

REF Issues
Outputs and Environment
Morris Sloman
Imperial College London

Deputy Chair Panel F23
Member REF Advisory Group

HEFCE Response to REF Consultation

- Indicates decisions on non-controversial issues, other than impact will be assessed.
- No decision on weighting of output, environment, impact
UKCRC suggested 60%, 20%, 20%
- Less emphasis on citations – sub-panel decision
- No change on panel/sub-panel proposals
- No indication of date for REF, but has to be delayed.

Range of Outputs

- Usual journals, conferences, books etc. over huge range of topics including quantum physics, mathematics, chemistry, electronics, software and art works
- Welcome interdisciplinary and pedagogic research in computing
- Double rating of books?

Output Submissions

- Essentially as in 2008
- 3 or 4 per person?
Depends on ratio of outputs/panel members
UKCRC: 800 per panel member is acceptable not 1200
3 may lead to grade inflation
- UKCRC suggested number of outputs should be proportional to FTE of person submitted to avoid game playing. Most others disagreed.
- Require 100 word significance statement

Correlation Between Citations & RAE 2008 Ratings

RAE *Rating vs Google Scholar Citations (21% 0 citations)				
GS pa	1st quartile < 0.4 pa	2nd quartile 0.4 - 1.8 pa	3rd quartile 1.8 – 5 pa	4th quartile > 5 pa
% 4* in quartiles	6.7%	5.4%	21.1%	66.9%
% 3* in quartiles	17.3%	26.2%	34.3%	22.2%
% 2* in quartiles	40.3%	36.8%	17.5%	5.3%
% 1* in quartiles	66.4%	25.5%	5.8%	2.3%
RAE *Rating vs ISI citations (63% 0 citations) Comparison based on 37% non zero citations				
GS pa	1st quartile < 0.5 pa	2nd quartile 0.5 - 1 pa	3rd quartile 1 - 2 pa	4th quartile > 2 pa
% 4th quartile in * rating	9.0%	16.4%	28.4%	46.2%
% 3rd quartile in * rating	25.8%	30.1%	26.3%	17.8%
% 2nd quartile in * rating	44.6%	26.9%	18.4%	10.1%
% 1st quartile in * rating	61.5%	23.1%	11.5%	3.8%

Bibliometrics

- Citation data is only one of a number of attributes which can *inform* judgment on outputs
- UKCRC requested Google Scholar citation data – I doubt we will get it.
- CS&I sub-panel will have to decide whether to still use GS, rely on HEFCE citations data covering small percentage of outputs, or not use citations at all.
- HEFCE: “We will reconsider whether the benefits of incorporating citation information into the REF outweigh the costs if only a small minority of panels request citation information, the costs are high, or if the equalities implications cannot be effectively mitigated”

Environment

- HEFCE: “Submissions will not be expected to relate to a single coherent organisational structure” ??
- HEFCE: Use HESA data rather than REF specific data for income, PhDs etc.
- UKCRC: all income should be considered in Environment rather than split between impact and environment
- Will esteem be assessed in environment?
UKCRC suggested it should be part of impact

UKCRC Environment Template

1. Infrastructure, facilities and administrative support for research
Institutional investment in laboratories, programmer support
Admin support for generating and managing research proposals
2. Enabling Translation of Research into Impact
Innovation and consultancy support & training
3. Arrangements for developing and supporting staff in their research
Support for early career researchers,
Mentoring and management of research grant proposals
Research team management/supervision training
4. Research Student Training
Research degrees (PhDs) awarded, Current numbers of PhD Students data
Research student training, monitoring, completion and conference support
5. Research income: funding strategy, amount received and sustainability
Research Assistant, Studentship data and sources
6. Credibility, vitality and sustainability of research organisation
Research Group structure and critical mass
Strategic vision, Leadership of discipline

Conclusion

- Outputs – no substantial change
- Environment more prescriptive but essentially similar to 2008
- Rating profile as in 2008 but weighting to be decided

Impact Pilot Experience

Imperial College Medicine

- 40 case studies of 1500 words or less
- Identified potential case studies from RAE 2008 submission
- Prepared by administrators not medics: ~6 man-months effort
- Broad range – spinouts, public engagement, influence policy e.g.
 - Drug development
 - Pregnancy book sold 0.5M copies
 - HIV program in Africa which did not really succeed (Negative impact)
- Assembling evidence of impact was the most difficult part
- Tracking impact within timescale criteria was difficult
e.g Spinout before period but taken over and expanded during period.
- A company may use concepts from publication but institution not involved in commercialisation – hard to track
- Useful exercise for publicity purposes