

REF Sub-panel 14: Meeting 1b

Wednesday 8 January 2014

CCT-Venues, Aldersgate House, 135- 137 Aldersgate Street, London

Minutes

Present:

Professor Muhammed Basheer
Professor Alistair Borthwick
Ms Katherine Branch (secretary)
Professor Abigail Bristow
Professor Kevin Cullinane
Professor Roger Falconer (Chair)
Professor Michael Forde
Professor Kirill Horoshenkov
Professor Tim Ibell
Professor Richard Jardine (Deputy chair)
Professor William Powrie
Professor Wolfgang Rodi (Main panel B member)
Dr Martin Tillotson
Ms Faith Wainwright

Apologies:

Professor Roger Owen
Dr Jean Venables

1. Introduction and competence to do business

- 1.1. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, and extended a special welcome to the new members of the sub-panel.
- 1.2. In the light of the attendance, the sub-panel confirmed its competency to do business.

2. Conflicts of interest

- 2.1. A paper was tabled indicating currently registered major conflicts of interest. Individuals were asked to declare any further major conflicts via the Panel Members Website and to flag minor conflicts to the chair and secretary.

3. Output calibration

- 3.1. The chair outlined the aims of the calibration exercise and gave a brief summary of the main panel calibration exercise which had taken place on the previous day. In advance of the sub-panel meeting, individuals had scored twenty papers which have been submitted to UOA 14. The chair highlighted that the aim is to develop a common understanding of the star levels and approach to assessment through discussion.
- 3.2. The individual scores were displayed as each paper was discussed and a score agreed. It was agreed to be useful to discuss aspects such as the significance, rigour, scope, originality and design of the research when reaching a score. It was noted that the scores were for the purpose of the calibration exercise only and would be disregarded at the end of the exercise.

4. Output allocation arrangements

- 4.1. It was agreed that at least two individuals will assess each output. Where disagreements in scoring arise, a third person from the relevant group will be asked to assess it, either by the first/second panellist or by the chair/deputy chair. The chair and deputy chair will carry out spot checks of output scores throughout the process.
- 4.2. By the 5 February meeting, each sub-panel member and output assessor should have assessed a minimum of 20% of their output allocation, and have assessed all of them by the 26 March meeting. Sub-panel members should sort their spreadsheets by staff member surname to ensure the same order is followed. Differences in scores should be resolved by telephone discussion or by meeting.
- 4.3. Where a sub-panel member identifies a conflict of interest with an output they have been allocated, the chair requested that the sub-panel member contact him with the output identifier and staff member name to allow rapid reallocation.
- 4.4. For outputs requiring an audit, it was agreed that sub-panel members would score the output at the same as raising an audit query to prevent delays.
- 4.5. A brief discussion took place on assessment of impact. The three impact assessors will assess all impact case studies, along with the two most relevant panel members for each one (taking conflicts of interest into account).
- 4.6. Early discussions took place on the calibration exercise for impact.

5. IT systems briefing

- 5.1. A briefing was delivered on the systems available in REF.

6. Future meetings

6.1. The meeting schedule was discussed.

7. A.O.B

7.1. No other business was raised.



REF Sub-panel 14: Meeting 2
Wednesday 5 February 2014, 10:00 – 16:30
The Studio, Cannon Street, Birmingham
Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (Secretary)
Professor Muhammed Basheer
Professor Alistair Borthwick
Professor Abigail Bristow
Professor Kevin Cullinane
Professor Roger Falconer (Chair)
Professor Michael Forde
Professor Kirill Horoshenkov
Professor Tim Ibell
Professor Richard Jardine (Deputy chair)
Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor Roger Owen
Professor William Powrie
Dr Martin Tillotson
Ms Faith Wainwright

Apologies:

There were no apologies.

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the Secretary, Catherine Annabel, and Adviser, Karen Ness, who had been unable to attend the previous meeting because of the scheduling of parallel Main Panel B sub-panel meetings. Members were advised that for future meetings both the Secretary and the Adviser will be present.

1.2 The chair reported that since the previous meeting two changes had been approved to the membership of the sub-Panel. Jean Venables will be an Impact Assessor rather than a full sub-Panel member, and Abigail Bristow will be a full sub-Panel member rather than an output assessor.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panel members of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited members to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Output assessment

4.1 Prior to the meeting, members had been asked to assess allocated outputs from a 20% tranche. Scores had been entered into personal spreadsheets and uploaded to the PMW, and in a proportion of cases where two readers had scored the output and readers had had the opportunity to discuss scores ahead of the meeting, an agreed score had also been uploaded. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

4.2 The chair outlined the aims of this exercise, highlighting that the target of 20% of outputs being assessed by this meeting had been exceeded.

4.3 The exercise raised a number of more general issues about output assessment.

4.3.1 As set out in the published REF guidance, citations and number of co-authors should not be taken into account in assessing outputs.

4.3.2 Members were reminded in reviewing the current distribution of scores that there is no quota of 4* outputs expected to be awarded and that all outputs should be assessed against the published criteria without regard to the overall distribution.

4.3.3 It was confirmed that where supplementary material is referenced within an output, panel members may, if it is appropriate, refer to that to inform their assessment.

4.3.5 The issue of duplicate outputs was discussed and it was noted that in the majority of cases pairs assessing one submission of an output would assess other submissions. Where conflicts of interest prevented this, in a small number of cases, reconciliation of scores would be required between the assessors. The secretary confirmed that a report

on duplicate outputs is available to the panel executive and that scores for these outputs are being monitored and a report will be provided to the next meeting.

4.3.6 It was noted that three proposed double-weighted outputs have been submitted to the panel. Panellists assigned to assess these outputs will consider the case made for double weighting and make recommendations for discussion by the panel.

4.4 For the next meeting, on 26 March, 50% of outputs will need to have been assessed. Given the progress made to date, members were encouraged where possible to assess all of their allocated papers and to identify any requiring detailed discussion by sub-groups at the meeting, or requiring a third reader where co-readers were unable to agree a score.

5. Audit briefing

5.1 The adviser presented a summary of the procedures relating to audit of outputs and staff members, covering data comparison and REF Team initiated sample based audits as well as panel-instigated audit. Members were reminded that guidance is available on the PMW, and that potential audit queries should be notified to the secretary for investigation and action where appropriate.

6. Cross-referrals and specialist advice

6.1 The secretary gave a verbal report on cross-referrals to and from SP14. At present five outputs had been referred into SP14 from SP7 (Earth Systems & Environmental Science) and none for referral to other sub-panels from SP14. Currently no outputs had been identified as requiring specialist advice.

7. Preparations for impact assessment

7.1 It was agreed that a sample of six impact case studies will be identified by the end of February for calibration. Of these, four will be provided to the Main Panel, which is expected to select two for the main panel calibration exercise. Subject to further guidance from the Main Panel Chair, SP14 will select a further two case studies in addition to the four offered to Main Panel. The selection methodology will be agreed by the Main Panel, and further guidance on assessment and scoring will be provided.

7.2 It was agreed that all impact case studies will be allocated to the three impact assessors/user members, one of whom will identify two academic panel members to assess each case study. Allocations will be checked by the Chair in order to identify any conflicts of interest, and to address any imbalances in workload.

7.3 Impact assessors will be fully briefed regarding the REF process.

7.4 Members were encouraged to scan case studies as soon as possible to allow early identification of audit issues and to assist in appropriate allocation to assessors/panel members.

8. Future meetings and work plan

8.1 Members received a plan of tasks and meetings over the REF period. This will be amended and additional detail provided regarding deadlines, and recirculated to members.

9. Any other business

9.1 There was no further business.



REF Sub-panel 14: Meeting 3

Wednesday 26 March 2014, 10:00 – 16:30

**Barbican, Aldersgate House, 135-137 Aldersgate Street,
EC1A 4JA, Central London**

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (Secretary)
Professor Muhammed Basheer
Professor Alistair Borthwick
Professor Abigail Bristow
Professor Kevin Cullinane
Professor Roger Falconer (Chair)
Professor Michael Forde
Professor Kirill Horoshenkov
Professor Tim Ibell
Professor Richard Jardine (Deputy chair)
Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor Roger Owen
Professor William Powrie
Dr Martin Tillotson
Dr Jean Venables (from item 6)
Ms Faith Wainwright

In attendance (part-time):

Duncan Shermer (REF)
Professor Dame Ann Dowling (Chair, MPB)

Apologies: There were no apologies for absence.

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panellists of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited members to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Clearly defined staff circumstances

4.1 The secretary presented an interim report on clearly defined staff circumstances and outlined the proportion of requests for a reduction in outputs associated with early career researcher status, part-time working and maternity/paternity leave, and other clearly defined circumstances. The numbers and types of audit queries raised to date were also reported.

5. Output assessment

5.1 Prior to the meeting, panellists had been asked to complete the assessment of allocated outputs. Scores had been entered into personal spreadsheets and uploaded to the PMW, and in most cases where two readers had scored the output and readers had had the opportunity to discuss scores ahead of the meeting, an agreed score had also been uploaded. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

5.2 The Chair thanked panellists for having completed the assessment of virtually all outputs, ahead of schedule. It was agreed that panellists will now review all outputs where scores are still to be agreed, and upload as soon as possible, at the latest by 18 May, for the next sub-panel meeting, SP4, scheduled for the 21-23 May. The scores to date will be provided to Main Panel B for their meeting on 23 April and any issues identified will be referred back for consideration at the next sub-panel meeting.

5.3 The issue of duplicate outputs was discussed and it was noted that in the majority of cases pairs assessing one submission of an output had assessed all other submissions. The secretary confirmed that a report on duplicate outputs is available to the panel executive and that scores are being monitored to ensure consistency.

5.4 The secretary presented a report on outputs cross-referred to the sub-panel and progress in assessing them. One output will be cross-referred from the sub-panel.

5.5 At the next meeting, on 22 May, all output scores will be finalised by the panel, and thus panellists will need to ensure that all agreed scores are uploaded by the

deadline of 18 May. Panellists were asked to begin compiling notes to contribute to the final confidential feedback to institutions.

5.6 Panellists had raised a small number of audit queries relating to outputs, and the secretary will monitor and report on outcomes so that final scores can be agreed.

5.7 Members received an updated workplan identifying the tasks to be completed at forthcoming meetings. It was agreed that, given the progress made towards the assessment of all outputs, the first day of the two-day meeting originally scheduled for 21-22 May will be cancelled, and work on outputs will be completed during the afternoon of 22 May. A revised version of the workplan will be circulated.

6. Impact

6.1 The chair welcomed the impact assessor to the meeting.

6.2 The adviser presented a briefing on the assessment of impact case studies and templates, and reported on the calibration exercise which had begun at Main Panel level.

6.3 It was agreed that following the meeting the calibration sample of eight case studies and two templates will be made available to panel members and impact assessors, who will be asked to score the sample using the agreed scale, recording the scores on the spreadsheet provided by the secretariat, and returning these by the deadline of 18 May.

6.4 In parallel with the calibration exercise, all case studies and templates will be allocated to two/three user members/impact assessors (taking account of conflicts of interest) and three academic panellists. Panellists were asked initially to review their allocations without scoring them, in order to identify minor conflicts of interest and potential audit matters, pending the conclusion of the calibration process.

7. Audit matters relating to impact

7.1 The adviser briefed panellists on the approach to audit in relation to impact case studies and templates.

8. Future meetings and workplan relating to impact

8.1 Panellists received a workplan showing the schedule for all tasks relating to the assessment of impact.

9. Any other business

9.1 There was no further business.



REF Sub-panel 14: Meeting 4 (Part 1)

22 May 2014

**Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead,
South Croydon, CR2 8YA Surrey**

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (Secretary)
Professor Muhammed Basheer
Professor Abigail Bristow
Professor Kevin Cullinane
Professor Dame Ann Dowling (Chair, MPB) (part-time)
Professor Roger Falconer (Chair)
Professor Michael Forde
Professor Kirill Horoshenkov
Professor Tim Ibell
Professor Richard Jardine (Deputy chair)
Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor William Powrie
Professor Wolfgang Rodi (International member, MPB)
Dr Martin Tillotson
Ms Faith Wainwright

Apologies were received from Professor Alastair Borthwick and Professor Roger Owen.

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Professor Wolfgang Rodi, international member of Main Panel B, and Professor Dame Ann Dowling, chair of Main Panel B.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panellists of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited panellists to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Clearly defined staff circumstances

4.1 The secretary presented a report on clearly defined circumstances. The panel was asked to approve 126 cases where a reduced number of outputs had been submitted on the basis of early career researcher status, part-time working or career break, or maternity/adoption leave. It was agreed that two further cases where audit queries were outstanding would be resolved by the Executive when the information was received.

5. Output assessment

5.1 Prior to the meeting, panellists had been asked to complete the assessment of allocated outputs. Individual and agreed scores had been entered into personal spreadsheets and uploaded to the PMW. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

5.2 The chair thanked panellists for having completed the assessment of all outputs.

5.3 The panel reviewed all cases where an output had been scored as unclassified and confirmed the scores.

5.4 The secretary presented a verbal report on outputs cross-referred to and from the sub-panel. It was noted that all but a small number of cross-referral requests were now completed.

5.5 The secretary reported on audit queries raised by panel members. Further information had been provided by HEIs for all queries raised, and the outputs had been scored accordingly.

5.7 Panel scores were agreed for all outputs submitted to UOA14, and HEI output profiles were reviewed and approved. Panellists left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6. Overview reports and feedback statements

Panellists received the REF template and guidance on overview reports and feedback statements. Draft feedback statements on outputs were prepared for each submission. Panellists left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

7. Future meetings and workplan

Panellists received the latest version of the workplan and agreed deadlines for the next phase of sub-panel activity.

8. Any other business

8.1 There was no further business.



REF Sub-panel 14: Meeting 4 (Part 2)

23 May 2014

**Selsdon Park Hotel, Addington Road, Sanderstead,
South Croydon, CR2 8YA, Surrey**

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (Secretary)
Professor Muhammed Basheer
Professor Abigail Bristow
Professor Kevin Cullinane
Professor Roger Falconer (Chair)
Professor Michael Forde
Professor Kirill Horoshenkov
Professor Tim Ibell
Professor Richard Jardine (Deputy chair)
Dr Karen Ness (Adviser)
Professor William Powrie
Professor Wolfgang Rodi (International member, MPB)
Dr Robert Sorrell (User member, MPB)
Dr Martin Tillotson
Dr Jean Venables
Ms Faith Wainwright

Apologies: There were apologies for absence from Professor Alistair Borthwick and Professor Roger Owen

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panellists of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited panellists to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Impact Calibration

4.1 The chair welcomed the impact assessor to the meeting.

4.2 Panellists reviewed the calibration scores for the sample of case studies and templates, and agreed panel scores in each case. Panellists had found impact calibration to be a very useful exercise, enabling detailed exploration of the issues associated with the assessment of impact including the threshold conditions, the range of types of impact, and the application of the assessment criteria. Through these discussions, individual panellists had been able to calibrate their own scoring behaviours.

5. Audit matters relating to impact

Panellists noted a number of potential audit queries already raised by user members. It was agreed that where further information was required in order to enable panellists to assess whether a threshold had been reached, or where corroboration was required for claims made regarding impact, panellists will provide details for the secretariat as soon as possible, so that queries could be raised with the HEIs or corroborating sources and responses received before the next meeting.

6. Assessment of impact

6.1 For each case study or template user/impact assessors and academic assessors will record individual scores prior to Meeting 5 when these will be discussed, and panel scores agreed.

7. Future meetings and workplan relating to impact

7.1 Panellists received a workplan showing the schedule for all tasks relating to the assessment of impact.

8. Any other business

8.1 There was no further business.



REF Sub-panel 14: Meeting 5

2-3 July 2014

**Radisson Blu, 12 Holloway Circus Queensway, B1 1BT
Birmingham**

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (secretary)
Professor Muhammed Basheer
Professor Alistair Borthwick
Professor Abigail Bristow
Mr Jack Boyer (MPB user member)
Professor Kevin Cullinane
Professor Roger Falconer (chair)
Professor Michael Forde
Professor Kirill Horoshenkov
Professor Tim Ibell
Professor Richard Jardine (deputy chair)
Dr Karen Ness (adviser)
Professor Roger Owen
Professor William Powrie
Dr Martin Tillotson
Ms Faith Wainwright

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting, in particular Mr Jack Boyer, MPB user member.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 22-23 May 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panellists of the arrangements for the declaration of conflicts of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited panellists to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Output assessment

4.1 The adviser presented a report on scores changed after the last meeting due to the REF audit, which had resulted in two additional outputs being unclassified. Revised HEI profiles were displayed and it was noted that the feedback statements drafted at the last meeting will be amended to reflect the changes.

4.2 The secretary confirmed that all outstanding audits of outputs and staff circumstances had been resolved and reminded panellists to ensure that there were no incoming cross-referral requests still awaiting a response.

5. Impact assessment

5.1 Prior to the meeting, panellists had been asked to complete the assessment of allocated impact case studies and templates. Individual scores had been entered into personal spreadsheets and uploaded to the PMW. An analysis of scoring data was presented by the adviser.

5.2 The secretary reported on audit queries raised by panel members. Further information had been provided by HEIs for all but two of the queries raised, and the impact items had been scored taking account of the audit responses received. Provisional scores were recorded where audit information had not yet been received.

5.3 The panel reviewed all case studies and templates and panel scores were agreed for all impact items submitted to UOA14. HEI impact profiles were reviewed and approved. Panellists left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6. Overview reports and feedback statements

6.1 Panellists received the REF template and guidance on overview reports and feedback statements. Draft feedback statements on impact were prepared for each submission. Panellists left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

7. Environment

7.1 Members received a briefing on the assessment of environment templates. The chair advised that each template had been allocated to five panel members who will record scores on their personal spreadsheets, but that all panel members are expected to read all templates. Members agreed an approach to the scoring of the various sections of the impact template, and discussed the way in which the standard analysis data may be used to inform the assessment. Scores will be agreed at sub-panel meeting 6.

8. Future meetings and workplan

8.1 Panel members received the latest version of the workplan and agreed deadlines for the next phase of sub-panel activity.

9. Any other business

9.1 The chair thanked the impact assessor for her contribution to the process.



REF Sub-panel 14: Meeting 6

10-11 September 2014

Radisson Blu, 12 Holloway Circus Queensway, B1 1BT

Birmingham

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (secretary)	Professor Tim Ibell
Professor Muhammed Basheer	Professor Richard Jardine (deputy chair)
Professor Alistair Borthwick	Dr Karen Ness (adviser)
Professor Abigail Bristow	Professor Roger Owen
Professor Kevin Cullinane	Professor William Powrie
Professor Roger Falconer (chair)	Professor Martin Tillotson
Professor Michael Forde	Ms Faith Wainwright
Professor Kirill Horoshenkov	

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 2-3 July 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panel members of the arrangements for the declaration of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited panel members to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and to ensure that any amendments are recorded promptly via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts should be notified to the chair and will be recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Assessment of outputs and impact

4.1 The secretary confirmed that all audit queries relating to outputs and to staff circumstances had been completed. One impact audit query was awaiting a response. It was agreed that the secretary will forward this on receipt to the panel members who had assessed the case study, who will determine whether the provisional score recorded will stand or requires amendment in light of the information received.

5. Environment assessment

5.1 Prior to the meeting, panel members had been asked to read all environment templates where there was no conflict of interest, to provide scores for the selected calibration template, and to complete the assessment of environment templates allocated to them. For the templates allocated to them, panel members had recorded scores in their personal spreadsheets and these had been uploaded to the PMW.

5.2 Panel members reviewed the scores for the calibration template and identified issues to be taken into account in arriving at agreed panel scores for all environment templates.

5.3 The panel reviewed and agreed panel scores for all environment templates submitted to SP14. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6. Approval of profiles, feedback statements and overview reports

6.1 Panel members reviewed and approved all three sub-profiles together with the overall profiles for all submissions to SP14. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6.2 Draft HEI feedback statements on outputs, impact and environment were agreed for each submission and will be finalised by the chair following the meeting. Panel members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest.

6.3 Panel members agreed a draft of the overview report on the submissions to SP14 which will be submitted to MPB for discussion at its next meeting.

7. Future meetings and work plan

7.1 Panel members received the latest version of the work plan and noted the business to be undertaken at the final meeting of the sub-panel on 16 October 2014.



REF Sub-panel 14: Meeting 7

16 October 2014

**CCT Venues - Barbican, Aldersgate House, 135-137
Aldersgate Street, London EC1A 4JA**

Minutes

Present:

Ms Catherine Annabel (secretary)
Professor Muhammed Basheer
Professor Alistair Borthwick
Professor Abigail Bristow
Professor Kevin Cullinane
Professor Roger Falconer (chair)
Professor Michael Forde
Professor Kirill Horoshenkov

Professor Tim Ibell
Professor Richard Jardine (deputy chair)
Dr Karen Ness (adviser)
Professor Roger Owen
Professor William Powrie
Professor Martin Tillotson
Ms Faith Wainwright

1. Introductions and competence to do business

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. The chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

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

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 10-11 September 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

3. Conflicts of interest

3.1 The chair reminded panel members of the arrangements for the declaration of interests, noting the differences between major and minor conflicts and the guidance material available via the panel members' website (PMW).

3.2 The chair invited panel members to check that the register of declared major conflicts was up-to-date, and that any amendments had been recorded via the PMW. In addition, minor conflicts had been notified to the chair and recorded by the secretary as appropriate.

4. Assessment of outputs, impact and environment

4.1 The secretary confirmed that all audit queries relating to outputs, impact and staff circumstances had been completed. The impact audit query recorded as outstanding at the last meeting had resulted in an unclassified grade, and the submitted unit's profile had been changed accordingly and the change reported to Main Panel.

4.2 The secretary confirmed that all cross-referrals into and out of the sub-panel had been completed.

5. Approval of results

5.1 The chair confirmed that Main Panel B had approved the profiles for SP14 at its meeting on 30 October.

6. Overview reports

6.1 Panel members reviewed the notes on the Main Panel section of the overview report. A number of points were raised which would be communicated to Main Panel secretariat for consideration for inclusion in the report.

6.2 Panel members reviewed the draft of the sub-panel section of the overview report and contributed a number of amendments. The chair and secretariat will finalise the draft for submission to the Main Panel.

7. Feedback statements

7.1 The sub-panel reviewed the draft feedback statements and agreed a number of amendments. Members left the meeting as required due to conflicts of interest. The chair and secretariat will finalise the draft for submission to the Main Panel.

8. Final phase of REF activity and publication of results

8.1 The adviser presented a briefing on the arrangements for publication of the REF results and the implications for confidentiality both in the interim and subsequent to publication.

8.2 The chair advised on arrangements for attendance by nominated sub-panel members at HEFCE feedback events. Members were asked to contribute any points that they wished to be raised by the nominees.

9. Any other business

9.1 The chair thanked panel members for their contributions to the 2014 REF.