

## Background

In September 2017, the funding bodies set out some high-level policy decisions for REF 2021. These included a decision that case studies continued from examples submitted in 2014 will be eligible for submission in REF 2021 ([REF 2017/01](#), paragraph 26.b.). Further to this:

- all continued case studies will have to meet the same eligibility criteria as new case studies, including timeframes.
- submitting units will need to identify continued case studies in the case study template.
- continued or developed case studies will need to provide evidence of additionality to the example submitted in 2014.

In the 'Initial Decisions' document, we also set out our plans to consult further to establish some general principles on additionality, which can be appropriately tailored by discipline area by the panels. This work will include consideration of where the continuation of impact within the new assessment period may itself represent additionality.

The discussion at this workshop, guided by the questions below, will feed in to the development of the guidance on submissions, and will inform main and sub-panels' development of the panel criteria. The draft criteria will be published for consultation in summer 2018.

## Questions

### Identifying continued case studies

In the 'Initial Decisions' document we determined that submitting units will need to identify continued case studies in the case study template. In order to identify continued case studies, institutions will require clear guidance outlining to what extent, and in what areas, case studies in 2021 must overlap with those submitted in 2014 for there to be continuity. This raises the following questions:

#### *Areas of overlap*

- Should continued case studies be identified solely by an overlap in the underpinning research sections submitted in 2014 and 2021?
- Are there other factors that might indicate that a case study has been continued from 2014?
- Which of the following would constitute continuity?
  - Same research, new type of impact
  - Same research, same type of impact
  - New research, same type of impact
  - New research, new impact

#### *Extent of overlap*

- To what extent does the underpinning research have to overlap with a 2014 case study?

- For example, if an output was cited as part of a broader unit-based impact case study in 2014, would the submission of a case study in 2021 that focuses on an individual researcher's work and includes this output constitute continuation?
- Would it make a difference if the 2014 case study was also built around the individual's research?
- If follow-on research is undertaken that leads to new types of impact would this constitute continuation?
- To what extent must impact arising in the 2021 assessment period relate to the 2014 case study to be considered a 'continued impact'?
- In the case of collaborative research, should an institution submitting the impact for the first time be required to flag it as a continued case study if it was submitted by a partner institution in 2014?

## **Defining additionality**

The decision to require continued case studies to demonstrate additionality responds to views raised in the consultation on REF 2021 ([REF 2021/02](#)), in which over half of respondents supported this stipulation. However, there was little consensus over what would constitute additionality. The workshop aims to develop some general principles around additionality and consider how they might apply to different types of impact.

Please read the hypothetical scenarios in Annex A and consider the following questions:

- Which examples demonstrate additionality, in your view, and why?
- Are there any examples that do not demonstrate additionality, in your view? Why not?
- To what extent are different types of additionality appropriate for different types of impact e.g. does additionality look different for policy impacts than health impacts?
- Does having the same impacts with new beneficiaries represent additionality?

## **Assessing continued case studies**

As stated in the 'Initial Decisions', continued case studies will be subject to the same eligibility criteria as new case studies, including the timeframes. Therefore, panels will only assess impact occurring in the REF 2021 assessment period (1 August 2013 to 31 July 2020) and will not be able to take into account impact that occurred in the previous REF period.

Maintaining continuity with 2014, impact will continue to be assessed in terms of reach and significance. For continued case studies, the question remains whether additionality should be a threshold judgement, with the absence of additionality leading to a 'U' classification, or whether it should inform the panels' assessment of the reach and significance of a case study.

The answer to this question will depend significantly on the principles developed above and will therefore be addressed at the workshop, following discussions on definitions of additionality.

### **Submission requirements for continued case studies**

As outlined above, units will be required to identify where case studies are continued from studies submitted in 2014. However, questions remain around the types of additional information and evidence that might be required to accompany the submission of continued case studies in order to facilitate their assessment by the panels. Please consider the following questions:

- Should units be required to provide a cover sheet explaining where the additionality lies in the case study?
- If so, what kinds of information might be provided?
- To what extent would the original case study need to be referenced in the new case study?
- What kinds of evidence might be required to demonstrate additionality?
- How might they differ from evidence provided in new case studies?
- What information, if any, should panels be given relating to the 2014 case study, bearing in mind that scores for individual case studies are no longer available?
- Should units be required to provide information in the environment template on the proportion of new and continuing case studies submitted?

## **Annex A: Examples**

Below are some hypothetical examples of continued case studies. Some are based on real case studies submitted to the previous REF; however, the post-2014 developments are purely hypothetical.

### **Impacts on health**

#### *A – Non-deterioration*

Research into the efficacy of vaccines against poliovirus was used to inform international strategies for eradicating the virus. One of these initiatives is credited with eradicating polio from India, with the last case reported in 2011. No new cases of polio have been reported in India since 2011.

#### *B – Continuation at flat rate*

The trial and introduction of a new drug to treat heart attack victims led to its adoption by 50% of UK hospitals by 2013. It was proven that the drug prevented one in five deaths and it was estimated that its introduction saved around 50,000 lives per year in 2012. Since 2013, the proportion of hospitals administering the drug remains 50% and the estimated number of lives saved p.a. continues to be 50,000.

#### *C – Ongoing reduction*

Research into treating rabies in feral dogs in S.E. Asia led to a year-on-year reduction by 500 instances in 2011-2013. The same method continues to be used to treat the disease and instances of rabies continue to fall by 200 p.a. in 2013-2020. It is estimated that rabies will be eradicated from the region within the next 20 years.

### **Economic impacts**

A research programme undertaken in 2005-2007 led to the creation of a successful spin-out company in 2008. It was acquired in 2010 by the UK's largest provider of communications for police forces. Between 2010 and 2013, the company grew to 25 staff. At the REF 2014 census date, its products were used by 15% of UK police forces. The main impacts claimed were:

- Economic benefit stemming from the creation of 25 jobs and increased turnover for the communications company;
- Efficiency savings for the police force, estimated to be over 20,000 officer hours p.a.

#### *Scenario A*

Further research is undertaken that enhances the efficiency of the initial product. This updated version is adopted by 75% of the previous customers. The remaining 25% continue to use the original product. Uptake does not spread to further police forces. Analysis demonstrates that the updated product saves 10% more staff time than the previous system. The company maintains its number of staff and its annual turnover remains the same.

### *Scenario B*

No further research is undertaken and the product continues to be used by the same number of customers. The number of staff and turnover remain the same as in 2013. However, a study is undertaken into the broader benefits of the product that shows that it has increased conviction rates by 20%. It is proven to have played a crucial role in a high-profile criminal case.

### **Impacts on policy**

Research conducted between 2000 and 2010 provided a new way for the UK government to measure income poverty, leading to a measure of persistent poverty being included in the *Child Poverty Act 2010*. The 2014 ICS demonstrated that the research had enriched policymakers' understanding of changes in inequality and provided a framework for the analysis of poverty dynamics.

There is a change in government in 2018 and the new government shows no interest in engaging with new or existing research produced by the research team. However, an independent evaluation of the *Child Poverty Act 2010* finds it made a significant positive difference to the lives of many children in the UK. The report cites the team's research as a determining factor in the success of the Act.

### **Cultural impacts**

#### *A – Different audiences*

Research into Shakespeare led to a collaboration with the National Theatre, culminating in 2013 in the performance of a new play based on his life. The play ran for 8 weeks and attracted an audience of 30,000. The box-office takings were just under £1,000,000. The play was accompanied by a number of workshops for students from underperforming schools and was shown to have increased their interest in, and understanding of, Shakespeare with 60% of them claiming to be more likely to attend a performance of his work in the future.

In 2014, the same production goes on tour around the UK and attracts an audience of 3,000. The box-office takings are £60,000. There are no workshops to accompany the play.

#### *B – Long-term impact*

Research into the positive effects of creative writing on prisoners and ex-offenders led to a partnership with twenty prisons. Over a three-year period (2010-13) around 2,000 prisoners took part in a creative writing project, which included workshops with researchers from the university and self-organised reading groups. The project was shown to have increased the prisoners' self-confidence, with over 70% of participants believing themselves to be more employable after taking part in the programme. Testimonials from prison officers also mentioned a noticeable improvement in behaviour within the prisons.

After 2013, the programme ended and no further workshops were held. In 2017, researchers followed up with the prison officers and a small group of prisoners to evaluate the long-term impacts of the project. It was found that a higher-than-average proportion had found employment and one participant had published a collection of short stories.