

Symplectic Elements REF Webinar 24 April 2019

Queries raised during the session for follow-up later

Thanks to you all for raising these questions. Please find below our responses on each of the 8 questions that we were unable to adequately cover during the webinar itself.

- 1. Even if you aren't directly supporting the impact case study submission, are you committing to developing the impact module further to help us gather/store/prepare the impact evidence?**

Adam Riches, MMU

Kate Byrne (VP, Product Management) is currently reviewing all Impact Module related feature requests to identify the next phase of work on the impact module ahead of our mid-year roadmap update. If you have any feedback about the Impact module specifically related to REF which isn't already captured as a feature request on the Support site please contact us via the Support site.

- 2. Would it be possible to have a custom scoreset at the Accepted -> Attributed decision stage, so that we can rank the pool of possibles into Definite/Likely/Reserve/etc - we will have maybe 3000 to whittle down to 1000 in just one UoA, so some sort of interim scoring would be useful.**

Andy Reid, LSHTM

Thanks for the question, Andy. We have a support query ongoing with you, including further clarifying questions regarding your intended use pattern here. We'll consider how scoresets can be best used for this purpose, and also consider alternatives. As a possibility, could it help to view / set labels on some of the REF2 screens?

- 3. How do we calculate (ideally) or flag that the publication was within the contract period for a 1B? What if multiple periods of Cat A eligible on a single 1B?**

Owen Roberson, Cambridge

Thanks for this Owen. As we take plans for the REF1 aspects of functionality further forward, we will consider how we might take content from the REF1 form for Category B staff and use it to validate against any attributed REF2s.

- 4. Would it be worth having a 'Fewer than 15 authors' flag as well?**

Andy Reid, LSHTM

We don't propose to have such a flag, but rather to employ logic to determine whether a 'author contribution statement' is required based on:

- UoA
- Number of co-authors (derived from associated Publication, or 'Number of additional co-authors override' field on the REF2)
- Is corresponding / lead author

Our current working notes on this point are covered by this annotation on the REF2 mockups (screenshot below). We welcome input from you and other interested parties in validating the logic involved is appropriate for purpose and that the prioritisation of this part of the feature is appropriate given other competing priorities.

LOGIC FOR AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Panels C and D

UoAs 7, 8, 10, 11, 12

No Author contribution statement is required - EVER

So, should we remove:

- Is corresponding / lead author field?
- Author contribution statement field?

Panel A

UoA 9

No Author contribution statement required if:

- Number of authors (Number of additional co-authors + 1) (or override, if populated) is 15 or less (in which case, we should remove / grey out the 'Author contribution statement' and 'Is corresponding / lead author' fields)
- Where >15 authors, but the attributed author is the lead / corresponding author (in which case, we should remove / grey out the 'Author contribution statement' field if 'Is corresponding / lead author' is TRUE)

There is a field in the data requirements "requiresAuthorContributionStatement" with the description "This flag is to enable the submission system to track the author contribution statements to aid institutions in developing their submissions"

- I'm not sure we need to replicate this in Elements? In those UoAs where a statement may be required, it won't be known if a statement is required until the output is attributed (and then, a statement will only be required if >15 authors and attributed author is not lead / corresponding author)
- if we have to return a value, I suggest we only return this in the submission XML, using the logic described above

Source: sticky note on mockup attached to <https://symplectic.jira.com/browse/ELE-7770>

5. **In terms of output selection, it would be great if, for each UoA, we could see the list of eligible/output ranked by review score**

Karl Smith, LSBU

We've added this to our development plans.

6. **For attribution support, maybe you could develop a report listing all accepted outputs and all REF1 authors in the UoA on a grid showing what could be attributed to who?**

Tim Brooks, Anglia

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	version 1					
2		Author 1	Author 2	Author 3	Author 4	
3	Output 1	x		x	x	
4	Output 2		x	x		
5	Output 3	x			x	
6	Output 4	x				
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13	version 2					
14		Author 1	Author 2	Author 3	Author 4	
15	Output 1	x		attributed	x	
16	Output 2		attributed	x		
17	Output 3	x			attributed	
18	Output 4	attributed				
19						
20						

We will put this request on our list of features to consider for future development. Unsure how well this will scale if say 300 REF1 authors and 1500 REF2 outputs.

7. Will it be possible to turn off the author selection workflow stage, so we could manage the full corpus in the review stage?

Keith Fildes, Sheffield Hallam

(Question repeated by Mark H at UAL on

<https://support.symplectic.co.uk/support/discussions/topics/6000057523>)

By full corpus, do you mean all REF eligible publications in the census period and linked to eligible REF1 staff, rather than only those which have been selected by one or more academic? It's a question of style/approach as to what extent REF managers chose to over-select publications and manage the whittling down later after they have been reviewed, using the new Acceptance and Attribution later in the REF2-specific future functionality.

8. Are there any plans to amend the open access verification screens? Or indeed a perceived need to amend these screens?

Nicola Bates, Brunel

We need a little more information to be able to answer this fully, so have contacted Nicola to discuss this directly.