

Consultation on draft panel criteria and working methods

Part 2D: Draft statement of Main Panel D

Main Panel D covers the following sub-panels:

- 27 Area Studies**
- 28 Modern Languages and Linguistics**
- 29 English Literature and Language**
- 30 History**
- 31 Classics**
- 32 Philosophy**
- 33 Theology and Religious Studies**
- 34 Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory**
- 35 Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts**
- 36 Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management**

The following sections set out the criteria and working methods that Main Panel D and its sub-panels will apply in assessing submissions. These should be read alongside the guidance provided in REF 02.2011 'Assessment framework and guidance on submissions' (hereafter 'guidance on submissions') and the generic statement of criteria and working methods provided in Part 1 of this document.

Section 1: Submissions and units of assessment

Section 2: Assessment criteria: outputs

Section 3: Assessment criteria: impact

Section 4: Assessment criteria: environment

Section 5: Working methods

Section 1: Submissions and units of assessment

Introduction

1. The main panel is charged with identifying excellence in the rich diversity of research covered by the units of assessment (UOAs) described below. It welcomes all outputs arising from this research, in whatever genre, medium or location that can be demonstrated to meet the definition of research for the REF, as outlined in Annex C of 'guidance on submissions' and that have entered the public domain during the publication period. Sub-panels are committed to applying criteria and working methods that reflect the distinctive character, methodologies and full breadth of these disciplines (including interdisciplinary research), and that facilitate the formation of a balanced range of judgements, without privileging or disadvantaging any particular form of research output, research methodology or type of research environment.
2. The main panel and its sub-panels will operate according to the following principles:
 - panels will assess submissions in the form that HEIs have chosen to present their research, within the REF framework
 - panels will aim to identify excellence wherever they can find it.

Unit of assessment descriptors and boundaries

UOA 27: Area Studies

3. UOA 27 includes research across the spectrum of Area Studies, broadly defined to include the study of all regions of the world and the communities which are associated with or which inhabit them. The sub-panel takes an inclusive view of Area Studies, which we recognise to be a dynamic field, and the following list should be considered as indicative rather than exhaustive: African studies; American and Anglophone studies, including Canada and the United States, taken to include colonial North America; Asian studies, including Central Asian, North East Asian (including China), South Asian and South East Asian studies; Latin American and Caribbean studies; Australian, New Zealand and Pacific studies; European studies, including European Union studies and Russian and East European studies (including post-Soviet studies); Middle Eastern studies including Israel studies and Islamic world studies; and the interactions of these regions and peoples with the wider world, including African, Asian, Jewish, Muslim and other diasporas.
4. The sub-panel has expertise across the humanities and social sciences, and welcomes work from any disciplinary, interdisciplinary or theoretical perspective. It will assess submissions covering all aspects of the history, languages, cultures, literatures, religions, media, society, economics, human geography, politics and international relations of the above areas, as well as inter-regional and globalisation studies. The sub-panel is confident of its ability to assess a wide range of multi- and interdisciplinary work, but given the broad scope of Area Studies, it recognises that submissions may be made in this UOA that include elements falling wholly or partially outside its members' expertise. It is therefore mindful of the need to liaise with, and where appropriate to

cross-refer parts of submissions to, other sub-panels in Main Panel C and Main Panel D. The sub-panel also acknowledges that additional assessors may need to be appointed in due course. Submissions may cover one of the areas listed or a combination of areas. The sub-panel recognises that it may be appropriate for HEIs to make multiple submissions, in which case they should refer to 'guidance on submissions' (paragraph 50) and paragraphs 44 to 48 below, and ensure they are in compliance with the conditions therein.

UOA 28: Modern Languages and Linguistics

5. The UOA includes research on the languages, literatures, cultures and societies of all regions, countries and communities where Celtic, Germanic, Romance or Slavonic languages or other languages of Europe and Latin America are, or were, used, as well as submissions on all areas of general, historical, theoretical, descriptive and applied linguistics and translation studies and interpreting studies, regardless of the language to which the studies are applied. The sub-panel will take a broad view of what constitutes modern language studies. This will include, but not be limited to: literature and thought; cultural studies; theatre studies; film and media studies; language studies; translation studies and interpreting studies; political, social and historical studies; postcolonial studies; gender studies; scholarly editions; philosophy and critical theory; comparative literature and literature in relation to the other arts; creative writing. The sub-panel expects that interdisciplinary work will be submitted in this UOA, and will ensure that such work is assessed with appropriate expertise.

6. Submissions may legitimately include areas of research which are eligible for submission in other UOAs, and the sub-panel recognises that submissions made in the UOA may include elements falling wholly or partially outside the membership's expertise, and will cross-refer where appropriate. Submitting units whose research involves the study of these languages, societies, and cultures, but whose predominant focus is on a specific discipline in another UOA, are invited to submit their work in that UOA.

7. The sub-panel recognises that it may be appropriate for HEIs to make multiple submissions, in which case they should refer to 'guidance on submissions' (paragraph 50) and paragraphs 44 to 48 below, and ensure they are in compliance with the conditions therein.

UOA 29: English Literature and Language

8. The UOA includes: English and Scots language (historical and modern); English and Scots linguistic studies, including applied linguistics; Old Norse/Icelandic (language, literature and linguistic studies); English literature from the early Middle Ages to the present day; North American literature; comparative literature; world literatures in English; colonial and postcolonial literatures and languages; women's writing; creative writing; life writing; children's literature; critical and cultural theory; cultural history; gender and sexuality studies; editorial scholarship, bibliography, textual criticism and theory, and history of the book; Irish literature in English; Scottish literature in English

and Scots; Welsh literature in English; and applied, practice based, and pedagogical research in English.

9. The sub-panel will take a broad view of what constitutes English literature and language, and is aware that in some submitting units significant work will also be done in areas such as the following: theatre and performance studies; cultural studies; film, television and digital media studies; popular music; art history; philosophy; the linguistics of languages other than those mentioned above; translation studies; Celtic. Where the submission spans the boundary between this UOA and one or more others, or falls outside the range of expertise of sub-panel members, other sub-panels and/or expert assessors will be consulted, as appropriate.

10. The sub-panel expects that interdisciplinary work will be submitted in this UOA which may include areas such as literature in relation to science and medicine, or creative technologies, and will ensure that such work is assessed with appropriate expertise.

UOA 30: History

11. The UOA includes all aspects of the study of the past except those specifically falling within the remit of other UOAs.

12. The sub-panel expects submissions in this UOA from all areas of history, including those listed below (in alphabetical order). This list is illustrative rather than exhaustive; it does not reflect any judgements about the relative significance of the subject areas, nor does it specify 'fields': business history; cultural history; economic history; environmental history; global history; heritage; historiography; history and memory; history of Britain, Ireland and Continental Europe (late Roman to the present); history of ideas; history of North America, South America, Africa, Asia and Australasia; history of science, technology and medicine; imperial/colonial history; international history; labour history; local and regional history; material history; media history; military history; oral history; political history; public history; religious history; social history; theory of history; transnational history; urban history; women's and gender history.

13. All classical history will be automatically cross-referred to Sub-panel 31 (Classics); Byzantine history will also normally be cross-referred where it seems more appropriate for Sub-panel 31 to consider the output. The sub-panel may also cross-refer other submitted outputs as appropriate, for example to Sub-panel 27 (Area Studies).

14. The sub-panel welcomes the submission of interdisciplinary research, which may include areas such as history in relation to literature or art history. It expects to assess a significant proportion of such work but may cross-refer to other sub-panels where appropriate.

UOA 31: Classics

15. The UOA includes the language, literature, history, culture, art, archaeology and thought (including ancient science and philosophy) of Greece and Rome from the earliest times to late antiquity; Latin language and literature of the Middle Ages and subsequent periods; Ancient Egypt and the ancient Near East, Byzantine studies; modern Greek language, literature, history and culture; the classical tradition; and the reception of these periods and subjects.

16. Within the boundaries are the following: the Greek world from the Bronze Age to the fall of the Byzantine Empire; the Roman world from the Bronze Age to late antiquity; Greek lands, including the Diaspora, from the medieval period to the present; the philology and linguistics of Latin and Greek and of related and neighbouring languages; theory; comparative literature and such literature, literary theory, philosophy, political thought, material culture, art, film, performance, music, and such political, archaeological and other cultural activity as exploits in any way the history or cultural products of the Greek, Roman and Byzantine world; the pedagogy associated with learning and teaching in the subjects listed here.

17. The list above is illustrative rather than exhaustive. It does not reflect any judgements about the relative significance of the subject areas, nor does it specify 'fields'.

18. UOA 31 spans boundaries with all the UOAs within Main Panel D and with Sub-panel 17 (Geography, Environmental Studies and Archaeology). It is expected that the sub-panel will cross-refer outputs when they will be more expertly assessed by other sub-panels.

UOA 32: Philosophy

19. The UOA includes all areas and styles of, and approaches to, philosophy. The sub-panel expects to receive submissions from all areas of philosophy, and considers the following subjects (listed alphabetically), among others, to be within the remit of the UOA: 19th and 20th century European philosophy including phenomenology, existentialism, critical theory, hermeneutics, and deconstruction; aesthetics; applied philosophy; epistemology; ethics, including applied ethics and meta-ethics; environmental philosophy; feminist philosophy; history of philosophy including ancient, medieval, modern and recent; logic; metaphysics; non-Western philosophy; philosophy of education; philosophy of language; philosophy of law; philosophy and history of mathematics; philosophy of mind; philosophy of religion; philosophy and history of science, technology, and medicine; political and social philosophy; teaching philosophy; theories of collective and individual rationality. The areas mentioned are illustrative rather than exhaustive, and do not reflect any judgement about the relative significance of the subject areas.

20. Because philosophy engages with conceptual and foundational issues raised by other disciplines, it spans boundaries with a number of other UOAs, including but not

limited to all the other UOAs within Main Panel D and the following UOAs within other main panels: UOA 2 (Public Health, Health Services and Primary Care), for example, medical ethics; UOA 4 (Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience), for example, cognitive science; UOA 10 (Mathematical Sciences), for example, mathematical logic; UOA 18 (Economics and Econometrics) for example, social choice theory and game theory; UOA 20 (Law), for example, jurisprudence; UOA 21 (Politics and International Studies), for example, political theory; UOA 23 (Sociology), for example, social theory.

21. The Philosophy sub-panel aims to be inclusive, and welcomes the submission of interdisciplinary outputs. As stated above, its remit covers all types of applied philosophy relating to practical issues both within and outside academia. The remit also covers work concerned with philosophical questions raised by other disciplines, for example work concerned with the foundations, methods, epistemic status, or interpretation of findings or theories in the other disciplines. The sub-panel may consider that work that merely references philosophical ideas without engaging with them philosophically will have its excellence best assessed by another sub-panel, and will consider cross-referral accordingly.

UOA 33: Theology and Religious Studies

22. The UOA encompasses all research in theology and religion, and is inclusive of all disciplinary approaches adopted in the field, including philosophical, theological, historical, philological, literary, phenomenological, psychological, sociological and anthropological methodologies. It encompasses the study and interpretation of religious institutions, movements, texts, laws, practices, ethics, beliefs, symbols, media, social relations, material objects, spaces and flows, both historical and contemporary. It includes all religious traditions, spiritualities and sacralised forms of commitment and their expression in different cultural media – for example, film, art, music and literature, in whatever genre or media. The study of varieties of secularism and secularity which reference religion explicitly or implicitly is also included. It also covers work concerned with theological and religious questions raised by other disciplines.

23. Theology and Religious Studies is an inherently multi- and cross-disciplinary subject, and religion intersects with many other aspects of society, politics, and culture. In recognition of this, the sub-panel will welcome submissions which overlap with the remit of other UOAs; or for which UOA 33 is not the only appropriate one; or from those undertaking relevant research in academic units not classified as theology, divinity or religious studies; or from academic units which specialise in only one area of the field.

24. Given the multidisciplinary reach of UOA 33, it is anticipated that a substantial portion of submissions received will overlap with other UOAs. Sub-panel 33 contains considerable linguistic, methodological and cross-disciplinary expertise, but will cross-refer where expertise needs to be augmented. Indicatively, it is anticipated that such cross-referral may include, but not be limited to: Sub-panel 17 (Geography, Environmental Studies and Archaeology), Sub-panel 20 (Law), Sub-panel 21 (Politics and International Studies) and the sub-panels within Main Panel D. Sub-panel 33

continues to welcome innovative and cross-disciplinary approaches to the study of religion as well as more traditional methods.

UOA 34: Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory

25. The UOA includes research from all aspects of the history, theory and practice of art and design. The sub-panel will consider outputs, in whatever genre or medium, that meet the definition of research (as outlined in 'guidance on submissions', Annex C). The sub-panel acknowledges the diversity and range of related methods of academic study and artistic practice, and therefore proposes to adopt an inclusive definition of its remit.

26. **Practice** encompasses all disciplines within art and design, in which methods of making, representation, interrogation and interpretation are integral to their productions. **History** and **Theory** encompass the history, criticism, theory, historiography, pedagogy and aesthetics of architecture, art, craft, and design in their widest chronological and geographical framework. The UOA may also embrace fields such as anthropology, archaeology, cultural, social and gender studies, entrepreneurship, innovation, management and business studies, media studies, museology, and urban planning, where these relate to visual, material and spatial cultures. In a number of cases, the fields of work may be interdisciplinary, and thus have no firm or rigidly definable boundaries. For this reason the sub-panel expects to assess submissions that do not necessarily map onto institutional structures. The sub-panel is committed to applying criteria and working methods that are appropriate to all submitting units, whatever their size or structure, without privileging any particular form of research output or environment.

27. The following is an illustrative list of subject areas within practice, theory and history that the sub-panel expects to assess: applied and decorative arts; architecture; conservation and technical art history; crafts; creative and heritage industries; entrepreneurship and enterprise; critical, historical, social and cultural studies; fine arts; landscape and garden design; museology and curatorship; policy, management and innovation studies; photography; product design; spatial, two- and three-dimensional design; textile, dress and fashion; time-based and digital media; visual and material culture.

28. The sub-panel recognises that it may be appropriate for HEIs to make multiple submissions, in which case they should refer to 'guidance on submissions' (paragraph 50) and paragraphs 44 to 48 below, and ensure they are in compliance with the conditions therein.

UOA 35: Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts

29. The UOA includes research from all areas of music, drama, dance, theatre, performance, live art, film and television studies, and the sub-panel anticipates that outputs will span a range of writings, research-led practices and practice-based media, as well as artefacts. The sub-panel expects to evaluate research that encompasses analytical, applied, ethnographical, historical, interdisciplinary, pedagogical, practice-led,

scientific, technological and theoretical approaches to the widest domains of dance, drama, music, performing and screen arts, and covers the broadest understanding of the subject disciplines within any cultural, geographical or historical context.

30. Sub-panels 35 and 36 recognise that much research relating to film or broadcasting could readily meet the remit of either, and might sit in the wide boundaries that imprecisely separate the two areas of assessment responsibility. It will be the aim of both sub-panels to ensure that a decision to submit to one or the other should not advantage or disadvantage any research. This will be ensured by cross-referral and by assessment across the two sub-panels where appropriate.

31. Sub-panel 35 anticipates further overlaps and a degree of cross-referral with other UOAs, for instance those in Main Panels C and D, as well as Sub-panel 3 (Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy); Sub-panel 4 (Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience); Sub-panel 9 (Physics); Sub-panel 11 (Computer Science and Informatics) and Sub-panel 13 (Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Metallurgy and Materials).

32. The sub-panel recognises that it may be appropriate for HEIs to make multiple submissions, in which case they should refer to 'guidance on submissions' (paragraph 50) and paragraphs 44 to 48 below, and ensure they are in compliance with the conditions therein.

UOA 36: Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management

33. The sub-panel recognises the rich diversity of research in communication, cultural and media studies, library and information management, and welcomes all outputs arising from this research, in whatever genre or medium, that can be demonstrated to meet the definition of research for the REF (as outlined in 'guidance on submissions', Annex C). In setting out its remit, the sub-panel recognises that the UOA descriptor covers two broad fields of research which are often distinct both organisationally and academically, and welcomes submissions that reflect this. It also recognises that the activities covered by its remit, even within its two broad fields of coverage, are often rooted in quite distinct research traditions or infrastructures. It will assess research on its merits, with no penalty for research which is plainly within a distinct tradition within the sub-panel's remit. It will nonetheless welcome research which seeks to engage with questions and concerns, such as the 'information society', heritage (both cultural and museum aspects), networks or convergence, which may transcend field boundaries.

34. The UOA includes research that addresses or deploys theory, history, institutional, policy, textual, critical and/or empirical analysis, or practice within communication, culture, media, journalism and film studies. Within UK higher education much, but not all, of this work is likely to emanate from units or departments in communication studies, cultural studies, media studies, journalism, or film and television studies. This work will include research on print media, broadcasting and the moving image, and will include computer-mediated communication, popular culture, and diverse information and

communication technologies, which will be variably titled and organised. Much will also be conducted in units or departments situated elsewhere within the social sciences, arts or humanities. The sub-panel will assess research as defined above which addresses (but is not confined to): policy for regulation of culture and the media; the organisation, institutions, political economy and practice of cultural production; media and cultural texts, forms and practices; and media and cultural audiences, consumption and reception, including questions of power, identity and difference.

35. The UOA also includes research concerned with the management of information and knowledge in all formats, namely librarianship and information science, archives and records management, and information systems. This may include: research on the generation, dissemination and publication, exploitation and evaluation of information and knowledge; information policy; information media; information literacy; systems thinking; systems development; knowledge management systems; information retrieval; preservation and conservation; impact assessment; digital humanities; and historical and cultural aspects of the disciplines.

36. The sub-panel will adopt an inclusive approach, and considers that it has the expertise to assess work in all of the areas covered by the UOA descriptor. Where research is at the boundaries of the UOA, submitting units are encouraged to submit their strongest work irrespective of the form of output or the extent of its interdisciplinary nature.

37. Sub-panels 35 and 36 recognise that much research relating to film or broadcasting could readily meet the remit of either, and might sit in the wide boundaries that imprecisely separate the two areas of assessment responsibility. It will be the aim of both sub-panels to ensure that a decision to submit to one or the other should not advantage or disadvantage any research. This will be ensured by cross-referral and by assessment across the two sub-panels where appropriate.

38. The sub-panel also anticipates likely overlap of areas within its remit with the concerns of other sub-panels both within Main Panel D and without, including for example Sub-panel 11 (Computer Science and Informatics), Sub-panel 19 (Business and Management Studies) and other social sciences panels, and will cross-refer where appropriate.

39. The sub-panel recognises that it may be necessary for HEIs to make multiple submissions, in which case they should refer to 'guidance on submissions' (paragraph 50) and paragraphs 44 to 48 below, and ensure they are in compliance with the conditions therein.

Pedagogic research

40. Pedagogic research that complies with the definition of research for the REF outlined in Annex C of 'guidance on submissions', and that relates to teaching in higher education within the discipline, may be submitted in the UOA to which it relates or in

UOA 25 (Education). Research into teaching in other education sectors or general educational issues should be submitted in UOA 25.

Cross-boundary issues and cross-referral

41. All sub-panels recognise that, in many cases, the fields of work described below may be interdisciplinary, and thus have no firm or rigidly definable boundaries. Therefore, while many **submissions** will reflect the work of administrative units such as departments, the sub-panels will also and equally assess submissions that do not map neatly onto departmental or other administrative structures within HEIs. The main panel's approach to **outputs** that are the consequence of interdisciplinary research is discussed in paragraph 106.

42. All sub-panels recognise that they may receive work which spans the boundary between their UOA and one or more others, both within and without Main Panel D. Indeed, each sub-panel within Main Panel D considers itself to share boundaries with all the other sub-panels within Main Panel D. In line with paragraph 75 of 'guidance on submissions', sub-panels will advise the REF manager on whether to cross-refer outputs to (an)other sub-panel(s). This will apply when the submitting HEI has requested cross-referral and when the sub-panel identifies that it needs additional expertise. In advising on cross-referral, Main Panel D will be guided by the principle that it aims to find and reward excellence, and will thus request that outputs be reviewed by sub-panels where the excellence they may contain will most readily be appreciated and assessed, while aiming not to cross-refer unnecessarily. More details on the main panel's approach to cross-referral are discussed in paragraphs 107 and 108. Responsibility for recommending a final quality profile remains with the originating sub-panel.

43. Main Panel D has identified a number of research areas including, but not limited to, applied linguistics, critical theory, digital cultural heritage, digital humanities, film studies, television studies, cultural history, gender studies, and museology, which may be undertaken in a range of different contexts and which therefore occur in the descriptors of a number of UOAs. The main panel takes the view that institutions active in such areas are free to submit their research in the way that represents the activity most effectively, in their view.

Multiple submissions

44. As set out in 'guidance on submissions' (paragraphs 50 to 52), multiple submissions may be requested where a sub-panel considers there is a case for them in its UOA, given the nature of the disciplines covered. The REF manager will decide on all such requests in consultation with chairs of the relevant main and sub-panels.

45. The following sub-panels expect to receive requests for multiple submissions, given the nature of the disciplines covered by their UOAs: 27, 28, 34, 35 and 36.

46. Where a multiple submission is requested in any UOA within Main Panel D, the relevant sub-panel chair will advise the REF manager on the request, according to the

criteria set out in paragraph 50 of 'guidance on submissions'.

47. In addition to the arrangements above, requests for multiple submissions may be granted if an institution involved in a joint submission wishes to make an additional individual submission in that UOA, in UOA 28 where one submission is in Celtic Studies and the other in Modern Languages and Linguistics, or where HEIs have merged after 1 July 2011, as set out in paragraph 50 of 'guidance on submissions'.

48. In the case of single submissions that contain clearly identifiable distinct organisation units or areas of research, in accordance with 'guidance on submissions' (paragraph 52) and where sub-panels consider it appropriate, they will provide feedback to the head of institution relating to those distinct units or areas of research.

Section 2: Assessment criteria: outputs

Criteria and level definitions

49. When assessing the quality of outputs, the sub-panels will apply the same criteria to all outputs regardless of their form. In so doing they will seek to identify the highest quality research wherever it exists, with four star (4*) being a realistic and attainable quality level in all components of the assessment.

50. The following criteria will be used:

- **Originality:** an intellectual advance or an important and innovative contribution to understanding and knowledge. This may include substantive empirical findings, new arguments, interpretations or insights, imaginative scope, assembling of information in an innovative way, development of new theoretical frameworks and conceptual models, innovative methodologies and/or new forms of expression.
- **Significance:** the degree to which work has enhanced, or is likely to enhance knowledge, thinking, understanding and/or practice in its field.
- **Rigour:** intellectual coherence, methodological precision and analytical power; accuracy and depth of scholarship; awareness of and appropriate engagement with other relevant work.

51. In working with the quality criteria set out above, the following table aims to clarify how the sub-panels will interpret and use these at each quality level:

Table 1

Starred levels	Level definitions
4*	Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour because it is, or ought to be, a primary point of reference and influence across and possibly beyond its field. It will display the highest attainable standards of originality, significance and rigour.
3*	Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour, and which is, or ought to be, a major point of reference in its field.
2*	Quality that is, or ought to be, recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour and which makes a substantial contribution to its field and which has the potential to inform subsequent work.
1*	Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour and which makes a contribution to its field.
Unclassified	Either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality that falls below the standard for nationally recognised work • work which is not research, as defined for the REF • a submission which represents a research output 'missing' for no justifiable reason.

52. The terms 'world-leading', 'international' and 'national' will be taken as quality benchmarks within the generic definitions of the quality levels. They will relate to the actual, likely or deserved influence of the work. There will be no assumption of any necessary international exposure in terms of publication or reception, or any necessary research content in terms of topic or approach. Nor will there be an assumption that work published in a language other than English or Welsh is necessarily of a quality that is internationally benchmarked.

Output types

53. The eligibility definitions and data requirements for research outputs are detailed in 'guidance on submissions' (Part 3, Section 2) and are based on the definition of research contained in 'guidance on submissions' (Annex C).

54. The sub-panels will neither advantage nor disadvantage any type of research or form of output, whether it is physical or virtual, textual or non-textual, visual or sonic, static or dynamic, digital or analogue. Outputs that embody research may include, but are not limited to (in no particular order): books (authored or edited); chapters in books; journal articles; conference contributions; electronic resources and publications; translations and scholarly editions; creative writing and compositions; curatorship and conservation; digital and broadcast media; performances and other types of live presentation; artefacts; designs and exhibitions; films, videos and other types of media

presentation; software design and development; advisory reports; and the creation of archival or specialist collections to support the research infrastructure.

55. All submitted outputs will be judged entirely on academic merit regardless of the medium or location of publication. In accepting the widest range and types of research output, the sub-panels will employ assessment methodologies appropriate to all of these outputs.

56. In undertaking their detailed examination of a research output, sub-panel members will draw upon this primary evidence along with any additional material made available to them in accordance with this document, in order to form expert judgements on the quality of the research submitted. 'Evidence' is taken to mean that which makes manifest the research content of the submission. Submitting units should, therefore, submit only such evidence as they deem necessary to enable sub-panel members properly to assess a research output, within the following guidelines:

- a. **Research output:** This should be submitted without additional material where the output is in itself deemed to constitute sufficient evidence of the research (this is likely to be the case for most outputs submitted in UOAs 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 36).
- b. **Additional information for practice-based outputs** ('guidance on submissions', paragraph 127): Submitting units may include a statement of up to 300 words in cases where the research imperatives, research process and the research significance of an output (such as an artefact, curation, digital format, installation, composition, performance or event, screening, tape, creative writing, textbook, translation or video) might further be made evident by descriptive and contextualising information. Such statements are expected to be more likely (although not exclusively) to accompany outputs submitted to Sub-panels 34, 35 and 36.
- c. **Portfolio:** In cases where the research output is ephemeral (for example, time-based, non-material, or no longer available); is one in a series of interconnected works (for example, performances or installations); or cannot fully represent its scholarly dimensions through the evidence provided in sub-paragraphs a and b above, a portfolio in either digital/physical form may be made available. This material must be sufficiently substantial to constitute evidence which will allow members to access the research and/or scholarly dimensions of the work. The expectation is that a portfolio is likely to include complementary evidence about the processes and outcomes of the work, for example DVDs, tapes (video and audio), photographs, sketchbooks, web-sites, catalogues, interviews or programme notes. The material should be presented to assist panel members in accessing the research and/or scholarly dimensions of the work.
- d. The sub-panels will ignore any additional material that includes evaluative commentary on the perceived quality of a research output.

57. The sub-panels recognise that there may be cases where two or more research outputs listed against an individual in a submission include significant material in common. The sub-panels will use their professional judgement in assessing such outputs within the scope permitted within 'guidance on submissions' (paragraph 108). For example, where a submitted article is subsequently incorporated in a book which is also submitted, the article will be assessed, and the book will be assessed with that section disregarded.

58. Similarly, in assessing research outputs that contain significant material published prior to 1 January 2008, panels will use their professional judgement within the scope permitted within the 'guidance on submissions' (paragraphs 112 and 113). In this case, submitting units are requested to explain in the REF2 form if/how the earlier work was revised to incorporate new material in order to assist panels in making their assessment (as set out in 'guidance on submissions', sub-paragraph 127c).

Co-authored, co-edited and collaborative outputs

59. The sub-panels welcome the submission of co-authored, co-edited and collaborative outputs, and will judge the output on its academic merits regardless of the number of contributors ('guidance on submissions', paragraphs 120 to 122).

60. The sub-panels accept that the same co-authored, co-edited or collaborative output may be listed by more than one author, whether the authors are within a single submission or in different submissions.

61. In all cases of co-authorship, submitting units are required to provide in the additional information on outputs an explanation (maximum of 100 words) of the nature and scale of the contribution of the submitting author (as set out in 'guidance on submissions', sub-paragraph 127d). This should **not** be expressed in percentage or other quantitative terms. Where the nature of the collaboration is such that it is not possible to describe the discrete contribution of an individual, this should be explained in the additional information.

62. In assessing the quality of the work, sub-panels expect in most cases to attribute the output with the same grade for each submitting author. However, having considered the additional information in relation to the research presented in the output, they may judge that significant differences in the quality of the authors' respective contributions should be taken into account in the final grades awarded.

Double-weighted outputs

63. The sub-panels recognise that there will be cases where the combined scale of academic investment in the research activity and the scope of the research output is equivalent to two or more single outputs and may, in some cases, have limited the ability of an individual researcher to produce four significant outputs within the assessment

period. The sub-panels want to recognise and double-weight such outputs ('guidance on submissions', paragraphs 123 to 126).

64. Institutions may identify outputs they consider to be worthy of double-weighting and submit a statement to justify their claim (maximum 100 words). When assessing claims for double-weighting against the criteria set out in paragraph 63, the sub-panels will not privilege or disadvantage any particular form of research or type of output.

65. Sub-panels will assess the claim for double-weighting separately from assessing the quality of the submitted work, and there is no presumption that double-weighted outputs will be assessed at the higher quality grades than single-weighted outputs.

66. Given the publication practices in our disciplines, and in view of the main panel's wish to give full recognition to outputs of extended scale and scope, institutions may (but are not required to) identify one of the remaining outputs as a reserve for each double-weighted claim; the reserve outputs will only be assessed if the sub-panel judges that the claim for double-weighting is not justified. If no reserve output is identified and the claim for double-weighting is not upheld, then the missing output will be graded as 'unclassified'.

67. As the number of outputs submitted for assessment cannot sum to more than four per staff member submitted, no more than two outputs per researcher may be identified for double-weighting. In other words, the maximum number of outputs listed against a member of staff will comprise one of the following:

- four single outputs
- two single outputs plus one double-weighted output, plus the option to identify one of the remaining outputs as a reserve
- two double-weighted outputs plus the option to identify a reserve output for each.

68. Given that sub-panels will assess submissions in the form that HEIs have chosen to present their research within the REF framework, they will only double-weight outputs where requested by the submitting institution and will not double-weight any output that has not been so identified in the submission.

Outputs in languages other than English

69. 'Guidance on submissions' (paragraphs 128 to 130) explains the requirement for a short abstract for research outputs that are in a language other than English.

70. This requirement is waived for outputs submitted in UOA 28 (Modern Languages and Linguistics) if the output is produced in any of the languages within the remit of that UOA.

71. The requirement is also waived for outputs submitted in UOA 31 (Classics) if the output is produced in French, German, Italian, Spanish or Modern Greek.

Citation data

72. The sub-panels within Main Panel D will not make use of any citation or bibliometric data to inform their judgements, nor will they make use of any journal rankings/lists in the assessment.

Section 3: Assessment criteria: impact

Introduction

73. Research across the arts and humanities (understood in their broadest definition) has consequences for individuals and groups in the UK and internationally, challenging imaginations and enriching lives economically, culturally, spiritually and educationally. The impact of such research is powerful, pervasive and ubiquitous, influencing civil society and the quality of life. Impact may be the result of individual or collective research (or a combination of these), including collaboration with researchers beyond the UK. The impact of research may be foreseen or unforeseen. It can emerge as an end product, but can also be demonstrated during the research process. Impact takes place through a wide variety of mechanisms that may have direct causal links between research and its consequences or that might be diffuse and non-linear. It may effect change for local, national or international communities, groups or individuals. The sub-panels will take all these factors into account as appropriate when weighing the evidence provided.

Range of impacts

74. The following list is intended to illustrate some of the wide variety of areas in which impact from research across Main Panel D may be found to have a positive influence on the quality of life of individuals and communities locally, nationally and internationally. **These are indicative only**, and in practice much of the impact will cross boundaries between them or go beyond them. Case studies are not expected to be classified in this way by submitting units.

Civil society	Influencing the form and content of associations between people or groups to illuminate and challenge cultural values and social assumptions.
Cultural life	Creating and interpreting cultural capital in all of its forms to enrich and expand the lives, imaginations and sensibilities of individuals and groups.
Economic prosperity	Applying and transferring the insights and knowledge gained from research to create wealth in the manufacturing, service, creative and cultural sectors.
Education	Influencing the form or the content of the education of any age group in any part of the world where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI.
Policy making	Influencing policy debate and practice through informed interventions relating to any aspect of human or animal well-being

	or the environment.
Public discourse	Extending the range and improving the quality of evidence, argument and expression to enhance public understanding of the major issues and challenges faced by individuals and society.
Public services	Contributing to the development and delivery of public services or legislation to support the welfare, education, understanding or empowerment of diverse individuals and groups in society, including the disadvantaged or marginalised.

75. **Examples of impact:** The following list offers submitting institutions some examples of impact that derive from research across the broad range of subjects covered by arts and humanities (and beyond). It is provided to stimulate ideas about the kinds of impact that could be developed into case studies where supported by relevant evidence. (An expanded list of examples will be published online in due course.) The examples are indicative only and do not articulate the expectations of any one sub-panel.

- Generating new ways of thinking that influence creative practice beyond the academy.
- Creating, inspiring and supporting new forms of artistic, literary, linguistic, social, economic, religious, and other expression beyond the academy.
- Contributing to innovation and entrepreneurial activity through the design and delivery of new products or services.
- Contributing to economic prosperity via the creative sector including publishing, music, theatre, museums and galleries, film and television, fashion, tourism, and computer games.
- Informing practice or policy as a result of research on the nature and extent of religious, ethnic or linguistic discrimination.
- Research into the languages and cultures of minority linguistic, ethnic, religious, immigrant, cultures and communities used by government, NGOs, charities or private sector to understand and respond to their needs.
- Helping professionals and organisations adapt to changing cultural values.
- Contributing to continuing personal and professional development.
- Preserving, conserving, and interpreting cultural heritage for audiences external to the academy.
- Developing stimuli to tourism and contributing to the quality of the tourist experience.
- Informing and influencing the design and delivery of curriculum and syllabi in schools, other HEIs or other educational institutions.
- Contributing to processes of commemoration, memorialisation and reconciliation.

- Contributing to a wider public understanding of basic standards of wellbeing and human rights conceptions.
- Informing or influencing the development of expert systems in areas such as medicine, human resources, accounting, and financial services.
- Influencing the methods, ideas or ethics of any profession.
- Providing expert advice to governments, NGOs, charities and the private sector in the UK and internationally and thereby influencing policy and/or practice.
- Engaging with and mediating between NGOs and charities in the UK and internationally to influence their activities, for example in relation to health, education and the environment.

Case studies: evidence

Evidence of impact

76. The sub-panels see the narratives in the case studies as a crucial part of the text; they will link the underpinning research to the impact or benefit claimed, and they will be the main contextualization in each case study for the types of evidence of impact provided.

77. It is fully accepted that all potential records of evidence may not be available. The integrity, coherence and clarity of the narrative accompanying each case study will be essential to the panels when forming their judgements, and key claims made in the narrative should be capable of corroboration.

78. While it is expected that narratives will differ according to the nature of the impact claimed, case studies should clearly articulate the relationship between the underpinning research and the impact. This is likely to be evident in the nature and extent of external engagement and dissemination, as well as in the types of individuals, groups or organisations engaged with. Case studies then have to demonstrate the reach and significance of the impact itself. This is typically evident in the outcomes of that process of engagement and dissemination. Evidence of dissemination on its own will not be sufficient.

79. Evidence for the relationship between research, impact, and evidence for impact may include **but not be limited to** items in the following indicative list:

Data	Publication and sales figures both in the UK and overseas, audience figures (including demographic data where relevant), broadcasting data and other forms of media, download figures or database and web-site hits over a sustained period. Funding from public or other charitable bodies. Evidence of use of education materials arising from the research (where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI).
-------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Tourism data, including audience figures and visitor numbers at exhibitions, events, performances.</p> <p>Growth of small businesses in the creative industries. Generation of new products. Sales figures and income generated. Employment data (for example, evidence of jobs created).</p> <p>Changes to professional standards and behaviour.</p>
Critiques or citations in users' documents	<p>Citations in reviews outside academic literature. Independent citations in the media, including in online documents. Reviews, blogs and postings. Programme, exhibition or catalogue notes. Prizes. Translations. Recorded feedback.</p> <p>Evidence of uptake of research in documents produced by public or commercial bodies; citations in policy documents and reviews, or other published reports on policy debates.</p>
Public and policy engagements	<p>Evidence of influence on a debate in public policy and practice through membership of or distinctive contributions to expert panels and policy committees or advice to government (at local, national or international level).</p> <p>Formal partnership agreements or research collaboration with major institutions, NGOs and public bodies. Consultancies to public or other bodies that utilise research expertise.</p> <p>Evidence of engagement with campaign and pressure groups and other civil organisations (including membership and activities of those organisations and campaigns) as a result of research.</p>
Independent testimony	<p>Acknowledgements in annual reports or other publications of NGOs, charities and other civil society organisations. Testimony of experts or users who can attest to the reach and/or significance of impact. Third-party evidence of changed policies, practices, processes, strategies.</p>
Formal evaluations	<p>Professional evaluations of exhibitions, performances or other outputs. Formal peer reviews of funded impact-relevant research. Studies on the social return on investment.</p>

80. The sub-panels recommend that institutions refer to the following list of characteristics when preparing case studies:

- All the material required to make a judgement is included – no further reading is required.
- There is a clear definition of who the non-academic beneficiaries were, or what had changed as a result of the research.
- The narrative is coherent, clearly explaining the relationship between the research and the impact, and the nature of the changes or benefits arising (note that narratives differ according to the areas of impact claimed).

- Indicators used are relevant, contextualised and precise in support of the case study, and the evidence is focused and concise.
- There is a brief explanation of what is original or distinctive about the research insights that contributed to the impact.
- The case study includes details of the names of researchers, their position in the HEI, and the dates and locations of the research activity.
- Specific and appropriate independent sources of corroborating information are supplied, and supporting evidence and claims can be independently checked.
- Where the research was carried out in collaboration with other HEIs, or was part of a wider body of research, that the input and impact depended on by the submitting UOA is clearly acknowledged.

Underpinning research

81. Sub-panels need to be assured that the impact claimed is based on excellent research (at least equivalent to two star, as defined in 'guidance on submissions', sub-paragraph 160b). Submitting units are required to identify the underpinning research (which may be a body of work produced over a number of years by one or more individuals, or may be the output or outputs of a particular project). Based on the information submitted, panels will use their academic judgement to determine in how much detail they need to review the underpinning research in order to be assured of its quality. Panels may be assisted in this by the inclusion of peer-reviewed publications and research grants, evaluators' comments, review articles, relevant academic awards and prizes.

82. The underpinning research may also be included in the outputs submission without disadvantage. The assessment of such outputs will be carried out without relation to the evaluation of the impact case study.

Impact template

83. General information relating to the impact template is detailed in 'guidance on submissions' (paragraphs 149 to 155) and submitting units should refer to these guidelines in the first instance.

84. The main panel believes that excellent impact can be achieved from within a wide variety of research contexts and resulting from a wide diversity of approaches, and it has no pre-formed view of the ideal context or approach. It will judge each submission on the basis on which it has been presented, as appropriate to the work of the submitted unit and without the expectation that the submission refers to a single, coherent organisational unit.

85. Submitting units should distinguish between collaboration in order to carry out research or professional engagements, which should be explained in the environment template, and collaboration in order to ensure that research has an impact, which should be explained in the impact template.

Specific information requested

- a. **Context:** Who are the main non-academic user groups, beneficiaries or audiences for the research in the submitting unit? What are the main types of impact specifically relevant to that research? How do these relate to the range of research activity or research groups in the unit?
- b. **Approach to impact:** What was the unit's approach to interacting with non-academic users, beneficiaries or audiences (during the period 2008 to 2013) where, for example, the impacts may not have been anticipated when the research was first undertaken; or there was always a planned causal link between the research and its subsequent impact; or the subsequent pathways to impact were diffuse and non-linear? Details could include (but are not limited to), for example:
- How staff in the unit interacted with, engaged with or developed relationships with key users, beneficiaries or audiences to develop impact from the research carried out in the unit (as distinct from research collaborations detailed in the environment template).
 - Evidence of the nature of those relationships and interactions.
 - Evidence of follow-through from these activities to identify resulting impacts.
 - How the unit specifically supported and enabled staff to achieve impact from their research.
 - How the unit made use of institutional facilities, expertise or resources in undertaking these activities.
 - Other mechanisms deployed by the unit to support and enable impact.
- c. **Strategy and plans:** What are the goals and plans for the unit to support impact from research in the future? How is the unit developing its strategy for impact?
- d. **Relationship to case studies:** How do the selected case studies relate to the unit's approach to achieving impact, as described above? This could include details of, for example, how particular case studies exemplify aspects of the approach, or how particular case studies informed the development of the approach. It is, however, recognised that case studies are underpinned by research over a timeframe that is longer than the assessment period, and that individual case studies may, therefore, not relate directly to the approach set out above.

Impact criteria and sub-profiles

86. When assessing impact, sub-panels will apply the following criteria:
- **Reach:** The extent and/or diversity of the organisations, communities and/or individuals who have benefitted from the impact.
 - **Significance:** The degree to which the impact enriched, influenced, informed or changed the policies, practices, understanding and awareness of organisations, communities and/or individuals.
87. The sub-panels will apply the criteria above and interpret them at each starred level as defined in 'guidance on submissions' (Annex A, Table A3).
88. Each of the case studies will be separately assessed against the criteria and quality levels set out for impact, with no greater or lesser rigour being applied than for outputs or environment.
89. The criteria will be applied to the extent of the research impact alone, wherever its effects have been felt, regardless of geography or location, and whether in the UK or abroad.
90. In assessing the impact described in a case study, panels will form an overall view about its reach and significance taken as a whole, rather than assess reach and significance separately. In this respect, sub-panels will use the evidence provided to exercise judgement on the balance between the spread and intensity of the impact.
91. Sub-panels in Main Panel D will follow a common approach to the formation of the impact sub-profile. In doing so, each sub-panel will apply its expert judgement in forming an overall view of the impact sub-profile for each submission based on all the relevant information provided.
92. Each case study will be assessed by a group consisting of at least one user member (or assessor) and at least one academic member of a sub-panel, with relevant expertise. Each case study will be assessed in terms of the reach and significance of the impact on a holistic basis.
93. The case studies will collectively contribute 80 per cent to the impact quality sub-profile. Each case study within an individual submission will carry equal weight in the impact quality sub-profile.
94. Each impact template will be assessed holistically based on a judgement of the merits of the individual sections according to the evidence presented. The impact template will contribute 20 per cent to the impact sub-profile.

Section 4: Assessment criteria: environment

Environment template

95. The main panel believes that outstanding research can be undertaken in a wide variety of research structures and environments, and that the health of the disciplines represented within Main Panel D is well served by that variety. The main panel has no pre-formed view of the ideal size or organisational structure for a research environment, and will judge each submission on the basis on which it has been presented as appropriate to the work of the organisation.

96. In this context, sub-panels will assess the vitality and sustainability of the submitting unit and of its contribution to the health of its discipline, recognising that the health of the disciplines require appropriate infrastructures and activity at HEI level to maintain and develop individuals and groups of researchers, and to train new generations of researchers.

97. Given that there is no expectation that the environment element of submissions relates to a single coherent organisational unit, submissions should explain any distinct groups or units covered, particularly where discrete organisational units form part of a single submission.

98. Specific information will be requested in the following five sections of the environment template:

a. **Overview:** This section should briefly describe the organisation of the submitting unit to set the context for sub-panels assessing the submission. It will not be assessed or contribute to the quality profile in its own right. Note that there is no expectation that this section will refer to a single 'department' or coherent organisational unit.

b. **Research strategy:** This section should provide evidence of the achievement of strategic aims for research during the assessment period, and details of future strategic aims and goals for research; how these relate to the structure described in the overview section, and how they will be taken forward. This may include (but is not limited to) evidence of:

- Where relevant, the submitting unit's position with reference to research plans described in RAE 2008, including reasons for any significant change of direction/strategy or profile.
- The submitting unit's plans and aspirations for developing its research over the next five years (2014 to 2019), having due regard to sustainability and the wider research context, and including how these plans and aspirations will be realised. This should cover the areas outlined by sections c to e below.
- Support for interdisciplinary and collaborative research (where appropriate).

c. **People:**

i. **Staffing strategy and staff development:** This may include (but is not limited to):

- Staff development strategy, for all staff contracted to undertake research (including research assistants), at all stages of their careers, including the use of mentoring, probation and appraisal and training, and the unit's implementation of the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers.
- Evidence of how individuals at the beginning of their research careers are being supported and integrated into the research culture of the submitting unit, such as through lighter loads for early career researchers.
- Clear procedures for career progression of staff at all stages of their careers (including fixed-term staff).
- Evidence of commitment to equal opportunities in the recruitment and support of research staff; as well as evidence of the submitting unit's strategies, activities and collaborations that support diversity and enable staff drawn from a wide cross-section of society to engage in research.
- Evidence of procedures to stimulate and facilitate exchanges between academia and business, industry or public or third sector bodies, for example, through the recruitment or secondment of research staff.

ii. **Research students:** This may include (but is not limited to):

- Evidence of the development of a research culture into which research students are fully integrated and are prepared for further research activity.
- Strong recruitment of doctoral research students and evidence of studentships from major funding bodies (for example, RCUK).
- Evidence of support for equal opportunities in the recruitment and support of research students.
- Evidence of procedures to stimulate and facilitate exchanges between academia and business, industry or public and third sector bodies, for example, through the recruitment or secondment of research students.
- Details of monitoring and support mechanisms linked to evidence of progress and of successful completions.
- Details of the support provided to research students in terms of skills development and preparation for their future career.

- d. **Income, infrastructure and facilities:** This may include (but is not limited to):
- Evidence of the successful generation of research income – although allowance will be made for disciplines that find it more difficult to attract research funding because of the nature of the research, and where more early career researchers are involved.
 - Scholarly infrastructure supporting research – including significant archives and collections, with a description of their development and use.
 - Organisational infrastructure supporting research, for example, evidence of areas where there has been significant investment through the development of research clusters that focus on distinctive areas of work.
 - Operational infrastructure supporting research, including technical and support staff as well as estate and facilities; advanced equipment; or IT resources.
 - The strategy by which an appropriate balance between the scholarly, organisational and operational infrastructures is established, and by which these elements are prioritised and maintained.
- e. **Collaboration and contribution to the discipline, other disciplines and beyond:** This may include (but is not limited to) collaborative arrangements, partnerships, networks and joint research projects with academic colleagues in other institutions, locally, nationally and internationally; membership of Research Council or similar national and international committees; involvement on university research advisory panels, or national/international research strategy or review boards; leading positions in professional subject associations and learned societies; editorial positions; examination of doctorates; organisation of conferences and scholarly encounters; refereeing academic publications or research proposals; HEI consultancies; scholarly awards or fellowships; invited keynotes, lectures and/or performances.

Environment data

99. Sub-panels will assess units by considering the standard environment data submitted in REF4a/b/c, regarding research doctoral degrees awarded (PhD) and research income. The data submitted will be used to form a holistic judgement, in support of the information provided in REF5 under the headings of overview; research strategy; people; income, infrastructure and facilities; and collaboration and contribution to the discipline.

Environment criteria and sub-profiles

100. When assessing the research environment, sub-panels will apply the same criteria, as follows:

- **Vitality:** The extent to which the research environment supports a research culture characterised by intellectual vigour, innovation and positive contribution to the discipline.
- **Sustainability:** The extent to which the research environment ensures the future health and well-being of the unit and the discipline.

101. The sub-panels will apply the criteria above and interpret them at each starred level as defined in 'guidance on submissions' (Annex A, Table A4).

102. Sub-panels will weight each of the five elements equally (research strategy; staffing strategy and staff development; research students; income, infrastructure and facilities; and collaboration and contribution to the discipline) in order to arrive at a graded sub-profile for the research environment.

Section 5: Working methods

Main panel working methods

103. The main panel will have oversight of sub-panel procedures through a variety of mechanisms, such as requiring reports from sub-panel chairs, attendance of main panel members at sub-panel meetings, and through a common approach to particular practices, drawing on knowledge and expertise from across all sub-panels.

Interdisciplinary research and cross-referral

104. As stated in paragraphs 41 to 43, all sub-panels of Main Panel D welcome outputs which are interdisciplinary and/or multidisciplinary in nature, and consider that such research is capable of displaying the highest standards of quality.

105. The main panel will identify a cadre of sub-panel members and assessors from across all its 10 sub-panels who have expertise in assessing interdisciplinary outputs. In some cases this may constitute all members of a particular sub-panel.

106. Where outputs are flagged as interdisciplinary, the sub-panel will consider what expertise is required to reach a robust judgement of quality, and employ one of the following methods as appropriate:

- a. Where there is sufficient expertise within the sub-panel (whether this relates to one or more than one sub-panel member or assessor), the item will be assessed within the sub-panel.
- b. Where the sub-panel does not contain the appropriate range of expertise to reach a robust judgement of the output in question, it will draw on the identified cadre of experts from across the main panel to facilitate this judgement.

- c. Where expertise beyond the main panel is required, the work will be cross-referred to the appropriate sub-panel outwith Main Panel D for advice.

107. As stated above in paragraph 42, in advising on cross-referral Main Panel D will be guided by the principle that it aims to find and reward excellence. It will thus request that outputs be read by sub-panels where the excellence they may contain will most readily be appreciated and assessed, while aiming not to cross-refer unnecessarily.

108. Where cross-referral within Main Panel D is required, the main panel will make use of the full range of expertise (including assessors) across its sub-panels to ensure that excellence in submitted outputs can be identified and assessed. Where outputs are received at the boundaries of the sub-panels within Main Panel D, or where submissions request the cross-referral of outputs from one sub-panel to another within Main Panel D, outputs will be assessed through a process of dialogue between the relevant sub-panels, for example, by bringing together relevant expertise. Where cross-referral outside the main panel is required, the work will be cross-referred to the appropriate sub-panel outwith Main Panel D for advice.

Appointment of assessors

109. The main panel will receive recommendations from sub-panels to appoint assessors for both outputs and impact case studies, where sub-panels have identified gaps in expertise or undue workload issues. The main panel will review such applications in the light of the following:

- Whether a demonstrable lack of expertise has been identified which cannot be covered from within the sub-panel.
- Whether there is a sufficient body of activity requiring assessment.
- Whether a serious workload issue has been identified requiring additional assessors for a particular subject area.
- The overall size of the sub-panel.
- The need to ensure that impact case studies are given fair consideration, and specifically, with the intention of ensuring that there is sufficient user expertise to review the range of likely impact case studies that will be submitted (taking account of the sub-panels of Main Panel D collectively).

110. Appointments will be agreed accordingly through an appropriate nominations process, with due regard to advice received from subject and professional associations and other bodies. At all times, the main panel will be guided by the principle of ensuring that sub-panels have access to appropriate expertise to reach robust and fair judgements with regard to submitted material.

Adherence to assessment criteria and standards

111. The main panel will work with its sub-panels to ensure adherence to assessment criteria and the consistent application of assessment standards by employing the following mechanisms:

- a. The main panel chair and advisors will engage with sub-panel discussions throughout the assessment process.
- b. Sub-panel chairs will make regular reports to the main panel on areas where cross-panel consistency is significant, which will include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - clearly defined individual staff circumstances
 - unfamiliar output types
 - impact case studies generally
 - double-weighted outputs.

Sub-panel chairs will seek advice from the main panel should they be unsure about how to handle specific instances.

- c. Sub-panel chairs will report to the main panel on the emerging assessment outcomes at UOA level, since the main panel remains responsible for awarding the outcomes, based on the recommendations of each of its sub-panels.
- d. Substantial divergences between the aggregate profiles of one sub-panel and the majority of other sub-panels will need to be justified to the main panel by the sub-panel chair, with reference to external evidence where available.

112. Members of the main panel will attend meetings of the sub-panels regularly as follows:

- a. The international members of the main panel will in particular be engaged in the calibration process and in the confirmation of final profiles, to ensure consistency with international standards.
- b. Main panel user representatives will provide leadership and focus for the sub-panel users, through establishing a user representatives' forum which will enable the transfer of good practice and equality of treatment, consistency of method and efficient use of expertise and knowledge in assessing impact case studies.
- c. Sub-panel chairs will attend a sample of sub-panel meetings as agreed with the main panel.

113. A calibration process will be undertaken at main and sub-panel level.

114. The main panel will make use of expertise across the full range of its sub-panels for the assessment of interdisciplinary work, work at the boundary of sub-panels and/or requiring cross-referral, and to support the assessment of impact case studies.

115. Sub-panels will adopt a common process for the formation of each of the three sub-profiles and to the sequence in which each sub-profile is formed. This will enable the sub-panels to report on emerging outcomes to the main panel at each stage in the assessment process.

Sub-panel working methods

Use of appropriate expertise to assess submissions

116. All sub-panel members (including user representatives) detailed their areas of expertise on appointment to their sub-panel. When sub-panels review HEIs' statements of submission intentions they will identify where they have gaps in their expertise that may require the appointment of additional academic assessors. Consideration will also be given to areas where the workload on individual assessors will be excessive due to a high volume of material likely to be submitted. Sub-panels will then make recommendations to the main panel for the appointment of additional academic assessors.

117. Following a similar process to that outlined above, the main panel will aim to ensure that, taking the membership of the 10 sub-panels as a whole, sufficient additional user assessors are appointed to cover as wide a range of fields as reasonable. As a consequence, where necessary and appropriate, user representatives (both full panel members and additional assessors) will work across sub-panel boundaries to provide appropriate expertise in the assessment of case studies.

118. All sub-panels will commence the assessment process by undertaking an initial overview of all submissions received. This will set the scene for all components of the review (outputs, impact and environment), and will involve consideration of each submission in its entirety and identifying any areas of a submission that will require specific action in order for the assessment to be undertaken, for example:

- interdisciplinary research
- practice-based research
- double-weighted outputs
- other areas where cross-panel expertise might be required.

119. This will include advising the sub-panel chair on what types of expertise are required for the assessment both of outputs and impact case studies, which will then be allocated accordingly.

Processes for the assessment of impact

120. Impact case studies will be reviewed by a balanced mix of user and academic expertise, identified according to the process outlined in paragraphs 116 to 119. User members and assessors will be primarily involved in the impact element of the submissions, but may also – where willing and with appropriate expertise – be involved in the assessment of other aspects of the submission. At all stages of the assessment, user members and assessors will be appropriately briefed (for example, with respect to equality and diversity) alongside the sub-panel members and academic assessors, and may also receive additional training to ensure that they are fully cognisant of the REF process.

Consistency of assessment within sub-panels

121. Sub-panels (including assessors) will undertake calibration exercises to ensure a consistent approach to assessment within each sub-panel. Targeted double-reading of outputs will also take place to address particular concerns of a reader, such as where outputs are judged at being on the borderline between two grades, or where the first reader is unsure of appropriate grading.

Proportion of outputs to be examined in detail

122. In every submission, all outputs will be examined with a level of detail sufficient to contribute to the formation of a reliable quality profile for all the outputs in that submission.