

This statement should be read alongside the statement for Main Panel N and the generic statement.

Absences of chair and declaration of interests from members

1. In line with the policy of the main panel, the sub-panel has elected a deputy chair. If both the chair and deputy are absent, a temporary chair will be elected from among those members present.
2. When submissions are discussed from an HEI in which a member has declared a major interest, that member will withdraw from the meeting. Members will declare minor interests and these will be recorded and handled in line with the guidance provided in Annex 4. Minor conflicts of interest will not necessarily exclude a panel member from the discussion of a submission, provided that such conflicts are transparent and brought to the attention of other sub-panel members.

UOA descriptor and boundaries

3. The UOA includes all areas and styles of, and approaches to, philosophy.
4. The sub-panel expects to receive submissions from all areas of philosophy, and considers the following subjects (listed alphabetically), among others, to be within the remit of the UOA:
 - 19th and 20th century European philosophy including phenomenology, existentialism, critical theory, hermeneutics, and deconstruction
 - aesthetics
 - applied philosophy
 - epistemology
 - ethics including applied ethics
 - feminist philosophy
 - history of philosophy including ancient, medieval, modern and recent
 - logic
 - metaphysics
 - non-Western philosophy
 - philosophy of language

- philosophy of mathematics
- philosophy of mind
- philosophy of religion
- philosophy of science
- political and social philosophy
- teaching philosophy.

This list is illustrative rather than exhaustive: it does not reflect any judgements about the relative significance of the subject areas, nor does it specify 'fields'.

5. Philosophy spans boundaries with a number of other UOAs. Aspects of submissions which in the opinion of the sub-panel fall within the competency and expertise of another UOA will be cross-referred to the relevant sub-panel or specialist adviser, whether or not the submitting institution has requested it. The sub-panel expects to be able to accede to all reasonable requests from HEIs to cross-refer material. All cross-referred material will be reviewed according to the criteria of the sub-panel originally receiving the submission, the 'originating' sub-panel. The originating sub-panel will be informed of the evaluation of the work made by the other sub-panels. The final recommendation on cross-referred research will remain with the originating sub-panel and will be based on discussion at a full sub-panel meeting. The sub-panel's sole concern is the assessment of research excellence and not the identification of disciplinary boundaries. It will treat all outputs equally whether they fall firmly within the remit of the UOA as described above or fall into an overlap with a neighbouring UOA.
6. Where appropriate the sub-panel will seek advice from external specialist advisers appointed by the RAE team.

Research staff

7. The contribution of Category A staff, including newly recruited staff, will be evaluated in relation to the research environment and esteem, and their submitted work will be considered in the assessment of the submitted research outputs. The contributions made by early career researchers, and those who have been

UOA 60, Philosophy

absent from research for prolonged periods, will be considered under all three elements of the quality profile: outputs, environment and esteem. The allowances made for staff in these circumstances are described in paragraphs 28-36 below.

8. The contribution of individuals in Categories B and D will be evaluated only in relation to their contribution to the department's research environment and esteem measures.

9. The contribution made by Category C staff will be evaluated in relation to the research environment and esteem, and their submitted work will be considered in the assessment of submitted research outputs. In order for individuals to be accepted as eligible for submission as Category C staff, and for their research activity to be included in a department's quality profile, the department must provide strong evidence in RA5c that they have a close and continuing relationship with the research of the department. Category C staff will be expected to have substantially similar research roles to staff on the payroll of the university, eg, in co-supervising research students or developing research seminars, colloquia or conferences. The research activity of individuals who cannot demonstrate such an enduring and substantial connection will not be counted towards the department's quality profile.

Research outputs

Types of output

10. A research output is the outcome of a research process that is presented in the public domain (unless it is a confidential output). As well as judging the quality of submitted outputs, the sub-panel will attach additional weight in the quality profile to those outputs which it considers to be of significant scale and scope (see paragraphs 18-27 below).

11. In judging outputs the sub-panel will be guided solely by its view of their research quality. All cited outputs will be judged on academic merit regardless of the medium (for example, in paper or electronic form) or location of publication. Web-based publications, including

for instance those published on publicly available departmental web-sites, will be judged by the same standards and criteria as other outputs.

12. The sub-panel will look for evidence of the following in judging the quality of outputs: originality, contribution to the advancement of knowledge and understanding, scope or range of the work, and scholarly rigour.

13. Types of output will not be ranked against each other, and outputs not already subject to a peer review or refereeing process will not for that reason be regarded as of lesser quality. No form of output will be regarded as intrinsically inferior to any other.

14. Where there is a visible contribution to research, the following forms of scholarly outputs (listed alphabetically) will be evaluated:

- articles
- books, including textbooks which incorporate considerable personal research or substantially advance the subject area
- chapters and papers in collected volumes
- commentaries and editions of texts
- critical databases and other scholarly support materials deriving from research
- edited collections of papers, where the editor has made a demonstrable contribution to the research published, for example by acting as a significant catalyst for original research, by promoting an innovative methodology or approach, or by writing an introduction or conclusion that contributes to the advancement of knowledge. The contribution of the editor should be clarified in the 'Other relevant details' field of RA2 (maximum length 300 words) and the whole volume should be submitted as the output
- exhibitions, catalogues or comparable publications, where there is an explicit research component and currently available evidence to support this
- media productions, such as television programmes, where there is an individually attributable research component

UOA 60, Philosophy

- scholarly web-sites
- significant reviews and review articles
- substantial dictionary and encyclopaedia entries, including groups of entries which may be submitted as a single output
- teaching materials where these contain a significant research element
- translations where there is a demonstrable research element.

15. Where an editor or other contributor has supplied an additional item or items to the same publication of a special edition of a journal, an edited book or other collected work these may be submitted together or separately with appropriate comment in the 'Other relevant details' field of RA2. This is notwithstanding the general guidance that where an output is published as a single coherent work it should be submitted as such and not subdivided for submission as two or more separate items.

16. In the case of material published before 1 January 2001 which has been re-issued in a revised edition or in a collection of papers, or which has been translated into another language, credit will be given only for new elements in this output.

17. Joint-authored pieces will normally be treated as a single-authored piece, ie, the piece will not be judged more harshly nor will the quality value be divided between the contributors. Departments should provide an explanation of the relative contributions of the joint authors in the 'Other relevant details' field of RA2. However, it is expected that authors who submit joint-authored outputs will each have made a substantial contribution to them, and significant imbalances in the relative contributions will be taken into account when judging the work. The sub-panel accepts that a joint-authored output may be listed by more than one individual in a department's submission.

Developing a quality profile for outputs

18. The normal expected number of outputs per research-active member of staff is four; this is also the maximum number. Staff in Categories A and

C will be treated identically for the purposes of producing a quality profile for research outputs. Each will be expected to submit four outputs, unless there is a good reason (of the kind described below) for submitting fewer than four.

19. Staff on part-time contracts will be given the same allowances as other staff pro rata; the expectations placed on part-time staff will also be pro rata. Notwithstanding the allowances made for part-time staff (as with allowances made for staff in other categories), such researchers may still submit up to four outputs.

20. The sub-panel aims to read all submitted outputs. Each submitted output will be examined in detail individually and graded as either 4*, 3*, 2*, 1* or Unclassified.

21. Each output will also be weighted. Weighting will be based on the scale, scope or nature of the research investment represented by the output. Outputs will receive a weighting of between one and four, normally no more than two. The sub-panel will use its professional judgement to attach weightings appropriate to each output. It will not require HEIs to nominate such outputs in submissions, and will disregard any claims that an output should have additional weighting.

22. Where a work is to receive a weighting greater than one, the judgement will be made by at least two sub-panel members and will, like all decisions, be subject to endorsement at a full meeting of the sub-panel.

23. The weighting given to an output will be arrived at separately from the assessment of its quality.

24. An output given a weighting of one will count as one grade towards the department's overall profile. An output given a weighting of two will count as two grades towards the department's overall profile, and so on.

25. If a staff member has produced fewer than four outputs, and there is a good reason for fewer than four outputs being submitted (as described in paragraph 39 of the generic statement), only the assessed outputs will be reflected in the quality profile for research outputs.

UOA 60, Philosophy

26. If fewer than four outputs have been submitted, and there is no good reason for fewer than four outputs being submitted, the 'missing' outputs will be carried forward into the department's overall profile as grades for Unclassified single outputs.

27. A judgement to carry forward an Unclassified grade where fewer than four outputs have been submitted will be made by at least two sub-panel members and will, like all decisions, be subject to endorsement at a full meeting of the sub-panel.

28. There are two broad types of special circumstances for submitting fewer than four outputs:

- a. Full-time and part-time absence from research, as described in paragraph 39 of the generic statement. As noted in paragraph 52 below, the sub-panel expects a commentary in RA5a on support arrangements for all staff, including any staff in this category.
- b. Engagement in a long-term research project. In these circumstances, the sub-panel expects that an individual researcher will normally have produced other outputs.

29. In cases falling within the special circumstances described above, the sub-panel will use its professional judgement to decide on the acceptability of the department's reason for submitting fewer than four outputs, where equality legislation does not apply.

30. The sub-panel will adopt a positive approach in judging the impact of any special circumstances on the volume of individuals' research output. It therefore welcomes information on any special circumstances which have significantly affected individuals' contributions to the submission. Such circumstances should be described in RA5b. The sub-panel will take account, as appropriate, of guidance in RAE 02/2005 'Equality briefing for panel chairs, members and secretaries'. As noted in the main panel statement, departments may exceptionally claim that an individual returning fewer than four outputs does so because the submitted work includes outputs produced as a result of research projects of significant scale or scope. This should also be explained briefly in RA5b.

31. The sub-panel will take note of the length of time during the assessment period (1 January 2001 to 31 October 2007) that a member of staff is absent from research. Each case will be considered individually and on the basis of information provided by the HEI in the RAE submission. However, in most normal circumstances the approach will be as follows:

- a. A staff member who has been absent from research for more than three years during the assessment period can be submitted to the RAE with one research output and will be considered without prejudice.
- b. A staff member who has been absent from research for between two and three years during the assessment period can be submitted to the RAE with two research outputs and will be considered without prejudice.
- c. A staff member who has been absent from research for between six months and two years during the assessment period can be submitted to the RAE with three research outputs and will be considered without prejudice.

32. The sub-panel recognises the possibility that some staff may have been absent from research for less than six months during the assessment period in relation to maternity, paternity or adoption leave. In such situations, the sub-panel may accept submissions from affected members of staff with three research outputs and will consider these submissions without prejudice.

33. In addition, the sub-panel will take note of the point at which new staff entered the academic profession with a contract suitable for inclusion under Category A (ie, early career researchers). Each case will be considered individually and on the basis of information provided by the HEI in the RAE submissions. However, in most normal circumstances, the consideration will be:

- a. A staff member who entered the profession (as described above) on or after 1 August 2004 can be submitted to the RAE with one research output without prejudice.

UOA 60, Philosophy

- b. A staff member who entered the profession (as described above) on or after 1 August 2003 can be submitted to the RAE with two research outputs without prejudice.

Notwithstanding these allowances, however, an early career researcher may choose to submit up to four outputs.

34. The sub-panel will pay close attention to the role of departments in developing the careers of new entrants to the profession. Submissions should explain the role and contribution of staff who have been recruited not only since 1 August 2003, but during the entire census period, and the ways in which they are helped to develop their careers. Institutions should submit any additional information they feel will inform the sub-panel about the integration and support of new members of staff.

35. The sub-panel will take account of special circumstances affecting the quantity of outputs submitted, but not in judging the quality of those outputs. All submitted outputs will be considered equally.

36. Institutions should submit information concerning other mitigating circumstances which may have reduced an individual's potential to engage in research, along with information about the reasons for submitting fewer than four items. The sub-panel will use this information to make a judgement about such circumstances and their academic impact, where equality legislation does not apply.

Research environment**Research students and research studentships**

37. Credit will be given to submissions showing evidence of the recruitment of postgraduate research students. Numbers of research students will be evaluated in relation to the number of research-active staff and the subject areas. However, there will be no automatic correlation between raw quantitative data and research assessment outcomes.

38. In evaluating evidence concerning research studentships, the sub-panel will regard success in winning peer reviewed studentships, such as from the Arts and Humanities Research Council or the Economic and Social Research Council, as an indicator of the research environment. Studentships awarded by other external bodies or by institutions themselves will not necessarily be considered less significant.

39. When evaluating the research environment, the sub-panel will also seek information on the numbers of completed postgraduate dissertations, both full-time and part-time; evidence of research training; support mechanisms to promote such postgraduate activities as the organising of conferences, seminars and publications; and mechanisms to develop the careers of postgraduates.

Research income

40. Credit will be given to submissions which show evidence of the successful generation of research income which makes a significant and demonstrable contribution to the research environment. This information should be provided in RA5a.

41. As with other quantitative evidence, the sub-panel does not regard research income as a necessary indicator of research quality in its subject areas, and is aware that research funding is more readily available and more important in some areas of philosophical research than in others. There will be no automatic correlation between data on research income and research assessment outcomes.

42. The sub-panel will pay attention to external income acquired through a competitive process of peer review, and to its productive outcomes, as an indicator of the research environment, but it will not automatically regard external funding from non-peer reviewed sources as of lesser significance.

Research structure

43. The sub-panel believes that outstanding philosophical research is and can be undertaken in a variety of research structures and environments,

UOA 60, Philosophy

and that the broader health of the discipline is well served through that variety. It recognises that the health of the discipline requires appropriate infrastructures and activity at HEI level to maintain and develop individuals and groups of researchers, and to train new generations of researchers. The discipline also requires a wider infrastructure and professional activity beyond the level of individual HEIs. The research structure and environment will be assessed with a view to both levels.

44. In general the sub-panel will be looking for evidence of an active and sustainable research culture, and for the use of available resources to create a favourable environment for research, including evidence of strategic planning for research. Submitting departments should supply any information relevant to demonstrating that such an environment exists; items mentioned in this criteria statement and elsewhere should not be viewed as prescriptive or exhaustive.

45. The sub-panel is aware that research of high quality is very often carried out by individual scholars. Nevertheless departments should outline the main areas of research and may, where relevant, define specific and genuine research groups working within the department (with reference to RA1), how they operate, and their main achievements. Neither the absence of research groups, nor the presence of individuals who cannot be assimilated into research groups, will count against individual submissions.

46. Departments should note other UOAs to which work has been submitted.

47. Departments should provide a general statement on departmental research management, supplemented by specific information on mechanisms for sustaining and developing an active research culture (including departmental and interdepartmental research seminars, organisation of colloquia and conferences), and for planning and monitoring research.

48. Departments should also comment, where appropriate, on institutional structures to support both research in general and interdisciplinary and collaborative research in particular.

49. Departments should describe the nature and quality of both their own and their institution's research infrastructure, including the physical resources (eg, for IT and space) and financial resources, and any specialist facilities to support research. Departments should also comment on facilities available to postgraduate research students and on departmental policy for the support, training and career development of research students.

50. Departments may provide information on any relationships with industry and commerce, museums, galleries, libraries and archives or other research users; and where relevant on the account taken of government policy initiatives and objectives.

51. The sub-panel will evaluate the department's contribution to the research environment of the discipline in its broadest sense, in terms of the conditions that support the development and sustainability of the discipline and promote research in philosophy across institutional and national boundaries. Please see also paragraphs 73-76.

Staffing policy

52. Departments should describe in RA5a their arrangements to develop and support staff in their research, including early career staff, new researchers, staff on fixed-term contracts, and staff returning to research after a period of absence; and for supporting their integration into a wider supportive research culture. Arrangements might include facilities for acquiring or enhancing research skills; the use of mentoring, probation and appraisal; the use of research leave, and the allocation of teaching and other duties through a work-management procedure.

53. Departments should explain the role and contribution of staff who have been recruited in the three years prior to the census date. They should submit any additional information they feel will inform the sub-panel about the role and integration of new members of staff.

54. Where appropriate, departments should comment on how the departure of staff in Categories B and D has affected the strength,

UOA 60, Philosophy

coherence and research culture of the department at the census date.

Research strategy

55. While it is understood that individual plans, in particular, are liable to develop over time, departments should provide a realistic statement of the main objectives and planned activities in research over the five years from the submission date, and where appropriate a brief commentary on the extent to which research plans put forward in RAE2001 have been fulfilled or adapted. Research strategies might identify, as relevant, existing areas to be strengthened, new research areas to be developed, and complementary expertise to be acquired.

56. The sub-panel's attention should be drawn to ongoing research work that is not producing immediate demonstrable outcomes.

Esteem indicators

57. Departments should list indicators of peer esteem and national and international recognition which relate to the staff submitted.

58. The sub-panel will give credit only for those measures of peer esteem and evidence of significance which help to develop the discipline.

59. Evidence of peer esteem which departments may wish to mention are:

- acting as an external assessor on tenure or filling of chairs externally
- editorships of journals or peer reviewed monograph series
- giving invited conference papers and keynote lectures
- membership of editorial boards
- research awards from national and international bodies
- serving on committees of professional societies and other organisations such as Research Councils
- translations of work into other languages
- visiting fellowships and professorships
- visits from overseas researchers and research students.

60. This is not a definitive list, and institutions should feel free to add or substitute other details they feel might be relevant and wish to bring to the attention of the sub-panel.

Applied research and practice-based research

61. The sub-panel recognises the importance of considering all types of research in whatever form they may be placed in the public domain. For example, a scholarly exhibition or television programme or museum-based or gallery-based activity might be submitted as a research output. The sub-panel desires to receive a breadth of submissions reflecting the extent of research covered by the UOA.

62. Some submitted outputs of a more unusual nature may require specialist advisers to assist the deliberations of the sub-panel.

Individual staff circumstances

63. The sub-panel has received RAE 02/2005 'Equality briefing for panel chairs, members and secretaries' and endorses and fully accepts the guidance provided. It further endorses and will implement in full the recommendations of Main Panel N on issues relevant to individual staff circumstances in general, such as the position of early career researchers, and on issues more explicitly covered by the promotion of diversity and equality.

64. In assessing submissions, the sub-panel will take account of the circumstances described in paragraph 39 of the generic statement. Departments should also refer to the main panel statement, paragraphs 26-28, for further information concerning the treatment of specific individual circumstances adversely affecting the research activity of any submitted staff member.

65. Departments should note any circumstances which have significantly affected individual staff members' contribution to the submission (eg, periods of sick leave, career breaks of any kind, or engagement on long-term projects) in RA5b. Departments may also wish to comment on recently appointed staff, early career researchers,

UOA 60, Philosophy

or staff producing works of significant scale and scope. The way in which the contributions from such staff will be treated is detailed in paragraphs 18-36 above.

Working methods

66. Fairness will be ensured by the universal application of the assessment criteria. In addition, a common secretariat for all the sub-panels within Main Panel N will help to ensure consistency across the cognate subject areas.

Definition of quality levels

67. In interpreting the quality levels, the sub-panel will use its professional judgement. Sub-panel members have been chosen for their standing in, and knowledge of, the subject in both its national and its international context. The sub-panel will not work with fixed proportions of any single quality level in mind.

68. The sub-panel will employ the following descriptors of the definitions of quality levels for research outputs:

- a. **4* – quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour.** Work which is or ought to be a primary point of reference in its field, ie, a contribution of which every serious worker in that field is or ought to be aware.
- b. **3* – quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which nonetheless falls short of the highest standards of excellence.** Work which is or ought to be a point of reference in its field, ie, a contribution of which serious workers in that field are or ought to be aware.
- c. **2* – quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.** Work which makes a substantial contribution and merits attention in its field.
- d. **1* – quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.** Work which makes a worthwhile contribution and merits some attention.

e. **Unclassified – quality that falls below the standard of nationally recognised work. Or work which does not meet the published definition of research for the purpose of this assessment.** Or ‘missing’ outputs where the reason for submitting fewer than four outputs has not been accepted by the sub-panel.

69. In interpreting the quality levels, the sub-panel will judge submissions against the best work in the relevant field. Factors which may affect the sub-panel’s judgement could include the influence, impact and recognition of submitted work in the UK and internationally. Work graded 4* will need to be exceptional in quality. However, the sub-panel considers 4* to be a realistic and attainable grade. For the purposes of defining quality levels, ‘world-leading’, ‘international’ and ‘national’ are quality benchmarks. The sub-panel will not equate ‘world-leading’ or ‘international’ with work on international themes, nor will it equate work on national themes with national excellence.

70. The sub-panel will employ the following descriptors of the definitions of quality levels for research environment and esteem indicators:

- a. **4*** – outstanding: exemplary for a unit of that size and type.
- b. **3*** – excellent: significantly more than the minimum that could reasonably be expected for a unit of that size and type.
- c. **2*** – good: more than the minimum that could reasonably be expected for a unit of that size and type.
- d. **1*** – adequate: no less than the minimum that could reasonably be expected for a unit of that size and type.
- e. **Unclassified** – inadequate: falling below the minimum that could reasonably be expected for a unit of that size and type.

71. In interpreting the quality levels for the research environment, the sub-panel will judge submissions within the department’s institutional context and academic area(s) of expertise.

UOA 60, Philosophy**Research outputs**

72. The sub-panel aims to assess in detail all submitted outputs, with the help of specialist advisers as necessary. The sub-panel will assign each institution to a single member, who will review all submitted outputs from that institution. Each output will also be read by a second member who is expert in the relevant area of philosophy. If necessary, a third member who is an expert in the relevant area of philosophy will also be asked to read a particular output. In this way the sub-panel will ensure that outputs are examined by experts in the field and that there are comparable assessments between different fields. If circumstances beyond the sub-panel's control prevent it from assessing in detail all eligible submitted outputs this will not adversely affect the department's quality profile.

Research environment

73. The sub-panel's judgement of the environment appropriate to the health of the discipline at both an institutional and a wider level informs its judgement of the research environment, and of the relative weighting of outputs, research environment and esteem. The sub-panel therefore recognises two dimensions to the research environment, and regards both as important.

74. The first aspect is the immediate environment of the particular department or HEI. Relevant factors in this context include the research ethos and infrastructure of the department and the institution; how members of staff are supported in their research; how early career researchers are being developed; the existence of a significant and active postgraduate community; and levels and use of research income. Departments should include information about the following:

- research students and research studentships
- research income
- research structure
- staffing policy
- research strategy.

75. Second, the sub-panel recognises the importance of the broader environment of the subject, nationally and internationally. Contributions to this broader research environment include editing journals; refereeing articles, manuscripts and grant proposals; reviewing books; organising conferences, seminar series and workshops; creating (and gaining funding for) collaborative research projects, especially those that cross institutional, disciplinary or national boundaries; research relationships with industry and commerce, museums, galleries, libraries and archives or other research users; external PhD examining; and contributions (other than research outputs) to the pedagogy of the discipline. Departments should describe any activities that provide significant support for, or develop the research environment of, philosophy as thus broadly understood.

76. The list of activities above is not definitive, and institutions should feel free to add or substitute other details they feel might be relevant and wish to bring to the attention of the sub-panel. The sub-panel will give credit to activity in both areas (the institutional research environment and the broader environment), while understanding that the level and scope of activity will vary according to the size and staff profile of the department. In determining a department's quality profile for the research environment, the sub-panel will give credit for positive aspects of the environment that are present rather than penalise for aspects that are not.

Research esteem

77. In assessing esteem the sub-panel will use a range of indicators: an indicative list is given in paragraph 59 above. It will give credit only for those measures of peer esteem and evidence of significance which help to develop the discipline.

78. When assessing the esteem indicators of a department, the sub-panel will weigh the range and prestige of indicators against the size and staff profile of the department.

UOA 60, Philosophy

Determining an overall quality profile

79. The assessment is one of peer review based on professional judgement. The sub-panel will develop a quality profile with a ratio of 80% for outputs, 15% for environment and 5% for esteem.

80. Every submission (in relation to the research environment and esteem) will be read by the whole sub-panel. There will be an individual and thorough discussion of each submission at the final meeting of the sub-panel, and the final profile will be subject to endorsement by the main panel. The sub-panel will begin by assessing the published output of each submitting department. It will then assess the other evidence provided and will combine these sets of evidence to arrive at a final recommended profile.

81. The sub-panel will not use a quantitative approach to assessing the evidence presented by, for instance, applying numerical values to different types of evidence. Equally the sub-panel will not be operating with any presupposition (explicit or implicit) of 'critical mass' with reference either to departmental size or to the scale or coverage of specific subject areas within a department.

82. The sub-panel will develop a quality profile for the research outputs component of the overall quality profile as described in paragraphs 18-36.

83. The research environment component of the quality profile will be based on an assessment of the department's contribution to the health of the discipline at both an institutional and a wider level as described in paragraphs 73-76. The sub-panel will consider all the factors mentioned individually and under both broad headings, and will build up from these elements to an overall quality profile with, if necessary, percentage allocations to the different quality levels. The sub-panel will have available all the standard analyses listed at Annex 7 to support its decision-making.

84. In respect of research esteem, the sub-panel will review each department's submission and arrive at an overall, holistic judgement of the quality level of the research esteem it portrays. It will normally assign 100% of the profile for

esteem to one of the quality levels (4*, 3*, 2*, 1* or Unclassified). In certain circumstances, it may split the award over two or more quality levels.

85. According to the procedure set out in Annex 1, the sub-panel will finally confirm that, in its expert judgement, the overall recommended profile is a fair reflection of the research activity in each submission, and that its assessment has taken account of all components of the submission. The sub-panel aims to reach decisions by consensus, but will vote in cases of contested decisions, with the chair having a casting vote in the unlikely event of a tie.

86. Where a department has staff affected by equal opportunity issues, the sub-panel will take these into account when assessing the research environment and esteem, in addition to the provisions for research outputs mentioned in paragraphs 18-36. In addition, it will seek to ensure that it does not set unrealistically high standards for a grading of 4*, or treat this in such a way that it is only attainable by certain types or sizes of department.