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Q1. What will the process be for deciding who in the panel assesses which papers, given that they should be read by an expert in that field or methodology?

*The subpanel chair and deputy chair allocate outputs to assessors, avoiding conflicts of interest. Assessors are all chosen from a list of those nominated by professional associations and learned societies (including UCET), with an attempt to cover the main substantive and methodological areas expected by the subpanel.  This is fine-tuned after the survey of submission intentions.*

Q2. Can a paper co-authored by an education academic be returned with a colleague (from the same institution) who is submitted in another UoA, be also returned in the other UoA?

*Please check with the REF guidance, and then with the ref team at Research England*.

The following was subsequently received from the REF team:

*I would refer you to paragraph 104 of the* [*'Guidance on submissions'*](https://www.ref.ac.uk/publications/guidance-on-submissions-201901/) *which sets out the following regarding collaborative research:*

*‘104. The REF will support collaborative research through the following arrangements:*

1. *We encourage joint submissions in a UOA by two or more UK institutions, where this is the most appropriate way of describing the research they have developed or undertaken collaboratively. (See paragraphs 78 to 84.)*
2. *Outputs that are co-authored or co-produced and are listed in more than one submission (whether within the same HEI or from different HEIs) may be listed in any or all of those submissions, and will be assessed on an equal footing to any other output.*
3. *Where a submitted impact is underpinned by collaborative research, each submitting unit whose research made a distinct and material contribution to the impact may submit that impact.*
4. *Within the environment template, a submitting unit should provide information about how they support collaboration both within and beyond academia, and panels will give due credit where these arrangements have enhanced the vitality and sustainability of the research environment or the submitted unit’s contribution to the wider research base, economy or society.’*

Q3. What is the position for submitted staff who are part of an Education Unit with **some** outputs that are not directly about education?  For example, those who research leadership, with some outputs on educational leadership but also some on things like workplace communication?

*The subpanel will operate with a generous interpretation of the published descriptor.  The test here is really whether a subpanel member would be able to see the relevance of the output in or for educational contexts/issues.  However, it is worth remembering that it is a subpanel for Education Research, and this should be taken into account when choosing which outputs to submit.*

Q4. Please could you confirm that two submitting units at different HEIs can draw upon the same impact to develop impact case studies in situations where both units were involved in co-producing research that made a distinct and material contribution to the impact? Obviously both submitting units would need to demonstrate their part in the production of this research. And (as in guidelines 313) that "in such cases, units may provide common descriptions of the impact arising, where they so wish."

*This question is complex.  There might be a situation where the underpinning research was done in more than one place and so two institutions could legitimately lay claim to it.  The more difficult issue is to do with the claim about responsibility for impact and its quality.  If the two institutions have worked in complete partnership and both wish to submit a case study focused on the impact of the joint research, then it seems that they would have to focus on different areas of impact which differentiate their responsibilities.  A****dvise that this query is referred to Research England ref team****.*

On the fourth issue (no. 3 on your list), and as discussed at the session, The question about two different submissions drawing on the same research in an impact case study is more complex than it appears.  I could see there might be a situation where the underpinning research was done in more than one place and so two institutions could legitimately lay claim to it.  The more difficult issue is to do with the claim about responsibility for impact and its quality.  If the two institutions have worked in complete partnership and both wish to submit a case study focused on the impact of the joint research, then it seems to me that they would have to focus on different areas of impact which differentiate their responsibilities.  **However, I would advise that this query is referred to Research England ref team**.

On the second issue (no. 1 in your list), as I described during the talk, the subpanel chair and deputy chair allocate outputs to assessors, avoiding conflicts of interest. Assessors are all chosen from a list of those nominated by professional associations and learned societies (including UCET), with an attempt to cover the main substantive and methodological areas expected by the subpanel.  This is fine-tuned after the survey of submission intentions.

On the third issue (no. 2 in your list) – please check with the REF guidance, and then with the ref team at Research England.

On the fourth issue (no. 3 on your list), and as discussed at the session, the subpanel will operate with a generous interpretation of the published descriptor.  The test here is really whether a subpanel member would be able to see the relevance of the output in or for educational contexts/issues.  However, it is worth remembering that it is a subpanel for Education Research, and this should be taken into account when choosing which outputs to submit.
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