hull will prepare its REF2014 submission. The Code of Practice is based on the principles of:

- Transparency
- Consistency
- Accountability
- Inclusivity

1.5 This Code of Practice will be applied consistently across the University to all aspects and stages of the staff selection process. The University takes very seriously its responsibilities with regard to equal opportunities.

1.6 Managerial decisions concerning the selection of staff members for inclusion within the REF submission will be at the discretion of the University and will be in line with this Code of Practice.

1.7 This Code of Practice will be published on the University’s Portal. Copies of it will be emailed to all individuals who are eligible to be considered for submission in REF2014. Where staff are absent, working off site, or have no access to email communication hard copies will be sent to them. All Equality Impact Assessments conducted on relevant policies and processes will be published with the Code of Practice.

2 Scope

2.1 This Code of Practice is applicable to all staff involved in research activities and any other persons associated with the research function of the University.

All those involved in the selection of staff for inclusion in the REF submission must observe this Code of Practice and must seek advice if still in doubt.

3 Legal Framework

3.1 The University of Hull is committed to fulfilling its obligations under equal opportunities legislation including the following:

- Equality Act 2010
- Part-time Workers (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000
- Fixed-Term Workers (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2002
- The Human Rights Act 1998
- Protection from Harassment Act 1997
4 Selection of Staff

4.1 Eligibility

REF02.2011 Assessment Framework and Guidance on Submissions sets out the formal criteria for REF2014. Additional subject specific criteria are given in the Panel Criteria and Working Methods REF01.2012. These include details of how individual staff circumstances will be taken into account.

To be eligible for inclusion in REF2014 under Category A, staff must meet the following minimum criteria:

- They must have an academic contract whose primary employment function is to undertake either ‘research only’ or ‘teaching and research’
- They must be paid through the University payroll
- Their contract must be for a minimum of 0.2 FTE
- They must be in post on 31 October 2013

Staff who hold institutional and NHS joint appointments are eligible to be returned as Category A, but must be returned with an FTE of less than 1.0.

Research assistants are not eligible to be listed as research active staff unless, exceptionally, they are named as principal investigator on a research grant or significant piece of research work on the census date and satisfy the definition of Category A academic staff.

Research assistants are defined as individuals who are on the payroll of and hold a contract of employment with the institution. They are academic staff whose primary employment function is defined as ‘research only’. They are employed to carry out another individual’s research programme rather than as independent researchers in their own right. They are usually funded from research grants or contracts from Research Councils, charities, the European Union EU) or other overseas sources, industry, or other commercial enterprises, but they may also be funded from the institution’s own funds. Individuals who meet this definition may be described in HEIs’ grading structures as something other than research assistant (for example research associate, assistant researcher).

Research assistants are, exceptionally, eligible to be returned to the REF if they are named as principal investigator or equivalent on a research grant or significant piece of research work on the census date and satisfy the definition of Category A staff.

Once these minimum criteria have been met the University will then consider the following:

4.2 Quality of Research Activity

The quality of research activity carried out during the REF2014 assessment period in terms of research outputs (normally publications). The University will use a threshold which must be met to ensure inclusion in a REF submission. The threshold will be based on quality to ensure the potential for the University to win Quality Related income and to enhance its reputation and standing, in accordance with its Strategic Plan. The threshold will be applied consistently across all Units of Assessment. The details of the quality threshold will be communicated to all staff by their REF Lead.
4.3 Volume of Research Activity

It is expected that four outputs per research active member of staff will be included. Reductions will be allowed for colleagues who have special circumstances in line with HEFCE’s published guidelines.

Where individuals’ circumstances do not require them to produce four outputs, their outputs will be weighted to ensure that no discrimination takes place regarding their ability to reach the quality threshold.

4.4 Individual Circumstances

Individual circumstances which affect the volume of research activity will be taken into account, and this is further discussed in Section 8 below. Cases can be made as part of the REF submission on behalf of those staff whose circumstances during the assessment period have prevented them from being able to submit the normal expectation of four research outputs. Staff should be aware of the tariff tables in the Panel Criteria and Working Methods documentation http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/pubs/2012/01_12/ which outline the reduction in the number of outputs allowable for clearly defined circumstances. More complex circumstances will need to be dealt with differently and REF Leads and Heads of Department will receive appropriate training (see Section 6).

4.5 Summary of selection process

All eligible researchers will submit up to ten outputs on their individual REF claim through Converis (the University’s Research Information System), nominating up to four of those listed as their strongest. The REF Lead may advise the researcher that alternative outputs could be considered as higher quality by the sub panel. A Unit of Assessment reading group, led by the REF Lead, will grade each output with a star rating. The judgement of the reading group will be calibrated by external reader(s). Following calibration the REF Lead and Head of Department will feedback to the researcher the star ratings allocated to their outputs and their likely submission status (include/exclude). At this point mentoring or other supportive processes may be put in place by the REF Lead and Head of Department to support the researcher to meet the quality threshold. A decision on the submission status will be made and communicated to all eligible staff by 31st March 2013.

If any member of staff wishes to challenge the decision on their submission status they may informally approach the REF Lead and/or Head of Department. The REF Lead will make a recommendation of the submission composition to the appropriate Dean(s) of the Faculty or Faculties within which returnable staff are based. Formal feedback on inclusion will be given to all eligible researchers by the Dean(s). If required the formal appeal process can be launched (see Section 10). The Deans formally recommend to the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) all Unit of Assessment submission compositions. The final decision rests with the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research and Enterprise).

4.6 Inclusivity

At all stages of staff selection the University will consider how different groups of staff are involved and represented in REF processes, ensuring that an environment of inclusivity is promoted. This is reflected in the University’s recent receipt of the
European Commission HR Excellence in Research Award and its planned application for Athena SWAN recognition.

4.7 Decisions on inclusion

The University recognises that, for strategic reasons, not all eligible staff may be returned in the REF submission. Decisions on REF inclusion on the one hand, and support for research activities on the other, are distinguishable and may involve different criteria. In the first, the overriding intention must be to maximise the overall benefit to the University from its REF submission. In the second, the concern is to harmonise individual career development with the longer term institutional interest. It should be noted, however, that non-inclusion in the REF submission will not be taken of itself to imply that particular staff members are necessarily 'research inactive’. The University will not automatically equate REF entry with research performance when deciding either time designated for research within departmental workload allocation arrangements or promotion prospects.

REF Leads and Heads of Department will identify Category C staff for inclusion, taking account of the criteria of individual panels and sub-panels. They will also identify any individuals whose research will form any part of an impact case study.

5 Roles and Responsibilities

This section sets out the roles and responsibilities of individuals and bodies involved in the preparation and approval of submissions for REF2014. It focuses in particular on responsibilities in respect of the inclusion or non-inclusion of individual staff members within submissions. All staff have a contractual obligation to conduct their duties in line with the institution’s policies on equality and diversity.

5.1 Individuals

5.1.1 Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise)

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) has executive responsibility for the research and enterprise of the University, including institutional strategy for the REF. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) is a member of the Executive and takes the lead in advising it on matters relating to the REF. The responsibility of the PVC (R&E) at Executive level for research matters informed his selection as the institutional lead for the REF processes. This designation was properly approved by Executive under the directorship of the Vice-Chancellor.

5.1.2 Deans

Deans are responsible for coordinating the REF strategy of their Faculty in consultation with Heads of Department and REF Leads. They are responsible for recommending the composition of the submissions of Unit of Assessments which fall within the remit of their Faculties to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise).

5.1.3 Deputy Deans (Research)

Deputy Deans (Research) work with REF Leads to coordinate submissions, providing support and direction where appropriate and advising Deans.
5.1.4 Heads of Department

Heads of Department are responsible for advising Deans of departmental issues relevant to the Faculty REF strategy.

5.1.5 REF Leads

REF Leads will produce submissions for their UoAs, retaining a cross-Faculty view where required. They lead internal reading groups and formally recommend the composition of each submission to the relevant Dean. It is the responsibility of all individual researchers to ensure that the records provided to REF Leads are up to date and accurate, and that all requests for information made by the REF Leads are met.

5.1.6 Central Administration

The Planning Officer (Academic Planning and Research Policy) is responsible for providing advice on REF regulations and strategy to anyone involved in preparing the submission. The REF Support Officer is responsible for supporting the University’s preparations, particularly focusing on advising staff on matters relating to impact.

The Central Administration will provide the required data on staff, research students and research income, will assist with the creation of impact case studies and templates and will assist REF Leads to coordinate the compilation of each Unit of Assessment submission.

5.1.7 External Advisors

All UoAs will be required to seek external advice to calibrate the judgements of their internal reading groups at least once. Where additional advice is considered beneficial or there is insufficient expertise within the University, further external advisors may be used. The decision to seek external advice will be taken by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) after consultation with the appropriate REF Lead, Head of Department, Dean and REF Working Group members.

External advisors will not decide which staff are to be submitted to the REF nor will they be given any information relating to individual staff circumstances. Where advisors are asked to provide feedback on outputs, they will be asked to comment only on the quality of research.

5.2 Groups

5.2.1 REF Working Group

The group is responsible for providing advice on REF Strategy and individual Unit of Assessment submissions to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) and the University Research and Enterprise Committee. Its membership is approved by the Executive and is drawn from the experienced research staff of the University. The process for establishing the group composition was at all times cognisant of the need to ensure that members were drawn from the broadest possible cross-section of the academic community, in line with equality and diversity considerations.
Unavoidable membership changes will be confirmed by the Chair.

5.2.3 University Research and Enterprise Committee

The University Research and Enterprise Committee is a sub-committee of Senate Executive Board. Its membership comprises the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), Pro Vice-Chancellor (Engagement), Director of the Graduate School, Directors of the Research Institutes, Director of Knowledge Exchange, Faculty and student representatives. UREC monitors the work of the REF Working Group and ensures it adheres to the REF Code of Practice.

5.2.4 University Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel

The University Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel considers all cases of complex individual staff circumstances (anonymised) and makes recommendations to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) on each case. The Panel also advises the PVC (R&E) on analysis and evaluation of equality and diversity characteristics across the University. The committee is chaired by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) and its membership comprises senior academics, the University’s Equality and Diversity Officer and the Planning Officer (Academic Planning and Research Policy).

5.2.5 Faculty and Departmental Research Committees

Faculties have responsibility for coordination of submissions within their cognate areas. Strategy on submission should be considered by the various research committees within faculties and departments.
6 Training

Training will be provided to staff involved in the selection of staff members for inclusion in the REF submission. REF-specific equalities training will be provided to all individuals relative to their role and responsibilities in line with this Code of Practice.

The University will record attendance at appropriate training events of those involved in the selection of staff for submission to the REF and make this available upon request.

All staff within the University have completed equality and diversity training and are aware of the requirements of the Equality Act 2010.

7 Individual Circumstances

All main panels for the REF2014 have produced guidance on how they will deal with circumstances which might have had an effect on an individual’s contribution to the submission.

The following circumstances, as stated in the REF panel criteria and working methods, paragraphs 70-86, will be taken into account accordingly in the selection of staff members for submission:

7.1 Clearly Defined Circumstances:

a) Status as an early career researcher:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date at which the individual first met the REF definition of an early career researcher</th>
<th>Number of outputs may be reduced by up to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On or before 31 July 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 August 2009 and 31 July 2010 inclusive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 August 2010 and 31 July 2011 inclusive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On or after 1 August 2011</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Staff who have been absent due to part-time working, secondments or career breaks may reduce their outputs without penalty in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total months absent between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013 due to working part-time, secondment or career break</th>
<th>Number of outputs may be reduced by up to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-11.99</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-27.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-45.99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Members of staff who meet the criteria to be selected as Category A or Category C staff on the census date, and who started their careers as independent researchers on or after 1 August 2009. For the purposes of REF, an individual is deemed to have started their career as an independent researcher from the point at which: a) they held a contract of employment of 0.2 FTE or greater, which included a primary employment function of undertaking ‘research’ or ‘teaching and research’, with any HEI or other organisation, whether in the UK or overseas, and b) they undertook independent research, leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on a research grant or significant piece of research work. (A member of staff is not deemed to have undertaken independent research purely on the basis that they are named on one or more research outputs.)
c) Staff who have been absent due to maternity, adoption or paternity leave may reduce the number outputs by one, for each discrete period of:

1. Statutory maternity leave or statutory adoption leave taken substantially during the period 1 January 2008 to 31 October 2013, regardless of the length of the leave.

2. Additional paternity\(^3\) or adoption leave lasting for four months or more, taken substantially during the period 1 January 2008 to 31 October 2013.

In addition to the above, the number of outputs may be reduced by up to two, without penalty for the following:

a) Junior clinical academics, defined as clinically qualified academics who are still completing their clinical training and have not gained a Certificate of Completion of Training (CCT) or its equivalent prior to 30 April 2013

b) Category C staff who are employed by the NHS, whose research is primarily focused in the submitting unit.

7.2 Complex Staff Circumstances
Any other personal circumstances which are considered to have had a significant impact on an individual’s ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs in the assessment period. All personal information will be handled confidentially with only the individual and REF Lead being aware of the details for clearly defined circumstances and the Head of Department, Dean and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) also being aware of the details for more complex circumstances. Anonymised copies of the complex individual staff circumstances will be considered by the University Equality and Diversity Panel which will make recommendations to the PVC (R&E). All personal information will be stored by the Planning Officer (Academic Planning and Research Policy). All electronic copies of information will be password protected and any information submitted in hard copy will be locked in a secure location in line with the University’s HR data management policy and the Data Protection Act 1998. [https://portal.hull.ac.uk/uPortal/render.userLayoutRootNode.target.u661n128.up?cw_inChannelLink=1&uP_root=me&cw_xml=http://portal-beaker.server-farm.hull.ac.uk/content/adm08/portal_content_serv_supp_tab/new/a_to_z_of_services/records/index.html]

7.3 All staff who are eligible for submission in REF2014 will be asked to complete a form (see Appendix 2) requesting them to disclose any circumstances which may need to be taken account of when preparing their REF submission. A nil return will be required where no circumstances exist and REF Leads will monitor response rates to ensure a 100% completion rate is achieved. The forms will be circulated by REF Leads to all eligible in September 2012, January 2013 and September 2013.

\(^3\)‘Additional paternity or adoption leave’ refers to leave of up to 26 weeks which is taken to care for a child where the person’s spouse, partner or civil partner was entitled to statutory maternity leave or statutory adoption leave, and has since returned to work. The term ‘additional paternity leave’ is often used to describe this type of leave although it may be taken by parents of either gender. For the purposes of the REF we refer to this leave as ‘additional paternity or adoption leave’.
7.4 The Panel Criteria and Working Methods (REF.01.2012) gives clear guidance in paragraphs 70-71 and 90-91 of Part A on how the REF panels will consider individual circumstances.

8 Fixed-Term, Part-Time and Contract Research Staff

8.1 The aims of this Code of Practice outline the University's commitment to equality of opportunity for those on fixed-term and part-time contracts. The selection criteria will take account of individual circumstances relating to staff members on fixed-term and part-time contracts, including contract research staff members, in decision-making procedure for submission. This will relate to the proportion (FTE) of time in post across the REF assessment period as a whole, and how this might have affected an individual's capacity to produce the expected volume of research outputs.

9 Monitoring

9.1 The University will produce an equality profile of the disability, gender, ethnicity and age and contract status of staff who are eligible for submission to the REF and those who are actually submitted. Where any significant imbalances are evident these will be investigated.

All Equality Impact Assessments will be regularly reviewed and updated.

10 Notification of Inclusion/Non-inclusion and Appeals Process

10.1 The University wishes to ensure that its staff have the opportunity to raise any concerns they may have with regard to their consideration for inclusion or non-inclusion in the REF in a timely manner. This section sets out the procedure through which the University will respond to concerns of this kind, investigating them, in a fair and transparent manner.

10.2 It should be noted that there is no right of appeal against the academic judgement of those responsible for selecting staff for inclusion in the REF submission or setting the University’s REF Strategy, including determining to which Units of Assessment the University will submit, and to which Unit of Assessment individuals will be submitted.

10.3 Every eligible staff member involved in research activities will receive oral feedback on the likelihood of their own inclusion in the REF submission and in which Unit of Assessment from his/her REF Lead or appropriate nominee. Formal confirmation of this feedback, including the grounds upon which the judgement has been reached, will be provided by each Dean by 31 March 2013 to allow meaningful re-consideration to take place if necessary.

10.4 At this initial formal feedback stage, each staff member will have the opportunity to provide additional information, within 10 working days, about their own circumstances and research profile.
10.5 Following the consideration of any new information provided by the staff member, the outcome in respect of inclusion, provisional inclusion, or non-inclusion in the submission, will be confirmed by his/her REF Lead or Dean.

10.6 If staff have concerns they are encouraged to talk to their REF Leads and Heads of Department, and attempt to deal with those concerns in an informal manner in the first instance. They may also wish to consult with their Deans on the same basis. The University would encourage any factual inaccuracies to be brought to the attention of the Head of Department to ensure decisions are made on veridical information.

10.7 If a staff member still has concerns following the procedures outlined above they can make a case to the REF Appeals Panel. The Appeals Panel will not be charged with revisiting academic judgements but will seek to ensure that decisions have been made consistent with the principles and processes within the Code of Practice.

10.8 REF Appeals Panel
Chair: A Pro Vice-Chancellor who does not have oversight of REF preparations.
Membership to be appointed by the Chair and to include appropriate senior and expert individuals. The Human Resources Director and the Planning Officer, (Academic Planning and Research Policy) will be in attendance at all panel meetings.

10.9 If the panel determines that there is a prima facie case the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) will be made aware of the issues and be required to revisit the original decision. The academic judgement will be the responsibility of the PVC (R&E). All cases will be monitored and an audit conducted at the completion of the process. See Appendix 1 for the appeals procedures.

11 Notes
The term 'Head of Department' has been used for ease of reference but also includes the Deans of HUBS, Education, Health and Social Care, PGMI and HYMS.
Appendix 1

Appeals Panel Procedures

1. Where a researcher wishes to formally appeal against a decision regarding their inclusion or exclusion from REF2014 they may do this through the REF Appeals Panel. It must be noted that the Appeals Panel will not be charged with revisiting academic judgements but will seek to ensure that decisions have been made consistent with the principles and processes within the Code of Practice.

2. The appellant will write to the Planning Officer (Academic Planning and Research Policy) requesting that a formal appeals process is launched to explore their case.

3. The Planning Officer (Academic Planning and Research Policy) will respond within 10 working days notifying the appellant of the date of the appeal and the membership of the Panel. The Panel must meet within 15 working days of the notification.

4. The appellant may bring a union representative or colleague to the meeting.

5. The Panel Chair may call any relevant individuals who were involved in the decision making process to attend the meeting as required.

6. All relevant documentation must be circulated to the attendees at least 5 working days before the Panel sits. Documentation must include:
   a. The formal decision of inclusion/exclusion
   b. The star rating allocated to each of the appellant’s outputs
   c. The grounds of the appeal. These must include:
      i. Evidence that the decision made was not consistent with the principles and processes of the Code of Practice; and/or
      ii. Evidence of new information which was not available to the REF Lead and Dean when the initial decision was made.
   d. Information regarding any relevant individual circumstances

7. The Panel has the authority to make any of the following decisions:
   a. To accept the appeal on the basis that the original decision made was not consistent with the principles and processes of the Code of Practice, and to amend the appellant’s inclusion/exclusion status
   b. To accept the appeal on the basis of new information and to amend the appellant’s inclusion/exclusion status
   c. To reject the appeal and uphold the appellant’s original inclusion/exclusion status
   d. To delay a decision and request further information

8. If the Panel is unable to make a decision due to lack of information they must reconvene within 10 working days to review the additional information and make a final decision.

9. The appellant will receive formal confirmation of the Panel’s decision within 5 working days after the Panel has met.

10. All Appeals must be heard by 31 May 2013 to ensure there is appropriate time for submission compositions to be amended.
Appendix 2

Individual staff circumstances disclosure form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section one:**

**Please select one of the following:**

- [ ] I have no individual circumstances that I wish to be taken into consideration for the purposes of the Research Excellence Framework (REF).
- [ ] I have individual circumstances that I wish to make known but I am not seeking a reduction in outputs. (Please complete sections two and three)
- [ ] In completing this form I am seeking a reduction in research outputs. (Please complete sections two and three)

**Section two:**

**Please select as appropriate:**

- [ ] I would like to be contacted by a member of human resources staff to discuss my circumstances and requirements and/or the support provided by the University of Hull. My contact details for this purpose are:
  - [ ] Email
  - [ ] Telephone
  - [ ] Preferred method of communication

- [ ] I do **not** wish to be contacted by a member of human resources staff

**Section three**

I wish to make the University aware of the following circumstances which have had an impact on my ability to produce four outputs or work productively between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013:

**Please provide information required on relevant circumstance/s and continue onto a separate sheet of paper if necessary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Information required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

EIA Feb2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early career researcher (started career as an independent researcher on or after 1 August 2009)</th>
<th>Date on which you became an early career researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junior clinical academic staff who have not gained Certificate of Completion of Training by 31 October 2013</th>
<th>Please place a tick in this box if the circumstance applies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part time employee</th>
<th>FTE and duration in months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career break or secondment outside of the higher education sector</th>
<th>Dates and duration in months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternity leave, statutory adoption leave, or additional paternity leave (taken by partners of new mothers or co-adopters)</th>
<th>For each period of leave state which type of leave was taken and the dates and duration in months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability (including conditions such as cancer and chronic fatigue)</th>
<th>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental health condition</th>
<th>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ill health or injury</th>
<th>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, paternity, adoption or childcare in addition to the period of maternity, adoption or additional paternity leave taken.</th>
<th>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other caring responsibilities
- (including caring for an elderly or disabled relative)

**Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months**

**Information**

### Gender reassignment

**Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months**

**Information**

### Other exceptional and relevant reasons, not including teaching or administrative work

**Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months**

**Information**

---

**Please select as appropriate:**

- I confirm that the information provided is a true and accurate description of my circumstances.

- I recognise that the information provided will be used for REF purposes and will be seen by my REF Lead. Where I have disclosed complex circumstances I understand that this information will also be seen by my Head of Department and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise).

- I realise that it may be necessary to share information with the UK funding bodies’ REF team, who may make the information available to REF panel chairs, members and secretaries and/or the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel. Where permission is not provided the University of Hull will be limited in the action it can take.

---

**Signature:** .......................................................... **Date:** ____

*(Staff member)*
For official use only
Following consideration of the personal circumstances described above, the [insert name of responsible committee or individuals]:

☐ Will progress the staff member’s inclusion in the REF submission with [insert number] of research outputs. [Subject to specified institutional criteria]. Rationale for the proposed number of outputs: e.g. this decision is based on the tariffs outlined in the panel criteria.

☐ Requires further information of the circumstances described as follows: e.g. please provide information from your occupational health assessment on the effectiveness of reasonable adjustments provided.

☐ Does not feel that the staff member meets the criteria outlined within the REF ‘Panel criteria and working methods’ for submitting fewer than four research outputs. The reason(s) for this decision are: e.g. circumstances detailed are not recognised within the assessment framework and guidance on submissions.

If [insert name of staff member] wishes to appeal against the decision of the [insert name of the committee or individuals] they will need to do so by 31st March 2013 and details of the appeals process can be found at [web address to be inserted].

Signature: ___________________________________________________________ Date: ___
(REF Lead)

Signature: ___________________________________________________________ Date: ___
(Dean)
Appendix 3

REF Reading Guidance – provision of feedback

- Once reading groups have met, read REF outputs, come to a conclusion regarding a star rating and calibrated their decisions using an external assessor feedback will need to be provided to staff on the quality of their work.

- Feedback should be considered confidential at this stage of the REF process, with the star rating of each output available to the following:
  - Author
  - Reading group
  - External reader (possibly – a sample will be provided for calibration purposes)
  - REF Lead
  - HoD
  - REF Review group (comprising REF Working Group, HoDs and Deans)

- Feedback should be provided in a face to face meeting with the researcher in a supportive and encouraging manner. Attendees should be the researcher, HoD and REF Lead.

- If appropriate a mentorship process should be initiated to assist the researcher to submit further outputs at higher star ratings.

- It should be made clear that the decision of the reading group is not a decision on inclusion, but that the selection strategy for the university is likely to be based on a quality threshold. All researchers should be made aware of the star ratings of their outputs and that an average rating of 2.5 or greater will need to be met in order to be entered by the University.