

Research Excellence Framework impact pilot exercise: Findings of the expert panels

Addendum: Impact profiles awarded to pilot submissions

December 2010

1. This document is an addendum to the report by the Research Excellence Framework (REF) impact pilot panel chairs, published in November 2010. It was prepared by the REF team to supplement the report, by providing the impact profiles awarded to the pilot submissions.
2. The aim of the pilot exercise was to test and develop the *method* of assessing impact, and the specific profiles awarded to individual submissions were not relevant to the general findings and conclusions of the exercise. The report by the pilot panel chairs therefore included anonymised tables of the profiles awarded to the pilot submissions. The profiles are published in full in this addendum as a matter of public record; they do not affect the findings of the exercise as out in the report by panel chairs.
3. The profiles in this addendum were awarded to pilot submissions on the basis of the impacts evidenced in the submissions received by the pilot panels, assessed against the criteria for the pilot exercise. However, these profiles should **NOT** be read as a clear judgement about the impact of research from the submitting departments as such, or as a means of predicting the impact profiles that departments may be expected to achieve in the real REF, for the following reasons:
 - a) The pilot process overall was experimental and the main aim of the panels was to test and identify lessons from the process in general, not to produce precise assessments of every submitted item.
 - b) To varying degrees, the pilot institutions deliberately sought to experiment with their submissions and test the boundaries of what would count as evidence of impact for the REF, or were uncertain about the requirements for the pilot exercise. Panels detected this in a number of the submissions, and their scores reflect the evidence as it was submitted.
 - c) The panels found that there was a lack of clear evidence provided in some of the pilot case studies and this significantly affected the scores awarded to them. The panels have set out a number of recommendations to improve the process to address these issues in future.
4. The profiles awarded to pilot submissions are set out in the tables below.

Clinical Medicine							
	FTE	Case studies	4*	3*	2*	1*	U
UOA average			17	25	34	12	12
Institutional profile							
University of Bristol	69	7	0	55	45	0	0
Universities of Exeter & Plymouth	32	4	25	25	25	0	25
Imperial College London	392	40	25	10	30	15	20
University of Oxford	234	24	20	25	25	10	20
Queen Mary University London	95	10	0	40	40	10	10
University of Warwick	39	4	0	0	75	25	0
University of Dundee	84	9	20	45	25	0	10
University of Glasgow	167	17	25	30	45	0	0
Cardiff University	120	13	0	40	35	25	0

Physics							
	FTE	Case studies	4*	3*	2*	1*	U
UOA average			20	27	26	21	6
Institutional profiles							
University of Cambridge	141	15	30	30	25	10	5
Durham University	70	7	30	35	35	0	0
Imperial College London	127	13	30	20	15	30	5
Keele University	10	1	0	0	0	100	0
Lancaster University	26	3	0	5	95	0	0
Liverpool John Moores	17	2	40	45	10	5	0
University College London	101	11	5	25	15	45	10
University of Warwick	51	6	15	40	15	15	15
University of York	26	3	0	0	100	0	0
University of St Andrews	32	4	20	75	5	0	0
Swansea University	21	3	0	0	5	65	30

Earth Systems & Environmental Science							
	FTE	Case studies	4*	3*	2*	1*	U
UOA average			18	28	24	15	15
Institutional profiles							
Brunel University	9	2	50	0	0	0	50
Durham University	32	4	0	50	0	0	50
University of East Anglia	72	8	35	25	25	15	0
University of Leeds	74	8	25	25	25	25	0
University of Manchester	37	4	25	25	50	0	0
University of Oxford	32	4	0	50	25	0	25
University of Plymouth	37	4	0	0	25	25	50
University of Glasgow	36	4	25	0	25	50	0
University of Stirling	20	2	0	100	0	0	0
University of Ulster	24	3	0	35	30	0	35

Social Work and Social Policy							
	FTE	Case studies	4*	3*	2*	1*	U
UOA average			19	14	38	29	0
Institutional profiles							
University of Bristol	47	5	10	75	0	15	0
DeMontfort University	21	3	0	0	60	40	0
University of East Anglia	16	2	0	35	65	0	0
Keele University	40	4	25	0	25	50	0
University of Leeds	32	4	20	15	35	30	0
London School of Economics	51	5	70	0	30	0	0
London South Bank University	19	2	0	0	10	90	0
University of York	54	6	50	10	40	0	0
University of Stirling	26	3	35	15	50	0	0
Swansea University	18	2	0	0	85	15	0
University of Ulster	16	2	0	35	0	65	0

English Language & Literature							
	FTE	Case studies	4*	3*	2*	1*	U
UOA profile			19	30	30	19	2
Institutional profiles							
Brunel University	17	2	0	0	0	100	0
University of Cambridge	70	8	10	20	50	20	0
De Montfort University	20	2	0	60	0	40	0
University of Exeter	44	4	20	40	40	0	0
Kingston University	18	2	40	0	60	0	0
Lancaster University	61	6	35	50	15	0	0
Liverpool John Moores	11	2	0	20	80	0	0
University of Manchester	33	4	0	0	20	80	0
Queen Mary University of London	35	4	40	60	0	0	0
University College London	25	3	25	50	25	0	0
University of Dundee	14	2	0	0	100	0	0
University of St Andrews	25	3	25	0	50	25	0
Cardiff University	44	5	20	30	20	15	15