



## **Guidance for REF2021 Reviewers of outputs – Main Panel D**

### **Some general comments on output assessment**

REF panellists will assess each output according to the panel criteria agreed for REF2021.

The main questions to answer are:

#### **Does the output meet the REF definition of research?**

Where an output does not meet the REF definition of research, it should be flagged and marked *unclassified*.

For other outputs, the assessment criteria listed below apply.

#### **Is it interdisciplinary according to the REF definition of interdisciplinary research?**

If the output is considered interdisciplinary within the REF definition, additional assessment criteria apply. These are listed below.

#### **How does it meet the quality level descriptors published by the relevant main panel?**

The REF has agreed star level definitions that apply across all panels. In addition, each panel has agreed level descriptors to guide the assessment of outputs. Reviewers are invited to assess the extent to which the output meets those descriptors.

The general descriptors and additional criteria are given below.

#### **Please note:**

For **co-authored outputs**, the REF does not take into account the relative contribution of the submitting author. Once it has been established that the submitting author has made significant contribution to the output, the overall quality of the output will be assessed. If, as a reviewer, you are in doubt whether the submitting author has made a significant contribution, then this should be raised separately.

**Double weighted outputs** will similarly be assessed for their overall quality, and the decision of whether to double weight an output is entirely separate from the quality assessment. If, as a reviewer, you feel an output should be double weighted, or should not be double weighted, this should be raised separately and should not be part of the quality assessment.

**Journal impact factors**, and generally journal reputation, will not be taken into account by REF panellists and should not be taken into account by REF reviewers. This applies to all disciplines, including those where journal impact factors are important within the disciplinary culture.

**Panel remits:** please assess the output(s) you have been invited to review under the specific panel remit you were given. The panel remits have been published by the REF team:

[https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1084/ref-2019\\_02-panel-criteria-and-working-methods.pdf](https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1084/ref-2019_02-panel-criteria-and-working-methods.pdf), pp 9ff. If you are in any doubt whether an output meets the panel remit for which it is being reviewed, please state that in your review. If, in your view, the output would benefit from cross referral to a different panel, it would be helpful to mention that in your review.

The REF team have confirmed that the panels will deal with interdisciplinarity and cross referrals entirely separately – an interdisciplinary item will only be assessed by the panel to which it has been submitted, using the additional criteria shown below, unless the submitting institution has made a request for cross referral. We can ask for cross referral for outputs that are not marked as interdisciplinary. Please note also that cross referral is at the discretion of panel members – we may request cross referral but it is not automatically granted. Equally, the panel to which an item is cross referred may suggest a grade, which may or may not be taken into account in the final grade assigned by the panel to which the output was submitted originally.

### **REF2021 Guidance and Assessment Criteria (excerpts from REF documentation)**

The following definitions and descriptors are taken from the REF Guidance on Submissions and the REF Panel Criteria and Working Methods (REF2019/01 and REF2019/02). You can access the full documents here:

REF Guidance on Submissions: [https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019\\_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf](https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf)

REF Panel Criteria and Working Methods: [https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1084/ref-2019\\_02-panel-criteria-and-working-methods.pdf](https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1084/ref-2019_02-panel-criteria-and-working-methods.pdf)

### **Definition of Research**

For the purposes of REF, research is defined as a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared.

It **includes** work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce, industry, culture, society, and to the public and voluntary sectors; scholarship, the invention and generation of ideas, images, performances, artefacts including design, where these lead to new or substantially improved insights; and the use of existing knowledge in experimental development to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products and processes, including design and construction. It **excludes** routine testing and routine analysis of materials, components and processes such as for the maintenance of national standards, as distinct from the development of new analytical techniques. It also **excludes** the development of teaching materials that do not embody original research.

It **includes** research that is published, disseminated or made publicly available in the form of assessable research outputs, and confidential reports.

Scholarship for REF is defined as the creation, development and maintenance of the intellectual infrastructure of subjects and disciplines, in forms such as dictionaries, scholarly editions, catalogues and contributions to major research databases.

### **Outputs will be assessed in terms of:**

**Originality** will be understood as the extent to which the output makes an important and innovative contribution to understanding and knowledge in the field. Research outputs that demonstrate originality may do one or more of the following: produce new empirical findings or material; engage with new and/or complex problems; develop innovative research methods, methodologies and analytical techniques; show imaginative scope; provide new arguments, formal innovations, interpretations and/or insights; collect and engage with novel types of data; and/or advance theory or the analysis of doctrine, policy or practice, and new forms of expression.

**Significance** will be understood as the extent to which the work has influenced, or has the capacity to influence, knowledge and scholarly thought, or the development and understanding of policy and/or practice.

**Rigour** will be understood as the extent to which the work demonstrates intellectual coherence and integrity, and adopts robust and appropriate concepts, analyses, theories and methodologies.

#### **REF definition of Interdisciplinary research:**

For the purposes of REF, interdisciplinary research is understood to achieve outcomes (including new approaches) that could not be achieved within the framework of a single discipline. Interdisciplinary research features significant interaction between two or more disciplines and / or moves beyond established disciplinary foundations in applying or integrating research approaches from other disciplines.

Interdisciplinary outputs will be assessed against the generic criteria of originality, significance and rigour. In assessing interdisciplinary outputs, the sub-panels will make use of additional guidance provided by the Interdisciplinary Research Advisory Panel (IDAP). The following guidance will work in parallel with – rather than replace – the generic criteria:

**Originality and significance** can be identified in one, some, or all of the constituent parts brought together in the work, or in their integration; they do not need to be demonstrated across all contributing areas/fields.

**Rigour** can be understood in the context of interdisciplinary research as the design and application of relevant and robust approaches, methods and concepts to achieve productive interactions between the disciplines.

#### **Output quality sub-profile: definitions of starred levels**

<b>Four star:</b>	Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour
<b>Three star:</b>	Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence
<b>Two star:</b>	Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour
<b>One star:</b>	Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour
<b>Unclassified:</b>	Quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work. Or work which does not meet the published definition of research for the purposes of this assessment.

#### **Main Panel D Supplementary Criteria – level definitions**

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 or is not internationally benchmarked.

In assessing outputs, the sub-panels will look for evidence of originality, significance and rigour and apply the generic definitions of the starred quality levels as follows:

- a. In assessing work as being **four star** (quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics across and possibly beyond its area/field:
  - A primary or essential point of reference
  - Of profound influence
  - Instrumental in developing new thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences

- A major expansion of the range and the depth of research and its application
  - Outstandingly novel, innovative and/or creative
- b. In assessing work as being **three star** (quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics across and possibly beyond its area/field:
- An important point of reference
  - Of considerable influence
  - A catalyst for, or important contribution to, new thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences
  - A significant expansion of the range and depth of research and its application
  - Significantly novel or innovative or creative
- c. In assessing work as being **two star** (quality that is recognized internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics across and possibly beyond its area/field:
- A recognized point of reference
  - Of some influence
  - An incremental and cumulative advance on thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences
  - A useful contribution to the range or depth of research and its application
- d. In assessing work as being **one star** (quality that is recognized nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of the following characteristics within its area/field:
- Based on existing traditions of thinking, methodology and/or creative practice
  - A useful contribution of minor influence
- e. A research output will be graded '**unclassified**' if it is either:
- Below the quality threshold for one star or
  - Does not meet the definition of research used for the REF.

Any further questions about internal review and REF preparations should be directed to your Dean of Research

Professor Michael Brown, ext. 2472, [m.brown@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:m.brown@abdn.ac.uk)

or to Marlis Barraclough ext. 3787, [m.barraclough@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:m.barraclough@abdn.ac.uk)

Feb 2019