

## Introduction

1. This document provides guidance for **HEIs making submissions to the REF impact pilot exercise (2009-10)**. Guidance for the full REF exercise will be developed and published after the conclusion of the pilot exercise, and therefore many aspects of this document may change or develop further before final guidance for the REF is issued. The document sets out:

- general background and aims of the pilot exercise
- what information should be submitted by institutions for the pilot exercise
- guidance on the scope, definitions and criteria
- how the pilot submissions will be reviewed, and what feedback will be provided to institutions and the sector.

2. This document should be read in conjunction with the relevant sections of our consultation document (HEFCE 2009/38) which outlines our proposed overall approach to assessing impact in the REF. (See in particular paragraphs 58 – 76 and Annex D.)

3. This guidance has been revised following discussions with the pilot institutions and the Steering Group, and takes account of feedback from the REF consultation events that took place from 28 October – 13 November 2009.

4. This document is the final version of the pilot guidance. It will be made available on the HEFCE web-site. Any further clarifications that may be necessary will be provided in separate supplementary notes.

## Pilot aims

5. The overall aim of the pilot is to test and develop the proposed approach to assessing impact in the REF, as outlined in HEFCE 2009/38. The following areas will be tested and developed:

- a. Submissions: developing guidance for, and preparing and submitting evidence of impact in a suitable form for panels to make robust judgements.
- b. Assessment: testing and refining the criteria and process for panels to assess the submissions and produce impact sub-profiles.
- c. Weighting: generating evidence to inform decisions on the weighting of the impact sub-profile, and how it will influence the overall outcomes.
- d. Implementation: identifying the operational implications of assessing impact (including burden) for institutions, research users, panels and the funding bodies.

6. Within each of these areas there are a number of specific issues to investigate through the pilot. These are outlined at **Annex A**.

## **Pilot scope**

### UOAs and HEIs

7. We have selected five units of assessment (UOAs) in which to pilot the impact proposals:

- Clinical Medicine
- Physics
- Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences
- Social Work and Social Policy & Administration
- English Language & Literature

(It should be noted that these are proposed REF UOAs.)

8. These five have been selected to cover a spread of disciplines and types of research, and anticipated types of impact relevant to a range of public, private and third sector groups. We intend that with this sample of UOAs we can test and develop a generic approach to assessing impact, while also identifying the extent to which the approach may need to be tailored by panels to account for disciplinary differences in the nature of research and its wider influence or impact.<sup>1</sup>

9. While we anticipate that the sample of five UOAs is suitable for this purpose, we also expect there will be particular issues and challenges for assessing impact in a number of other disciplines not covered by the pilot – we plan to investigate these through a series of workshops during 2010.

10. Twenty nine HEIs from across the UK have been selected to take part in the pilot, to provide a spread of at least 10 institutions with differing characteristics submitting to each pilot UOA. The selected institutions reflect the distribution of research funding, rather than providing a sample that is representative of the HE sector as such.

11. We are inviting each pilot institution to make submissions to two of the five pilot UOAs (with some exceptions where only one UOA would be relevant). The list of HEIs and UOAs is at **Annex B**.

### Timeframe

12. The pilot will cover the following timeframe:

- a. Impacts that have occurred between Jan 2005 and Dec 2009.
- b. The underpinning research could date back to 1993.

(Definitions of 'impacts' and 'underpinning research' are provided below.)

---

<sup>1</sup> For the REF in general we aim to achieve greater consistency in the criteria and process of assessment across all UAOs, allowing variation only where justified by disciplinary differences.

## Definition and types of impact

13. For the purpose of the pilot we define impact as any identifiable benefit to or positive influence on the economy, society, public policy or services, culture, the environment or quality of life.

14. It follows that:

- For the purpose of assessing the impact element in the REF we do not include impacts within the academic sphere or the advancement of scientific knowledge (these are covered by the 'outputs' and 'environment' elements of REF).
- There is no geographic bias - impacts will be assessed against criteria of 'reach' and 'significance' regardless of the geographic territory in which they occur. We expect that many impacts will contribute to the economy and society within the UK, but equally value the contribution of UK research to international development and global challenges.
- Annex D of HEFCE 2009/38 provides an initial draft 'menu of indicators'. This is in no way intended to be exhaustive or restrictive and we expect the pilot exercise to reveal many more types of impact than those suggested by the 'menu'.
- Impacts can be manifest in a wide variety of ways and the pilot will be inclusive, including: the many types of beneficiaries (individuals, organisations, communities, regions, and other entities including the natural environment); impacts on products, processes, behaviours, beliefs, policies, practices, and so on; and including the avoidance of harm as well as creating positive benefits.

15. The intention is to identify and assess economic and social benefits or **outcomes** that are evident during the period 2005-09. **Inputs** that lead to benefits or outcomes may well need to be explained in order to demonstrate how the impact came about, but these are not the focus of assessment.

16. Nevertheless, we recognise there are often 'interim' outcomes at several stages along the journey from research to the eventual impacts. In some areas, the time-lags are such that only these 'interim' impacts can be captured within the timeframe for the pilot; or the nature of the impact is such that only the 'interim' impacts can be clearly evidenced or attributed to the underpinning research. Thus 'interim' impacts are included within the scope of the pilot and may be submitted as case studies.

17. Several examples of 'pathways' from research to impact are provided in a separate document. These illustrate different points along the pathways that would be considered 'impacts' as opposed to 'inputs'. (For example, providing advice to a policy committee is considered an 'input'. A change to government policy, influenced by that advice, is considered an 'interim impact'.)

18. Case studies should focus on the furthest stage along the pathway towards eventual outcomes, at which:

- it is possible to trace back to the influence or contribution made by the research;
- evidence of the extent ('reach' and 'significance') of the impact can be provided; and;
- this 'impact' and the underpinning research took place within the timeframe at paragraph 12.<sup>2</sup>

### **Pilot oversight**

19. HEFCE is managing the pilot on behalf of the four UK higher education funding bodies. It is being overseen by a steering group – membership and terms of reference are at **Annex C**.

### **Pilot approach**

20. The pilot will involve the following:

- a. Providing guidance to institutions and to pilot panels, based on the approach proposed in HEFCE 2009/38.
- b. Pilot institutions making submissions. This is discussed in detail below.
- c. A panel for each pilot UOA will be established to assess the submissions and provide feedback on the process. We intend that the pilot panels will include a range of research user representatives and practising researchers. Further information about the panels will be provided in due course.
- d. Holding workshops to investigate issues and challenges that may be specific to a number of other UOAs.
- e. Gathering and collating feedback from the pilot institutions, panels and workshops, and drawing conclusions with advice from the Steering Group.
- f. Publishing the outcomes, including material to support the sector in preparing for the REF.

21. The pilot will be an open process, with frequent updates and discussions with the sector more widely.

### **Timetable**

22. The current timetable for the impact pilot is as follows:

23 Sept	Publish REF consultation
---------	--------------------------

<sup>2</sup> An implication of this approach is that an institution could submit to successive REF exercises the same 'impact' at different stages on the pathway, that arose from the same underpinning research.

Late Sept	Select pilot UOAs and HEIs
22 Oct	First briefing event for pilot HEIs
28 Oct – 13 Nov	REF consultation events
19 Nov	Final guidance on submissions provided
25 Nov	Second briefing event for pilot HEIs
Nov – Feb 2010	HEIs prepare submissions
Nov – Dec	Recruit pilot panels Plan additional discipline workshops
16 Dec	Consultation closes
Feb - May	Additional discipline workshops
1 March 2010	Submissions deadline
Mar - May	Panels assess submissions
May	Sub-profiles provided to pilot HEIs
Jun - Jul	Gather feedback from panels and HEIs
Autumn 2010	UK funding bodies take decisions on pilot outcomes Publish outcomes

## Pilot submissions

23. Each submission will comprise of:

- overview information relating to the submitted unit as a whole, and
- a number of case studies illustrating specific impacts.

Submissions will be made via the HEFCE extranet.

## Overview information

24. The following overview information will be included in each submission:

a. The number of staff submitted

This will indicate the overall 'size' of the submission, and hence determine the number of case studies to be submitted. For the purpose of the pilot we will use FTE Category A staff submitted to the 2008 RAE (in relevant UOAs) as a proxy for this. HEFCE will provide these data. (Note that while we will use this as a proxy for the 'size' of the submission, this does not mean that the pilot submissions should only include impacts achieved by staff who were submitted to the RAE – this is discussed further below).

b. Information about the research context

For the purpose of the pilot, panels will need some contextual information about the unit's main areas of research activity, and how, in broad terms, this is structured.

HEFCE has uploaded institutions' RA5 documents that were submitted to the 2008 RAE in relevant UOAs to the extranet. Institutions are asked to extract from these a brief outline of

the main areas or themes of research undertaken across the unit during the RAE period (or, if appropriate, by each substantive research group within the unit). Where the main areas of research activity have changed since the RAE period this information may be updated.

Information relating to esteem indicators, staff development and so on should be removed.

The 'research context' document should be uploaded to the HEFE extranet in MS Word 2003 or PDF format. The HEI name and UOA name should be indicated clearly at the start of the document. The following word limits apply:

Number of staff	Maximum word limit
0-40	500
41-100	1,000
101+	1,500

c. An impact statement

This will provide an overview of the unit's interactions with research users (broadly defined) and impacts achieved during the 2005-09 period. This is intended to provide panels with evidence of the breadth of the unit's contributions to society or the economy; to be illustrated in more detail through the case studies. We expect the impact statement will be used by panels to inform the impact sub-profile.

A template for the impact statement is provided at **Annex D**, for institutions to complete. The following word limits will apply:

Number of staff	Maximum word limit
0-20	2,000
21-40	3,000
41-70	4,000
71-100	5,000
101+	6,000

d. Indicators of impact

The intention is that impact submissions to the REF will include some key indicators of impact that apply to 'whole units', presented in a standard format (either across the exercise as a whole or as defined by panels). Indicators relating to individual case studies are discussed below.

For the pilot exercise, indicators applying to 'whole units' will be:

- Data on research income from 'users'. HEFCE will provide these data to the pilot panels, drawn from submissions to the 2008 RAE. Institutions can view these data via the HEFCE extranet, but are not asked to make any amendments. Further details of this are at **Annex E**.

- We invite submissions to include – within the impact statements – any appropriate indicators of impact, collaboration or other interactions with ‘users’ that could apply to whole units. (We will use this information to explore the scope for any standardised indicators in addition to ‘user’ income that could potentially be developed for the REF.<sup>3</sup>)

e. A list of the submitted case studies

Institutions are asked to complete a spreadsheet listing the titles of the case studies, indicating the type of impact and relevant research expertise for each (this will assist panels in allocating the case studies to members for review), and whether the case study is considered as confidential (this is discussed below). A template will be provided on the extranet for this.

## Case studies

25. The bulk of the evidence will be in the form of case studies submitted by the institution. The following guidance should be followed:

a. Number and range of case studies

For the purpose of the pilot exercise, one case study should be submitted for every ten staff (rounded up to the nearest 10). Where there are ten or fewer staff, the submission may include two rather than one case study. This is to mitigate the risk of the impact assessment relying too heavily on a single case study.

HEIs are encouraged to submit a range of case studies, including:

- examples of impact that the submitted unit has achieved from across the breadth of its research activity, rather than concentrating narrowly on particular areas or relying heavily on a limited group of staff. The assessment panels will be asked to consider how far the impact statement and the case studies together demonstrate a breadth of impacts that might be expected, given the unit’s particular areas of research activity.
- examples where the impacts can be clearly evidenced and attributed to the institution’s research, as well as some that are more complex or challenging to demonstrate.<sup>4</sup>

b. Content of case studies

---

<sup>3</sup> We are also exploring the potential to produce indicators of co-authorship with users, from available bibliometrics databases. We expect to discuss this with the pilot institutions and panels, but not to include this as part of the pilot submissions.

<sup>4</sup> In addition to the submitted case studies, institutions may if they wish provide a small number of ‘supplementary’ examples that are considered to highlight particular cases where the guidelines are felt to be overly ambiguous or restrictive. (For example, to illustrate areas where major impacts during 2005-09 have arisen from research undertaken prior to 1993.) If institutions wish to provide any ‘supplementary’ case studies they should contact HEFCE to discuss and agree this in advance of the submission deadline. Any such ‘supplementary’ case studies will be provided to panels to consider and comment on the issues raised, but will not affect the sub-profiles awarded to the submission.

Each case study should be completed using the generic template at **Annex F**. This is designed to capture:

- The nature and extent of a specific impact occurring during 2005-09. This should include a clear explanation of both the impact's 'reach' (how widely felt it was) and its 'significance' (how much difference it made to the beneficiaries) during the assessment period.
- An outline of specific research-based activity within the unit that contributed to the impact, and an explanation of how it made a contribution.
- Details of the underpinning research, and justification that this was of high quality.
- Evidence to support or verify the claims made.

c. Assessment criteria

Case studies will be graded on a five point scale against criteria of the 'reach' and 'significance' of the impact. The draft definitions of the levels (to be refined by the panels through the pilot exercise) are:

<b>Four star</b>	<b>Exceptional:</b> Ground-breaking or transformative impacts of major value or significance, relevant to a range of situations have been demonstrated
<b>Three star</b>	<b>Excellent:</b> Highly innovative (but not quite ground-breaking) impacts such as new products or processes, relevant to several situations have been demonstrated
<b>Two star</b>	<b>Very good:</b> Substantial impacts of more than incremental significance, or incremental improvements that are wide-ranging have been demonstrated
<b>One star</b>	<b>Good:</b> Impacts in the form of incremental improvements or process innovation, of modest range have been demonstrated
<b>Unclassified</b>	The impacts are of little or no significance or reach. Or the links between the impacts and excellent research, or a significant research-driven contribution by the submitted unit, have not been demonstrated

d. Threshold criteria

In addition to assessing the 'reach' and 'significance' of the impact described in each case study and grading this on the five point scale, panels will be asked to make several 'threshold' judgements about each case study, as follows:

- i. Time of impact: *That the impact occurred – in the particular form being described – during the pilot assessment period (Jan 2005 – Dec 2009).*



- ii. Contribution by the institution: That specific research-based activity within the institution made a significant contribution to achieving the impact.
- iii. Quality of underpinning research: That underpinning research, which produced at least some output(s) since 1993, met a sufficient standard of rigour and originality.
- iv. Evidence: That there is sufficient evidence to support the above judgements (about the extent of the impact and the threshold criteria).

26. Panels will be guided to rate a case study as 'Unclassified' if it does not meet one or more of these thresholds. Further explanation and guidance on these criteria is provided below.

#### Contribution by the institution

27. There are a wide variety of ways in which research creates or contributes to impacts; the processes can be complex, involving many influences over a long period of time. Hence a key issue for the pilot is to establish how to 'attribute' impacts to submitted units for the REF.

28. We anticipate there could be a wide range of ways in which a unit may potentially have contributed to an impact. However, not all types of 'contribution' would be regarded as sufficient for the purposes of the REF. For example:

- staff may have moved into or out of the submitted unit since the original research was undertaken, or may move during the assessment period
- the unit may have contributed to an impact by applying or exploiting research undertaken elsewhere
- the unit may have contributed by undertaking the original research, but this was exploited by others to secure impact
- the contribution of the unit may be indirect in that the research findings (for example in one discipline) influenced further research (in another discipline or undertaken in another unit) that led to the impact
- the impact may have been achieved through the contributions of multiple institutions or units; their individual contributions may be comparatively small but collectively led to a substantial impact
- the unit may have contributed through the expertise of a researcher (for example as an advisor on a committees), drawing on their wider expertise as well as personal research record.

29. In all cases it will be important to show that **specific research-based activity within the institution made a significant contribution to achieving the impact**. For the purpose of the pilot submissions, this 'research-based activity' must be either:

- a. Underpinning research that was undertaken by staff within the institution. This could be any type of research that meets the Frascati principles, including basic research, practice-based research, applied or translational research (that may have built on work done previously or elsewhere) and research undertaken in collaboration with other institutions or organisations.

b. Other research-based activity undertaken by research-active staff at the institution which drew or built substantially on their own research. This could include, for example, the contribution of an individual as an expert advisor on a committee, where this was based to a significant degree on their personal research record.

30. In either case:

- the 'research-based activity' must have been undertaken by staff within the institution at the time of the activity
- the research or the staff involved should reasonably be associated, albeit retrospectively, with the fields covered by the Unit of Assessment to which the submission is being made
- the underpinning research must meet the threshold of rigour and originality, and have produced an original output (or outputs) during 1993 or later.

31. The research need not have been submitted to any previous assessment exercise, or have been undertaken by staff submitted to an exercise. Research or other research-based activity by staff who were not employed directly by the institution can be included *where this research activity was focused within the institution*.

32. Ideally the institution would also have been involved in exploiting the research to achieve impact, but need not necessarily have done so for the purposes of the pilot exercise.

33. The specific contribution of the unit's research activity must be a 'significant' contributing or influencing factor in realising the impact. In principle, this means that the impact would not have occurred, or would have been substantially reduced, had it not been for this activity.

34. More than one institution can submit the same impact, so long as each institution made a significant contribution, in line with the above guidance. In cases where there is a wide range of contributing research (for example, a policy change based on a body of evidence built-up over a period of time, undertaken by numerous institutions), an institution would need to show that its particular contribution was decisive or had a distinct influence.

#### Quality of underpinning research

35. Each case study should briefly outline and provide references to underpinning research outputs, at least some of which were published or made available since 1993.

36. We wish to develop a means of assuring the quality of the underpinning research that does not require the expert panels to review substantial numbers of outputs. We therefore ask submissions to include justification that the research met a high standard of rigour and resulted in original findings. This should involve brief statements of how the research has been peer reviewed (including at grant application and publication stages) or any other external quality assurance process that may be applicable. We recognise that in some cases, for example grey literature or research commissioned by business or government, there may not have been formal

peer review; panels may need to review at least some of these to satisfy themselves that the quality threshold has been met.

### Evidence

37. A key challenge in assessing essentially qualitative information will be to ensure that the evidence presented to panels is sufficiently robust and can be relied upon for the assessment. Ultimately the expert panels will make judgements about the credibility of the information presented to them. We also ask pilot submissions to:

- Include indicators as supporting evidence where appropriate; in principle these are verifiable or auditable.
- Include references, where appropriate, to external sources of verification. This could be references to external reports or other information in the public domain; or contact details of research users that could potentially be asked to corroborate claims made.<sup>5</sup>

38. Panels may seek further evidence to corroborate claims by raising 'audit' queries via HEFCE. For the pilot, we expect to pursue these on a sample basis spread across the institutions. The aim will be to understand the nature and scope of underpinning evidence and audit processes that might in future be required by the REF. We will not expect institutions to respond in detail to audit queries in the pilot exercise.

39. Within the case studies, institutions are encouraged to include appropriate indicators to help describe and provide supporting evidence of the impact. These could be indicators relating to:

- the impact's reach or significance (outcome indicators), or
- the unit's contribution to the impact (process indicators).

(For example, the number of practitioners influenced by new guidelines indicates the reach of the impact; whereas participation on advisory committees provides evidence of the unit's contribution to the guidelines.)

40. Institutions are invited to include any indicators that are appropriate to the context of each case study. The draft 'common menu' (at **Annex G**) provides some initial ideas but is in no way intended to be comprehensive. In particular, the menu includes relatively few indicators relevant to arts and humanities research; this is partly because cultural and other impacts typically generated by arts and humanities research may be less amenable to indicators, and partly because such indicators are yet to be developed. We expect that the extent to which indicators are used within the assessment will vary between disciplines.

41. Note that indicators need not necessarily be quantitative; they should, however, be auditable in principle.

---

<sup>5</sup> Engineering submissions to the 2008 RAE included short statements about the impact of research outputs and included details of users who could be contacted on a sample basis to corroborate the information.

## **Submissions process**

42. For the full REF we will develop a data collection system. For the purpose of the pilot we will provide templates in Word and Excel for institutions to complete, and ask institutions to submit the information electronically through the HEFCE extranet. All documents should be submitted in MS Office 2003 or PDF format.

43. Submissions will be due by midday on **1 March 2010**.

44. We may, following advice from the panels, request clarification or supporting evidence of some of the submitted information. This would take place during March – April 2010. If panels raise large numbers of queries we will pursue these on a sample basis across the submitting institutions.

## **Feedback and publication of the outcomes**

45. Expert panels will assess and produce an impact sub-profile for each submission. We will also seek their feedback on the process, including a number of the issues listed at Annex A.

46. We will provide each pilot HEI with the impact sub-profile awarded to each submission they make. We do not anticipate providing further feedback on individual submissions (or indeed, individual case studies), as this would be too onerous for the panels and may be perceived as providing an unfair advantage to the pilot institutions.

47. We are considering organising feedback events that bring together the pilot institutions and panel members.

48. We intend to publish the outcomes of the exercise, including:

a. General lessons emerging from the REF impact pilot as a whole (including feedback from the pilot institutions).

b. A report from each pilot panel, including their feedback on the assessment process, the impact sub-profiles awarded to submissions, discussion of the range and nature of impacts and evidence presented to them, and a selection of case studies – potentially including the grades awarded – with the institutions' consent.

## **Use and retention of submissions**

49. The aim of the pilot is to help the funding bodies, working with the sector, to develop and refine the approach to assessing impact in the REF. We also expect to produce materials that will assist the sector more widely in preparing for the REF. To this end we anticipate using the submitted information for the purposes of assessment by the panels, further analysis for the pilot, and to publish examples of case studies or other materials.

50. At the same time we are aware that some of the submitted information may be sensitive for commercial or other reasons. We do not plan to publish the submissions themselves, but need to

consider the implications of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 particularly regarding sensitive information.

51. The Freedom of Information Act 2000 gives a public right of access to any information held by a public authority. In the event of a request for information generated through the REF pilot exercise, we have a duty to decide whether the information should be disclosed. Requests must be considered on a case-by-case basis, and we can refuse to disclose information only in specific circumstances.

52. We will ask institutions in their submissions to identify any material they regard as confidential or sensitive. Should we receive a FOI request, we will give careful consideration to whether the release of this information would, or would be likely to harm the commercial interests of the institution or any other organisation. If information has been identified as confidential by the HEI, for example due to commercial reasons, we would consider whether any exemptions apply, and could argue that it should not be disclosable. However, we cannot guarantee this as it depends on the particular case.

53. We will not seek to publish any material identified by the institution as confidential or sensitive, and we will destroy these materials as soon as the pilot assessment and analysis is completed and we have no further use for them for the specific purpose of the pilot.

54. Other material (not identified as confidential or sensitive) will be retained until after we have concluded the pilot and published the final outcomes and any supporting material. This will enable us to select examples for publication. We will seek the institutions' consent prior to publishing material submitted by them.

### **Institutions' feedback on the pilot**

55. We will expect the participating HEIs to provide structured feedback on the pilot process to HEFCE. This feedback may be collected through a short report or questionnaire, and through discussions (including at pilot briefing events).

56. We also expect the pilot HEIs to be willing to take part in activities to share their experiences with other institutions. We may appoint consultants to gather lessons learned and good practice materials.

## **Annex A**

### **Issues to be investigated in the pilot exercise**

#### Submissions

- Refining the templates for case studies and impact statements
- Determining the appropriate number of case studies to be included in impact submissions
- Testing and developing generic indicators to be included in the impact statements, and developing the common menu of impact indicators to be used within the case-studies
- Developing criteria and guidelines to address the challenges of attribution – to establish appropriate links between the impacts and the research activity of the submitted unit
- Determining an appropriate time limit for the underpinning research
- Developing appropriate means of verifying or corroborating evidence

#### Assessment

- Testing the suitability of the evidence presented to inform robust judgements, and any areas that may need strengthening
- Identifying how best to establish the link between impact and high quality research
- Refining the criteria of 'reach' and 'significance'
- Testing how panels can take account of the range of activities and impacts within a submission, to avoid a narrow concentration on a limited part of the unit's activity
- Testing the approach to forming an impact sub-profile by scoring individual case studies, and how this should be moderated or influenced by the wider impact statement
- Refining the definitions of the four starred levels in the impact sub-profile
- Testing how the degree of differentiation in the impact sub-profiles compares to that for outputs and environment (based on RAE 2008 outcomes)
- Testing the appropriate balance of user and academic members on panels (we aim to involve a majority of user members in the assessment of impact)

## Weighting

- Assessing the overall level of robustness and confidence in the assessment of impact
- Testing approaches to combining impact with the other sub-profiles to meet overall policy aims

## Implementation

- Identifying how far a generic approach to assessment can be workable across the full range of UOAs and types of impact, and any specific areas where panels may need to vary their guidance or working methods to assess impact
- Identifying the burden on institutions involved in making impact submissions, and how this can be kept the minimum that is necessary
- Identifying aspects of good practice in producing impact submissions, to assist institutions in preparing for the REF
- Exploring the implications for user organisations that might be asked to provide or corroborate evidence in submissions, including identifying any commercial or other sensitivities that could constrain their input
- Identifying the workload and the potential benefits for user members on the panels; and how we could best encourage widespread user involvement on REF panels
- Identifying requirements for the REF data collection system.

## Annex B

### Pilot institutions and UOAs

CLINICAL MEDICINE	PHYSICS	EARTH SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL POLICY	ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
University of Bristol			University of Bristol	
		Brunel University		Brunel University
	University of Cambridge			University of Cambridge
			De Montfort University	De Montfort University
	University of Durham	University of Durham		
		University of East Anglia	University of East Anglia	
University of Exeter				University of Exeter
Imperial College	Imperial College			
	Keele University		Keele University	
				Kingston University
	Lancaster University			Lancaster University
		University of Leeds	University of Leeds	
	Liverpool John Moores University			Liverpool John Moores University
			London School of Economics and Political Science	
			London South Bank University	
		University of Manchester		University of Manchester
University of Oxford		University of Oxford		
University of Plymouth		University of Plymouth		
Queen Mary University London				Queen Mary University London
	University College London			University College London
University of Warwick	University of Warwick			
	University of York		University of York	



<b>CLINICAL MEDICINE</b>	<b>PHYSICS</b>	<b>EARTH SYSTEMS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE</b>	<b>SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL POLICY</b>	<b>ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE</b>
University of Dundee				University of Dundee
University of Glasgow		University of Glasgow		
	University of St Andrews			University of St Andrews
		University of Stirling	University of Stirling	
Cardiff University				Cardiff University
	Swansea University		Swansea University	
		University of Ulster	University of Ulster	

## Annex C

### Impact Pilot Exercise Steering Group

#### Terms of reference

1. HEFCE is managing the REF impact pilot exercise on behalf of the four UK higher education (HE) funding bodies.
2. The Steering Group's role is to advise HEFCE on the implementation of the REF impact pilot exercise and on the pilot exercise outcomes, to assist in the development of a robust, workable and efficient approach to assessing impact in the REF.
3. In particular, the steering group will provide advice on:
  - the aims and objectives of the pilot
  - the selection of UOAs and HEIs
  - the nature and format of submissions and guidance for HEIs
  - the establishment of pilot panels and how they will operate
  - gathering and reviewing feedback from the pilot exercise institutions and panels, and the role of any consultants appointed to assist with this
  - considering relevant aspects of the consultation outcomes
  - the interface between impact and the 'output' and 'environment' elements of REF (especially the 'user significance' of outputs, and engagement aspects of environment)
  - identifying the key findings and lessons emerging
  - reporting of the pilot outcomes.
4. The Steering Group will meet around four times between September 2009 and August 2010, and may also be asked to comment on items by e-mail.

#### Membership

##### External members:

- Simon Denegri, AMRC
- Janet Finch, Keele University
- Russell Hamilton, Department of Health
- Alison Hodge, QinetiQ
- Roger Kain, University of Exeter
- Ian Leslie, University of Cambridge
- Ashley Malster, Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
- John Rea, DEFRA
- John Stageman, Astrazenaca
- Jeremy Watson, ARUP
- Marie Williams, RCUK

HEFCE members:

- David Sweeney (Chair), Director of Research and Innovation
- Graeme Rosenberg, REF Project Manager
- Hannah Chaplin (Secretary), Higher Education Policy Adviser

5. HEFCE will report on the progress of the pilot exercise to the other three UK HE funding bodies through the REF Steering Group. The funding bodies will also be invited to comment on the paperwork for the REF impact pilot exercise Steering Group and to attend meetings and other pilot exercise events if they wish.

## Annex D

### Template for the impact statement

HEI name:
UOA name:
Filename:
1. During the assessment period, what range of opportunities have been identified to apply, exploit or build on the unit's research findings?
2. Describe the range and types of interactions with research users (or potential users) during the assessment period.
3. Outline the full range and significance of impacts or benefits occurring during the assessment period, that the unit's research activity has contributed to.
4. What activities are undertaken currently within the unit to build on research to secure future impacts or benefits?

## Annex E

### Indicators of research user income

1. HEFCE will provide a spreadsheet of research income data from research users, drawn from RAE submissions. For the Clinical Medicine UOA this will be aggregated from the relevant RAE UOAs. The data will be broken down by income source and by year. We will explain to the pilot panels where the data has come from, and hence that the data relates to an earlier period than the pilot assessment period (2005-09). We will also explain what the categories of income sources are, and that we plan in future to change these to align with the HESA financial returns.

2. We will make the data available to the pilot institutions prior to submitting it to the panels, but do not anticipate that pilot institutions would amend the data. An example, from the Clinical Medicine UOA, is provided below.

<b>Source</b>	<b>2000-01*</b>	<b>2001-02</b>	<b>2002-03</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Total per FTE</b>
UK-based charities	7,185,328	13,358,449	13,697,346	14,881,289	17,202,668	20,232,684	20,500,282	<b>107,058,046</b>	<b>641,642</b>
Other government bodies in the UK	816,631	988,117	1,326,601	1,639,414	1,091,946	2,523,470	1,806,398	<b>10,192,577</b>	<b>61,088</b>
Regional Development Agency	15,852	131,772	193,771	187,820	83,853	118,623	75,252	<b>806,943</b>	<b>4,836</b>
UK industry & commerce	2,479,410	2,706,014	1,526,438	1,508,302	1,710,148	2,535,140	2,662,342	<b>15,127,794</b>	<b>90,667</b>
Government bodies in the EU	402,389	626,622	922,319	974,512	807,670	1,178,434	1,457,787	<b>6,369,733</b>	<b>38,176</b>
EU other	418,807	497,909	649,778	462,219	296,766	682,372	723,357	<b>3,731,208</b>	<b>22,363</b>
Other overseas - Charity	37,219	62,571	79,915	92,623	62,484	250,652	172,352	<b>757,816</b>	<b>4,542</b>
Other overseas - Government	35,082	31,631	48,905	24,815	80,003	255,877	251,157	<b>727,470</b>	<b>4,360</b>
Other overseas - Industry	1,655,222	2,922,970	3,460,635	725,227	627,420	2,416,611	1,173,247	<b>12,981,332</b>	<b>77,802</b>
Other - EU govt (building)	96,360	0	0	0	0	1,710,272	442,715	<b>2,249,347</b>	<b>13,481</b>
Other - NHS (building)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,480,832	<b>1,480,832</b>	<b>8,875</b>
Other - RDA (building)	16,729	27,655	0	0	180	0	0	<b>44,564</b>	<b>267</b>
Other - UK charity (building)	0	225,498	937,633	2,938,558	5,375,080	5,464,707	0	<b>14,941,476</b>	<b>89,550</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,159,029</b>	<b>21,579,208</b>	<b>22,843,341</b>	<b>23,434,779</b>	<b>27,338,218</b>	<b>37,368,842</b>	<b>30,745,721</b>	<b>176,469,138</b>	<b>1,057,651</b>

\* Partial year: 1 January to 31 July 2001

## Annex F

### Template for case studies

HEI name:
UOA name:
Filename:
Confidential?:
Title of case study:
<p>1. Describe and provide evidence of the specific benefit or impact (maximum 500 words). Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explanation of the nature of the impact in terms of its reach and significance</li> <li>• details of when the impact occurred</li> <li>• evidence of the above, including appropriate indicators.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Explain how the unit's research activity contributed to the impact (maximum 500 words). Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an outline of what the underpinning research was, when this was undertaken and by whom (references should be provided in section 4)</li> <li>• how the research (or other research-based activity) influenced or contributed to the impact</li> <li>• any efforts made by the institution to exploit or apply the research to secure the impact</li> <li>• acknowledgement of any other significant factors or contributions to the impact.</li> </ul>
<p>3. Provide references to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• key research outputs that underpin the impact – and state how the research was peer reviewed (whether at grant application or publication stage) or otherwise quality assured</li> <li>• external sources (reports or documents, or contact details of a user), that could corroborate the information provided in sections 1 and 2 above.</li> </ul>

## Annex G

### Draft 'common menu' of impact indicators

Type of impact	Possible indicators
Delivering highly skilled people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff movement between academia and industry</li> <li>• Employment of post-doctoral researchers in industry or spin-out companies</li> </ul>
Creating new businesses, improving the performance of existing businesses, or commercialising new products or processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research contracts and income from industry</li> <li>• Collaborative research with industry (for example, measured through numbers of co-authored outputs)</li> <li>• Income from intellectual property</li> <li>• Increased turnover/reduced costs for particular businesses/industry</li> <li>• Success measures for new products/services (for example, growth in revenue)</li> <li>• Success measures for spin-out companies (for example, growth in revenue or numbers of employees)</li> <li>• Patents granted/licences awarded and brought to market</li> <li>• Staff movement between academia and industry</li> </ul>
Attracting R&D investment from global business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research income from overseas business</li> <li>• Collaborative research with overseas businesses</li> </ul>
Better informed public policy-making or improved public services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research income from government organisations</li> <li>• Changes to legislation/regulations/government policy (including references in relevant documents)</li> <li>• Changes to public service practices/guidelines (including references in guidelines)</li> <li>• Measures of improved public services (for example, increased literacy and numeracy rates)</li> <li>• Staff exchanges with government organisations</li> <li>• Participation on public policy/advisory committees</li> <li>• Influence on public policy debate (for example, as indicated by citations by non-government organisations or the media)</li> </ul>
Improved patient care or health outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research income from the NHS and medical research charities</li> <li>• Measures of improved health outcomes (for example, lives saved, reduced infection rates)</li> <li>• Measures of improved health services (for example, reduced treatment times or costs, equal access to services)</li> <li>• Changes to clinical or healthcare training, practice or guidelines (including references in relevant documents such as National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence guidelines)</li> <li>• Development of new or improved drugs, treatments or other medical interventions; numbers of advanced phase clinical trials</li> <li>• Participation on health policy/advisory committees</li> <li>• Changes to public behaviour (for example, reductions in</li> </ul>

	smoking)
Progress towards sustainable development, including environmental sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of solutions to sustainable development (new technologies, behavioural change and so on)</li> <li>• Measures of improved sustainability (for example, reduced pollution, regeneration of natural resources)</li> </ul>
Cultural enrichment, including improved public engagement with science and research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased levels of public engagement with science and research (for example, as measured through surveys)</li> <li>• Changes to public attitudes to science (for example, as measured through surveys)</li> <li>• Enriched appreciation of heritage or culture (for example, as measured through surveys)</li> <li>• Audience/participation levels at public dissemination or engagement activities (exhibitions, broadcasts and so on)</li> <li>• Positive reviews or participant feedback on public dissemination or engagement activities</li> </ul>
Improved social welfare, social cohesion or national security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of new ideas to improve social equity, inclusion or cohesion</li> <li>• Measures of improved social equity, inclusion or cohesion (for example, improved educational attainment among disadvantaged groups, or increased voting rates in lower participation communities)</li> <li>• Application of new security technologies or practices</li> </ul>
Other quality of life benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please suggest what might also be included in this list</li> </ul>