# Lord Stern’s review of the Research Excellence Framework - response form

The call for evidence is available at: [www.gov.uk/government/consultations/research-excellence-framework-review-call-for-evidence](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/research-excellence-framework-review-call-for-evidence)

The closing date for responses is **Thursday 24 March 2016**.

Please return completed forms to:

Hannah Ledger  
Research Strategy Unit  
Department for Business, Innovation and Skills   
1 Victoria Street  
London  
SW1H 0ET

Email: [REFreview@bis.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:REFreview@bis.gsi.gov.uk)

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or release to other parties or to disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes. Please see the consultation document for further information.

If you want information, including personal data, that you provide to be treated as confidential, please explain to us below why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we shall take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the department.

I want my response to be treated as confidential

Comments:

Click here to enter text.

## Questions

Name: Click here to enter text.

Email: Click here to enter text.

Address:

Click here to enter text.

Name of Organisation (if applicable): Click here to enter text.

Please check the box that best describes you as a respondent to this consultation

|  | **Respondent type** |
| --- | --- |
|  | Alternative higher education provider  (with designated courses) |
|  | Alternative higher education provider (no designated courses) |
|  | Awarding organisation |
|  | Business/Employer |
|  | Central government |
|  | Charity or social enterprise |
|  | Further Education College |
|  | Higher Education Institution |
|  | Individual (Please describe any particular relevant interest; teaching staff, student, etc.) |
|  | Legal representative |
|  | Local Government |
|  | Professional Body |
|  | Representative Body |
|  | Research Council |
|  | Trade union or staff association |
|  | Other (please describe) |

If you selected ‘Individual,’ please describe any particular relevant interest; teaching staff, student, etc

Comments: Click here to enter text.

If you selected 'Other,' please give details

Comments: Click here to enter text.

### Section 1

The primary purpose of the REF is to inform the allocation of quality-related research funding (QR).

1. What changes to existing processes could more efficiently or more accurately assess the outputs, impacts and contexts of research in order to allocate QR? Should the definition of impact be broadened or refined? Is there scope for more or different use of metrics in any areas?

Please tell us your thoughts in no more than 500 words:

Click here to enter text.

1. If REF is mainly a tool to allocate QR at institutional level, what is the benefit of organising an exercise over as many Units of Assessment as in REF 2014, or in having returns linking outputs to particular investigators? Would there be advantages in reporting on some dimensions of the REF (e.g. impact and/or environment) at a more aggregate or institutional level?

Please tell us your thoughts in no more than 500 words:

Click here to enter text.

### Section 2

While the primary purpose of REF is QR resource allocation, data collected through the REF and results of REF assessments can also inform disciplinary, institutional and UK-wide decision making.

1. What use is made of the information gathered through REF in decision making and strategic planning in your organisation? What information could be more useful? Does REF information duplicate or take priority over other management information?

Please tell us your thoughts in no more than 500 words:

Click here to enter text.

1. What data should REF collect to be of greater support to Government and research funders in driving research excellence and productivity?

Please tell us your thoughts in no more than 500 words:

Click here to enter text.

### Section 3

The incentive effects of the REF shape academic behaviour, such as through the introduction of the impact criteria.

1. How might the REF be further refined or used by Government to incentivise constructive and creative behaviours such as promoting interdisciplinary research, collaboration between universities, and/or collaboration between universities and other public or private sector bodies?

Please tell us your thoughts in no more than 500 words:

Click here to enter text.

### Section 4

Previous studies have focused on the costs of REF with respect to the time and resources needed for the submission and assessment processes. The Review is also interested in views and any associated evidence that the REF influences, positively or negatively, the research and career choices of individuals, or the development of academic disciplines. It is also interested in views on how it might encourage institutions to `game-play’ and thereby limit the aggregate value of the exercise.

1. In your view how does the REF process influence, positively or negatively, the choices of individual researchers and / or higher education institutions? What are the reasons for this and what are the effects? How do such effects of the REF compare with effects of other drivers in the system (e.g. success for individuals in international career markets, or for universities in global rankings)? What suggestions would you have to restrict gaming the system?

Please tell us your thoughts in no more than 500 words:

Click here to enter text.

1. In your view how does the REF process influence the development of academic disciplines or impact upon other areas of scholarly activity relative to other factors? What changes would create or sustain positive influences in the future?

Please tell us your thoughts in no more than 500 words:

Click here to enter text.

### Section 5

Much of REF focuses on the retrospective analysis of success achieved by institutions either through output or impact. Yet the resources provided anticipate continued success based on that track record. Are there means of better addressing forward-looking institutional plans and priorities, and how these might feed in to national policy?

1. How can the REF better address the future plans of institutions and how they will utilise QR funding obtained through the exercise?

Please tell us your thoughts in no more than 500 words:

Click here to enter text.

### Final thoughts

The Review is keen to hear of creative ideas and insights and to be open in its approach.

1. Are there additional issues you would like to bring to the attention of the Review?

Please tell us your thoughts in no more than 500 words:

Click here to enter text.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge receipt of individual responses unless you tick the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply
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