Examples of impact. 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.
- 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.

HEIs are reminded that impacts on research or the advancement of academic knowledge within the higher education sector (whether in the UK or internationally) are excluded. Other impacts within the HE sector that meet the definition of impact for the REF are included where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI. (See ‘guidance on submissions’, Annex C.)

Case studies: evidence of impact

An impact case study for the purposes of the REF is necessarily a written submission (see ‘guidance on submissions’, paragraph 147b and Annex G). 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.

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.

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.

91. 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:

**Table D2 Examples of evidence of impact**

| 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. |
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.

**Case studies: underpinning research**

93. 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).

94. 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.

95. 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.

96. 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 (including a portfolio if relevant) available on request.

97. 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.

**Impact template**

98. General information relating to the impact template is detailed in ‘guidance on submissions’ (paragraphs 149-155), and submitting units should refer to these guidelines in the first instance.

99. The main panel believes that excellent impact can be achieved from within a wide variety of research contexts and resulting from a wide diversity of approaches, and it has no pre-formed view of the ideal context or approach. It will judge each submission on the basis on which it has been presented, as appropriate to the work of the submitted unit and without the expectation that the submission refers to a single, coherent organisational unit.

100. Submitting units should distinguish between collaboration in order to carry out research, which should be explained in the environment template; and