

REF IMPACT CASE STUDY CHECKLIST FOR AUTHORS & REVIEWERS

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide case study authors and reviewers with a checklist of key features and information that the impact case study (ICS) must have in order to satisfy the requirements of the Research Excellence Framework.

Background

Research England's [panel criteria and working methods](#) document for the Research Excellence Framework sets out the criteria and process for how the impact of research will be assessed. The following is a summary of the key information from the document.

The impact case studies will be peer reviewed by a panel of experts, made up of researchers from other institutions within your field and users of research evidence.

The panels will assess both the '**reach and significance**' of the **impact** claimed, whether this is impact on the economy, society and/or culture. They will make an overall judgement of impact rather than assessing each criterion separately, whilst recognising that the balance of reach and significance will vary on a case by case basis.

The following definitions provided are key:

- **“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.” (therefore academic impact is excluded for this exercise)
- **“Reach** will be understood as the extent and/or diversity of the beneficiaries of the impact, as relevant to the nature of the impact. Reach will be assessed in terms of the extent to which the potential constituencies, number or groups of beneficiaries have been reached; it will not be assessed in purely geographic terms, nor in terms of absolute numbers of beneficiaries. The criteria will be applied wherever the impact occurred, regardless of geography or location, and whether in the UK or abroad.
- **Significance** will be understood as the degree to which the impact has enabled, enriched, influenced, informed or changed the performance, policies, practices, products, services, understanding, awareness or wellbeing of the beneficiaries”¹.

The impacts can be of any stage of maturity but need to have been achieved within the impact window of 1 August 2013 to 31 July 2020 (i.e. the ICS should not include any future potential / anticipated impact).

The excellent research (of at least 2* quality) needs to have been conducted within the submitting institution (i.e. University of Bath) between 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2020 and within the submitting unit of assessment

Key documents from Research England:

Guidance on submission - <https://www.ref.ac.uk/publications/guidance-on-submissions-201901/>

Panel Criteria and working methods - <https://www.ref.ac.uk/publications/panel-criteria-and-working-methods-201902/>

Panel members for your Unit of Assessment can be found here:

<https://www.ref.ac.uk/panels/panel-membership/>

For more information or help please contact the Research Impact Team on research-impact@bath.ac.uk

¹ <https://www.ref.ac.uk/publications/panel-criteria-and-working-methods-201902/>

Checklist

1. General

	Yes	No
Format Maximum 5 pages long Arial 11 point Single line spacing Margins 2cm		
Indicative word counts Summary of impact 100 words Underpinning research 500 words Details of impact 750 words		
Language and style Written as a narrative (story)? Clear and accessible to a generalist in your field? Easy to read?		
Essentials Does the account describe both the reach and significance of the impact? Was the research carried out between 1st January 2000 and 31 December 2020 at the University of Bath ? Did the impact occurred between 1 August 2013 and 31st July 2020?		

2. Title

	Yes	No
Does the title effectively describes the impact being claimed?		

3. Summary

	Yes	No
Does the section clearly describe the impact being claimed, the problem being addressed and how your research contributed?		
Does it summarise the <i>specific impacts</i> being described in the case study?		
Is it obvious what form(s) of impact is being claimed, <i>e.g.</i> an effect on or benefits to, one or more of: the economy; the environment (natural and built); health; public policy and services; quality of life; society.		
Does it reflect the language of Annex A of the Panel Criteria 's 'examples of impacts and indicators'?		
Have quantitative data about the impact been included where available?		

4. Underpinning research

	Yes	No
Does it outline the <i>key research</i> insights and findings that underpin the impact?		
Are details given of what research was undertaken and when?		
Does it say who undertook the research and their position at the time of research? Is it clear that this research was conducted at University of Bath?		
Is the link between the underpinning research findings and the impact clear?		
Have all references been listed in Section 3 and cross-referenced here so that no details are included in this section?		
Does it demonstrate that your underpinning research was 2* quality? (e.g. REF eligible outputs of 2* or above; peer-reviewed or high profile funding; prizes/ awards to named outputs.)		

5. References to the Research

	Yes	No
Are there up to, but no more than, 6 references that describe the research in the previous section?		
Have all relevant details been provided? Author(s), Title, Year of publication, type of output and identifying information (e.g. journal title and issue).		
Are all the references within the period 1st January 2000 and 31 December 2020?		
Have you provided URL links, DOIs or other means for the panel to access the output if required?		
Is evidence provided to support the quality of the research conducted (awards, peer review, high profile grants)		
Are the details of key, high profile research grants included here?		

6. Details of the Impact

	Yes	No
Is the link between the research insights and the impact clear? Does it describe the 'distinct and material' contribution that the Bath research made?		
Does it explain the pathway from the research to the impact (e.g. how it was disseminated, how it came to influence users/beneficiaries, or how it came to be exploited, taken up or applied).		

Is it clear what impact is being claimed? See Annex A of the Panel Criteria		
Does it clearly outline what has changed, for whom and by how much? Is it specific enough?		
Does it demonstrate both reach and significance of impact? i.e. Has sufficient context been provided for the panel to understand the reach? E.g. the extent to which a target population/ audience/market have been reached?		
Has supporting evidence been incorporated into the narrative? i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has evidence or indicators of the extent of the impact been included? • Have performance measures been quantified e.g. sales figures, income, etc • Is there qualitative evidence of impact? E.g. are key quotes provided? 		
Does it include dates for when the impact occurred?		
Have all impacts on academia been excluded?		
If the research was part of a wider body of work (e.g. other institutions or organisations) does this section specify the contribution of the underpinning research and does it acknowledge other key research contributions?		

7. Sources to corroborate the impact

	Yes	No
Are there a maximum of 10 sources given here?		
Are all the sources external to Bath?		
Do the source types reflect one or more of the following examples: (a) reports; (b) reviews; (c) web links; (d) documents in the public domain; (e) confidential reports or documents; (f) individual users/beneficiaries (i.e. testimonials); (g) factual statements already provided to the HEI by key users/beneficiaries.		
Are no more than 5 individuals cited if the source type is (f) or (g)?		
Are only the organisation (and if appropriate, the position) of the individual stated here?		
Does it indicate which impact they are corroborating – cross-referencing with the impact section?		

8. Any other comments:

--