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Recall... REF 2014

- REF process separated by Units of Assessment (UoA)
- Not all eligible staff included: selection of staff to submit
- Selected staff submitted with (as base rule) four publications
- Also submission of “impact case studies” and environment template (narrative).
- All submissions at UoD/dept level.
Recommendation 1: ALL REF eligible staff to be submitted

- Should work against department with a weak (previously unsubmitted) tail of staff.

- Research v. teaching staff: ensuring that staff are on most appropriate contract.
Recommendation 2: Number of outputs reduced to an AVERAGE of two/staff (with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 6)

- Changes the focus away from monitoring/selecting staff with four outputs towards ensuring that a department has a strong collective “basket” of output to submit.

- Will benefit department who in previously did not submit all staff (whose publications couldn’t be used).

- Already having an impact on changing College’s internal output monitoring process.
Recommendation 3: Non-portability of outputs: outputs "remain" at HEI where the researcher was at the time of acceptance.

- Important to have papers accepted by researchers at RHUL

- Promotes incentives for investment in staff; reduces the incentives/scope buying “hired guns”.

- Less favourably viewed change by staff who are in the process of “moving up”
Recommendation 4: Broadening of the notion of impact to more general forms of public engagement.

- Impact case studies could be linked to a research activity and a body of work as well as to a broad range of research outputs.

- Breaks the strict link to a particular output.

- Evidence suggested that in REF2014 some UoAs were more applied stricter criteria than others. E.g. public debate. This is aimed at homogenizing.

- Less need to worry about if the nature of an impact case is “right”.
Recommendation 5: New institutional-level impact case studies which arise from multi- and inter-disciplinary and collaborative work.

- Less important at Dept level as require ownership and development at College level.

- Current discussions revolve e.g. around the Magna Carta (supposed to be a Centre...).
Recommendation 6: A new, institutional level Environment assessment

- Should include an account of the institution’s future research environment strategy; individual Unit of Assessment environment statements are condensed, made complementary to the institutional level environment statement.

- Ownership of the institutional assessment still not clear.

- Depts can focus their narratives more on dept-specific dimensions of research strategy.