This presentation provides an overview of the final guidance for the REF, with a particular focus on the implications for public engagement. This guidance was published in January 2012, following a consultation process.

It summarises the key elements of the assessment framework, and highlights the specific references to public engagement.

It begins by briefly summarising the key changes that have been made to the main panels’ guidance regarding public engagement. There have been a number of small and some more significant changes.
These are the key documents referenced in this presentation

- **HEFCE’s assessment framework.** This was published in July 2012. It provides the over-arching guidance on procedures, the data that will be required, and the criteria and definitions that will apply.
  

- **Panel Criteria and working methods.** This was published in January 2012, and contains the guidance from the four main panels. This guidance was published in draft form in July 2011, and consultation responses were invited. Some small and some significant revisions have been made to the way public engagement is treated by the different panels, which we draw out in this presentation.
This section briefly summarises the key changes made to the panel guidance published in January 2012, with a particular focus on public engagement with research.

KEY CHANGES TO THE PANEL GUIDANCE
There is now more consistency in how each of the panels articulates their guidance on impact.

Panel C now offers a list of possible types of impact, in line with the other panels, and includes significantly more detail in its guidance about impacts arising from public engagement, ‘either as the main impact described or as one facet of a broader range of impacts.’

Panel A adds this reference to its list of examples of impacts on health and welfare:

• ‘Public engagement/involvement in research has improved.’

Panel A adds this clarification to its guidance on public engagement, inviting examples of how PE can inform the focus of the research:

– The activity should go beyond ‘business as usual’ engagement or involvement (for example, there was active involvement of service users and/or the public, the activity informed the focus of the research or created widespread interest, was particularly innovative, or created legacy resources).
Impacts on society, culture and creativity

Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, creative practices and other activity have been influenced

- Public discourse has been stimulated or informed by research.
- Public interest and engagement in science and engineering has been stimulated, including through the enhancement of science and engineering-related education in schools.
- The awareness, attitudes or understanding of (sections of) the public have been informed, and their ability to make informed decisions on issues improved, by engaging them with research.
- The work of an NGO, charitable or other organisation has been influenced by the research.
- Research has contributed to community regeneration.

For case studies claiming impact from public engagement:

- There must be a clear link between the research and the engagement or involvement activity (see ‘guidance on submissions’ paragraph 161c).
- Evidence should be provided about dissemination, as well as a clear explanation about the significance or the benefits to audiences.
- The activity should go beyond ‘business as usual’ engagement or involvement (for example, there was active involvement of service users and/or the public, the activity informed the focus of the research or created widespread interest, was particularly innovative, or created legacy resources).
January 2012

Impacts arising from public engagement activity

81. Public engagement is an activity that may lead to the impact of research. Sub-panels will welcome case studies that include impact achieved in this way, either as the main impact described or as one facet of a broader range of impacts.

82. Case studies which include impacts that derive from engaging the public with research must:
a. At least in part, be based on specific research or a body of research carried out in the submitted unit, and explain clearly which particular aspects of the research underpinned the engagement activity and contributed to the impact claimed.
b. Include evidence of the reach of the impact. This should extend beyond simply providing the numbers of people engaged and may also, for example, include:
   • information about the types of audience
   • whether there was secondary reach, for example from follow-up activity or media coverage
   • other quantitative indicators such as evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources, and/or access to web content.
c. Include evidence of the significance of the impact. This should include a description of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Examples of the evidence that might be provided for this include:
   • evaluation data
   • critical external reviews of the engagement activity
   • evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices
   • user feedback or testimony
   • evidence of sustainability through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes or use of resources.

July 2011: Public engagement activity may often be a part of the chain of activity leading to demonstrable benefit, change or effect, but should not of itself be claimed as impact without evidence of some benefit, change or effect beyond the engagement activity itself.

Panel C significantly increases the detail of the guidance it provides about public engagement. Its guidance now aligns helpfully with Panel B’s
Panel C expands its guidance in ‘evidence of impact’, emphasising ‘reach and significance’ and the importance of a coherent narrative account.

Unlike the other panels, Panel D doesn’t provide a separate headed section about public engagement, but it adds this reference to PE to its definition of impact.

Panel D also adds this explicit guidance about public engagement to its section on ‘evidence of impact’.

In constructing a narrative account in a case study, there are many different types of indicators or evidence which could be used to demonstrate the links in the chain between the underpinning research and impact, and the reach and significance of the impact. No type of evidence is inherently preferred over another; judgements will be based on the extent to which the cited evidence provides a convincing link between the underpinning research and the impact claimed, and convincing evidence of the reach and significance of the impact.

83. Impact takes place through a wide variety of mechanisms. The links between research and its consequences may be direct and causal, or diffuse and non-linear.

It may effect change or enrichment for local, national or international communities, groups or individuals. Consequently public engagement may be an important feature of many case studies, typically as the mechanism by which the impact claimed has been achieved. The sub-panels will take all these factors into account as appropriate when weighing the evidence provided.

Public engagement
- Information about the number and profile of people engaged and types of audience. Follow-up activities or media coverage. Evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources or access to web content.
- Descriptions of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Evaluation data. User feedback or testimony. Critical external reviews of the engagement activity. Evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices, contributions (financial or in-kind) by third parties to enhance services or support for the public, or evidence of funds from third parties to enhance or extend the engagement activity. Evidence of sustainability, through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes, continuing sales, downloads, or use of resources.
All the panels offer a similar framework for assessing impacts arising from engaging the public with research

Cutting across all the panels there is now a consistent and quite coherent framework for approaching the challenge of assessing impact arising from public engagement.

It appears to be closely aligned with the discussion paper we prepared for the panels in 2011: [Discussion paper: Assessing impacts arising from engaging the public with research](www.publicengagement.ac.uk)

One change we had hoped to see was reference to the ‘Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research’, to mirror the Panels’ references to the ‘Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers’. This hasn’t happened.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>11 - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact: reach and significance</td>
<td>Clarifying the two criteria chosen for assessing impact: the ‘reach’ and the ‘significance’ of the impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact: Submission requirements</td>
<td>Units’ impact submissions need to include ‘impact case studies’ and an ‘impact template’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining impact</td>
<td>How impact is defined – in the generic guidance and by the four Main Panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact: types of impact</td>
<td>Each panel breaks down impact into different types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing how the panels exemplify impact</td>
<td>We have attempted to synthesise the panels’ different approaches to categorising impact and to look for the similarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact: Examples and indicators of impact</td>
<td>Each Panel provides examples of impact, linked to the different ‘types’ they identify, and they also provide guidance about what would count as indicators of impact being acheived. This section details the guidance they provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact case study</td>
<td>73-76 The generic guidance provided about the impact case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Impact case study template</td>
<td>77-80 The template provided for the case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The underpinning research</td>
<td>81- 84 How each panel clarifies their expectations about the quality of the underpinning research featured in impact case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact template</td>
<td>85 - 89 What each UoA needs to include in its ‘impact template’ – its account of how it has ‘supported and enabled’ impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public engagement and impact</td>
<td>90 - 93 A summary of each panel’s guidance about public engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section outlines the key elements of the impact assessment framework, as laid out in the ‘Assessment Framework and guidance on submissions’ published in July 2011.
This document sets out the general framework for assessment in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) and provides guidance to UK higher education institutions about making submissions to the 2014 REF. It includes guidance on procedures, the data that will be required, and the criteria and definitions that will apply. The deadline for submissions is 29 November 2013.

It outlines the aspects of the REF assessment framework that are standard to all four panels. Slides that detail this generic guidance carry this label in the top right hand corner:
25. The sub-panels will assess three distinct elements of each submission, against the following generic criteria:

a. **Outputs:** The sub-panels will assess the quality of submitted research outputs in terms of their ‘originality, significance and rigour’, with reference to international research quality standards. This element will carry a weighting of **65 per cent** in the overall outcome awarded to each submission.

b. **Impact:** The sub-panels will assess the ‘reach and significance’ of impacts on the economy, society and/or culture that were underpinned by excellent research conducted in the submitted unit, as well as the submitted unit’s approach to enabling impact from its research. This element will carry a weighting of **20 per cent**.

c. **Environment:** The sub-panels will assess the research environment in terms of its ‘vitality and sustainability’, including its contribution to the vitality and sustainability of the wider discipline or research base. This element will carry a weighting of **15 per cent**.
Annex C Definition of research for the REF

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

2. It includes work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce, industry, 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.

3. It includes research that is published, disseminated or made publicly available in the form of assessable research outputs, and confidential reports (as defined at paragraph 115 in Part 3, Section 2).
## The overall quality profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four star</strong></td>
<td>Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three star</strong></td>
<td>Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two star</strong></td>
<td>Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One star</strong></td>
<td>Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclassified</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The criteria for assessing the outputs are: **originality, significance and rigour**.

### The outputs sub profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four star</strong></td>
<td>Quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three star</strong></td>
<td>Quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two star</strong></td>
<td>Quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One star</strong></td>
<td>Quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclassified</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The impact sub profile

The criteria for assessing impacts are ‘reach’ and ‘significance’:

- In assessing the impact described within a case study, the panel will form an overall view about its ‘reach and significance’ taken as a whole, rather than assess ‘reach and significance’ separately.
- In assessing the impact template (REF3a) the panel will consider the extent to which the unit’s approach described in the template is conducive to achieving impacts of ‘reach and significance’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four star</strong></td>
<td>Outstanding impacts in terms of their reach and significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three star</strong></td>
<td>Very considerable impacts in terms of their reach and significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two star</strong></td>
<td>Considerable impacts in terms of their reach and significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One star</strong></td>
<td>Recognised but modest impacts in terms of their reach and significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclassified</strong></td>
<td>The impact is of little or no reach and significance; or the impact was not eligible; or the impact was not underpinned by excellent research produced by the submitted unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The environment sub profile

The research environment will be assessed in terms of its ‘vitality and sustainability’. Panels will consider both the ‘vitality and sustainability’ of the submitted unit, and its contribution to the ‘vitality and sustainability’ of the wider research base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Star Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four star</strong></td>
<td>An environment that is conducive to producing research of world-leading quality, in terms of its vitality and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three star</strong></td>
<td>An environment that is conducive to producing research of internationally excellent quality, in terms of its vitality and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two star</strong></td>
<td>An environment that is conducive to producing research of internationally recognised quality, in terms of its vitality and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One star</strong></td>
<td>An environment that is conducive to producing research of nationally recognised quality, in terms of its vitality and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclassified</strong></td>
<td>An environment that is not conducive to producing research of nationally recognised quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Timetable

44. The timetable for the 2014 REF is as follows, and is repeated at Annex E:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Publication of ‘Initial decisions’ by the funding bodies on the conduct of the REF (HEFCE Circular letter 04/2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>Publication of ‘Units of assessment and recruitment of expert panels’ (REF 01.2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>Publication of reports on the REF impact pilot exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td>Panel membership announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Publication of ‘Decisions on assessing research impact’ (REF 01.2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>Publication of ‘Assessment framework and guidance on submissions’ (REF 02.2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End July 2011</td>
<td>Publication of draft panel criteria and working methods for consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 October 2011</td>
<td>Close of consultation on draft panel criteria and working methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>Publication of panel criteria and working methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July 2012</td>
<td>Institutions intending to make submissions to the REF submit their codes of practice on the selection of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2012</td>
<td>Pilot of the REF submissions system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>Invitation to HEIs to make submissions; invitation to request multiple submissions; and start of survey of submissions intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2012</td>
<td>Survey of submissions intentions complete and deadline for requests for multiple submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>Launch of submissions systems and accompanying technical guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July 2013</td>
<td>End of assessment period (for research impacts, the research environment, and data about research income and research doctoral degrees awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td>Appointment of additional assessors to panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 October 2013</td>
<td>Census date for staff eligible for selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 November 2013</td>
<td>Closing date for submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 December 2013</td>
<td>End of publication period (cut-off point for publication of research outputs, and for outputs underpinning impact case studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout 2014</td>
<td>Panels assess submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Publication of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>Publication of submissions, panel overview reports and sub-profiles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The four main panels

Panel A

Main Panel A covers the following sub-panels:
1 Clinical Medicine
2 Public Health, Health Services and Primary Care
3 Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy
4 Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience
5 Biological Sciences
6 Agriculture, Veterinary and Food Science

Panel B

Main Panel B covers the following sub-panels:
7 Earth Systems and Environmental Sciences
8 Chemistry
9 Physics
10 Mathematical Sciences
11 Computer Science and Informatics
12 Aeronautical, Mechanical, Chemical and Manufacturing Engineering
13 Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Metallurgy and Materials
14 Civil and Construction Engineering
15 General Engineering

Panel C

Main Panel C covers the following sub-panels:
16 Architecture, Built Environment and Planning
17 Geography, Environmental Studies and Archaeology
18 Economics and Econometrics
19 Business and Management Studies
20 Law
21 Politics and International Studies
22 Social Work and Social Policy
23 Sociology
24 Anthropology and Development Studies
25 Education
26 Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism

Panel D

Main Panel D covers the following sub-panels:
27 Area Studies
28 Modern Languages and Linguistics
29 English Language and Literature
30 History
31 Classics
32 Philosophy
33 Theology and Religious Studies
34 Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory
35 Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts
36 Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management
The four main panels

Each of the main panels interprets the guidance in subtly different ways. Throughout this presentation, we show how the four panels interpret different aspects of the framework. We include an appendix which shows how their guidance has changed as a result of the consultation, with changes highlighted in red.

Some slides place all four panels’ guidance side by side, indicated by this label:

Others detail the guidance of individual panels:

Information about the different panels is colour-coded to make it easier to locate.

Generic guidance is coded green:
There are two key dimensions to the assessment of Impact: reach and significance

**IMPACT: REACH AND SIGNIFICANCE**
The criteria for assessing impacts are ‘reach’ and ‘significance’:

- In assessing the impact described within a case study, the panel will form an overall view about its ‘reach and significance’ taken as a whole, rather than assess ‘reach and significance’ separately.
- In assessing the impact template (REF3a) the panel will consider the extent to which the unit’s approach described in the template is conducive to achieving impacts of ‘reach and significance’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four star</th>
<th>Outstanding impacts in terms of their reach and significance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three star</td>
<td>Very considerable impacts in terms of their reach and significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two star</td>
<td>Considerable impacts in terms of their reach and significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One star</td>
<td>Recognised but modest impacts in terms of their reach and significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>The impact is of little or no reach and significance; or the impact was not eligible; or the impact was not underpinned by excellent research produced by the submitted unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The guidance says surprisingly little about ‘reach and significance’. This table is included in Annex A, with a clarification about reach. There is no definition of what is meant by reach and significance. The pilot guidance offered the following:

Our initial view is that there are two key criteria for assessing the extent of the impacts: their ‘reach’ (how widely the impact has been felt) and ‘significance’ (how much difference was made to the beneficiaries).

Each of the main panels provide their own slightly different definitions of reach and significance, listed on the next slide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A3: Impact sub-profile: Criteria and definitions of starred levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The criteria for assessing impacts are ‘reach and significance’:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In assessing the impact described within a case study, the panel will form an overall view about its ‘reach and significance’ taken as a whole, rather than assess ‘reach and significance’ separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In assessing the impact template (REF3a) the panel will consider the extent to which the unit’s approach described in the template is conducive to achieving impacts of ‘reach and significance’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Four star | Outstanding impacts in terms of their reach and significance. |
| Three star | Very considerable impacts in terms of their reach and significance. |
| Two star | Considerable impacts in terms of their reach and significance. |
| One star | Recognised but modest impacts in terms of their reach and significance. |
| Unclassified | The impact is of little or no reach and significance; or the impact was not eligible; or the impact was not underpinned by excellent research produced by the submitted unit. |

The criterion of ‘reach’ for impacts does not refer specifically to a geographic scale. Sub-panels will consider a number of dimensions to the ‘reach’ of impacts as appropriate to the nature of the research and its impacts. For example, an impact located within one region of the UK might be judged as ‘outstanding’ (graded as four star). Equally, an impact with international reach might not be judged as ‘outstanding’, ‘very considerable’ or ‘considerable’. (p.44)
Each main panel defines ‘reach’ and ‘significance’ slightly differently in their guidance. There are no changes from their draft guidance, except for Panel A dropping dates from their definition of ‘significance’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main panel A</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the spread or breadth of influence or effect on the relevant constituencies.</td>
<td>the intensity of the influence or effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main panel B</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the extent and breadth of the beneficiaries of the impact.</td>
<td>the degree to which the impact has enabled, enriched, influenced, informed or changed the products, services, performance, practices, policies or understanding of commerce, industry or other organisations, governments, communities or individuals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main panel C</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the extent and diversity of the communities, environments, individuals, organisations or any other beneficiaries that have benefitted or been affected.</td>
<td>the degree to which the impact has enriched, influenced, informed or changed policies, opportunities, perspectives or practices of communities, individuals or organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main panel D</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent and/or diversity of the organisations, communities and/or individuals who have benefitted from the impact.</td>
<td>The degree to which the impact enriched, influenced, informed or changed the policies, practices, understanding and awareness of organisations, communities and/or individuals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT: SUBMISSION

REQUIREMENTS
The framework document clarifies what each UOA will need to submit – case studies plus an ‘impact template’

Submission requirements for impact

146. The REF aims to assess the impact of excellent research undertaken within each submitted unit. This will be evidenced by specific examples of impacts that have been underpinned by research undertaken within the unit over a period of time, and by the submitted unit’s general approach to enabling impact from its research. The focus of the assessment is the impact of the submitted unit’s research, not the impact of individuals or individual research outputs, although they may contribute to the evidence of the submitted unit’s impact.

147. Each submission must include:
   a. **A completed impact template (REF3a):** describing the submitted unit’s approach, during the assessment period (1 January 2008 to 31 July 2013), to enabling impact from its research.
   b. **Impact case studies (REF3b):** describing specific impacts that have occurred during the assessment period (1 January 2008 to 31 July 2013) that were underpinned by excellent research undertaken in the submitted unit. The underpinning research must have been produced by the submitting HEI during the period 1 January 1993 to 31 December 2013.

148. Panels will assess all the evidence provided in the completed impact template (REF3a) and the submitted case studies (REF3b), and will initially form an impact sub-profile for each submission by attributing a weighting of 20 per cent to the impact template (REF3a) and 80 per cent to the case studies (REF3b). Panels will apply their expert judgment based on all the information provided in the impact template and case studies, before confirming the impact sub-profiles.

*Note the emphasis on the assessment of the impact of the unit’s research as a whole – not of individuals: the impact template will be key to framing the case studies and to providing that overview.*
DEFINING IMPACT
Part 3 Section 3: Impact template and case studies (REF3a/b)

Definition of impact for the REF

140. For the purposes of the REF, impact is defined as an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia (as set out in paragraph 143).

141. Impact includes, but is not limited to, an effect on, change or benefit to:
   - the activity, attitude, awareness, behaviour, capacity, opportunity, performance, policy, practice, process or understanding
   - of an audience, beneficiary, community, constituency, organisation or individuals
   - in any geographic location whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.

142. Impact includes the reduction or prevention of harm, risk, cost or other negative effects.

143. For the purposes of the impact element of the REF:
   a. Impacts on research or the advancement of academic knowledge within the higher education sector (whether in the UK or internationally) are excluded. (The submitted unit’s contribution to academic research and knowledge is assessed within the ‘outputs’ and ‘environment’ elements of REF.)
   b. Impacts on students, teaching or other activities within the submitting HEI are excluded.
   c. Other impacts within the higher education sector, including on teaching or students, are included where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI.

144. Impacts will be assessed in terms of their reach and significance regardless of the geographic location in which they occurred, whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally. The UK funding bodies expect that many impacts will contribute to the economy, society and culture within the UK, but equally value the international contribution of UK research.

145. The REF panels will provide further guidance in relation to the kinds of impact that they would anticipate from research in their UOAs; this guidance will not be restrictive, and any impact that meets the general definition at Annex C will be eligible.
ANNEX C

Definition of impact for the REF

4. For the purposes of the REF, impact is defined as an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia (as set out in paragraph 7).

5. Impact includes, but is not limited to, an effect on, change or benefit to:
   • the activity, attitude, awareness, behaviour, capacity, opportunity, performance, policy, practice, process or understanding
   • of an audience, beneficiary, community, constituency, organisation or individuals
   • in any geographic location whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.

6. Impact includes the reduction or prevention of harm, risk, cost or other negative effects.

7. For the purposes of the impact element of the REF:
   a. Impacts on research or the advancement of academic knowledge within the higher education sector (whether in the UK or internationally) are excluded. (The submitted unit’s contribution to academic research and knowledge is assessed within the ‘outputs’ and ‘environment’ elements of REF.)
   b. Impacts on students, teaching or other activities within the submitting HEI are excluded.
   c. Other impacts within the higher education sector, including on teaching or students, are included where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI.

Each of the main panels go on to interpret impact in subtly different ways
## Comparing the four panels’ definitions of impact

The final paragraph of Panel D’s definition contains an important new reference to public engagement.

---

### PANEL A

62. The impact of research within Main Panel A is broad. The main panel welcomes case studies which describe impacts that have provided benefits to one or more areas of the economy, society, culture, public policy and services, health, production, environment, international development or quality of life, whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.

63. Impacts can be manifested in a wide variety of ways including, but not limited to: the many types of beneficiary (individuals, organisations, communities, regions and other entities); impacts on products, processes, behaviours, policies, practices; and avoidance of harm or the waste of resources. Examples are provided in Table A1 as a guide to the range of potential impacts that may be eligible as case studies. The list is not exhaustive or exclusive, and does not rank examples in any way. The main panel acknowledges that within its remit impact may take many forms and occur in a wide range of spheres, and the sub-panels will consider any impact that meets the general definition of impact given in ‘guidance on submissions’ (Annex C).

---

### PANEL B

71. The main panel welcomes case studies describing impacts that have provided benefits to one or more areas of culture, the economy, the environment, health, public policy and services, quality of life, or society, whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.

72. A single body of research work may underpin impact which provides benefits in more than one area. An impact case study may therefore describe more than one type of impact arising from such bodies of work; for example, a new drug can generate both health and economic impact, and a new energy technology can generate both environmental and economic impact.

---

### PANEL C

The main panel also acknowledges that there are multiple ways of achieving impact. Impact may arise from individual research projects or from collaborations within or between a range of organisations, within higher education and beyond. The resultant impact may be achieved by a variety of possible models: from individuals, to inter-institutional groups, to groups including both academic and non-academic participants. The relationship between research and impact may be neither direct nor linear. The main panel has determined that no one model or relationship will be considered intrinsically preferable, and each impact case study will be assessed on its own merits.

The main panel acknowledges that impact within its remit may take many forms and occur in a wide range of spheres. These may include (but are not restricted to): creativity, culture and society; the economy, commerce or organisations; the environment; health and welfare; practitioners and professional services; public policy, law and services. The categories used to define spheres of impact, for the purpose of this document, inevitably overlap and should not be taken as restrictive. Case studies may describe impacts which have affected more than one sphere. Impact of any type may be local, regional, national or international, in any part of the world. The beneficiaries of impact may include (but are not restricted to) community/ies, the environment, individuals and organisations. The panel will treat all forms and spheres of impact and any beneficiaries described on an equal basis, assessing them according to the generic REF criteria of reach and significance.

The main panel particularly acknowledges that there may be impacts arising from research within Main Panel C disciplines which take forms such as holding public or private bodies to account or subjecting proposed changes in society, public policy, business practices, and so on to public scrutiny. Such holding to account or public scrutiny may have had the effect of a proposed change not taking place; there may be circumstances in which this of itself is claimed as impact. There may also be examples of research findings having been communicated to, but not necessarily acted upon, by the intended audience, but which nevertheless make a contribution to critical public debate around policy, social or business issues. The main panel also recognises that research findings may generate critique or dissent, which itself leads to impact(s). For example, research may find that a government approach to a particular social or economic issue is not delivering its objectives, which leads to the approach being questioned or modified.

---

### PANEL D

83. Research across the arts and humanities (understood in their broadest definition) has consequences for individuals and groups in the UK and internationally, challenging imaginations and enriching lives economically, culturally, spiritually and educationally. The impact of such research is powerful, pervasive and ubiquitous, influencing civil society and the quality of life. Impact may be the result of individual or collective research (or a combination of these), including collaboration with researchers beyond the UK. The impact of research may be foreseen or unforeseen. It can emerge as an end product, but can also be demonstrated during the research process.

Impact takes place through a wide variety of mechanisms. The links between research and its consequences may be direct and causal, or diffuse and non-linear.

It may effect change or enrichment for local, national or international communities, groups or individuals. Consequently public engagement may be an important feature of many case studies, typically as the mechanism by which the impact claimed has been achieved. The sub-panels will take all these factors into account as appropriate when weighing the evidence provided.
How each panel ‘frames’ impact

Panel A

The main panel welcomes case studies which describe impacts that have provided benefits to one or more areas of the economy, society, culture, public policy and services, health, production, environment, international development or quality of life, whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.

Panel B

The main panel welcomes case studies describing impacts that have provided benefits to one or more areas of culture, the economy, the environment, health, public policy and services, quality of life, or society, whether locally, regionally, nationally or internationally.

Panel C

The main panel acknowledges that impact within its remit may take many forms and occur in a wide range of spheres. These may include (but are not restricted to): creativity, culture and society; the economy, commerce or organisations; the environment; health and welfare; practitioners and professional services; public policy, law and services. The categories used to define spheres of impact, for the purpose of this document, inevitably overlap and should not be taken as restrictive. Case studies may describe impacts which have affected more than one sphere. Impact of any type may be local, regional, national or international, in any part of the world. The beneficiaries of impact may include (but are not restricted to) community/ies, the environment, individuals and organisations. The panel will treat all forms and spheres of impact and any beneficiaries described on an equal basis, assessing them according to the generic REF criteria of reach and significance.

Panel D

Research across the arts and humanities has consequences for individuals and groups in the UK and internationally, challenging imaginations and enriching lives economically, culturally, spiritually and educationally. The impact of such research is powerful, pervasive and ubiquitous, influencing civil society and the quality of life.

Panels A and B have almost identical definitions, limiting themselves to the areas of society that might be affected. Panel C provides a more extensive ‘palate’, but follows the same approach of defining the areas of society that might be affected. Panel D offers a different approach, stepping back to frame impact in the arts and humanities in terms of its higher purposes (‘challenging imaginations and enriching lives’)
Impacts can be manifested in a wide variety of ways including, but not limited to:

- the many **types of beneficiary** (individuals, organisations, communities, regions and other entities);
- impacts on **products, processes, behaviours, policies, practices**;
- and **avoidance of harm** or the waste of resources.

A single body of research work may underpin impact which provides benefits in more than one area. An impact case study may therefore describe more than one type of impact arising from such bodies of work; for example, a new drug can generate both health and economic impact, and a new energy technology can generate both environmental and economic impact.

Impact may be the result of individual or collective research (or a combination of these), including collaboration with researchers beyond the UK. The impact of research may be foreseen or unforeseen. It can emerge as an end product, but can also be demonstrated during the research process.

Impact takes place through a wide variety of mechanisms. The links between research and its consequences may be direct and causal, or diffuse and non-linear. It may effect change or enrichment for local, national or international communities, groups or individuals. Consequently public engagement may be an important feature of many case studies, typically as the mechanism by which the impact claimed has been achieved.
The main panel particularly acknowledges that there may be impacts arising from research within Main Panel C disciplines which take forms such as holding public or private bodies to account or subjecting proposed changes in society, public policy, business practices, and so on to public scrutiny. Such holding to account or public scrutiny may have had the effect of a proposed change not taking place; there may be circumstances in which this of itself is claimed as impact. There may also be examples of research findings having been communicated to, but not necessarily acted upon, by the intended audience, but which nevertheless make a contribution to critical public debate around policy, social or business issues. The main panel also recognises that research findings may generate critique or dissent, which itself leads to impact(s). For example, research may find that a government approach to a particular social or economic issue is not delivering its objectives, which leads to the approach being questioned or modified.
Each panel provides types and examples of impact – each stressing these are not meant to be restrictive. There are some subtle changes from the guidance published in July 2011 to A, B and D and a big change for C – which now provides a list of types of impact, whereas it chose not to before

**IMPACT: TYPES OF IMPACT**
Since the REF constitutes a new research assessment process, the main panel recognises that institutions will be considering how to ensure that they prepare case studies which represent their strongest extra-academic impacts. In drawing up its assessment criteria and the advice to submitting institutions, the main panel agreed that providing HEIs with detailed lists of impacts and evidence and/or indicators for those impacts would be unhelpful because these could appear prescriptive or limiting.

It wishes to encourage the submission (across the REF as a whole) of a wide range of types of change, benefit or effect outside academia, as evidence of the strength and diversity of the impact of research from Main Panel C disciplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts on creativity, culture and society:</strong> Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, practices, rights or duties have been influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic, commercial, organisational impacts:</strong> Impacts where the beneficiaries may include new or established businesses, or other types of organisation undertaking activities which create wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts on the environment:</strong> Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural, historic and/or built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and welfare impacts:</strong> Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (human or animal) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or harm mitigated) or whose rights or interests have been protected or advocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts on practitioners and professional services:</strong> Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts on public policy, law and services:</strong> Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society through the implementation or non-implementation of policies, systems or reforms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel C sees the biggest changes: it now provides a list of examples, which it didn’t do previously.
### Main panel A

**Economic impacts:** Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually the NHS or private health care or agricultural activity

**Commercial impacts:** Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually companies, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that may create wealth

**Impacts on public policy and services:** Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector, and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society, through the implementation of policies

**Impacts on society, culture and creativity:** Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours or practices have been influenced

**Production impacts:** Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced

**Health and welfare impacts:** Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (both human and animals) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated)

**Impacts on practitioners and services:** Impacts where beneficiaries are organisations or individuals, including service users involved in the development of and delivery of professional services

**Impacts on the environment:** Impacts where the key beneficiary is the natural or built environment

**Impacts on international development:** Impacts where the beneficiaries are international bodies, countries, governments or communities

### Main panel B

**Economic impacts** Impacts where the beneficiaries may include businesses, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that may create wealth

**Impacts on public policy and services** Impacts where the beneficiaries may include government, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), charities and public sector organisations and society, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society

**Impacts on society, culture and creativity** Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, practices, rights or duties have been influenced

**Production impacts** Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced

**Health and welfare impacts** Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals (including groups of individuals) whose health outcomes have been improved or whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated) through the application of enhanced healthcare for individuals or public health activities

**Impacts on practitioners and services** Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development of and delivery of professional services

**Impacts on the environment** Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural environment and/or the built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result

### Main panel C

**Economic, commercial, organisational impacts** Impacts where the beneficiaries may include new or established businesses, or other types of organisation undertaking activities which create wealth

**Impacts on public policy, law and services** Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society through the implementation or non-implementation of policies, systems or reforms

**Impacts on creativity, culture and society** Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, practices, rights or duties have been influenced

**Impacts on society, culture and creativity** Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, practices, rights or duties have been influenced

**Production impacts** Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced

**Health and welfare impacts** Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (human or animal) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or harm mitigated) or whose rights or interests have been protected or advocated

**Impacts on practitioners and professional services** Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services and ethics

**Impacts on the environment** Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural, historic and/or built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result

### Main panel D

**Economic prosperity** Applying and transferring the insights and knowledge gained from research to create wealth in the manufacturing, service, creative and cultural sectors.

**Policy making** Influencing policy debate and practice through informed interventions relating to any aspect of human or animal well-being

**Public services** Contributing to the development and delivery of public services or legislation to support the welfare, education, understanding or empowerment of diverse individuals and groups in society, including the disadvantaged or marginalised.

**Civil society** Influencing the form and content of associations between people or groups to illuminate and challenge cultural values and social assumptions.

**Cultural life** Creating and interpreting cultural capital in all of its forms to enrich and expand the lives, imaginations and sensibilities of individuals and groups.

**Public discourse** Extending the range and improving the quality of evidence, argument and expression to enhance public understanding of the major issues and challenges faced by individuals and society.

**Education** Influencing the form or the content of the education of any age group in any part of the world where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI.

---

**SUMMARY OF TYPES OF IMPACT: JANUARY 2012**
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COMPARING HOW THE PANELS EXEMPLIFY IMPACT
Comparing the examples of impact given by the panels

A Impacts on society, culture and creativity:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours or practices have been influenced

B Impacts on society, culture and creativity
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, creative practices and other activity have been influenced

C Impacts on creativity, culture and society:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, practices, rights or duties have been influenced

A Economic impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually the NHS or private health care or agricultural activity

B Economic impacts
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include businesses, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that may create wealth

C Economic, commercial, organisational impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include new or established businesses, or other types of organisation undertaking activities which create wealth

A Commercial impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually companies, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that creates wealth

A Impacts on public policy and services:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector, and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society, through the implementation or non-implementation of policies, systems or reforms

B Impacts on public policy and services
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include government, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), charities and public sector organisations and society, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society

C Impacts on public policy, law and services:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society through the implementation of policies

A Impacts on practitioners and services:
Impacts where beneficiaries are organisations or individuals, including service users involved in the development of and delivery of professional services

B Impacts on practitioners and professional services
Impacts where beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services and ethics

C Impacts on practitioners and professional services:
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services and ethics

A Production impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced

B Production impacts
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced or potential harm mitigated

C Production impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced or potential harm mitigated

A Health and welfare impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (both human and animals) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated)

B Health impacts
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals (including groups of individuals) whose health outcomes have been improved or whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated) through the application of enhanced healthcare for individuals or public health activities

C Health and welfare impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (human or animal) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or harm mitigated) or whose rights or interests have been protected or advocated

A Impacts on the environment:
Impacts where the key beneficiary is the natural or built environment

B Impacts on the environment
Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural environment and/or the built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result

C Impacts on the environment:
Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural, historic and/or built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result

A Impacts on international development:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are international bodies, countries, governments or communities

B Impacts on international development
Impacts where the beneficiaries are international bodies, countries, communities or organisations who benefit as a result

C Impacts on international development:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are international bodies, countries, governments or communities who benefit as a result

It is easy to map Panels A-C together as they take a very similar approach: describing the impacts in terms of the beneficiaries/domains in which impact might be realised
Comparing the examples of impact given by the panels

**D Public discourse** Extending the range and improving the quality of evidence, argument and expression to enhance public understanding of the major issues and challenges faced by individuals and society.

**D Cultural life** Creating and interpreting cultural capital in all of its forms to enrich and expand the lives, imaginations and sensibilities of individuals and groups.

**D Education** Influencing the form or the content of the education of any age group in any part of the world where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI.

**D Economic prosperity** Applying and transferring the insights and knowledge gained from research to create wealth in the manufacturing, service, creative and cultural sectors.

**D Public services** Contributing to the development and delivery of public services or legislation to support the welfare, education, understanding or empowerment of diverse individuals and groups in society, including the disadvantaged or marginalised.

**D Policy making** Influencing policy debate and practice through informed interventions relating to any aspect of human or animal well-being.

Panel D’s approach is different. They map impacts in terms of the kinds of outcomes that might be achieved.

It is possible to ‘overlay’ Panel D’s definitions, as the next three slides show.

[www.publicengagement.ac.uk](http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk)
Comparing the examples of impact given by the panels

Panels A - C

A Economic impacts
Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually the NHS or private health care or agricultural activity

B Economic impacts
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include businesses, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that creates wealth

A Economic, commercial, organisational impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include new or established businesses, or other types of organisation undertaking activities which create wealth

B Economic, commercial, organisational impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include businesses, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that may create wealth

A Impact on public policy and services
Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector, and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society, through the implementation of policies

B Impact on public policy and services
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include government, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), charities and public sector organisations and society, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society

C Impact on public policy, law and services:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society through the implementation or non-implementation of policies, systems or reforms

A Impact on practices and services
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services and ethics

B Impact on practitioners and professional services
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services

C Impact on practitioners and professional services:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are organisations or individuals involved in the development and delivery of professional services

A Health and welfare impacts
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (both human and animals) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated)

B Health impacts
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals (including groups of individuals) whose health outcomes have been improved or whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated) through the application of enhanced healthcare for individuals or public health activities

C Health and welfare impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (human or animal) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or harm mitigated) or whose rights or interests have been protected or advocated

A Impact on the environment
Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural environment and/or the built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result

B Impact on the environment
Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural, historic and/or built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result

C Impact on the environment:
Impacts where the key beneficiaries are international bodies, countries, governments or communities

A Impact on international development
Impacts where the beneficiaries are international bodies, countries, governments or communities

B Impact on practitioners and professional services
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services

C Impact on practitioners and professional services:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are organisations or individuals involved in the development and delivery of professional services

A Production impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced
### Impact domains

| A Impacts on society, culture and creativity: Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours or practices have been influenced | B Impacts on society, culture and creativity Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, creative practices and other activity have been influenced |
| C Impacts on creativity, culture and society: Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, practices, rights or duties have been influenced | D Civil society Influencing the form and content of associations between people or groups to illuminate and challenge cultural values and social assumptions. |
| D Public discourse Extending the range and improving the quality of evidence, argument and expression to enhance public understanding of the major issues and challenges faced by individuals and society. | D Cultural life Creating and interpreting cultural capital in all of its forms to enrich and expand the lives, imaginations and sensibilities of individuals and groups. |

### Culture and society

| A Health and welfare impacts: Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (both human and animals) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated) | B Health impacts Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals (including groups of individuals) whose health outcomes have been improved or whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated) through the application of enhanced healthcare for individuals or public health activities |
| C Health and welfare impacts: Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (human or animal) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or harm mitigated) or whose rights or interests have been protected or advocated | |

### Health and welfare

| A Economic and commercial impacts: Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually companies, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that may create wealth | B Economic impacts Impacts where the beneficiaries may include businesses, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that may create wealth |
| C Economic, commercial, organisational impacts: Impacts where the beneficiaries may include new or established businesses, or other types of organisation undertaking activities which create wealth | |

### Economic and commercial

| A Production impacts: Impacts where the beneficiaries are organisations or individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced | B Impacts on practitioners and professional services Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services and ethics |
| A Impacts on practitioners and services: Impacts where beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and delivery of professional services | C Impacts on practitioners and professional services: Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and delivery of professional services |

### Practitioners and services

| A Impacts on international development: Impacts where the beneficiaries are international bodies, countries, governments or communities | B Impacts on the environment Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural environment and/or the built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result |
| C Impacts on the environment: Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural, historic and/or built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result | |

### Environment

| A Impacts on public policy and services: Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector, and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society, through the implementation of policies | B Impacts on public policy and services Impacts where the beneficiaries may include government, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), charities and public sector organisations and society, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society |
| C Impacts on public policy, law and services: Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society through the implementation of policies, systems or reforms | D Policy making Influencing policy debate and practice through informed interventions relating to any aspect of human or animal well-being |
| D Education Influencing the form or the content of the education of any age group in any part of the world where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI. | |

### Public policy and services
For each of the ‘types’ of impact listed, the panels also provide specific examples of what impact might look like in practice, and then go on to suggest ‘indicators’ which count as evidence. There are some significant differences in how each panel has approached this

IMPACT: EXAMPLES AND INDICATORS OF IMPACT
Examples and indicators of impact

PANEL A
Panel A Types and examples of impact (1)

**Impacts on commerce:**
*Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually companies, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that creates wealth*
- A spin-out or new business has been created and established its viability by generating revenue or profits.
- Industry (including overseas industry) has invested in research and development.
- The performance of an existing business has been improved.
- A business or sector has adopted a new technology or process.
- The strategy, operations or management practices of a business have changed.
- A new product or service is in production or has been commercialised.
- Highly skilled people have taken up specialist roles (including academic consultancy) in companies or other organisations.
- Jobs have been created or protected.
- Social enterprise initiatives have been created.

**Impacts on the economy:**
*Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually the NHS, private healthcare, or agriculture*
- Policies have been introduced which have had an impact on economic growth or incentivising productivity.
- The costs of treatment or healthcare have changed as a result of research-led changes in practice.
- Gains in productivity have been realised as a result of research-led changes in practice.
- The roles and/or incentives for health professionals and organisations have changed, resulting in improved service delivery.

**Impacts on public policy and services:**
*Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector, and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society, through the implementation of policies*
- Policy debate has been stimulated or moved forward by research evidence.
- Policy decisions or changes to legislation, regulations or guidelines have been informed by research evidence.
- The implementation of a policy (for example, health, environment or agricultural policy) or the delivery of a public service has changed.
- A new technology or process has been adopted.
- The quality, accessibility, acceptability or cost-effectiveness of a public service has been improved.
- The public has benefitted from public service improvements.
- Control measures for infections have improved.

**Impacts on society, culture and creativity:**
*Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours or practices have been influenced*
- Public understanding has improved.
- Public debate has been stimulated or informed by research.
- Changes to social policy have been informed by research.
- Changes to social policy have led to improved social welfare, equality or social inclusion.
Panel A Types and examples of impact (2)

Impacts on health and welfare:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (both human and animals) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated)
- Outcomes for patients or related groups have improved.
- Public health and well-being has improved.
- A new clinical or lifestyle intervention (for example, drug, diet, treatment or therapy) has been developed, trialled with patients, related or other groups (for example, prisoners, community samples), and definitive (positive or negative) outcome demonstrated.
- A new diagnostic or clinical technology has been adopted.
- Disease prevention or markers of health have been enhanced by research.
- Animal health and welfare has been enhanced by research.
- Care and educational practices have changed.
- Clinical, dietary or healthcare guidelines have changed.
- Healthcare training guidelines have changed.
- Decisions by a health service or regulatory authority have been informed by research.
- Public awareness of a health risk or benefit has been raised.
- Public engagement/involvement in research has improved.
- Public behaviour has changed.
- The user experience has improved.
- Animal health and welfare has been enhanced by research.
- The control of diseases has changed.

Impacts on production:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced
- Production, yields or quality have increased or level of waste has been reduced.
- Decisions by regulatory authorities have been influenced by research.
- Costs of production, including food, have been reduced.
- Husbandry methods have changed.
- Management practices in production businesses have changed.

Impacts on practitioners and services:
Impacts where beneficiaries are organisations or individuals, including service users involved in the development of and delivery of professional services
- Professional standards, guidelines or training have been influenced by research.
- Practitioners/professionals have used research findings in conducting their work.
- The quality or efficiency of a professional service has improved.
- Work force planning has been influenced by research.
- Forensic methods have been influenced by research.
- Educational or pedagogical practices and methods have changed outside of the submitting unit.
- Law enforcement and security practices have changed.

Impacts on the environment:
Impacts where the key beneficiary is the natural or built environment
- Policy debate on climate change or the environment has been influenced by research.
- Environmental policy decisions have been influenced by research evidence.
- Planning decisions have been informed by research.
- The management or conservation of natural resources has changed.
- The management of an environmental risk or hazard has changed.

Impacts on international development:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are international bodies, countries, governments or communities
- International policy development has been influenced by research.
- International agencies or institutions have been influenced by research.
- Quality of life in a developing country has improved.
Each case study must include evidence appropriate to the type(s) of impact that supports the claims, including who or what has benefitted, been influenced or acted upon. Relevant indicators of the extent of the impact, in terms of its reach and significance, should also be included. Evidence and indicators may take many different forms depending on the type of impact.

The sub-panels within Main Panel A recommend that institutions refer to the following list of characteristics when preparing case studies:

• All the material required to make a judgment should be included – no further reading should be required.
• There should be a clear definition of who the non-academic beneficiaries were, or what had changed as a result of the research.
• The narrative should be coherent, clearly explaining the relationship between the research and the impact, and the nature of the changes or benefits arising.
• Indicators used should be meaningful, contextualised and precise in support of the case study, and the evidence should be focused and concise.
• Supporting evidence and claims should be capable of verification.
• There should be a brief explanation of what is original or distinctive about the research insights that contributed to the impact.
• The case study should include details of the names of researchers, their position in the institution, and the dates and locations of the research activity.
• Specific and appropriate independent sources of corroborating information should be supplied.
• Where the research was carried out in collaboration with other institutions, or was part of a wider body of research, this should be acknowledged and the specific input of the submitting unit’s research clearly stated.
• For case studies claiming impact from public engagement:
  • There must be a clear link between the research and the engagement or involvement activity (see ‘guidance on submissions’ paragraph 161c).
  • Evidence should be provided about dissemination, as well as a clear explanation about the significance or the benefits to audiences.
  • The activity should go beyond ‘business as usual’ engagement or involvement (for example, there was active involvement of service users and/or the public, the activity informed the focus of the research or created widespread interest, was particularly innovative, or created legacy resources).

The list of examples in Table A2 provides a guide to potential evidence or indicators that may be most relevant to the type of impact claimed; however, it is not intended to be exhaustive or rank any indicators in any way. Some indicators may be relevant to more than one type of impact.

The main panel will consider any appropriate evidence that is verifiable. Wherever possible, quantitative indicators should be included. Verifiable sources for key evidence and indicators should be provided in section 5 of the impact case study template, and must be available on request. The main panel does not welcome testimonials offering individuals’ opinions as evidence of impact; however, factual statements from external, non-academic organisations would be acceptable as sources to corroborate claims made in a case study.

The main panel recognises that some evidence in case studies may be of a confidential or sensitive nature. The arrangements for submitting and assessing case studies that include such material are set out in Part 1, paragraphs 58-59.

Institutions may submit case studies that describe impacts at any stage of development or maturity. However, the assessment will be solely on the impact achieved during the assessment period, regardless of the stage of maturity. No account will be taken of anticipated or future potential impact.

www.publicengagement.ac.uk
Panel A: Indicators or impact

**Impacts on the economy**
- Evidence of improved cost-effectiveness.
- Evidence of service change.

**Impacts on public policy and services**
- Documented evidence of policy debate (for example, at a parliamentary Select Committee, material produced by non-governmental organisations).
- Documented evidence of changes to public policy/legislation/regulations/guidelines.
- Measures of improved public services.
- Documented evidence of influence on health policy and/or advisory committees.
- Evidence of use of process/technology.

**Impacts on society, culture and creativity**
- Documented evidence that public understanding has been enhanced through active collaborative involvement in research.
- Critical reviews in the media.
- Evidence of public debate.
- Documented evidence of changes to social policy.
- Measures of improved social equality, welfare or inclusion.
- Increased public uptake of scientific training, through public engagement.
- Documented shift in public attitude (for example, to sexual behaviour, or social factors in health).

**Impacts on practitioners and services**
- Literature/web information from practitioners and advisers, including the research findings and how they are applied in practice.
- Evidence of adoption of best practice (for example, by educators or law enforcement personnel).

**Impacts on health and welfare**
- Measures of improved clinical outcomes, public behaviour or health services (lives saved, reduced infection rates).
- Measures of improved well-being.
- Documented changes to clinical and public health guidelines (documented references to research evidence in guidelines).
- Evidence from audit, change in guidelines.
- Documented changes to animal welfare codes or guidelines.
- Evidence of enhanced awareness of health risks and benefits by consumers.
- Evidence of enhancement of patient experience.

**Impacts on production**
- A new product has been recommended for use or adopted.
- Development of a new plant variety or crop protection product which has entered the appropriate national or international regulatory testing system.
- Published rights for animals and plants.
- Evidence of improved sustainability.
- Documented changes to working guidelines.
- Documented evidence of improved working practices and/or level of production.

**Impacts on the environment**
- Sales of new products, or improvements in existing products, that bring quantifiable environmental benefits.
- Verifiable influence on particular projects or processes which bring environmental benefits.
- Evidence of generic environmental impact across a sector, confirmed by independent authoritative evidence.
- Traceable reference to inclusion of research into government policy papers, legislation and industry guidance.
- Traceable reference to the influence of research in planning decision outcomes.

**Impacts on international development**
- Documented evidence of changes to international development policies.
- Measures of improved international equality, food security, welfare or inclusion.
- Evidence of take-up and use of new or improved products and processes that improve quality of life or animal welfare in developing countries.

**Impacts on commerce**
- Sales of new products/services.
- Business performance measures (for example, turnover/profits, trends in key technical performance measures underlying economic performance).
- Employment figures.
- Licences awarded and brought to market; market authorisation.
- Demonstrable collaborations with industry (including knowledge transfer partnerships, and contracts).
- Commercial adoption of a new technology, process, knowledge or concept.
### Panel A: Types, examples and indicators or impact (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF IMPACT</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
<th>INDICTORS/EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Impacts on commerce:**  
  Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually companies, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that creates wealth | • A spin-out or new business has been created and established its viability by generating revenue or profits.  
  • Industry (including overseas industry) has invested in research and development.  
  • The performance of an existing business has been improved.  
  • A business or sector has adopted a new technology or process.  
  • The strategy, operations or management practices of a business have changed.  
  • A new product or service is in production or has been commercialised.  
  • Highly skilled people have taken up specialist roles (including academic consultancy) in companies or other organisations.  
  • Jobs have been created or protected.  
  • Social enterprise initiatives have been created.                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | • Sales of new products/services.  
  • Business performance measures (for example, turnover/profits, trends in key technical performance measures underlying economic performance).  
  • Employment figures.  
  • Licences awarded and brought to market; market authorisation.  
  • Demonstrable collaborations with industry (including knowledge transfer partnerships, and contracts).  
  • Commercial adoption of a new technology, process, knowledge or concept.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| **Impacts on the economy:**  
  Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually the NHS, private healthcare, or agriculture | • Policies have been introduced which have had an impact on economic growth or incentivising productivity.  
  • The costs of treatment or healthcare have changed as a result of research-led changes in practice.  
  • Gains in productivity have been realised as a result of research-led changes in practice.  
  • The roles and/or incentives for health professionals and organisations have changed, resulting in improved service delivery.                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | • Evidence of improved cost-effectiveness.  
  • Evidence of service change.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| **Impacts on public policy and services:**  
  Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector, and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society, through the implementation of policies | • Policy debate has been stimulated or moved forward by research evidence.  
  • Policy decisions or changes to legislation, regulations or guidelines have been informed by research evidence.  
  • The implementation of a policy (for example, health, environment or agricultural policy) or the delivery of a public service has changed.  
  • A new technology or process has been adopted.  
  • The quality, accessibility, acceptability or cost-effectiveness of a public service has been improved.  
  • The public has benefitted from public service improvements.  
  • Control measures for infections have improved.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | • Documented evidence of policy debate (for example, at a parliamentary Select Committee, material produced by non-governmental organisations).  
  • Documented evidence of changes to public policy/legislation/regulations/guidelines.  
  • Measures of improved public services.  
  • Documented evidence of influence on health policy and/or advisory committees.  
  • Evidence of use of process/technology.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF IMPACT</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
<th>INDICTORS/EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts on society, culture and creativity:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours or practices have been influenced</td>
<td>• Public understanding has improved.&lt;br&gt;• Public debate has been stimulated or informed by research.&lt;br&gt;• Changes to social policy have been informed by research.&lt;br&gt;• Changes to social policy have led to improved social welfare, equality or social inclusion.</td>
<td>• Documented evidence that public understanding has been enhanced through active collaborative involvement in research.&lt;br&gt;• Critical reviews in the media.&lt;br&gt;• Evidence of public debate.&lt;br&gt;• Documented evidence of changes to social policy.&lt;br&gt;• Measures of improved social equality, welfare or inclusion.&lt;br&gt;• Increased public uptake of scientific training, through public engagement.&lt;br&gt;• Documented shift in public attitude (for example, to sexual behaviour, or social factors in health).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts on health and welfare:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (both human and animals) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated)</td>
<td>• Outcomes for patients or related groups have improved.&lt;br&gt;• Public health and well-being has improved.&lt;br&gt;• A new clinical or lifestyle intervention (for example, drug, diet, treatment or therapy) has been developed, trialled with patients, related or other groups (for example, prisoners, community samples), and definitive (positive or negative) outcome demonstrated.&lt;br&gt;• A new diagnostic or clinical technology has been adopted.&lt;br&gt;• Disease prevention or markers of health have been enhanced by research.&lt;br&gt;• Animal health and welfare has been enhanced by research.&lt;br&gt;• Care and educational practices have changed.&lt;br&gt;• Clinical, dietary or healthcare guidelines have changed.&lt;br&gt;• Healthcare training guidelines have changed.&lt;br&gt;• Decisions by a health service or regulatory authority have been informed by research.&lt;br&gt;• Public awareness of a health risk or benefit has been raised.&lt;br&gt;• Public engagement/involvement in research has improved.&lt;br&gt;• Public behaviour has changed.&lt;br&gt;• The user experience has improved.&lt;br&gt;• Animal health and welfare has been enhanced by research.&lt;br&gt;• The control of diseases has changed.</td>
<td>• Measures of improved clinical outcomes, public behaviour or health services (lives saved, reduced infection rates).&lt;br&gt;• Measures of improved well-being.&lt;br&gt;• Documented changes to clinical and public health guidelines (documented references to research evidence in guidelines).&lt;br&gt;• Evidence from audit, change in guidelines.&lt;br&gt;• Documented changes to animal welfare codes or guidelines.&lt;br&gt;• Evidence of enhanced awareness of health risks and benefits by consumers.&lt;br&gt;• Evidence of enhancement of patient experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF IMPACT</td>
<td>EXAMPLES</td>
<td>INDICTORS/EVIDENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Impacts on the environment:** Impacts where the key beneficiary is the natural or built environment | • Policy debate on climate change or the environment has been influenced by research.  
• Environmental policy decisions have been influenced by research evidence.  
• Planning decisions have been informed by research.  
• The management or conservation of natural resources has changed.  
• The management of an environmental risk or hazard has changed. | • Sales of new products, or improvements in existing products, that bring quantifiable environmental benefits.  
• Verifiable influence on particular projects or processes which bring environmental benefits.  
• Evidence of generic environmental impact across a sector, confirmed by independent authoritative evidence.  
• Traceable reference to inclusion of research into government policy papers, legislation and industry guidance.  
• Traceable reference to the influence of research in planning decision outcomes. |
| **Impacts on production:** Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals (including groups of individuals) whose production has been enhanced | • Production, yields or quality have increased or level of waste has been reduced.  
• Decisions by regulatory authorities have been influenced by research.  
• Costs of production, including food, have been reduced.  
• Husbandry methods have changed.  
• Management practices in production businesses have changed. | • A new product has been recommended for use or adopted.  
• Development of a new plant variety or crop protection product which has entered the appropriate national or international regulatory testing system.  
• Published rights for animals and plants.  
• Evidence of improved sustainability.  
• Documented changes to working guidelines.  
• Documented evidence of improved working practices and/or level of production. |
| **Impacts on practitioners and services:** Impacts where beneficiaries are organisations or individuals, including service users involved in the development of and delivery of professional services | • Professional standards, guidelines or training have been influenced by research.  
• Practitioners/professionals have used research findings in conducting their work.  
• The quality or efficiency of a professional service has improved.  
• Work force planning has been influenced by research.  
• Forensic methods have been influenced by research.  
• Educational or pedagogical practices and methods have changed outside of the submitting unit.  
• Law enforcement and security practices have changed. | • Literature/web information from practitioners and advisers, including the research findings and how they are applied in practice.  
• Evidence of adoption of best practice (for example, by educators or law enforcement personnel). |
| **Impacts on international development:** Impacts where the beneficiaries are international bodies, countries, governments or communities | • International policy development has been influenced by research.  
• International agencies or institutions have been influenced by research.  
• Quality of life in a developing country has improved. | • Documented evidence of changes to international development policies.  
• Measures of improved international equality, food security, welfare or inclusion.  
• Evidence of take-up and use of new or improved products and processes that improve quality of life or animal welfare in developing countries. |
Examples and indicators of impact

PANEL B
Panel B Types and examples of impact (1)

Impacts on public policy and services
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include government, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), charities and public sector organisations and society, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society
- A policy has been implemented (including those realised through changes to legislation) or the delivery of a public service has changed.
- (Sections of) the public have benefited from public service improvements.
- In delivering a public service, a new technology or process has been adopted or an existing technology or process improved.
- Policy debate has been stimulated or informed by research evidence.
- Policy decisions or changes to legislation, regulations or guidelines have been informed by research evidence.
- Changes to education or the school curriculum have been informed by research.
- Risks to the security of nation states have been reduced.
- The development of policies and services of benefit to the developing world has been informed by research.

Impacts on society, culture and creativity
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, creative practices and other activity have been influenced
- Public discourse has been stimulated or informed by research.
- Public interest and engagement in science and engineering has been stimulated, including through the enhancement of science and engineering-related education in schools.
- The awareness, attitudes or understanding of (sections of) the public have been informed, and their ability to make informed decisions on issues improved, by engaging them with research.
- The work of an NGO, charitable or other organisation has been influenced by the research.
- Research has contributed to community regeneration.

Economic impacts
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include businesses, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that may create wealth
- The performance of an existing business has been improved through the introduction of new, or the improvement of existing, products, processes or services; the adoption of new, updated or enhanced technical standards and/or protocols; or the enhancement of strategy, operations or management practices.
- A spin-out or new business has been created, established its viability, or generated revenue or profits.
- A new business sector or activity has been created.
- A business or sector has adopted a new or significantly changed technology or process, including through acquisition and/or joint venture.
- Performance has been improved, or new or changed technologies or processes adopted, in companies or other organisations through highly skilled people having taken up specialist roles that draw on their research, or through the provision of consultancy or training that draws on their research.
- Potential future losses have been mitigated by improved methods of risk assessment and management in safety or security critical situations.
Panel B Types and examples of impact (2)

**Impacts on practitioners and professional services**

*Impacts where beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development of and delivery of professional services*

- Changes to professional standards, guidelines or training have been informed by research.
- Practitioners/professionals/lawyers have used research findings in the conduct of their work.
- The quality or efficiency or productivity of a professional service has improved.
- Professional bodies and learned societies have used research to define best practice.
- Practices have changed, or new or improved processes have been adopted, in companies or other organisations, through the provision of training or consultancy.
- Expert and legal work or forensic methods have been informed by research.

**Health impacts**

*Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals (including groups of individuals) whose health outcomes have been improved or whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated) through the application of enhanced healthcare for individuals or public health activities*

- A new drug, treatment or therapy, diagnostic or medical technology has been developed, trialled with patients, or adopted.
- Patient health outcomes have improved through, for example, the availability of new drug, treatment or therapy, diagnostic or medical technology, changes to patient care practices, or changes to clinical or healthcare guidelines.
- Public health and quality of life has been enhanced through, for example, enhanced public awareness of a health risk, enhanced disease prevention or, in developing countries, improved water quality or access to healthcare.
- Decisions by a health service or regulatory authority have been informed by research.
- The costs of treatment or healthcare have reduced.
- Quality of life in a developed or developing country has been improved by new products or processes.

**Impacts on the environment**

*Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural environment and/or the built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result*

- The environment has been improved through the introduction of new product(s), process(es) or service(s); the improvement of existing product(s), process(es) or services; or the enhancement of strategy, operations or management practices.
- New methods, models, monitoring or techniques have been developed that have led to changes or benefits.
- Policy debate on the environment, environmental policy decisions or planning decisions have been stimulated or informed by research and research evidence.
- The management or conservation of natural resources, including energy, water and food, has been influenced or changed.
- The management of an environmental risk or hazard has changed.
- The operations of a business or public service have been changed to achieve environmental (green) objectives.
- Direct intervention, based on research evidence, has led to reduction in carbon dioxide or other environmentally damaging emissions.
Case studies: evidence
Evidence of impact
Each case study must provide a clear and coherent narrative that includes an account of who or what constituency, group, sector, organisation and so on, has benefited, been influenced, or acted upon. Evidence appropriate to the type(s) of impact described should be provided to support the claims made of the nature and extent of the impact, in terms of its reach and significance.

Evidence may take many different forms depending on type of impact(s) reported. Wherever possible, quantitative indicators should be included. Sources that could verify key evidence and indicators provided in the case study should be included in section 5 of the impact case study template.

The main panel recognises that some of the evidence in case studies may be of a confidential or sensitive nature. The arrangements for submitting and assessing case studies that include such material are set out in Part 1, paragraphs 58-59.

The examples in Table B2 provide a guide to potential types of evidence or indicators that may be most relevant to each of the types of impact described in Table B1. However, HEIs should note that:

- This is not intended to be exhaustive.
- Some indicators may be relevant to more than one type of impact.
- Sub-panels will consider any appropriate evidence that is verifiable.
- Sub-panels recognise the varying degrees to which evidence and indicator information may be available to HEIs.

There are small changes to one of its ‘types’ of impact – where the scope is broadened beyond the media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of impact</th>
<th>Examples of evidence or indicators: July 2011</th>
<th>Examples of evidence or indicators: January 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on society, culture and creativity</td>
<td>• Visitor or audience numbers or feedback.</td>
<td>• Visitor or audience numbers and feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts where the beneficiaries may include</td>
<td>• Critical reviews in the media.</td>
<td>• Critical reviews in the media and/or other professional publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals, groups of individuals, organisations</td>
<td>• Evidence of public debate in the media.</td>
<td>• Evidence of public debate in the media or other fora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or communities whose knowledge, behaviours,</td>
<td>• Evidence of sustained and ongoing engagement with a group.</td>
<td>• Evidence of sustained and ongoing engagement with a group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative practices and other activity have been</td>
<td>• Measures of increased attainment and/or measures of improved engagement with science in non-HE education.</td>
<td>• Measures of increased attainment and/or measures of improved engagement with science in non-HE education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Panel B: Indicators or impact

Economic impacts
- Business performance measures, for example, sales, turnover, profits or employment associated with new or improved products, processes or services.
- Licences awarded and brought to market.
- Jobs created or protected.
- Investment funding raised from UK and/or non-UK agencies (venture capital/Business Angel, and so on) for start-up businesses and new activities of existing businesses.
- Evidence of critical impact on particular projects, products and processes confirmed by independent authoritative evidence, which should be financial where possible.
- Priority shifts in expenditure profiles or quantifiable reallocation of corporate, non-profit or public budgets.

Impacts on public policy and services
- Documented evidence of policy debate (for example, in Parliament, the media, material produced by NGOs).
- Documented evidence of changes to public policy/legislation/regulations/guidelines.
- Measures of improved public services, including, where appropriate, quantitative information; such information may relate for example to the quality, accessibility or cost-effectiveness of public services.
- Documented evidence of changes to international development policies.
- Measures of improved international welfare or inclusion.

Impacts on practitioners and professional services
- Traceable reference to inclusion of research in national or international industry standards or authoritative guidance.
- Traceable references by practitioners to research papers that describe their use and the impact of the research.
- New or modified professional standards and codes of practice.
- New or modified technical standards or protocols.
- Documented changes in knowledge, capability or behaviours of individuals benefiting from training.

Impacts on society, culture and creativity
- Visitor or audience numbers and feedback.
- Critical reviews in the media and/or other professional publications.
- Evidence of public debate in the media or other fora.
- Evidence of sustained and on-going engagement with a group.
- Measures of increased attainment and/or measures of improved engagement with science in non-HE education.

Health impacts
- Evidence from clinical trials.
- Measures of improved patient outcomes, public health or health services.
- Documented changes to clinical guidelines.
- Evidence of take-up and use of new or improved products and processes that improve quality of life in developing countries.

Impacts on the environment
- Sales of new products or improvements in existing products that bring quantifiable environmental benefits.
- Traceable impacts on particular projects or processes which bring environmental benefits.
- Evidence of generic environmental impact across a sector, confirmed by independent authoritative evidence.
- Documented case-specific improvements to environment-related issues.
- Traceable reference to inclusion of research into government policy papers, legislation and industry guidance.
- Traceable reference to impact of research in planning decision outcomes.
- Policy documentation.
### Panel B: Types, examples and indicators or impact (1)

#### TYPE OF IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic impacts</th>
<th>Impacts where the beneficiaries may include businesses, either new or established, or other types of organisation which undertake activity that may create wealth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EXAMPLES         | • The performance of an existing business has been improved through the introduction of new, or the improvement of existing, products, processes or services; the adoption of new, updated or enhanced technical standards and/or protocols; or the enhancement of strategy, operations or management practices.  
• A spin-out or new business has been created, established its viability, or generated revenue or profits.  
• A new business sector or activity has been created.  
• A business or sector has adopted a new or significantly changed technology or process, including through acquisition and/or joint venture.  
• Performance has been improved, or new or changed technologies or processes adopted, in companies or other organisations through highly skilled people having taken up specialist roles that draw on their research, or through the provision of consultancy or training that draws on their research.  
• Potential future losses have been mitigated by improved methods of risk assessment and management in safety or security critical situations. |
| INDICTORS/EVIDENCE | • Business performance measures, for example, sales, turnover, profits or employment associated with new or improved products, processes or services.  
• Licences awarded and brought to market.  
• Jobs created or protected.  
• Investment funding raised from UK and/or non-UK agencies (venture capital/Business Angel, and so on) for start-up businesses and new activities of existing businesses.  
• Evidence of critical impact on particular projects, products and processes confirmed by independent authoritative evidence, which should be financial where possible.  
• Priority shifts in expenditure profiles or quantifiable reallocation of corporate, non-profit or public budgets. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts on public policy and services</th>
<th>Impacts where the beneficiaries may include government, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), charities and public sector organisations and society, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EXAMPLES | • A policy has been implemented (including those realised through changes to legislation) or the delivery of a public service has changed.  
• (Sections of) the public have benefited from public service improvements.  
• In delivering a public service, a new technology or process has been adopted or an existing technology or process improved.  
• Policy debate has been stimulated or informed by research evidence.  
• Policy decisions or changes to legislation, regulations or guidelines have been informed by research evidence.  
• Changes to education or the school curriculum have been informed by research.  
• Risks to the security of nation states have been reduced.  
• The development of policies and services of benefit to the developing world has been informed by research. |
| INDICTORS/EVIDENCE | • Documented evidence of policy debate (for example, in Parliament, the media, material produced by NGOs).  
• Documented evidence of changes to public policy/legislation/regulations/guidelines.  
• Measures of improved public services, including, where appropriate, quantitative information; such information may relate for example to the quality, accessibility or cost-effectiveness of public services.  
• Documented evidence of changes to international development policies.  
• Measures of improved international welfare or inclusion. |

| Impacts on society, culture and creativity | Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, creative practices and other activity have been influenced |
| EXAMPLES | • Public discourse has been stimulated or informed by research.  
• Public interest and engagement in science and engineering has been stimulated, including through the enhancement of science and engineering-related education in schools.  
• The awareness, attitudes or understanding of (sections of) the public have been improved, and their ability to make informed decisions on issues improved, by engaging them with research.  
• The work of an NGO, charitable or other organisation has been influenced by the research.  
• Research has contributed to community regeneration. |
| INDICTORS/EVIDENCE | • Visitor or audience numbers and feedback.  
• Critical reviews in the media and/or other professional publications.  
• Evidence of public debate in the media or other fora.  
• Evidence of sustained and ongoing engagement with a group.  
• Measures of increased attainment and/or measures of improved engagement with science in non-HE education. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF IMPACT</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
<th>INDICTORS/EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health impacts</strong>&lt;br&gt;Impacts where the beneficiaries may include individuals (including groups of individuals) whose health outcomes have been improved or whose quality of life has been enhanced (or potential harm mitigated) through the application of enhanced healthcare for individuals or public health activities</td>
<td>• A new drug, treatment or therapy, diagnostic or medical technology has been developed, trialled with patients, or adopted.  &lt;br&gt;• Patient health outcomes have improved through, for example, the availability of new drug, treatment or therapy, diagnostic or medical technology, changes to patient care practices, or changes to clinical or healthcare guidelines.  &lt;br&gt;• Public health and quality of life has been enhanced through, for example, enhanced public awareness of a health risk, enhanced disease prevention or, in developing countries, improved water quality or access to healthcare.  &lt;br&gt;• Decisions by a health service or regulatory authority have been informed by research.  &lt;br&gt;• The costs of treatment or healthcare have reduced.  &lt;br&gt;• Quality of life in a developed or developing country has been improved by new products or processes.</td>
<td>• Evidence from clinical trials.  &lt;br&gt;• Measures of improved patient outcomes, public health or health services.  &lt;br&gt;• Documented changes to clinical guidelines.  &lt;br&gt;• Evidence of take-up and use of new or improved products and processes that improve quality of life in developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts on practitioners and professional services</strong>&lt;br&gt;Impacts where beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development of and delivery of professional services</td>
<td>• Changes to professional standards, guidelines or training have been informed by research.  &lt;br&gt;• Practitioners/professionals/lawyers have used research findings in the conduct of their work.  &lt;br&gt;• The quality or efficiency or productivity of a professional service has improved.  &lt;br&gt;• Professional bodies and learned societies have used research to define best practice.  &lt;br&gt;• Practices have changed, or new or improved processes have been adopted, in companies or other organisations, through the provision of training or consultancy.  &lt;br&gt;• Expert and legal work or forensic methods have been informed by research.</td>
<td>• Traceable reference to inclusion of research in national or international industry standards or authoritative guidance.  &lt;br&gt;• Traceable references by practitioners to research papers that describe their use and the impact of the research.  &lt;br&gt;• New or modified professional standards and codes of practice.  &lt;br&gt;• New or modified technical standards or protocols.  &lt;br&gt;• Documented changes in knowledge, capability or behaviours of individuals benefiting from training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts on the environment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural environment and/or the built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result</td>
<td>• The environment has been improved through the introduction of new product(s), process(es) or service(s); the improvement of existing product(s), process(es) or services; or the enhancement of strategy, operations or management practices.  &lt;br&gt;• New methods, models, monitoring or techniques have been developed that have led to changes or benefits.  &lt;br&gt;• Policy debate on the environment, environmental policy decisions or planning decisions have been stimulated or informed by research and research evidence.  &lt;br&gt;• The management or conservation of natural resources, including energy, water and food, has been influenced or changed.  &lt;br&gt;• The management of an environmental risk or hazard has changed.  &lt;br&gt;• The operations of a business or public service have been changed to achieve environmental (green) objectives.  &lt;br&gt;• Direct intervention, based on research evidence, has led to reduction in carbon dioxide or other environmentally damaging emissions.</td>
<td>• Sales of new products or improvements in existing products that bring quantifiable environmental benefits.  &lt;br&gt;• Traceable impacts on particular projects or processes which bring environmental benefits.  &lt;br&gt;• Evidence of generic environmental impact across a sector, confirmed by independent authoritative evidence.  &lt;br&gt;• Documented case-specific improvements to environment-related issues.  &lt;br&gt;• Traceable reference to inclusion of research into government policy papers, legislation and industry guidance.  &lt;br&gt;• Traceable reference to impact of research in planning decision outcomes.  &lt;br&gt;• Policy documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples and indicators of impact

PANEL C
Panel C provided no examples of impact in its July 2011 draft guidance

**Impacts on creativity, culture and society:**
*Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals, groups of individuals, organisations or communities whose knowledge, behaviours, practices, rights or duties have been influenced*

- Enhancements to heritage preservation, conservation and presentation; the latter including museum and gallery exhibitions.
- Production of cultural artefacts, including for example, films, novels and TV programmes.
- Public or political debate has been shaped or informed; this may include activity that has challenged established norms, modes of thought or practices.
- Improved social welfare, equality, social inclusion; improved access to justice and other opportunities (including employment and education).
- Improvements to legal and other frameworks for securing intellectual property rights.
- Enhancements to policy and practice for securing poverty alleviation.
- Influential contributions to campaigns for social, economic political and/or legal change.
- Enhanced cultural understanding of issues and phenomena; shaping or informing public attitudes and values.

**Economic, commercial, organisational impacts:**
*Impacts where the beneficiaries may include new or established businesses, or other types of organisation undertaking activities which create wealth*

- Changed approach to management of resources has resulted in improved service delivery.
  - Development of new or improved materials, products or processes.
  - Improved support for the development of ‘small scale’ technologies.
  - Improved effectiveness of workplace practices.
  - Improvements in legal frameworks, regulatory environment or governance of business entities.
  - Better access to finance opportunities.
  - Contribution to improved social, cultural and environmental sustainability.
  - Enhanced corporate social responsibility policies.
  - More effective dispute resolution.
  - Understanding, developing and adopting alternative economic models (such as fair trade).

**Impacts on the environment:**
*Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the natural, historic and/or built environment, together with societies, individuals or groups of individuals who benefit as a result*

- Specific changes in public awareness or behaviours relevant to the environment.
- Improved management or conservation of natural resources or environmental risk.
- Improved management of an environmental risk or hazard.
- Operations or practice of a business or public service have been changed to achieve environmental objectives.
- Improved design or implementation of environmental policy or regulation.
- Changed conservation policy/practice or resource management practices.
- Changes in environmental or architectural design standards or general practice.
- Influence on professional practice or codes.
- Changes in practices or policies affecting biodiversity.
Health and welfare impacts:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals and groups (human or animal) whose quality of life has been enhanced (or harm mitigated) or whose rights or interests have been protected or advocated
- Development or adoption of new indicators of health and well-being.
- Development of policy and practice with regard to medical ethics, health services or social care provision.
- Influence on CPD.
- Influence or shaping of relevant legislation.
- Influencing policy or practice leading to improved take-up or use of services.
- Improved provision or access to services.
- Development of ethical standards.
- Improved standards in training.
- Improved health and welfare outcomes.

Impacts on practitioners and professional services:
Impacts where the beneficiaries may include organisations or individuals involved in the development and/or delivery of professional services and ethics
- Changed practice for specific groups (which may include cessation of certain practices shown to be ineffective by research).
- Influence on professional standards, guidelines or training.
- Development of resources to enhance professional practice.
- Use of research findings in the conduct of professional work or practice.
- Influence on planning or management of services.
- Use of research findings by professional bodies to define best practice, formulate policy, or to lobby government or other stakeholders.
- Practitioner debate has been informed or stimulated by research findings.
- Research has challenged conventional wisdom, stimulating debate among stakeholders.

Impacts on public policy, law and services:
Impacts where the beneficiaries are usually government, public sector and charity organisations and societies, either as a whole or groups of individuals in society through the implementation or non-implementation of policies, systems or reforms
- Legislative change, development of legal principle or effect on legal practice.
- Forms of regulation, dispute resolution or access to justice have been influenced.
- Shaping or influence on policy made by government, quasi-government bodies, NGOs or private organisations.
- Changes to the delivery or form of any service for the public.
- Policy debate has been stimulated or informed by research evidence, which may have led to confirmation of policy, change in policy direction, implementation or withdrawal of policy.
- Effect on the quality, accessibility, cost-effectiveness or efficiency of services.
- Impact on democratic participation.
- Influencing the work of NGOs or commercial organisations.
- Improved public understanding of social issues.
- Enabling a challenge to conventional wisdom.
Panel C evidence of impact: overview

Panel C’s guidance is slightly expanded

Case studies will be assessed in terms of the criteria of reach and significance (see paragraphs 102-104). In assessing impact case studies, sub-panels will consider both the chain of evidence linking excellent research within the submitting unit to the impact(s) claimed, and the evidence of the reach and significance of the impact. Within their narrative account in the case study, institutions should provide the indicators and evidence most appropriate to the impact(s) claimed, and to support that chain. The sub-panels will use their expert judgement regarding the integrity, coherence and clarity of the narrative of each case study, but will expect that the key claims made in the narrative to be supported by evidence and indicators.

The main panel anticipates that impact case studies will refer to a wide range of types of evidence, including qualitative, quantitative and tangible or material evidence, as appropriate. Individual case studies may draw on a variety of forms of evidence and indicators. The main panel does not wish to pre-judge forms of evidence. It encourages submitting units to use evidence most appropriate to the impact claimed.

However, submitting units should ensure that, so far as possible, any evidence cited is independently verifiable. Where testimony is cited, it should be made clear whether the source is a participant in the process of impact delivery (and the degree to which this is the case), or is a reporter on the process. While it is recognised that the evidence for many significant and far-reaching forms of impact may be hard to define, greater weight may be placed on evidence of fact over evidence of opinion in determining the significance and reach associated with a claimed impact.

The main panel recognises that some of the evidence in case studies may be of a confidential or sensitive nature. The arrangements for submitting and assessing case studies that include such material are set out in Part 1, paragraphs 58-59.

The sub-panels in Main Panel C wish to understand how underpinning research activity links to impact or benefit, for which simple descriptions of the activity will not suffice. Acting as an adviser to a public body, for example, does not of itself represent impact. However, providing advice based on research findings from the submitted unit, which has influenced a policy, strategy or public debate would constitute impact if there is evidence that the advice has had some effect or influence.

In constructing a narrative account in a case study, there are many different types of indicators or evidence which could be used to demonstrate the links in the chain between the underpinning research and impact, and the reach and significance of the impact. No type of evidence is inherently preferred over another; judgements will be based on the extent to which the cited evidence provides a convincing link between the underpinning research and the impact claimed, and convincing evidence of the reach and significance of the impact.
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Panel C indicators of impact

Panel C doesn’t link its exemplar indicators of impact to its ‘types’ of impact, as the other panels do. It simply provides a ‘common list’

88. The examples of evidence and indicators provided below are simply indicative, and are not designed to be exhaustive, limiting or prescriptive. Main Panel C recognises that different types of evidence are likely to be applicable across any or all spheres of impact. The examples provided are therefore in the format of a common list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citation in a public discussion, consultation document or judgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation by journalists, broadcasters or social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation by international bodies such as the United Nations, UNESCO, IMF and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of citation in policy, regulatory, strategy, practice or other documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor or audience numbers, or number of participants (for example, in the uptake of CPD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative data relating, for example, to cost-effectiveness or organisational performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They also direct readers to Para 82, for ‘further examples of impact that derive from engaging the public with research’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Impacts arising from public engagement activity

81. Public engagement is an activity that may lead to the impact of research. Sub-panels will welcome case studies that include impact achieved in this way, either as the main impact described or as one facet of a broader range of impacts.

82. Case studies which include impacts that derive from engaging the public with research must:

• At least in part, be based on specific research or a body of research carried out in the submitted unit, and explain clearly which particular aspects of the research underpinned the engagement activity and contributed to the impact claimed.

• Include evidence of the reach of the impact. This should extend beyond simply providing the numbers of people engaged and may also, for example, include:
  • information about the types of audience
  • whether there was secondary reach, for example from follow-up activity or media coverage
  • other quantitative indicators such as evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources, and/or access to web content.

• Include evidence of the significance of the impact. This should include a description of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Examples of the evidence that might be provided for this include:
  • evaluation data
  • critical external reviews of the engagement activity
  • evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices
  • user feedback or testimony
  • evidence of sustainability through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes or use of resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of impact</th>
<th>Examples of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Economic, commercial, organisational impacts:**                             | • Development of new or improved materials, products or processes.  
• Improved support for the development of ‘small scale’ technologies.  
• Improved effectiveness of workplace practices.  
• Improvements in legal frameworks, regulatory environment or governance of business entities.  
• Better access to finance opportunities.  
• Contribution to improved social, cultural and environmental sustainability.  
• Enhanced corporate social responsibility policies.  
• More effective dispute resolution.  
• Understanding, developing and adopting alternative economic models (such as fair trade).                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| **Impacts on public policy, law and services:**                               | • Legislative change, development of legal principle or effect on legal practice.  
• Forms of regulation, dispute resolution or access to justice have been influenced.  
• Shaping or influence on policy made by government, quasi-government bodies, NGOs or private organisations.  
• Changes to the delivery or form of any service for the public.  
• Policy debate has been stimulated or informed by research evidence, which may have led to confirmation of policy, change in policy direction, implementation or withdrawal of policy.  
• Effect on the quality, accessibility, cost-effectiveness or efficiency of services.  
• Impact on democratic participation.  
• Influencing the work of NGOs or commercial organisations.  
• Improved public understanding of social issues.  
• Enabling a challenge to conventional wisdom.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| **Impacts on creativity, culture and society:**                               | • Enhancements to heritage preservation, conservation and presentation; the latter including museum and gallery exhibitions.  
• Production of cultural artefacts, including for example, films, novels and TV programmes.  
• Public or political debate has been shaped or informed; this may include activity that has challenged established norms, modes of thought or practices.  
• Improved social welfare, equality, social inclusion; improved access to justice and other opportunities (including employment and education).  
• Improvements to legal and other frameworks for securing intellectual property rights.  
• Enhancements to policy and practice for securing poverty alleviation.  
• Influential contributions to campaigns for social, economic political and/or legal change.  
• Enhanced cultural understanding of issues and phenomena; shaping or informing public attitudes and values.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

**NB:** Panel C does not provide a list of indicators linked to the examples/types. It provides a ‘common list’, and additional guidance on public engagement, included on the next slide.

### Common list of indicators

- Citation in a public discussion, consultation document or judgement.
- Citation by journalists, broadcasters or social media.
- Citation by international bodies such as the United Nations, UNESCO, IMF and so on.
- Evidence of citation in policy, regulatory, strategy, practice or other documents.
- Evidence of debate among practitioners, leading to developments in attitudes or behaviours.
- Public debate in the media.
- Parliamentary or other democratic debate.
- Visitor or audience numbers, or number of participants (for example, in the uptake of CPD).
- Media reviews.
- Measures of improved inclusion, welfare or equality.
- Independent documentary evidence of links between research and claimed impact(s).
- Documented evidence of influence on guidelines, legislation, regulation, policy or standards.
- Documented change to professional standards or behaviour.
- Satisfaction measures (for example, with services).
- Use in scrutiny or audit processes, such as Select Committees.
- Incorporation in training or CPD material.
- Outcome measures, including measures of outcomes for beneficiaries.
- Quantitative data relating, for example, to cost-effectiveness or organisational performance.
- Further examples of evidence relating to impacts that derive from engaging the public with research are provided at paragraph 82.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of impact</th>
<th>Examples of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and welfare impacts:</td>
<td>• Development or adoption of new indicators of health and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts where the beneficiaries are individuals</td>
<td>• Development of policy and practice with regard to medical ethics, health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and groups (human or animal) whose quality of</td>
<td>or social care provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life has been enhanced (or harm mitigated) or</td>
<td>• Influence on CPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whose rights or interests have been protected</td>
<td>• Influence or shaping of relevant legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or advocated</td>
<td>• Influencing policy or practice leading to improved take-up or use of services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved provision or access to services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of ethical standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved standards in training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved health and welfare outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on practitioners and professional services:</td>
<td>• Changed practice for specific groups (which may include cessation of certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts where the beneficiaries may include</td>
<td>practices shown to be ineffective by research).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisations or individuals involved in the</td>
<td>• Influence on professional standards, guidelines or training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development and/or delivery of professional</td>
<td>• Development of resources to enhance professional practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services and ethics</td>
<td>• Use of research findings in the conduct of professional activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence on planning or management of services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of research findings by professional bodies to define best practice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formulate policy, or to lobby government or other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Practitioner debate has been informed or stimulated by research findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research has challenged conventional wisdom, stimulating debate among</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•_ssional work or practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on the environment:</td>
<td>• Specific changes in public awareness or behaviours relevant to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts where the key beneficiaries are the</td>
<td>environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural, historic and/or built environment,</td>
<td>• Improved management or conservation of natural resources or environmental risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>together with societies, individuals or groups of</td>
<td>• Improved management of an environmental risk or hazard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals who benefit as a result</td>
<td>• Operations or practice of a business or public service have been changed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>achieve environmental objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved design or implementation of environmental policy or regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changed conservation policy/practice or resource management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in environmental or architectural design standards or general practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence on professional practice or codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes in practices or policies affecting biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impacts arising from public engagement activity**

81. Public engagement is an activity that may lead to the impact of research. Sub-panels will welcome case studies that include impact achieved in this way, either as the main impact described or as one facet of a broader range of impacts.

82. Case studies which include impacts that derive from engaging the public with research must:

- At least in part, be based on specific research or a body of research carried out in the submitted unit, and explain clearly which particular aspects of the research underpinned the engagement activity and contributed to the impact claimed.
- Include evidence of the reach of the impact. This should extend beyond simply providing the numbers of people engaged and may also, for example, include:
  - information about the types of audience
  - whether there was secondary reach, for example from follow-up activity or media coverage
  - other quantitative indicators such as evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources, and/or access to web content.
- Include evidence of the significance of the impact. This should include a description of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Examples of the evidence that might be provided for this include:
  - evaluation data
  - critical external reviews of the engagement activity
  - evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices
  - user feedback or testimony
  - evidence of sustainability through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes or use of resources.
Examples and indicators of impact

PANEL D
Main panel D

**Economic prosperity**  Applying and transferring the insights and knowledge gained from research to create wealth in the manufacturing, service, creative and cultural sectors.

**Policy making**  Influencing policy debate and practice through informed interventions relating to any aspect of human or animal well-being.

**Public services**  Contributing to the development and delivery of public services or legislation to support the welfare, education, understanding or empowerment of diverse individuals and groups in society, including the disadvantaged or marginalised.

**Civil society**  Influencing the form and content of associations between people or groups to illuminate and challenge cultural values and social assumptions.

**Cultural life**  Creating and interpreting cultural capital in all of its forms to enrich and expand the lives, imaginations and sensibilities of individuals and groups.

**Public discourse**  Extending the range and improving the quality of evidence, argument and expression to enhance public understanding of the major issues and challenges faced by individuals and society.

**Education**  Influencing the form or the content of the education of any age group in any part of the world where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI.

Unlike the other panels, Panel D does not provide examples of impact for each of the ‘types’ of impact it has listed.

It emphasises that its description of the possible range of impacts is ‘indicative only, and in practice much of the impact will cross boundaries between them or go beyond them. Case studies are not expected to be classified in this way by submitting units’.

It does provide a generic list of examples of impact, listed on the next slide.
The following list offers submitting institutions some examples of impact that derive from research across the broad range of subjects covered by arts and humanities (and beyond). It is provided to stimulate ideas about the kinds of impact that could be developed into case studies where they meet the definition of impact set out in Annex C of ‘guidance on submissions’. The examples below are indicative only and do not articulate the expectations of any one sub-panel.

- Generating new ways of thinking that influence creative practice.
- Engaging with and mediating between NGOs and charities in the UK and internationally to influence their activities, for example in relation to health, education and the environment.
- Contributing to innovation and entrepreneurial activity through the design and delivery of new products or services.
- Preserving, conserving, and presenting cultural heritage.
- Developing stimuli to tourism and contributing to the quality of the tourist experience.
- Contributing to a wider public understanding of basic standards of wellbeing and human rights conceptions.
- Helping professionals and organisations adapt to changing cultural values. Contributing to continuing personal and professional development.
- Research into the languages and cultures of minority linguistic, ethnic, religious, immigrant, cultures and communities used by government, NGOs, charities or private sector to understand and respond to their needs.
- Creating, inspiring and supporting new forms of artistic, literary, linguistic, social, economic, religious, and other expression.
- Contributing to widening public access to and participation in the political process.
- Contributing to economic prosperity via the creative sector including publishing, music, theatre, museums and galleries, film and television, fashion, tourism, and computer games.
- Providing expert advice to governments, NGOs, charities and the private sector in the UK and internationally, and thereby influencing policy and/or practice.
- Informing or influencing the development of expert systems in areas such as medicine, human resources, accounting, and financial services.
- Contributing to processes of commemoration, memorialisation and reconciliation.
- Informing or influencing practice or policy as a result of research on the nature and extent of religious, sexual, ethnic or linguistic discrimination.
- Influencing the methods, ideas or ethics of any profession.
- Contributing to processes of commemorating, memorialising, and reconciliation.
- Contributing to a wider public understanding of basic standards of wellbeing and human rights conceptions.
Evidence of impact

87. The sub-panels see the narratives in the case studies as a crucial part of the text; they will link the underpinning research to the impact or benefit claimed, and they will be the main contextualisation in each case study for the types of evidence of impact provided.

It is fully accepted that not all potential evidence might be available to submitting institutions. The integrity, coherence and clarity of the narrative accompanying each case study will be essential to the panels when forming their judgements, and key claims made in the narrative should be capable of corroboration.

While it is expected that narratives will differ according to the nature of the impact claimed, case studies should clearly articulate the relationship between the underpinning research and the impact. This is likely to be evident in the nature and extent of external engagement and dissemination, as well as in the types of individuals, groups or organisations engaged with.

Case studies then have to demonstrate the reach and significance of the impact itself. This is typically evident in the outcomes of that process of engagement and dissemination. Evidence of dissemination on its own will not be sufficient.
Panel D evidence of impact: indicators

Evidence for the relationship between the underpinning research and the impact claimed and evidence for the impact itself may include **but not be limited to** items in the following indicative list:

### Quantitative indicators
- Publication and sales figures both in the UK and overseas, audience or attendance figures (including demographic data where relevant), broadcasting data and other forms of media, download figures, or database and web-site hits over a sustained period.
- Funding from public or other charitable bodies.
- Evidence of use of education materials arising from the research (where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI).
- Tourism data, including audience figures and visitor numbers at exhibitions, events, performances.
- Growth of small businesses in the creative industries. Generation of new products. Sales figures and income generated. Employment data (for example, evidence of jobs created).

### Independent testimony
- Acknowledgements in annual reports or other publications of NGOs, charities and other civil society organisations. Testimony of experts or users who can attest to the reach and/or significance of impact. Third-party evidence of changed policies, practices, processes, strategies.

### Formal evaluations
- Professional evaluations of exhibitions, performances or other outputs. Formal peer reviews of funded impact-relevant research. Studies on the social return on investment.

### Policy engagements
- Evidence of influence on a debate in public policy and practice through membership of or distinctive contributions to expert panels and policy committees or advice to government (at local, national or international level).
- Formal partnership agreements or research collaboration with major institutions, NGOs and public bodies. Consultancies to public or other bodies that utilise research expertise.
- Evidence of engagement with campaign and pressure groups and other civil organisations (including membership and activities of those organisations and campaigns) as a result of research.
- Changes to professional standards and behaviour.

### Public engagement
- Information about the number and profile of people engaged and types of audience. Follow-up activities or media coverage. Evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources or access to web content.
- Descriptions of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Evaluation data. User feedback or testimony. Critical external reviews of the engagement activity. Evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices, contributions (financial or in-kind) by third parties to enhance services or support for the public, or evidence of funds from third parties to enhance or extend the engagement activity. Evidence of sustainability, through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes, continuing sales, downloads, or use of resources.

### Critiques or citations in users’ documents
- Citations in reviews outside academic literature. Independent citations in the media, including in online documents. Reviews, blogs and postings. Programme, exhibition or catalogue notes. Prizes. Translations. Recorded feedback.
- Inclusion in teaching materials or teaching bibliographies. Replication of work in structure of courses.
- Evidence of uptake of research in documents produced by public or commercial bodies; citations in policy documents and reviews, or other published reports on policy debates.
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92. The sub-panels recommend that institutions refer to the following list of characteristics when preparing case studies:

- All the material required to make a judgement should be included – no further reading should be required.
- There should be a clear definition of the beneficiaries, or what had changed as a result of the research.
- The narrative should be coherent, clearly explaining the relationship between the research and the impact, and the nature of the changes or benefits arising (noting that narratives differ according to the areas of impact claimed).
- Indicators used should be relevant, contextualised and precise in support of the case study, and the evidence focused and concise.
- There should be a brief explanation of what is original or distinctive about the research insights that contributed to the impact.
- The case study should include details of the names of researchers, their position in the HEI, and the dates and locations of the research activity.
- Specific and appropriate independent sources of corroborating information should be supplied.
- Where the research was carried out in collaboration with other HEIs, or was part of a wider body of research, this should be acknowledged and the specific input of the submitting unit’s research clearly stated.
Impact types

**Economic prosperity** Applying and transferring the insights and knowledge gained from research to create wealth in the manufacturing, service, creative and cultural sectors.

**Policy making** Influencing policy debate and practice through informed interventions relating to any aspect of human or animal well-being.

**Public services** Contributing to the development and delivery of public services or legislation to support the welfare, education, understanding or empowerment of diverse individuals and groups in society, including the disadvantaged or marginalised.

**Civil society** Influencing the form and content of associations between people or groups to illuminate and challenge cultural values and social assumptions.

**Cultural life** Creating and interpreting cultural capital in all of its forms to enrich and expand the lives, imaginations and sensibilities of individuals and groups.

**Public discourse** Extending the range and improving the quality of evidence, argument and expression to enhance public understanding of the major issues and challenges faced by individuals and society.

**Education** Influencing the form or the content of the education of any age group in any part of the world where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI.

**Impact examples**

- Generating new ways of thinking that influence creative practice.
- Creating, inspiring and supporting new forms of artistic, literary, linguistic, social, economic, religious, and other expression.
- Contributing to innovation and entrepreneurial activity through the design and delivery of new products or services.
- Contributing to economic prosperity via the creative sector including publishing, music, theatre, museums and galleries, film and television, fashion, tourism, and computer games.
- Informing or influencing practice or policy as a result of research on the nature and extent of religious, sexual, ethnic or linguistic discrimination.
- Research into the languages and cultures of minority linguistic, ethnic, religious, immigrant, cultures and communities used by government, NGOs, charities or private sector to understand and respond to their needs.
- Helping professionals and organisations adapt to changing cultural values.
- Contributing to continuing personal and professional development.
- Preserving, conserving, and presenting cultural heritage.
- Developing stimuli to tourism and contributing to the quality of the tourist experience.
- Influencing the design and delivery of curriculum and syllabi in schools, other HEIs or other educational institutions where the impact extends significantly beyond the submitting HEI, for example through the widespread use of text books, primary sources or an IT resource in education.
- Contributing to processes of commemoration, memorialisation and reconciliation.
- Contributing to a wider public understanding of basic standards of wellbeing and human rights conceptions.
- Informing or influencing the development of expert systems in areas such as medicine, human resources, accounting, and financial services.
- Influencing the methods, ideas or ethics of any profession.
- Providing expert advice to governments, NGOs, charities and the private sector in the UK and internationally, and thereby influencing policy and/or practice.
- Engaging with and mediating between NGOs and charities in the UK and internationally to influence their activities, for example in relation to health, education and the environment.
- Contributing to widening public access to and participation in the political process.
# Impact indicators

## Quantitative indicators
- Publication and sales figures both in the UK and overseas, audience or attendance figures (including demographic data where relevant), broadcasting data and other forms of media, download figures, or database and web-site hits over a sustained period.
- Funding from public or other charitable bodies.
- Evidence of use of education materials arising from the research (where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI).
- Tourism data, including audience figures and visitor numbers at exhibitions, events, performances.
- Growth of small businesses in the creative industries. Generation of new products. Sales figures and income generated. Employment data (for example, evidence of jobs created).

## Critiques or citations in users' documents
- Citations in reviews outside academic literature. Independent citations in the media, including in online documents. Reviews, blogs and postings. Programme, exhibition or catalogue notes. Prizes. Translations. Recorded feedback.
- Inclusion in teaching materials or teaching bibliographies. Replication of work in structure of courses.
- Evidence of uptake of research in documents produced by public or commercial bodies; citations in policy documents and reviews, or other published reports on policy debates.

## Public engagement
- Information about the number and profile of people engaged and types of audience. Follow-up activities or media coverage. Evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources or access to web content.
- Descriptions of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Evaluation data. User feedback or testimony. Critical external reviews of the engagement activity. Evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices, contributions (financial or in-kind) by third parties to enhance services or support for the public, or evidence of funds from third parties to enhance or extend the engagement activity. Evidence of sustainability, through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes, continuing sales, downloads, or use of resources.

## Policy engagements
- Evidence of influence on a debate in public policy and practice through membership of or distinctive contributions to expert panels and policy committees or advice to government (at local, national or international level).
- Formal partnership agreements or research collaboration with major institutions, NGOs and public bodies. Consultancies to public or other bodies that utilise research expertise.
- Evidence of engagement with campaign and pressure groups and other civil organisations (including membership and activities of those organisations and campaigns) as a result of research.
- Changes to professional standards and behaviour.

## Independent testimony
- Acknowledgements in annual reports or other publications of NGOs, charities and other civil society organisations. Testimony of experts or users who can attest to the reach and/or significance of impact. Third-party evidence of changed policies, practices, processes, strategies.

## Formal evaluations
- Professional evaluations of exhibitions, performances or other outputs. Formal peer reviews of funded impact-relevant research. Studies on the social return on investment.
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Case studies are the vehicle for UoA’s to describe the impacts they have generated. This section revisits the generic guidance about these published in July 2011

IMPACT CASE STUDIES
Impact case studies (form REF3b)

Number of case studies in a submission

156. The number of case studies required in each submission will be determined by the number (FTE) of Category A staff returned in the submission, as set out in Table 1. If a submission includes fewer than the required number of case studies, a grade of unclassified will be awarded to each required case study that is not submitted. Submissions may not include more than the required number of case studies.

**Table 1: Number of case studies required in submissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Category A staff submitted (FTE)</th>
<th>Required number of case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 14.99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24.99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34.99</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44.99</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 or more</td>
<td>6, plus 1 further case study per additional 10 FTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

157. Submissions will **not** be expected to provide impact case studies that are representative of the spread of research activity across the whole submitted unit. Institutions should select the strongest examples of impact that are underpinned by the submitted unit’s excellent research, and should explain within the impact template how the selected case studies relate to the submitted unit’s approach to enabling impact from its research.

Eligibility definitions for case studies

158. Each case study must provide details of a specific impact that:

a. Meets the definition of impact for the REF in Annex C.

b. Occurred during the period 1 January 2008 to 31 July 2013 (see paragraph 159).

c. Was underpinned by excellent research produced by the submitting unit in the period 1 January 1993 to 31 December 2013 (see paragraphs 160-161 and footnote 6).
159. Case studies must describe impacts that occurred specifically within the period 1 January 2008 to 31 July 2013. The impacts may have been at any stage of development or maturity during this period, so long as some effect, change or benefit meeting the definition of impact at Annex C took place during that period. This may include, for example, impacts at an early stage, or impacts that may have started prior to 1 January 2008 but continued into the period 1 January 2008 to 31 July 2013. Case studies will be assessed in terms of the reach and significance of the impact that occurred only during the period 1 January 2008 to 31 July 2013, and not in terms of any impact prior to this period or potential future or anticipated impact after this period.

160. To be eligible for assessment as an impact, the impact described in a case study must have been underpinned by excellent research produced by the submitting unit, during the period 1 January 1993 to 31 December 2013 (see footnote 6). Each case study must describe the underpinning research, include references to one or more key research outputs, provide evidence of the quality of that research, and explain how that research underpinned or contributed to the impact. Further guidance on the information required in case studies is at Annex G.

The following definitions apply:

a. ‘Research produced by the submitting unit in the period 1 January 1993 to 31 December 2013’ means that staff carried out research within the scope of the relevant UOA descriptor, while working in the submitting HEI (even if those staff have since left). This research must be evidenced by outputs referenced in the case study, published between 1 January 1993 and 31 December 2013. The staff may, but need not, have been selected for a previous RAE or the 2014 REF. The research outputs may, but need not, have been submitted to a previous RAE or the 2014 REF. If staff employed by the submitting HEI on the census date conducted all of the research underpinning an impact before joining the institution, the submitting HEI may not submit the impact of this research. (In this case, the institution where the staff conducted the research may submit the impact.)

b. ‘Excellent research’ means that the quality of the research is at least equivalent to two star: ‘quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour’. Each case study must include references to one or more key research outputs that underpinned the impact and were produced by the submitting HEI, and evidence of the quality of the research as requested in the relevant panel criteria documents. Panels will consider the evidence of research quality, and may review outputs referenced in a case study. A panel will grade as unclassified a case study if it judges that the underpinning research outputs are not predominantly of at least two star quality.

c. ‘Underpinned by’ means that the research made a distinct and material contribution to the impact taking place, such that the impact would not have occurred or would have been significantly reduced without the contribution of that research. Each case study must explain how (through what means) the research led to or contributed to the impact, and include appropriate sources of information external to the HEI to corroborate these claims (see Annex G). Where the panel judges that the submitted unit’s research did not make a distinct and material contribution to the impact, the case study will be graded as unclassified.
161. There are many ways in which research may have underpinned impact, including but not limited to:
   a. Research that contributed directly or indirectly to an impact. For example, a submitted unit’s research may have informed research in another submitted unit (whether in the same or another HEI), which in turn led to an impact. In this case, both submitted units may show that their research made a distinct and material contribution to the impact.
   b. Research embodied in one or more outputs, conducted by one or more individuals, teams or groups, within one or more submitted units, that led to or underpinned an impact. More than one submitted unit (within the same HEI or in different HEIs) may include the same impact within their respective case studies, so long as each submitted unit produced excellent research that made a distinct and material contribution to the impact.
   c. Impacts on, for example, public awareness, attitudes, understanding or behaviour that arose from engaging the public with research. In these cases, the submitting unit must show that the engagement activity was, at least in part, based on the submitted unit’s research and drew materially and distinctly upon it.
   d. Researchers that impacted on others through the provision of professional advice or expert testimony. In such a case, the submitting unit must show that the researcher’s appointment to their advisory role, or the specific advice given, was at least in part based on the submitted unit’s research and drew materially and distinctly upon it.
   e. Research that led to impact through its deliberate exploitation by the HEI or through its exploitation by others. The submitting HEI need not have been involved in exploiting the research, but must show that its research made a distinct and material contribution to the impact.

162. Institutions must submit impact case studies in the appropriate UOAs. Impacts from research undertaken at the submitting HEI may be submitted either in the REF UOA that relates to the underpinning research, or, if this differs, to the REF UOA that relates to the staff who conducted the research.

Case study submission requirements (form REF3a)
163. Submitting units are required to submit case studies using a generic template. The template, annotated with guidance, is at Annex G. The template has been developed, through the impact pilot exercise, to enable submitting units in all UOAs to clearly explain and demonstrate the impact of their research through a narrative that includes indicators and evidence as appropriate to the case being made, and in a format that is suitable for panels to assess them.

164. The onus is on submitting units to provide appropriate evidence within each case study of the particular impact claimed. The REF panels will provide guidance, in the panel criteria documents, about the kinds of evidence and indicators of impact they would consider appropriate to research in their respective UOAs, but this guidance will not be exhaustive.
THE IMPACT CASE STUDY TEMPLATE
Annex G

Impact case study template and guidance

1. This annex provides the template for impact case studies, annotated with guidance about the information required in each of its sections. This should be read alongside the definitions and eligibility criteria for impact case studies in Part 3, Section 3 of the main document, and alongside the panel criteria statements. The case study template for use in preparing submissions will be provided in Word, along with templates for REF3a and REF5, on the REF submission system.

2. Each case study should include sufficiently clear and detailed information to enable panels to make judgements based on the information it contains, without making inferences, gathering additional material, following up references or relying on members’ prior knowledge. References to other sources of information will be used for verification purposes only, not as a means for panels to gather further information to inform judgements.

3. Each completed case study template will be limited to four pages in length (see Annex F). Within the annotated template below, indicative guidance is provided about the expected maximum length limit of each section, but institutions will have flexibility to exceed these so long as the case study as a whole remains no longer than four pages and the guidance on formatting at Annex F is adhered to.
Title of case study:

1. **Summary of the impact** (indicative maximum 100 words)
   This section should briefly state what specific impact is being described in the case study.

2. **Underpinning research** (indicative maximum 500 words)
   This section should outline the key research insights or findings that underpinned the impact, and provide details of what research was undertaken, when, and by whom. References to specific research outputs that embody the research described in this section, and evidence of its quality, should be provided in the next section.
   Details of the following should be provided in this section:
   - The nature of the research insights or findings which relate to the impact claimed in the case study.
   - An outline of what the underpinning research produced by the submitted unit was (this may relate to one or more research outputs, projects or programmes).
   - Dates of when it was carried out.
   - Names of the key researchers and what positions they held at the institution at the time of the research (where researchers joined or left the HEI during this time, these dates must also be stated).
   - Any relevant key contextual information about this area of research.

3. **References to the research** (indicative maximum of six references)
   This section should provide references to key outputs from the research described in the previous section, and evidence about the quality of the research.
   Include the following details for each cited output:
   - Author(s).
   - Title.
   - Year of publication.
   - Type of output and other relevant details required to identify the output (for example journal title and issue).
   - Details to enable the panel to gain access to the output, if required (for example, a DOI or URL), or stating that the output is listed in REF2 or can be supplied by the HEI on request.

   All outputs cited in this section must be capable of being made available to panels. If they are not available in the public domain or listed in REF2, the HEI must be able to provide them if requested by the REF team.

   Evidence of the quality of the research must also be provided in this section. Guidance on this will be provided in the panel criteria documents. Where panels request details of key research grants or end of grant reports, the following should be provided:
   - Who the grant was awarded to.
   - The grant title.
   - Sponsor.
   - Period of the grant (with dates).
   - Value of the grant.
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4 Details of the impact (indicative maximum 750 words)
This section should provide a narrative, with supporting evidence, to explain:
• how the research underpinned (made a distinct and material contribution to) the impact
• the nature and extent of the impact.
The following should be provided:
• A clear explanation of the process or means through which the research led to, underpinned or made a contribution to the impact (for example, how it was disseminated, how it came to influence users or beneficiaries, or how it came to be exploited, taken up or applied).
• Where the submitted unit’s research was part of a wider body of research that contributed to the impact (for example, where there has been research collaboration with other institutions), the case study should specify the particular contribution of the submitted unit’s research and acknowledge other key research contributions.
• Details of the beneficiaries – who or what community, constituency or organisation has benefitted, been affected or impacted on.
• Details of the nature of the impact – how they have benefitted, been affected or impacted on.
• Evidence or indicators of the extent of the impact described, as appropriate to the case being made.
• Dates of when these impacts occurred.

5. Sources to corroborate the impact (indicative maximum of 10 references)
This section should list sources external to the submitting HEI that could, if audited, provide corroboration of specific claims made in the case study. Sources provided in this section should not be a substitute for providing clear evidence of impact in section 4; the information in this section will be used for audit purposes only.
This section should list sufficient sources that could, if audited, corroborate key claims made about the impact of the unit’s research. These could include, as appropriate to the case study, the following external sources of corroboration (stating which claim each source provides corroboration for):
• Reports, reviews, web links or other documented sources of information in the public domain.
• Confidential reports or documents (if listed, these must be made available by the HEI if audited).
• Individual users/beneficiaries who could be contacted by the REF team to corroborate claims*.
• Factual statements already provided to the HEI by key users/beneficiaries, that corroborate specific claims made in the case study and that could be made available to the REF team by the HEI if audited*.

* Where the sources are individuals who could be contacted or have provided factual statements to the HEI, the submitted case study should state only the organisation (and, if appropriate, the position) of the individuals concerned, and which claim(s) they can corroborate. Their personal details (name, position, contact details) must be entered separately on the REF submission system and not on REF3b. Details of a maximum of five individuals may be entered for each case study; these data will not be published as part of the submission.
The panels articulate how they will ensure that the underpinning research is of at least ‘2 star’ quality. Provided they are satisfied that the quality threshold has been met, the quality of the underpinning research will not be taken into consideration in the assessment of the reach and significance of the claimed impact.
160. To be eligible for assessment as an impact, the impact described in a case study must have been underpinned by excellent research produced by the submitting unit, during the period 1 January 1993 to 31 December 2013. Each case study must describe the underpinning research, include references to one or more key research outputs, provide evidence of the quality of that research, and explain how that research underpinned or contributed to the impact.

• ‘Excellent research’ means that the quality of the research is at least equivalent to two star: ‘quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour’. Each case study must include references to one or more key research outputs that underpinned the impact and were produced by the submitting HEI, and evidence of the quality of the research as requested in the relevant panel criteria documents. Panels will consider the evidence of research quality, and may review outputs referenced in a case study. A panel will grade as unclassified a case study if it judges that the underpinning research outputs are not predominantly of at least two star quality.

• ‘Underpinned by’ means that the research made a distinct and material contribution to the impact taking place, such that the impact would not have occurred or would have been significantly reduced without the contribution of that research. Each case study must explain how (through what means) the research led to or contributed to the impact, and include appropriate sources of information external to the HEI to corroborate these claims. Where the panel judges that the submitted unit’s research did not make a distinct and material contribution to the impact, the case study will be graded as unclassified.

The generic guidance clarifies the requirements for the ‘underpinning research’ which must feature in the case studies

The four panels clarify their expectations of the underpinning research as follows
Case studies: underpinning research

Underpinning research quality

Case studies must include references to one or more key research outputs produced by the submitted unit that underpinned the impact, and must provide evidence of the quality of the research. A case study will be eligible for assessment only if the sub-panel is satisfied that the underpinning research is predominantly of at least two star quality.

Case studies should include references to underpinning outputs that clearly demonstrate the threshold has been met. They should include additional indicators, as appropriate, of the quality of the underpinning research, for example evidence of peer-reviewed funding. The sub-panels will use the information provided in case studies, and where necessary will review outputs referenced in section 3, in order to be assured that the quality threshold has been met.

Provided the sub-panel is satisfied that the quality threshold has been met, the quality of the underpinning research will not be taken into consideration as part of the assessment of the reach and significance of the claimed impact.

Underpinning research referenced in a case study may also be included in a submission as an output (listed in REF2), without disadvantage. In these situations, the assessment of the impact case study will have no bearing on the assessment of the quality of the output. The assessment of the quality of the output may inform the assessment of the case study, only in terms of assuring the threshold for underpinning research quality.
**Case studies: underpinning research**

**Underpinning research quality**

Case studies must include references to research produced by the submitted unit that underpinned the impact, and provide evidence of the quality of the research. A case study will be eligible for assessment only if the sub-panel is satisfied that the underpinning research is predominantly of at least two star quality.

The main panel notes in particular that while the REF is a process for assessing the excellence of research in submitting units, there is a key difference in the assessment of impact: the excellence of the underpinning research for an impact case study is a threshold judgement (a level which has to be met in order for a case study to be eligible for assessment), but the quality of the underpinning research will not be taken into consideration as part of the assessment (or indeed the assigned quality profile) of the claimed impact.

Submissions must ensure that each case study fulfils the threshold criterion on research quality (see ‘guidance on submissions’, paragraph 160). A sample of the research should be cited that is sufficient to identify clearly the body of work, or individual project, that underpins the claimed impact. Sub-panels do not expect to review underpinning research output(s) as a matter of course to establish that the threshold has been met. The onus is on the institution submitting case studies to provide evidence of this quality level. Some of the indicators of such quality might be (but are not restricted to): research outputs which have been through a rigorous peer-review process; research outputs which are the result of external grant funding that has been peer-reviewed (sources should be specified); end of grant reports referencing a high quality grading; favourable reviews of outputs from authoritative sources; prestigious prizes or awards made to individual research outputs of underpinning research; evidence that an output has been highly cited and has formed a reference point for further research beyond the original institution. It is noted that not all indicators of quality will apply to all forms of research output.

Such indicators will allow sub-panels to make an initial assessment as to whether the underpinning research meets the threshold quality criterion to make a case study eligible for assessment. Where there is doubt that the evidence provided confirms that underpinning research meets the required quality threshold, sub-panels may, exceptionally, decide to examine the outputs. This will be at the discretion of the sub-panel, and submitting HEIs will need to be able to make the outputs available on request.

The sub-panels do not anticipate that submitting units will normally need to cite more than five references, and submissions should include references that best demonstrate the quality of the underpinning research.

Underpinning research referenced in a case study may also be included in a submission as an output (listed in REF2), without disadvantage. In these situations, the assessment of the impact case study will have no bearing on the assessment of the quality of the output. The assessment of the quality of the output may inform the assessment of the case study, only in terms of assuring the threshold for underpinning research quality.

---

**Case studies: underpinning research**

Sub-panels need to be assured that the impact claimed is based on research (at least equivalent to two star, as defined in ‘guidance on submissions’, sub-paragraph 160b). Submitting units are required to identify the underpinning research (which may be a body of work produced over a number of years by one or more individuals, or may be the output or outputs of a particular project).

The main panel notes in particular that while the REF is a process for assessing the excellence of research in submitting units, there is a key difference in the assessment of impact: the quality of the underpinning research for an impact case study is a threshold judgement (a level which has to be met in order for a case study to be eligible for assessment), but the quality of the underpinning research will not be taken into consideration as part of the assessment of the reach and significance of the claimed impact.

A sample of the underpinning research should be cited that is sufficient to identify clearly the body of work, or individual project that underpins the impact. The onus is on the institution submitting case studies to provide evidence of this quality level. Some of the indicators of such quality might be (but are not restricted to): research outputs which have been through a rigorous peer-review process; end of grant reports referencing a high quality grading; favourable reviews of outputs from authoritative sources; prizes or awards made to individual research outputs cited in the underpinning research; evidence that an output is a reference point for further research beyond the original institution. Not all indicators of quality will apply to all forms of output.

Such indicators will allow sub-panels to make an initial assessment as to whether the underpinning research meets the threshold quality criterion to make a case study eligible for assessment. Where the evidence provided is insufficient to confirm that the underpinning research meets the required quality threshold, sub-panels may decide to examine the outputs in more detail. This will be at the discretion of the sub-panel, and submitting HEIs will need to be able to make the outputs available on request.

Underpinning research referenced in a case study may also be included in a submission as an output (listed in REF2), without disadvantage. In these situations, the assessment of the impact case study will have no bearing on the assessment of the quality of the output. The assessment of the quality of the output may inform the assessment of the case study, only in terms of assuring the threshold for underpinning research quality.
The final element in the impact assessment is the ‘impact template’, where UoAs need to describe their approach to supporting and enabling impact from research conducted.

THE IMPACT TEMPLATE
Impact template (form REF3a)

149. Submissions must include a completed impact template, describing the submitted unit’s approach during the assessment period (1 January 2008 to 31 July 2013) to supporting and enabling impact from research conducted within the unit. This information is intended to enable a more holistic and contextualised assessment of impact than would be possible from case studies alone, through the provision of:

- context for the individual case studies (though panels will recognise that case studies are underpinned by research over a timeframe that is longer than the assessment period, and that individual case studies may therefore not relate directly to the approach set out in the impact template)
- additional information about a wider range of activity within the submitted unit and its capacity for impact, than may be captured in the case studies.

150. The inclusion of the impact template also provides a mechanism for the assessment to take account of particular circumstances of a unit that may have constrained its selection of case studies (for example where it is a new department, or where the focus of its research may have limited opportunities for application).

151. The impact template will seek information on each of the following:

- context
- the unit’s approach to impact during the period 2008-2013
- strategy and plans for supporting impact
- the relationship between the unit’s approach to impact and the submitted case studies (recognising that individual case studies may not relate directly to the approach).

152. The impact template recognises that the submitted unit may not have had a specific strategy for impact in place during the REF assessment period, and therefore enables submissions to describe their approach to impact during the assessment period as well as their development of a strategy and plans for the future.

153. Panel criteria statements will provide further guidance on the kinds of information and evidence expected within each section of the impact template. Panels will assess the impact template in terms of the extent to which the unit’s approach is conducive to achieving impacts of reach and significance.

154. The completed impact template should:

a. Focus primarily on the approach taken by the submitted unit to achieving impact from its research – not the approach of the HEI as a whole. However, part of the submitted unit’s approach could include a statement of how it has made use of institutional resources and infrastructure, and aligned with a wider HEI strategy.

b. Not repeat detailed evidence that is included in case studies, though the completed impact template could refer to submitted case studies.

c. Include evidence and specific details or examples of the submitted unit’s approach, rather than broad general statements.
July 2011 guidance

The impact template will seek information on each of the following:
- context
- the unit’s approach to impact during the period 2008-2013
- strategy and plans for supporting impact
- the relationship between the unit’s approach to impact and the submitted case studies (recognising that individual case studies may not relate directly to the approach).

*Each of the Main Panels devotes considerable time to spelling out their expectations in their guidance. This is unchanged from the draft guidance*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PANEL A</th>
<th>PANEL B</th>
<th>PANEL C</th>
<th>PANEL D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CONTEXT** | Institutions should describe the main non-academic user groups, beneficiaries or audiences for the unit's research, the main types of impact specifically relevant to the unit's research, and how these relate to the range of research activity or research groups in the unit. | • Describe the main non-academic user groups, beneficiaries or audiences for the unit’s research.  
• Describe the main types of impact specifically relevant to the unit’s research, and how these relate to the range of research activity or research groups in the unit. | Who are the main non-academic user groups, beneficiaries or audiences for the research in the submitting unit? What are the main types of impact specifically relevant to that research? How do these relate to the range of research activity or research groups in the unit? |
| **APPROACH TO IMPACT** | Institutions should describe the unit’s approach to interacting with non-academic users, beneficiaries or audiences and to achieving impacts from its research, during the period 2008 to 2013. This could include details of, for example:  
• how staff in the unit interacted with, engaged with or developed relationships with key users, beneficiaries or audiences to develop impact from the research carried out in the unit [Note that within the environment template, submissions should explain research collaborations with users, and how their relationships/interactions inform the development of the unit’s research activity/strategy].  
• evidence of the nature of those relationships and interactions  
• evidence of follow-through from these activities to identify resulting impacts  
• how the unit specifically supported and enabled staff to achieve impact from their research  
• how the unit made use of institutional facilities, expertise or resources in undertaking these activities  
• other mechanisms deployed by the unit to support and enable impact. | Describe the unit’s approach to its interaction with non-academic users, beneficiaries or audiences and to achieving impacts from its research, during the period 2008 to 2013. This could include details of, for example:  
• How staff in the unit interacted with, engaged with or developed relationships with key users, beneficiaries or audiences to develop impact from the research carried out in the unit.  
• Evidence of the nature of those relationships and interactions. This may include, for example, participation in schemes such as Research Council knowledge exchange schemes and industrial doctoral training centres, and interactions through training provided or consultancy undertaken, where these have led to beneficial relationships.  
• Evidence of follow-through from these activities to identify resulting impacts.  
• Evidence of an agile approach to opportunities.  
• How the unit specifically supported and enabled staff to achieve impact from their research and ways in which they are rewarded or recognised for achieving impact.  
• How the unit made use of institutional facilities, expertise or resources in undertaking these activities.  
• Other mechanisms deployed by the unit to support and enable impact. | Submissions should describe the unit’s approach and its infrastructural mechanisms to support staff to achieve impact, during the period 2008-2013. This may include (but is not limited to):  
– how staff in the unit engaged with or developed relationships with key users in order to develop impact from the unit’s research  
– evidence of the nature of those relationships  
– how the unit has specifically supported staff to enable impact to be achieved from their research  
– how the unit has made use of institutional support, expertise, or resources to provide support to its staff. |
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### STRATEGY AND PLANS

**Institutions should describe how they are developing a strategy for achieving impact, including goals and plans for supporting and enabling impact from current and future research.**

**Describe how the unit is developing its strategy for achieving impact, including its goals for supporting and enabling impact from its research in the future.**

**Submissions should describe clearly stated goals and plans for maximising the potential for impact from current and future research.**

**What are the goals and plans for the unit to support impact from research in the future? How is the unit developing its strategy for impact?**

### RELATIONSHIP TO CASE STUDIES

**Institutions should describe how the selected case studies relate to their approach to achieving impact. This could include details of, for example, how particular case studies exemplify aspects of the approach, or how particular case studies informed the development of the unit’s approach.**

**The sub-panels do not expect that submitted case studies will necessarily have arisen out of the approaches to achieving impacts described above for the period 2008 to 2013. However, where this is relevant, they would welcome details of, for example, how particular case studies exemplify aspects of the approach, or how particular case studies informed the development of the unit’s approach.**

**Submissions should describe the relationship between the support for impact described and the case studies (although the main panel acknowledges that impacts may have been serendipitous rather than planned, or may have arisen from research prior to the period 2008-2013). This could include details of how, for example, particular case studies exemplify aspects of the approach adopted, or how particular case studies informed the development of the unit’s approach.**

**How do the selected case studies relate to the unit’s approach to achieving impact, as described above? This could include details of, for example, how particular case studies exemplify aspects of the approach, or how particular case studies informed the development of the approach. It is, however, recognised that case studies are underpinned by research over a timeframe that is longer than the assessment period, and that individual case studies may, therefore, not relate directly to the approach set out above.**
Some specific references to public engagement are made in the different documents, listed in this section. This section details what these are.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND IMPACT
The following specific mentions of public engagement and impact are made

**REF FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT**

161. There are many ways in which research may have underpinned impact, including but not limited to:

c. Impacts on, for example, public awareness, attitudes, understanding or behaviour that arose from engaging the public with research. In these cases, the submitting unit must show that the engagement activity was, at least in part, based on the submitted unit’s research and drew materially and distinctly upon it.

**Panel A**

**Panel A provides this clarification:**

For case studies claiming impact from public engagement:

- There must be a clear link between the research and the engagement or involvement activity (see ‘guidance on submissions’ paragraph 161c).
- Evidence should be provided about dissemination, as well as a clear explanation about the significance or the benefits to audiences.
- The activity should go beyond ‘business as usual’ engagement or involvement (for example, there was active involvement of service users and/or the public, the activity informed the focus of the research or created widespread interest, was particularly innovative, or created legacy resources).

**Panel D**

The panel includes these prompts for ‘evidence’ of impact arising from public engagement:

- Information about the number and profile of people engaged and types of audience. Follow-up activities or media coverage. Evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources or access to web content.
- Descriptions of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Evaluation data. User feedback or testimony. Critical external reviews of the engagement activity. Evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices, contributions (financial or in-kind) by third parties to enhance services or support for the public, or evidence of funds from third parties to enhance or extend the engagement activity. Evidence of sustainability, through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes, continuing sales, downloads, or use of resources.
**Panel B**

**Impacts arising from public engagement activity**

Engaging the public with research is an activity that may lead to impact. Sub-panels will welcome case studies that include impact achieved in this way, either as the main impact described or as one facet of a wider range of impacts.

Public engagement is a very broad area, not all of which is underpinned by research. Case studies which include impacts that derive from engaging the public with research must:

- At least in part, be based on specific research or a body of research carried out in the submitted unit, and explain clearly which particular aspects of the research underpinned the engagement activity and contributed to the impact claimed.
- Include evidence of the reach of the impact. This should extend beyond simply providing the numbers of people engaged and may also, for example, include:
  - information about the types of audience
  - whether there was secondary reach, for example from follow-up activity or media coverage
  - other quantitative indicators such as evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources, and/or access to web content.

- Include evidence of the significance of the impact. This should include a description of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Examples of the evidence that might be provided for this include:
  - evaluation data
  - user feedback or testimony
  - critical external reviews of the engagement activity
  - evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices, contributions (financial or in-kind) by third parties to enhance services or support for the public, or evidence of funds from third parties to enhance or extend the engagement activity
  - evidence of sustainability, through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes, continuing sales, downloads, or use of resources.
Impacts arising from public engagement activity

81. Public engagement is an activity that may lead to the impact of research. Sub-panels will welcome case studies that include impact achieved in this way, either as the main impact described or as one facet of a broader range of impacts.

82. Case studies which include impacts that derive from engaging the public with research must:
   a. At least in part, be based on specific research or a body of research carried out in the submitted unit, and explain clearly which particular aspects of the research underpinned the engagement activity and contributed to the impact claimed.
   b. Include evidence of the reach of the impact. This should extend beyond simply providing the numbers of people engaged and may also, for example, include:
      - information about the types of audience
      - whether there was secondary reach, for example from follow-up activity or media coverage
      - other quantitative indicators such as evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources, and/or access to web content.
   c. Include evidence of the significance of the impact. This should include a description of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Examples of the evidence that might be provided for this include:
      - evaluation data
      - critical external reviews of the engagement activity
      - evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices
      - user feedback or testimony
      - evidence of sustainability through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes or use of resources

83. Impact takes place through a wide variety of mechanisms. The links between research and its consequences may be direct and causal, or diffuse and non-linear.

It may effect change or enrichment for local, national or international communities, groups or individuals. Consequently public engagement may be an important feature of many case studies, typically as the mechanism by which the impact claimed has been achieved. The sub-panels will take all these factors into account as appropriate when weighing the evidence provided.
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