

## Panel D criteria:

### *Impact template*

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. Submitting units should distinguish between collaboration in order to carry out research, which should be explained in the environment template; and collaboration in order to ensure that research has an impact, which should be explained in the impact template.
4. The sub-panels request the following information in each section. Where possible, relevant illustrative examples with verifiable references should be given rather than broad general statements:
  - a. **Context:** Who are the main non-academic user groups, beneficiaries or audiences for the research in the submitting unit? What are the main types of impact specifically relevant to the unit's research? How do these relate to the range of research activity or research groups in the unit?
  - b. **Approach to impact:** What was the unit's approach to interacting with non-academic users, beneficiaries or audiences (during the period 2008-2013)? This may include interactions where, for example, the impacts may not have been anticipated when the research was first undertaken; or there was a planned or direct impact; or the subsequent pathways to impact were diffuse and non-linear. Details could include (but are not limited to), for example:
    - How staff in the unit interacted with, engaged with or developed relationships with key users, beneficiaries or audiences to develop impact from the research carried out in the unit (as distinct from research collaborations detailed in the environment template).
    - Evidence of the nature of those relationships and interactions.
    - Evidence of follow-through from these activities to identify resulting impacts.
    - How the unit specifically supported and enabled staff to achieve impact from their research.
    - How the unit made use of institutional facilities, expertise or resources in undertaking these activities.
    - Other mechanisms deployed by the unit to support and enable impact.

c. **Strategy and plans:** What are the goals and plans for the unit to support impact from research in the future? How is the unit developing its strategy for impact?

d. **Relationship to case studies:** How do the selected case studies relate to the unit's approach to achieving impact, as described in b above? This could include details of, for example, how particular case studies exemplify aspects of the approach, or how particular case studies informed the development of the approach. The main panel recognises that case studies are underpinned by research over a time frame that is longer than the assessment period, and that individual case studies may, therefore, not relate directly to the approach set out in b above.

### *Impact criteria*

5. The sub-panels will assess impact according to the generic criteria and level definitions in 'guidance on submissions', Annex A, Table A3. The criteria will be understood as follows:

- **Reach:** The extent and/or diversity of the organisations, communities and/or individuals who have benefited from the impact.
- **Significance:** The degree to which the impact enriched, influenced, informed or changed the policies, practices, understanding or awareness of organisations, communities or individuals.

6. In assessing the impacts described in case studies, the sub-panels will form an overall view about their reach and significance taken as a whole, rather than assess each criterion separately. While case studies need to demonstrate both reach and significance, the balance between them may vary at all quality levels. The sub-panels will exercise their judgement without privileging or disadvantaging either reach or significance.

7. In considering reach, the potential domain for an impact will be taken into consideration. In other words, reach will be not be assessed in purely geographic terms, nor in terms of absolute numbers of beneficiaries, but rather in terms of the extent to which the potential number or groups of beneficiaries have been affected. The criteria will be applied wherever the impact has been felt, regardless of geography or location, and whether in the UK or abroad.

8. Each of the case studies will be separately assessed against the criteria and quality levels set out for impact, with no greater or lesser rigour being applied than for outputs or environment.