

Section A

The fields in this section are mandatory.

Institution:

Unit of Assessment:

Title of case study:

The title should focus on the impact, it shouldn't be a standard research title. Use a present participle to demonstrate agency.

Period when the underpinning research was undertaken:

Provide month / year where possible (must be between Jan 2000 and Dec 2020)

Details of staff conducting the underpinning research from the submitting unit:

Add all SHU researchers which have significantly contributed to the underpinning research (UPR) here.

Name(s):

Role(s) (e.g. job title):

Period(s) employed by submitting HEI:

Period when the claimed impact occurred:

Provide month / year where possible (must be between Aug 2013 and July 2020)

Is this case study continued from a case study submitted in 2014? Y/N

The definition of continued case studies is provided in the 'Guidance on submissions', paragraph 316.

There are no continued ICSs from SHU. If a related case study was submitted in 2014, do not refer to it at all in this case study.

Section B

1. Summary of the impact (indicative maximum **100** words)

This section should briefly state what specific impact is being described in the case study.

This section should be hard-hitting, concise and really sell the impact, but without exaggeration. Include big quantitative figures if relevant (e.g. percentage of beneficiaries impacted, £££ generated / saved, or maybe even a short quote - but only if it is excellent.

Sentence 1: Set out the problem statement / context.

Sentence 2: Briefly describe the research which led to the impact, "Research from Sheffield Hallam University into... [research topic]

Sentence 3: This led to... [describe the impact (impact types and main beneficiaries)]

If you are low on words, lose the problem statement before anything else.

2. Underpinning research (indicative maximum **500** words) See paragraphs 318 to 326.

This section should outline the key research insights or findings that underpinned the impact, and provide details of what research was undertaken, when, and by whom. This research may be a body of work produced over a number of years or may be the output(s) of a particular project. References to specific research outputs that embody the research described in this section, and evidence of its quality, should be provided in the next section (section B3).

Details of the following should be provided in this section:

- *The nature of the research insights or findings which relate to the impact claimed in the case study.*
- *An outline of what the underpinning research produced by the submitted unit was (this may relate to one or more research outputs, projects or programmes).*
- *Any relevant key contextual information about this area of research.*

Paragraph 1: Set out the problem statement / research issue / context. Why was this research needed? What was it addressing?

Paragraph 2: List the main researchers who worked on the underpinning research (UPR) - titles, disciplinary contribution and dates. Clarify the (disciplinary) contribution of the SHU authors vs non-SHU collaborators.

Paragraph 3 onwards: Describe the research.

It may be beneficial to write a (brief) paragraph which demonstrates the level of expertise in the area (body of work) by the author / research centre / institute - only do this if it adds weight to the research narrative.

When describing the underpinning research, focus on the novel component, the methods and the findings. Be specific - only write about the research which led to the impact, do not waste words on describing research which did not underpin the impact, that is, it made a 'distinct and material contribution to the impact taking place' (see [Guidance on Submissions](#), paragraph 319c, p.73).

Grant information can be included here, but only if it adds weight to the case study.

Number the outputs in section B3 and cross-reference them here.

Do not refer to any impacts in this section, even if the impact came before the UPR output. Put all impact in section B4.

3. References to the research (indicative maximum of **six** references)

This section should provide references to key outputs from the research described in the previous section, and evidence about the quality of the research. Underpinning research outputs may include the full range of types listed in the output glossary (Annex K) and are not limited to printed academic work. All forms of output cited as underpinning research will be considered equitably, with no one type of output being preferred over others.

Include the following details for each cited output:

- *author(s)*

- title
- year of publication
- type of output and other relevant details required to identify the output (for example, DOI, journal title and issue)
- details to enable the panel to gain access to the output, if required (for example, a DOI or other URL), or stating that the output is listed in REF2 or can be supplied by the HEI on request.

All outputs cited in this section must be capable of being made available to panels. If they are not available in the public domain or listed in REF2, the HEI must be able to provide them if requested by the REF team.

Evidence of the quality of the research must also be provided in this section. Guidance on this is provided in the 'Panel criteria'.

Where panels request details of key research grants or end of grant reports, the following should be provided:

- who the grant was awarded to
- the grant title
- sponsor
- period of the grant (with dates)
- value of the grant.

Provide all the details requested in the bullet point list above (if exporting from Impact Tracker, this will automatically be done for outputs in Elements).

Number them for cross-reference in section B2.

Provide information which demonstrates 2 quality, e.g. add a sentence to state that these outputs have undergone rigorous peer review. (See [Panel Criteria](#), paras 319-323 for more guidance on this)*

Do not include grant information unless you are providing it to demonstrate the quality of the UPR. You should include grant information in the Additional Contextual Information, but the panel won't have access to this. So if you think mention of a grant is particularly key to your case study, add it to section B2.

4. Details of the impact (indicative maximum **750** words). The 'Panel criteria', Annex A, Table 1 provides an illustrative list of evidence that could be provided.

This section should provide a narrative, with supporting evidence, to explain:

- *how the research underpinned (made a distinct and material contribution to) the impact;*
- *the nature and extent of the impact.*

The following should be provided:

- *A clear explanation of the process or means through which the research led to, underpinned or made a contribution to the impact (for example, how it was disseminated, how it came to influence users or beneficiaries, or how it came to be exploited, taken up or applied).*
- *Where the submitted unit's research was part of a wider body of research that contributed to the impact (for example, where there has been research collaboration with other institutions), the case study should specify the particular contribution of the submitted unit's research and acknowledge other key research contributions.*
- *Details of the beneficiaries – who or what community, constituency or organisation has benefitted,*

been affected or impacted on.

- *Details of the nature of the impact – how they have benefitted, been affected or impacted on.*
- *Evidence or indicators of the extent of the impact described, as appropriate to the case being made.*
- *Dates of when these impacts occurred.*

Divide your impact into subheadings (using the storyboards in Impact Tracker). This might be according to impact type (see [Panel Criteria](#), Annex A, Table 1 for a list) or by beneficiary, or by some other logical structure.

Under each subheading, make sure the following information is included.

- *the beneficiaries / type of impact (whichever the subheading isn't)*
- *how they found out about your research (pathway to impact)*
- *what changed? (what was the impact)*
- *what is the reach (spread) and the significance (depth) of the impact?*
- *what evidence do you have / would you need to prove the link between the research and the impact, and/or the reach/significance of the impact?*

Additional notes

Impact / pathways to impact - do not confuse the two. Impact is usually a change. It's what the beneficiary does as a result of being made aware of the research.

Pathways to impact demonstrate how the beneficiaries were made aware of your research, i.e. dissemination, in whatever form (publication, media, social media, workshops, relationships with beneficiaries, etc.). If this isn't clear, the case study may be unclassified - this is a threshold criteria to demonstrate the link between your research and the impact.

Be economical with your words on pathways to impact - save your words to describe the reach and significance of the impact - this is what is assessed to award the star rating.

You may decide to write a summary of the pathways to impact in the opening paragraph, or it might feature underneath each subheading, particularly if the different impacts had different pathways to impact.

List your corroborating evidence in section B5 and cross-reference it here. Make sure you use the ~10 references to demonstrate the most impressive impact / the pathway to impact which the panel is most likely to query. Put yourselves in their shoes - if you were reading this, what evidence would you need to believe it?

5. Sources to corroborate the impact (indicative maximum of ten references)

This section should list sources external to the submitting HEI that could, if requested by panels, provide corroboration of specific claims made in the case study. Sources provided in this section should not be a substitute for providing clear evidence of impact in Section B4; the information in this section will be used for audit purposes only.

This section should list sufficient sources that could corroborate key claims made about the impact of the unit's research. These could include, as appropriate to the case study, the following external sources of corroboration

(stating which claim each source provides corroboration for):

- *Reports, reviews, web links or other documented sources of information in the public domain.*
- *Confidential reports or documents (if listed, these must be submitted to the REF team by 29 January 2021).*
- *Individual users/beneficiaries who could be contacted by the REF team to corroborate claims*.*
- *Factual statements already provided to the HEI by key users/beneficiaries, that corroborate specific claims made in the case study (if listed, these must be submitted to the REF team by 29 January 2021)*.*

This is just a list of corroborating evidence. We will be submitting the original evidence to REF in January 2021.

MAKE SURE THIS EVIDENCE IS IN THE PROJECT EVIDENCE VAULT of your Impact Tracker project.

Make sure this evidence is independent, where possible.

Testimonials from key beneficiaries / stakeholders are often a good way to link the research to the impact.

([Panel Criteria para 310](#))

"Testimonials should draw on statements of fact and relate specifically to the impact(s) claimed. There may be occasions where opinion-based testimonials are appropriate (for example, where the impact is on public understanding of an issue). Where such testimonials are cited as evidence in impact case studies, sub-panels will consider the extent to which the testimonial citation evidences the significance of the claims. Sub-panels recognise the varying degrees to which evidence and indicator information may be available to HEIs. Where testimony is cited, it should be made clear whether the source is a participant in the 56 REF 2019/02 process of impact delivery (and the degree to which this is the case), or is a reporter on the process."

** Where the sources are individuals who could be contacted or have provided factual statements to the HEI, the submitted case study should state only the organisation (and, if appropriate, the position) of the individuals concerned, and which claim(s) they can corroborate. Their personal details (name, position, contact details) must be entered separately on the REF submission system and not on REF3. Details of a maximum of five individuals may be entered for each case study; these data will not be published as part of the submission.*

Additional contextual data

The fields in this section are mandatory, where applicable. The information will be used in post-assessment evaluations and will **not** be routinely provided to panels. This information should be provided in a separate web form and is not included in the five-page limit.

This information will not be seen by the panels, so you must make sure any information that is key to the ICS is included in Sections A and B above.

Name(s) of funder(s):**Global Research Identifier of funder(s) (<https://www.grid.ac/>):****Name(s) of funding programme(s):****Grant number(s):****Amount of grant (in GBP):****ORCID for each named researcher, where held:****Name(s) of formal partner(s):****Country/countries where the impact occurred**:**

** Where the impact occurred specifically within one country that is part of the UK (for example, Wales), this country rather than 'UK' should be specified in the country/countries field.