

# Impact: points raised so far

- Demonstrable
- Economic, cultural, social, quality of life and public policy
- At level of department, research group
- Statement + case-studies; text boxes for outputs
- Covering previous + current REF period

# Assessment

- Assessed by peer review (+ indicators?)
- At sub-panel level
- Profile (discussion of scaling)
- Weight: 20%+

# Indicators: the template so far

- Supply of skilled people
- New knowledge-based businesses
- Improvements to performance of existing kbb
- Attracting inward investment
- Improving public services and policy

# RCs active in broadening agenda

- AHRC: 'intrinsic effects', social and cultural
- + broad economic impact of cultural activity
- ESRC: 'extremely diverse'..
- Economic competitiveness, esp for UK
- Effectiveness of public services
- Quality of life, health and creative outputs

# Technical issues

- Audit
- Attributing 'legacies' to research perhaps 12 years old
- Double-counting, since impact assessment periods may overlap

# Impact of impact

- Bias towards work with demonstrable impact?
- Bias towards input rather than outcome?
- Bias towards work supportive rather than critical of policy, ‘working with the grain’ of current ideas (e.g. migration, EU, homelessness, poverty, public order, regulation of economy)?

# Impact: assessing how non-researchers use research

- Researchers' responsibility for the use made of research
- MMR, Bell Curve, IQ and 'race', dependency culture
- Criteria of significance and rigour (and originality?) to be applied to researcher or to use made of the research outputs?