



# agenda

## Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	<b>2021-02-11</b>
Scheduled Start:	1300h
Scheduled End:	1500h
Location:	Microsoft Teams

### SECTION 1      NGĀ KUPU ARATAKI | PRELIMINARIES

1. Karakia Timatanga | Opening Prayer
2. Mihi Whakatau | Welcome from the Chair
3. Membership
4. Terms of Reference

### SECTION 2      STANDING ITEMS

1. Ngā Whakapāha | Attendance, Apologies & Quorate Status
2. Pitopito Kōrero o Ngā Hui | Minutes of the Previous Meetings
3. Mahia Atu | Matters Arising

### SECTION 3      MEA HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

1. ECR Support: Return from Parental Leave Application – Dr Hoa Nguyen
2. Definition of an Early Career Researcher at Unitec
3. Research Centre Annual Report Template

### SECTION 4      WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

N/A

### SECTION 5      NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

1. 2021 Unitec Early Career Researcher Fund Outcomes
2. Reaccreditation of the Centre for Computational Intelligence and Cybersecurity (CCICS) and the Centre of Computational Intelligence for Environmental Engineering (CIEE)
3. Update on research undertaken into non-completing students at Unitec

### SECTION 6      KUPU WHAKAMUTUNGA | CLOSING

1. Ētahi Kaupapa Anō | Any Other Business
2. Komiti Self-Assessment
3. Karakia Whakamutunga | Closing Karakia

## **SECTION 1                      NGĀ KUPU ARATAKI | PRELIMINARIES**

---

### **Item 1.1                      Karakia Tīmatanga | Opening Prayer**

<b>KARAKIA TĪMATANGA</b>	<b>OPENING PRAYER</b>
<i>Manawa mai te mauri nuku</i>	<i>Embrace the power of the earth</i>
<i>Manawa mai te mauri rangi</i>	<i>Embrace the power of the sky</i>
<i>Ko te mauri kai au</i>	<i>The power I have</i>
<i>He mauri tipua</i>	<i>Is mystical</i>
<i>Ka pakaru mai te pō</i>	<i>And shatters all darkness</i>
<i>Tau mai te mauri</i>	<i>Cometh the light</i>
<i>Haumi ē, Hui ē, Tāiki ē!</i>	<i>Join it, gather it, it is done!</i>

### **Item 1.2                      Mihi Whakatau | Welcome from the Chair**

### **Item 1.3                      Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec Membership**

Marcus Williams (Associate Professor)	Chair and Director Research and Enterprise
Daisy Bentley-Gray (New and Emerging)	Nominee of Director, Pacific Success
Dr Jenny Lee-Morgan (Professor)	Nominee of Director, Māori Success
Dr Helen Gremillion (Associate Professor)	Healthcare and Social Practice
Yusef Patel (New and Emerging)	Architecture
Roger Birchmore (Early Career)	Building Construction
Dr Lian Wu (Associate Professor)	Healthcare and Social Practice
Dr Hamid Sharifzadeh (Associate Professor)	Computing and Information Technology
Dr Leon Tan (Associate Professor)	Creative Industries
Dr Kristie Cameron (Early Career)	Environmental & Animal Sciences
Dr Maryam Mirzaei (Early Career)	Applied Business
Robyn Gandell (Early Career)	Bridgepoint
Susan Eady	Subject Librarian
Vacant	One member nominated by the Student Council
Arun Deo	Research Advisor

**In attendance:** Brenda Massey                      Acting URC Secretary

### **Item 1.4                      Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec Terms of Reference**

The powers and functions of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec (URC) shall be to:

- a. Foster the conduct of research, and support the achievement of Unitec's strategic research, enterprise and innovation priorities;
- b. Propose and advise on strategic directions and priorities for research, enterprise and innovation;
- c. Provide expert advice on institutional policy;
- d. Develop protocols and guidelines and make recommendations in relation to the conduct of research, enterprise and innovation;
- e. Oversee the Grants Advisory Committee and the reporting of funded projects;
- f. Encourage and enhance the development of the research, enterprise and innovation culture along with student and staff research capability, with emphasis on the development of Māori and Pacific research capability;
- g. Oversee the monitoring of research outputs and research reporting; and,
- h. Foster Māori and Pacific, transdisciplinary, collaborative and externally engaged research, enterprise and innovation.

## SECTION 2                      STANDING ITEMS

### **Section 2.1                      Ngā Whakapāha | Attendance, Apologies & Quorate Status**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the committee accepts the apologies of today's meeting.

### **Section 2.2                      Pitopito Kōrero o Ngā Hui | Minutes of the Previous Meetings**

*refer to [pg5](#)*

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the committee approves the minutes of the meeting of 2020-12-10.

### **Section 2.3                      Mahia Atu | Matters Arising**

*refer to [pg10](#)*

## SECTION 3                      MEI HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

### **Section 3.1                      ECR Support: Return from Parental Leave Application – Dr Hoa Nguyen**

*refer to [pg11](#)*

### **Section 3.2                      Definition of an Early Career Researcher at Unitec**

*refer to [pg26](#)*

### **Section 3.3                      Research Centre Annual Report Template**

*refer to [pg28](#)*

## SECTION 4 WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

---

N/A

## SECTION 5 NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

---

### Section 5.1 2021 Unitec Early Career Researcher Fund Outcomes

refer to [pg32](#)

### Section 5.2 Reaccreditation of the Centre for Computational Intelligence and Cybersecurity (CCICS) and the Centre of Computational Intelligence for Environmental Engineering (CIEE)

refer to [pg34](#)

### Section 5.3 Update on research undertaken into non-completing students at Unitec

[Verbal update](#)

## SECTION 6 KUPU WHAKAMUTUNGA | CLOSING

---

### Section 6.1 Ētahi Kaupapa Anō | Any Other Business

### Section 6.2 Komiti Self-Assessment

refer to [pg48](#)

### Section 6.3 Karakia Whakamutunga | Closing Karakia

TE KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA	CLOSING PRAYER
<i>Ka wehe atu tātou</i>	<i>We are departing</i>
<i>I raro i te rangimārie</i>	<i>Peacefully</i>
<i>Te harikoa</i>	<i>Joyfully</i>
<i>Me te manawanui</i>	<i>And resolute</i>
<i>Haumi ē, Hui ē, Tāiki ē!</i>	<i>We are united, progressing forward!</i>



# minutes

## Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	2020-12-10
Scheduled Start:	1300h
Scheduled End:	1500h
Location:	Microsoft Teams

<b>MEETING OPENED:</b>	1300h
------------------------	-------

### SECTION 1 – NGĀ KUPU ARATAKI | PRELIMINARIES

#### Item 1.1 Karakia Timatanga | Opening Prayer

KARAKIA TIMATANGA	BEGINNING PRAYER
<i>Manawa mai te mauri nuku</i>	<i>Embrace the power of the earth</i>
<i>Manawa mai te mauri rangi</i>	<i>Embrace the power of the sky</i>
<i>Ko te mauri kai au</i>	<i>The power I have</i>
<i>He mauri tipua</i>	<i>Is mystical</i>
<i>Ka pakaru mai te pō</i>	<i>And shatters all darkness</i>
<i>Tau mai te mauri</i>	<i>Cometh the light</i>
<i>Haumi ē, Hui ē, Tāiki ē!</i>	<i>Join it, gather it, it is done!</i>

#### Item 1.2 Mihi Whakatau | Welcome from the Chair

The Chair warmly welcomed members of the committee to the meeting.

### SECTION 2 – STANDING ITEMS

#### Item 2.1 Ngā Whakapāha | Attendance, Apologies & Quorate Status

##### Members Present

1. A/P Marcus Williams (Chair)
2. Daisy Bentley-Gray
3. Dr Kristie Cameron
4. Roger Birchmore
5. A/P Helen Gremillion
6. Yusef Patel
7. A/P Hamid Sharifzadeh

8. Dr Maryam Mirzaei
9. Tui Matelau (proxy for Robyn Gandell)
10. Arun Deo
11. Gerald Ryan

Total members represented: 11 members

#### Apologies

1. Susan Eady
2. A/P Lian Wu
3. Robyn Gandell

Total apologies: 3 member/s

#### Absent

1. Prof Jenny Lee-Morgan
2. Shantanu Birthare
3. A/P Leon Tan

Total absences: 3 member/s

**Those present noted the apologies.**

#### Quorate Status

A minimum of 9 representatives is required; the meeting was quorate.

#### Hunga Mahi | Staff in Attendance

1. Brenda Massey, Acting Secretary

#### Item 2.2 Pitopito Kōrero o Ngā Hui | Minutes of Previous Meeting

##### **MOTION**

**That the committee approve the minutes of the 2020-11-12 meeting as a true and accurate record.**

**Moved: Roger Birchmore**

**Seconded: Maryam Mirzaei**

**MOTION CARRIED**

#### Item 2.3 Mahia Atū | Matters Arising

Agenda Item	Action	Responsible	Outcome
2.3	Add the development of an implementation plan with targets that will help Unitec reach the goals articulated in the new Unitec Research Strategy 2020-2024 to the URC's 2021 workplan.	Marcus Williams / Brenda Massey	Complete
2.3	Add consideration of potential reviewers for the PBRF internal QE review to the URC's 2021 workplan.	Marcus Williams / Brenda Massey	Complete
2.3	Add implementation of the proposed PBRF internal QE review plan with the addition of School-by-School engagement sessions to the URC's 2021 workplan.	Marcus Williams / Brenda Massey	Complete
4.1	Consider items to be discussed/addressed in 2021 and advise Marcus Williams or Brenda Massey accordingly.	All	Complete

4.2	Update the committee's membership list and composition requirements.	Brenda Massey	Complete
5.2	Inquire into the reason why the School of Architecture is still to submit a Research Plan.	Marcus Williams	Complete. The School of Architecture's Research Plan has now been received.

### SECTION 3 – MEA HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

#### **Section 3.1                      2021 URC Terms of Reference**

The Committee supported the amendments proposed to the Terms of Reference and thanked Marcus Williams and Brenda Massey for their work on this.

#### **MOTION**

**That the committee approves the proposed revisions to its Terms of Reference.**

**Moved: Daisy Bentley-Gray**

**Seconded: Hamid Sharifzadeh**

**MOTION CARRIED**

#### **Section 3.2                      2021 URC Work Plan**

The Chair spoke to the line items captured in the proposed Work Plan, asking the committee to note in particular:

- Tūāpapa Rangahau is undertaking a piece of research in partnership with the priority group directors to understand why some priority group students aren't completing their courses. It is important that the committee is apprised of this work.
- The Grants Advisory Committee, a sub-committee of the Unitec Research Committee, sat earlier this week to review the applications received to the 2021 Early Career Researcher Fund. Significant effort is put into providing applicants with feedback on their proposals. Outcomes will be reported to the committee in February 2021.
- Templates for reporting will be developed for research centres, and schools on their research plans. The committee is keen to ensure that the templates are as simple and concise as possible so that the work required to provide them is kept to a minimum. The draft templates will be brought to the committee for their feedback and approval. The research centre reporting process will be used to ascertain the performance of centres and whether some centres could become foci. The school research plan reporting process will provide an opportunity for schools to revise their plans, for example proposing the establishment of new research centres.
- Staff in Tūāpapa Rangahau have reflected on the learnings from this year's research symposium, specifically the success of the Māori and Pacific research streams, the potential to engage researchers from the other subsidiaries of Te Pūkenga, the opportunity afforded for staff to achieve research outputs and the potential for Unitec to work more closely with colleagues from MIT. The Chair requested that discussion around the Unitec Research Symposium be had in March, instead of June as currently reflected in the Work Plan.

- “Present Annual Unitec Research Report to Academic Committee” is scheduled for August in the Work Plan. The Chair asked the committee to consider whether they would like to input into the format of the report. It was agreed that the format of the report should be considered by the committee in March. **Action:** Brenda Massey to present the 2019 research report to the committee in March.
- The Chair asked that the November and December rows be merged as the items scheduled then are generally considered over two meetings.
- The Chair asked that “Construct a 2022 Work Plan” be added to November/December.
- The Chair advised the committee that the Work Plan does not include items of business as usual. The Work Plan reflects the committee’s ‘SMART’ goals.

**Action:** Brenda Massey to amend the Work Plan as outlined above.

#### **MOTION**

**That subject to the amendments outlined above, the committee approves the proposed 2021 Work Plan.**

**Moved: Arun Deo**

**Seconded: Roger Birchmore**

**MOTION CARRIED**

### **SECTION 4 - WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

---

No items were scheduled for discussion this meeting.

### **SECTION 5 - NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE**

---

#### **Section 5.1 Classification of the URC’s 2020 agenda items**

The committee noted that the classification exercise demonstrates that the items it has considered this year represent a healthy balance between strategic and compliance orientated. They also noted that all of the Terms of Reference are being responded to, with few items presented that did not respond to any of the Terms of Reference (these all being matters of compliance).

#### **Section 5.2 Discontinuation of SPSS software effective from 1 February 2021**

The Chair noted that the discontinuation of SPSS could have had significant impact if the change process hadn’t been managed in such an exemplary manner. He thanked Arun Deo for leading this important piece of work.

**Action:** The Chair requested that Arun Deo undertake a survey early in Semester One 2021, to ascertain any ongoing need for support amongst former SPSS users and report this to the URC.

### **SECTION 6 - KUPU WHAKAMUTUNGA | CLOSING**

---



## **Section 6.1                      Ētahi Kaupapa Anō | Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

## **Section 6.2                      Komiti Self-Assessment**

Daisy Bentley-Gray praised the way meetings have been run this year and the way the Chair has created a safe space for all to contribute. In response the Chair articulated the value he sees in running an inclusive committee where members feel confident to participate.

The Chair is satisfied with the planning process that the committee has implemented. It represents a team-based and co-creative approach. He thanked the committee for their engagement and commitment this year, and their generosity in sharing their collective expertise for the benefit of the wider Unitec research community.

Any additional feedback can be emailed to the Secretary following the meeting.

## **Section 6.3                      Karakia Whakamutunga | Closing Karakia**

<b>TE KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA</b>	<b>ENDING PRAYER</b>
<i>Ka wehe atu tātou</i>	<i>We are departing</i>
<i>I raro i te rangimārie</i>	<i>Peacefully</i>
<i>Te harikoa</i>	<i>Joyfully</i>
<i>Me te manawanui</i>	<i>And resolute</i>
<i>Haumi ē, Hui ē, Tāiki ē!</i>	<i>We are united, progressing forward!</i>

<b>MEETING CLOSED:</b> 1315 h
-------------------------------

## **SUMMARY OF ACTIONS**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
3.2	Amend the 2021 Work Plan as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule “discuss the date and format of the Unitec Research Symposium” for March not June.</li> <li>• Schedule “consider the format of the annual research report” for March. Bring the 2019 annual research report to the committee in March for feedback on the format.</li> <li>• Merge the November and December rows, as the items scheduled then are generally considered over two meetings.</li> <li>• Schedule “construct a 2022 Work Plan” for November/ December.</li> </ul>	Brenda Massey	
5.2	Undertake a survey early in Semester One 2021, to ascertain any ongoing need for support amongst former SPSS users and report this to the URC.	Arun Deo	

### MATTERS ARISING

---

Agenda Item	Action	Responsible	Outcome
3.2	Amend the 2021 Work Plan as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule “discuss the date and format of the Unitec Research Symposium” for March not June.</li> <li>• Schedule “consider the format of the annual research report” for March. Bring the 2019 annual research report to the committee in March for feedback on the format.</li> <li>• Merge the November and December rows, as the items scheduled then are generally considered over two meetings.</li> <li>• Schedule “construct a 2022 Work Plan” for November/December.</li> </ul>	Brenda Massey	Complete
5.2	Undertake a survey to ascertain any ongoing need for support amongst former SPSS users.	Arun Deo	In progress

## Early Career Research Support Return from Parental Leave Application Template

### Declarations

**1. I am a member of the Early Career Researcher forum**

Yes ☒ No ☐

**2. I have returned from parental leave recently**

Yes ☒ No ☐

**If yes, please provide the date of return and duration of leave**

I was on parental leave from May 22 to September 7, 2020.

**3. I submitted a PBRF portfolio for the 2018 round**

Yes ☒ No ☐

**4. I have attached my approved Individual Research Plan outlining a pathway toward submitting a PBRF portfolio for the 2024 round**

Yes ☒ No ☐

**5. I have retrieved a report of my ROMS account from the Research Advisor, attached.**

Yes ☒ No ☐

**6. I have led or participated in an external funding bid, application attached.**

I led and won an external funding application to the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW) in 2017 (application attached).

**7. My Head of School, Academic Programme Manager, Research Leader and Research Partner are aware of this application:**

Yes ☒ No ☐

**8. I have an ORCID number:**

Yes ☒ No ☐

## Summary of support request

**9. Amount requested** (maximum \$2000): **\$2000**

**10. Support description** *What will the support resources be used for, how will the money be spent. 500 words maximum.*

Upon returning from parental leave, I would like to continue being productive in research publication and keep me on track for the PBRF application in 2024. However, it is difficult to keep up with manuscript writing given the current amount of teaching load. This grant would help me buy out some teaching time so that I could have more time for writing manuscripts to submit for publication in peer-reviewed journals.

Currently, I have two manuscripts that I am working on:

1. Formative evaluation of a Financial capability education program for youth in New Zealand (to be submitted to ANZASW journal)
2. Lived experiences of young people after they leave care homes/ centres to live independently in Vietnam (to be submitted to Children & Youth Services)

In addition, I am leading and implementing a research project about lived experience of undocumented Tuvalu immigrants in West Auckland and developing a learning module based on the results of the young care leavers project in Vietnam.

Having a little bit more research time would help me speed up the manuscripts writing, keeping me on track for the PBRF 2024.

**11. Expected outcomes** *Describe what success looks like if you receive this support and when this can be reported on.*

**12.**

Budget Item (excl GST)	(\$)	<sup>5</sup> Rationale/justification in relation to outcomes
<sup>1</sup> Assistance		
<sup>2</sup> Materials/consumables		
<sup>3</sup> Travel		
<sup>4</sup> Teaching buy-out	2000	See above in #10.
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF SUPPORT (\$)</b>	<b>2000</b>	

## Declarations

**Declaration (Early Career Researcher)**

I declare that to the best of my knowledge the information I have provided is true and correct; that ethical approval will be sought and obtained prior to the commencement of the research, if required; that funding for this project will not be used to contribute to a project team member's higher degree research; and that I hold an FTE position at Unitec of 0.5 or more. I acknowledge that Tūāpapa Rangahau will be monitoring my progress on the project and the expenditure of my grant if I am allocated funding.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Type te here

Dated: 20.01.2021

**Declaration (Early Career Researcher's Head of School)**

I have read and support this application and, if funded, will ensure that adequate time is given to meaningfully utilise the support proposed and that there are no impediments to a successful outcome.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  


Dated: 27/01/2021

Email your completed, fully signed Application Form to [amunir@unitec.ac.nz](mailto:amunir@unitec.ac.nz)

You will be advised, in writing, of the outcome of your application following the Unitec Research Committee's meeting subsequent to your application.

## MY RESEARCH PLAN

Please enter your answers to the following questions where indicated by the grey area. These areas will expand to accommodate whatever length answer is provided.

### Researcher Details

Name: Hoa Nguyen

Email: hnguyen@unitec.ac.nz

Ph/ext: 022-100-8316

Pathway I primarily teach/supervise on: Social Practice

Programmes I teach/supervise on: Social Practice

### Main Goals

*How would you identify yourself as a researcher? (Developing, Established, Expert).*

Developing

*What are your current research and/or innovation goals??*

Continue implementing my research projects and have at least one quality output per year; get some external research fundings.

*What impact from your research and/or innovation are you trying to achieve (academic, social, environmental, cultural, economic or commercialisation)? How will you achieve this, including partnering with researchers from within your discipline or another discipline institution? Also include how you will collaborate with industry or external partners.*

I have and am collaborating with a couple of external organizations in doing researches: one local in West Auckland with the Te Atatu Electoral Office and another in Ireland. We are looking into seeking more fundings to continue another phase of our research project.

### Following are Unitec's four Research Goals:

*Are you aiming to meet Unitec's Research Productivity Traffic Light criteria (one research output produced per year, or two across two years, recorded in ROMS)?*

Across 2 years

*Are you aiming to gain a **PBRF** rank (to achieve a competitive research portfolio you will generally need to publish two quality assured outputs per year)?*

Yes

*Are you aiming to apply for an external research grant(s)? If so, please give details.*

Yes. One potential that I am looking at is a Canadian fund to support international project in Vietnam.

*Are you aiming to contribute to an Industry Funded and/or partnered research projects(s)? If so, please give details.*

No

*Other?*

## My Research Projects

Please describe your research project(s) for 2020 focusing on activities requiring significant use of your time and any assistance needed.

### Project One

Proposed Research/Innovation Activity (activities might involve research design, proof of concept, forming the research team, industry partnership, data collection, analysis, write up, project management)

#### *Short summary of project*

Evaluation of the HBSI's Financial Capability Program for Youth and Validation of a Financial Self-efficacy scale (FSES) for Kiwis. This project is completed. I am just writing manuscript for journal publication at the moment.

#### *Other project team members*

HBSI program manager and FC educator

#### *Is there scope to involve students?*

May be to help with writing literature review; involved some students in the past to transcribe and interview

#### *Industry / community partnerships and/or funding*

HBSI contributed \$5000 and staff time

*Research professional development needs. See the [Research Profess Dev suite](#).*

*Mentor / Mentee relationships*

*Planned research output(s). See [Unitec's Research Output Guide](#).*

At least one article in peer-reviewed journal. Have presented the results at a couple of conferences in the past year

*Requests for financial support. See [Unitec research funding options](#).*

*Planned external funding sources (if applicable)*

*Research voucher possibilities (joint funded projects with industry/community organisations)*

*Milestones*

July 2020	Completed manuscript to submit to journal
Dec 2020	
2021	

---

## Project Two (if applicable)

Proposed Research/Innovation Activity (activities might involve research design, proof of concept, forming the research team, industry partnership, data collection, analysis, write up, project management)



### *Short summary of project*

Explore the lived experiences of young people after they leave care homes/ centres to live independently in Vietnam. We have completed the data collection and currently writing article for this research.

### *Other project team members*

Robert Gilligan – Trinity College of Dublin

Nga Do – Ho Chi Minh University of social sciences and Humanities

Thao Nguyen - Ho Chi Minh University of social sciences and Humanities

### *Is there scope to involve students?*

### *Industry / community partnerships*

Research professional development needs. See the [Research Profess Dev suite](#).

### *Mentor / Mentee relationships*

Planned research outputs. See [Unitec's Research Output Guide](#).

Conference presentations and journal article

Requests for financial support. See [Unitec research funding options](#).

### *Planned external funding sources (if applicable)*

Seeking a Canadian fund to implement phase II

### *Research voucher possibilities (joint funded projects with industry/community organisations)*

May be another research voucher for phase II

### *Milestones*

July 2020	Completed the first article and submit grant for phase II
Dec 2020	
2021	

### Project Three (if applicable)

Proposed Research/Innovation Activity (activities might involve research design, proof of concept, forming the research team, industry partnership, data collection, analysis, write up, project management)

#### *Short summary of project*

Lived experience of Tuvalu undocumented immigrants living in West Auckland. This is a collaborative project with Te Atatu Electoral office. The project has just started. This is a research voucher project and the paperwork is being processed.

## ADEP Section

After completing the Research Plan, please then summarise your main research goals and plan for 2020 in this ADEP summary section. This summary can then be added to your ADEP to enable you to track progress and discuss any issues with your line manager throughout the year. If you are experiencing barriers to achieving your research goals your pathway Research Leader and Tuapapa Rangahau Research Partner can assist.

**ACHIEVE** (name your main research goal(s) and plan here)

1. Publish the "field education model in Vietnam" article in peer-reviewed journal
2. Publish the article "strategies to develop SPUs for community organisations" in Whanake journal
3. Present at a conference about the findings of the research "lived experienced of young care leavers in Vietnam"
4. Write research reports for the following projects:
  - Culutural values and financial capability training for youth
  - Lived experience of young care leavers in Vietnam.

**DEVELOP** (list any research development needs here, referring to the [\*Research Professional Development suite\*](#) )

- Attend writing retreat to write manuscripts
- Attend a conference to present the findings of the young care leaver project before publishing and network to seek further funding for phase II. (estimated budget \$1500)

**ENJOY** (name the research activities you really enjoy here)

**PARTNER** (add industry or community partnered research relationships here)

## **IASSW – International Project Application 2017**

- I. Project Title:** Lived experience of young people after they leave care homes/ centers to live independently in Vietnam

### **II. Participants:**

**1. Dr. Hoa Thi Nguyen – Coordinator and contact person for this project**

Lecturer

Unitec Institute of Technology

5-7 Ratanui Street, Henderson

Auckland 0612

New Zealand

Email: [hnguyen@unitec.ac.nz](mailto:hnguyen@unitec.ac.nz)

**IASSW school membership code: 237-1-2-NZL**

**2. Associate Professor Nga Hanh Do**

Associate Professor - Department of Social Work

Ho Chi Minh University of Social Sciences and Humanities

10-12 Dinh Tien Hoang, Ben Nghe Ward, District 1

Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Email: [dohanhnha@gmail.com](mailto:dohanhnha@gmail.com)

**IASSW school membership code: 500-1-2-VIE**

**3. Professor Robert Gilligan**

Chair of Social Work and Social Policy

Room 3063 Arts Building

Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, 2, Ireland

Email: [RGILLIGN@tcd.ie](mailto:RGILLIGN@tcd.ie)

**IASSW individual membership:** has just joined and waiting for membership number.

### **III. Rationale and purpose of the project (5-10 lines).**

In most countries, children who grow up in official care centers, or in official foster families, must leave the care setting when they reach 18 years of age. It is often very challenging for these young people to suddenly have to manage on their own with little or no support. Young people who grow up in their own families can normally count on their

parents' support and advice as they begin to establish themselves in the world. But for the young people leaving official care setting, they may lack this support and may have never had the opportunity to learn skills to live independently. They will typically have little or no money or other resources, few if any contacts to call on for support, and usually no entitlement to any official help.

Young people leaving care must manage on their own in so many ways: they have to find a way to make a living, to find somewhere safe to live, to find friends and contacts who will be supportive and not take advantage of them. Even basic skills like cooking may not be easy for them. The most well-known research in this area is largely confined to richer countries although some work is beginning to emerge in middle and low-income countries. There seems to be only one study so far conducted in Vietnam on this area (Collins & Bui, 2016).

This project is interested in investigating the following questions: How do young people leaving care in Vietnam manage? What happens to them? Where do they find help and support? What are the challenges they face? What have they found helpful as they try to negotiate their new life outside the care setting? Who, if any, are the people they found supportive?

Based on the results of this study, we aim to develop a learning module about experiences of care leavers in Vietnam and recommended practices in preparing young people to leave care. The intended audiences are practitioners and policy makers. Practitioners who work with these young people then could have a better understanding about the needs of young people after leaving care and policy makers could make better policies and programs to address these needs. This learning module could also be embedded in a course to train social work students in working with children in fostered care.

During the course of implementing this project, in addition to the goal of strengthening the relationship among three partners, this project also aims to enhance research capacity for lecturers in Vietnam. We intend to do training about research methods for our research assistants who are lecturers at University of Social Sciences of Humanities, HCM campus.

#### IV. **Action plan:** i.e. activities planned as part of the project (5-10 lines).

The following activities will need to be implemented as part of this project:

1. Conduct further literature review

2. Develop interview questions
3. Getting approval from the ethics committee
4. Recruit participants who have left care centers in Vietnam
5. Conduct training about research methods and data collection
6. Collect data: Interview care leavers
7. Transcribe and translate data
8. Analyze data
9. Write report and develop training module.

#### **V. Expected contribution and outcomes of the project (5-10 lines).**

Expected outcomes for this project include:

- A learning module for staff at care centers and related stakeholders in Vietnam on the experiences of young people leaving care and recommended practices in preparing young people to leave care.
- A manuscript submitted to a peer-reviewed journal
- Presentations at conferences

#### **VI. Dissemination of the project outcomes.**

The project outcomes will be disseminated via the following channels:

- Presentation for staff at care centers and policy makers in Vietnam
- Presentations at conferences
- A journal article

#### **VII. Time table**

#	Activities	Timeline
1	Literature Review	November 2017- November 2018
2	Develop interview questions	November 2017 – December 2017
3	Ethics application	November 2017 – January 2018
4	Participants recruitment	January 2018 – March 2018
5	Data collection	March 2018 – May 2018
6	Transcribe and translate data	May 2018 – June 2018
7	Data analysis	June 2018 – October 2018

<b>8</b>	Write report	November 2018 – February 2019
<b>9</b>	Develop training module	February 2019 – April 2019

### VIII. Budget

This project is currently funded with 2000EUR from Trinity College Dublin (TCD). The US\$4000 grant from IASSW will allow us to expand the project a little bit more and develop a training module afterward. Detailed proposed budget is as follow:

<b>Budget item</b>	<b>USD</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>Funding source</b>
Research assistant(s) in Vietnam	1500	The research assistant(s) in Vietnam will co-ordinate the collection, transcribe, and translation of data; assist in all related project activities.	TCD
Compensation for interviewers	600	Transportation and time to do the interviews	TCD
Compensation for interviewees	250	Gifts/ honorarium for interviewees	IASSW
Transcribe data	350		IASSW
Translate data	1000		IASSW
Domestic travel within Vietnam	600	All partners plan to meet in Vietnam sometime in Feb-March 2018 to discuss details for the project. This cost is to cover domestic travels.	IASSW
Training about research methods and data collection	300	Robert and Hoa will do a brief training about research method and data collection for the research assistant(s) in Vietnam. This cost covers food and other expense for the training.	IASSW

Develop learning module	1000	Expert time in developing the module; special software; copy right materials, translation, etc.	IASSW
Unexpected expense	500		IASSW
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,100</b>		

### IX. Short (5–7 lines) biographical sketches of the participants

**Dr Hoa Thi Nguyen** is a Lecturer in the Social Practice Pathway, Unitec Institute of Technology. She completed her MSW and PhD in Social Work from University of Minnesota, USA. Before coming to Unitec, Nguyen worked as Program Coordinator for the Social Work Education Enhancement Program (SWEET), an international collaborative between USAID, San Jose State University, Cisco System, and 8 Vietnamese universities to help Vietnam strengthen their capacities in delivering undergraduate social work programs. At one time, Nguyen served as a national consultant for the evaluation of social work initiatives for UNICEF Vietnam. Her research interest includes child welfare, domestic violence, economic empowerment, social work education, and measurement development. Nguyen has been the Lead researchers for four research projects, published six articles in peer-reviewed journals, one book chapter and presented at numerous national and international conferences. One of her journal articles was recently awarded with the Best Conceptual Article in the Journal of Social Work Education.

**Professor Robert Gilligan** holds the Chair of Social Work and Social Policy, at Trinity College Dublin, Ireland. He has published extensively on issues relating to children and young people in care. He is co-Principal Investigator on the five country project studying the pathways of young people in care into the world of work ('Care to Work Pathways Study) conducted in Belgium, Czech Republic, Ireland, Spain and Sweden. He has been a Visiting Academic in a number of centers including the Department of Social Work, Massey University, New Zealand (2016), School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago (2012), the Dept. of Social Work, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic (2012, 2015, 2106). He is a member of the Board of the European Scientific Association for Residential and Family Care for Children and Adolescents, and of Intrac - the international network of researchers on care leaving. He is also a member of the Editorial Board of the journals, Child Abuse and Neglect, Child and Family Social Work, Child Indicators



Research, Children and Society, European Journal of Social Work, International Journal of Child and Family Welfare and of the Advisory Board of Adoption and Fostering.

**Dr Nga Hanh Do** is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Social Work, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City. She was the Dean of the Faculty from 2013 to 2017. She had Bachelor degree of Educational Psychology at the Ariol National University of Education (Russia), Master of Assessment and Evaluation at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (Australia), and PhD in Psychology at the Institute of Psychology – Vietnam Institute of Social Sciences. Do lead three sub-project of Higher Education Project under Ministry of Education and Training initiated by the government and funded by World Bank Credit and had several years serving as the deputy director of the Centre for Educational Testing and Quality Assessment in Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City. Do also took part in the Melbourne University group to do research under grant of World Bank like Vietnam Primary School Teacher Development Project, Assessment programme for primary teachers in Viet Nam and Primary Education for Disadvantaged Children (PEDC) in 2001 - 2008. Her research interests include studying adolescent, coping strategies and some other issues in School Psychology and Social Work.

### References

Collins, M. E. & Bui, T. T. T.. (2016). Youth leaving care in developing countries: observations from Vietnam. In Mendes, P. & Snow, P. (Eds.) *Young people transitioning from out-of-home care: International research, policy, and practice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

## Unitec New Zealand Limited

### Meeting of Unitec Research Committee

11 February 2021

<b>Title</b>	Definition of an Early Career Researcher at Unitec
<b>Provided by:</b>	Penny Thomson & Gregor Steinhorn, Research Partners
<b>For:</b>	<b>APPROVAL</b>

### Recommendation

That the Committee approves a revised definition of an Early Career Researcher (ECR) at Unitec in regards to eligibility for ECR Funding as follows (the proposed changes are highlighted yellow):

Principal Investigators must meet the Unitec definition of an ECR:

*An ECR at Unitec lies between ‘emerging/beginner’ and ‘senior/advanced’. An ECR is within 10 years (prior to the closing date for full applications) of becoming an ‘independent’ researcher, which is defined as:*

- 1. A researcher who has completed a higher research qualification (a PhD, or Masters<sup>1</sup>); or*
- 2. A researcher who was the first author of a disseminated research output.*

*Time taken for parental leave<sup>2</sup> is not counted as part of the 10-year window (i.e. one year of parental leave would extend the eligibility period to 11 years since graduating).*

### Purpose

Every year, two or three Unitec ECRs find they are just outside the eligibility criteria for ECR funding because they have taken parental leave and are therefore no longer “within 10 years of becoming an ‘independent’ researcher”. The revised definition will broaden the eligibility criteria for ECR funding so as not to exclude those ECRs who would be eligible for funding had they not taken parental leave. It will make the scheme more equitable and will also align Unitec’s definition of an ECR more closely with the Royal Society Te Apārangi’s definition of an ECR.

### Background

---

<sup>1</sup> Must be a minimum 90 credit Master’s Thesis

<sup>2</sup> Other forms of extended leave may be considered by negotiation with Tūāpapa Rangahau.

The ECR Fund provides annual, contestable funding to emerging and established ECRs at Unitec. It aims to support ECRs to produce quality outputs that will help them to build a track-record, aid their career progression and enable their participation in the PBRF.

### **Next Steps**

If the proposal is approved, the change of definition will be communicated to Research Leaders and Heads of Schools to inform research active staff and the guidelines of the ECR Scheme will be updated.

### **Contributors**

---

A/P Marcus Williams, Director Research and Enterprise

Brenda Massey, Senior Grants Advisor

## Unitec New Zealand Limited

### Meeting of Unitec Research Committee

11 February 2021

<b>Title</b>	Research Centre Annual Report Template
<b>Provided by:</b>	Brenda Massey
<b>For:</b>	<b>APPROVAL</b>

### Recommendation

That the Committee reviews and approves a template for Unitec Research Centres to report on their activities.

### Purpose

Unitec's Research Centre Procedure requires all Unitec Research Centres to report annually to the Committee. Centres need to be provided with an annual report template, developed in accordance with the requirements of the Research Centre Procedure, for this purpose.

### Background

The Research Centre Procedure requires Unitec Research Centres to report annually to the URC. Reports will include:

- a) performance against forecast budget and outputs; and
- b) evidence of external funding applications.

A/P Marcus Williams and Brenda Massey have drafted a reporting template that requests updates on information provided in Centres' original applications to establish themselves. The template has been designed to be flexible to reflect the diversity of Centres' missions, visions and purposes, and so as to only require succinct and pertinent information from busy Centre Directors.

### Next Steps

Unitec's Research Centres will be asked to submit annual reports for review by the Committee to an achievable deadline. Centre Directors will be provided with the finalised reporting template for this purpose.

### Contributors

---

A/P Marcus Williams, Director Research and Enterprise

## Attachments

---

- Unitec Research Centre Reporting Template (draft)

## Unitec Research Centre Reporting Template

Unitec's [Research Centre Procedure](#) requires Unitec's Research Centres to report annually to the Unitec Research Committee.

This reporting template requests updates on information provided in Centre Directors' original applications to establish Centres. It aims to reflect the diversity of Centres' different missions, visions, purposes, aims and priorities. The template was designed to be flexible and to procure a succinct report of pertinent information from busy Centre Directors. It can be adapted to suit Centres' own contexts as required. For example, different Centres used different terms in their applications to establish. Please use the term relevant to your Centre's application.

Research Centre:	[Name]
Centre Director:	[Name]

Outline any variations to the vision, mission, aims, priorities and/or distinctiveness of the Centre:

Vision Mātauranga aims "to unlock the innovation potential of Māori knowledge, resources and people to assist New Zealanders to create a better future". Provide an overview of how the Centre has responded to this kaupapa:

Summarise any opportunities afforded to students to be involved in the Centre and its activities:

Outline any changes pertaining to the management and operation of the Centre, including to the Centre's Advisory Board and personnel working in or with the Centre:

Outline any changes to the Centre's research streams/themes:

Outline any changes to the Centre's internal and external partnerships/collaborations, highlighting any new partnerships/collaborations that have been made:

Please list all submitted and successful external funding applications (a spreadsheet or similar can be appended if easier):

Please report on the Centre's annual budgeted versus actual income from the year of commencement of the Centre to the year ended 31 December 2020 (expand the table accordingly, or alternatively this information can be appended if you have it in a different format):

Income Source	Year Ending	Budgeted Income \$	Actual Income \$

Briefly account for any difference between budgeted and actual income:

If there is anything else you wish to report, please do so here:

Please email your completed Research Centre Report to [bmassey@unitec.ac.nz](mailto:bmassey@unitec.ac.nz) before [deadline TBC].

## Unitec New Zealand Limited

### Meeting of Unitec Research Committee

11 February 2021

<b>Title</b>	2021 Unitec Early Career Researcher Fund Outcomes
<b>Provided by:</b>	Brenda Massey, Senior Grants Advisor
<b>For:</b>	<b>INFORMATION</b>

### Recommendation

That the Committee notes the outcomes of the 2021 Unitec Early Career Researcher (ECR) Fund.

### Key Points

- Seven Registrations of Interest (RoIs) were received. All were invited to submit full proposals.
- Seven full applications were received.
- Three applications were approved (two subject to modification).
- Four applications were declined.
- One of the declined applicants has been offered seed funding to assist them to find suitable industry partners.

Full details of the outcomes of the seven applications are as follows:

Applicant	School	Project Title & Outcome	Amount
Min Hall	Architecture	Earth Aotearoa Stage 1. Outcome: declined.	\$0
Dr Marleen Baling	Environmental & Animal Sciences	Testing the feasibility of identifying reptile species using eDNA from tracking tunnels. Outcome: approved, subject to modification.	\$18,270
Dr Cat Mitchell	Learning & Achievement	Ma te huruhuru, ka rere te manu: Postgraduate supervision and writing support for tauira Māori within a vocational education context. Outcome: approved.	\$23,110
Dr David Airehrou	Business	A machine learning design framework to jump-start the New Zealand tourism industry in a post-covid-19 era. Outcome: declined, however the GAC agreed to allocate discretionary seed funding to assist the researcher to find suitable industry partners.	\$0
Renata Jadresin-Milic	Architecture	'Digitalisation of Heritage in NZ' Phase Two. Outcome: Approved, subject to modification.	\$27,845



Cam Moore	Architecture	Gummer and Ford. Outcome: declined.	\$0
Dr Soheil Varastehpour	Computing & Information Technology	Smartphone Contact Tracing App. Outcome: declined.	\$0
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$69,225</b>

Some themes which came out of this year's assessment of the applications were:

- Strong research ideas with significant potential for impact over a wide range of areas.
- Better engagement with teams in and outside of the discipline of the Principal Investigator, i.e. more collaboration, diversity and inclusiveness than in the past.
- It is quite common for there to be inadequate detail around the "how"; how will the questions be answered? What is the methodology and methods?
- Still more work is required on acquiring industry or community partnerships which have genuine depth and commitment; co-funding remains rare, even "in kind".
- Vision Mātauranga is poorly understood ranging from an expressed appreciation of its importance but with no real agency in the project itself, to complete lack of comprehension of what it means. There is less deficit narrative in responses to the Vision Mātauranga section of the application form, but a lack of understanding of the value proposition of engaging with Māori to solve problems and answer questions remains. The judges of the Research with Impact Award at the 2020 Unitec Research Symposium expressed similar opinions. Schools are encouraged to engage with Kaihautu in the context of developing funding applications and with help from Tūāpapa Rangahau, to actively seek relationships and partnerships with Māori in the context of research.

## Information/Background

The ECR Fund provides annual, contestable funding to emerging and established ECRs at Unitec in order to develop their capability, capacity and career progression as a Principal Investigator on a high quality applied research project that meets the evaluation criteria.

Applicants were required to signal their interest in applying for ECR funding by completing a RoI. The RoI enabled Tūāpapa Rangahau to check the PI met the definition of an ECR, to assign the PI a mentor (if requested) and to identify the types of assessment expertise that would be required during the later phase of the application process. Full applications were invited from eligible PIs and were assessed by a Grants Advisory Committee (GAC), a sub-committee of the Unitec Research Committee, on research quality, impact, engagement, capability development and application quality.

The GAC convened on Tuesday, 8 December 2020 to decide the outcome of the submitted applications. Applicants were notified of the outcome of their applications on 11 December 2020.

## Unitec New Zealand Limited

### Meeting of Unitec Research Committee

11 February 2021

<b>Title</b>	Reaccreditation of the Centre for Computational Intelligence and Cybersecurity (CCICS) and the Centre of Computational Intelligence for Environmental Engineering (CIEE)
<b>Provided by:</b>	A/P Marcus Williams
<b>Authored by:</b>	Brenda Massey
<b>For:</b>	<b>INFORMATION</b>

### Recommendation

That the Committee notes that the Centre for Computational Intelligence and Cybersecurity (CCICS) and the Centre of Computational Intelligence for Environmental Engineering (CIEE) are required to apply for reaccreditation if they are to continue to operate as Research Centres at Unitec.

### Purpose

The CCICS and CIEE are required to apply for reaccreditation if they are to continue to operate as Research Centres at Unitec, as per Unitec's Research Centre Procedure.

### Information/Background

The Committee approved the CCICS as a Research Centre at Unitec at an e-Meeting on 10-11 October 2012 and the CIEE as a Research Centre at a meeting on 10 June 2014

Section 3.1.9.2 of the Research Centre Procedure states that a Research Centre shall be accredited for a period of up to three years and shall be subject to a re-accreditation process every three years or as determined by the Director, Research and Enterprise.

Section 3.1.9.4 states that where a Research Centre has reached the end of its period of accreditation that centre may apply to renew accreditation.

### Next Steps

A/P Marcus Williams, Director Research and Enterprise, will notify the Head of School of Computing and Information Technology that the CCICS and CIEE need to be reaccredited if they are to continue to operate as Research Centres at Unitec.

## Attachments

---

- Research Centre Procedure
- Minutes Unitec Research Committee e-Meeting, 10-11 October 2012.
- Minutes Unitec Research Committee meeting, 10 June 2014.



# RESEARCH CENTRE PROCEDURE

## 1 Purpose

This procedure outlines the requirements for the establishment, accreditation, and review of Research Centres at Unitec.

## 2 Scope

A Research Centre is a formally-constituted grouping of researchers who work together to collectively achieve defined research aims.

As part of the development and enhancement of a vibrant and active research culture Unitec may establish Research Centres.

These arrangements will have formal institutional standing and recognition and will operate in ways that serve to enhance Unitec's research capability, activity, and reputation.

## 3 Procedure

### 3.1 Establishing Research Centres

#### 3.1.1 Criteria for establishment

1. Applications for the establishment of Research Centres will be evaluated against a set of criteria; these include:
  - a. demonstrable consideration of the principles of *Te Noho Kotahitanga*;
  - b. adherence to research-relevant policies, procedures, and guidelines;
  - c. clearly-identified research aims that, if achieved, will result in research with impact;
  - d. demonstrated linkage between the aims of the centre and:
    - i. institutional and/or Network research themes, clusters, or strategies; and/or
    - ii. programmes or areas of academic provision.
  - e. identification of a critical mass of staff with credibility in the area and a demonstrated track record of research outputs;
  - f. sustainability in both financial and human terms, using existing physical and human resources of Unitec;
    - i. the centre must seek external funding;
  - g. provision of opportunities for involvement of students;
  - h. distinctiveness of the proposed centre's aims in relation to other centres that may or may not exist at other institutions; and
  - i. Identification of the location and management of any financial and human resource matters including specification of clear lines of responsibility/authority.

### 3.1.2 Benefits

1. Potential benefits include:
  - a. promotion of the Research Centre's activities by Unitec;
  - b. invitation to contribute to Unitec research publications including *Advance Magazine* and Unitec's e-Press; and/or
  - c. potential for discretionary funding and scholarships.

### 3.1.3 Expectations

1. All Research Centres will be expected to:
  - a. perform at a high standard of research excellence, including meeting agreed milestones and outputs;
  - b. aim to become fully externally-funded;
  - c. seek to enact and further Unitec's *Research and Enterprise Strategy*, including:
    - i. building more and deeper relationships with industry;
    - ii. improving and supporting researchers' performance; and
    - iii. broadening teaching-related/ -integrated research.

### 3.1.4 Centre management

1. Research Centre Directors will be senior researchers within Unitec with proven experience in managing large-scale projects.
2. An application for a proposed centre may propose Research Centre Directors.
  - a. Unitec's Research Committee, in considering the application, may appoint those proposed or appoint alternatives.
3. Directors report to the Dean: Research and Enterprise and are responsible for:
  - a. leadership of research and the centre's programme;
  - b. line management of centre staff;
  - c. input into the research-related performance of staff not managed by the centre;
  - d. overseeing supervision of students working with the centre; and
  - e. unless an agreement with Unitec states otherwise, continuing to contribute to teaching and research at Unitec.

### 3.1.5 Centre membership

1. Members of the Research Centre will generally be Unitec-employed academic staff who are highly research-engaged and have relevant research expertise.
2. It is expected members will:
  - a. actively engage with the work of the centre – including its programme of research, seminars and workshops, and strategic planning; and
  - b. unless the centre 'buys out' their time or comes to an agreement with Unitec for that staff member's time, continue to fulfil the duties for which they are contracted by Unitec.

### 3.1.6 Advisory Board

1. Each Research Centre shall have an advisory board, typically comprising:
  - a. the Dean: Research and Enterprise;
  - b. a Research Partner (Performance);
  - c. a Dean: Innovation and Development;
  - d. Unitec staff members not involved in the Centre
  - e. a mātauranga Māori champion; and
  - f. representatives from relevant external groups (such as an industry partner, external research organisation, or community group).

### 3.1.7 Resources

1. All staff must exercise responsible stewardship of Unitec's resources.
2. The centre's funding and resources will be managed by the Research Centre Director, in consultation with the REO.
3. Specific funding and resources from Unitec for a Research Centre will be negotiated upon application.

### 3.1.8 Request process

1. In recommending the establishment of a Research Centre, the criteria set out in 3.1.1 must be addressed in supporting documentation.
2. A completed *Request to Establish a Research Centre* must be submitted with specified documentation.
3. Proposals to establish a Research Centre at Unitec must follow the procedure outlined below:
  - a. The proposal must be approved by the appropriate committee before being presented to the Unitec Research Committee (URC).
  - b. The proposal is presented to the URC.
  - c. The URC advises the relevant parties of the outcome of their decision.

### 3.1.9 Centre review and evaluation

1. Upon approval for registration as a Research Centre, the centre will receive an agreement outlining expectations, resources, and other agreed-upon terms.
2. A Research Centre shall be accredited for a period of up to three years and shall be subject to a re-accreditation process every three years or as determined by the Dean: Research and Enterprise.
3. Each centre will report annually to the URC. Reports will include:
  - a. performance against forecast budget and outputs; and
  - b. evidence of external funding applications.

4. Where a Research Centre has reached the end of its period of accreditation that centre may apply to renew accreditation.
  - a. The centre must apply to the relevant committee, which will make a recommendation to the URC.
  - b. The re-accreditation recommendation must:
    - i. consider the performance and relevance of the centre against the establishment criteria in force at the time of re-accreditation;
    - ii. include evidence of past and future research outputs; and
    - iii. make specific reference to the centre's record and achievements.

## 4 Responsibilities

Role
Research Centres
Research Centre Directors
Tuapapa Rangahau: Research and Enterprise Office
Unitec Research Committee
Dean: Research and Enterprise

## 5 Definitions

Unless otherwise specified the definitions in the *Policy Framework Glossary* (to be completed) apply. If a definition is not listed in that resource, ask the Policy Framework Manager to consider adding it.

## 6 Reference Documents

- *Academic Statute*;
- *Code of Conduct*;
- *Conduct of Research Policy*;
- *Guidelines for Applying for and Managing External Funding*;
- *Te Noho Kotahitanga*; and
- *Unitec Research and Enterprise Strategy 2015-2020*.

## 7 Document Details

Version Number	2.1
Version Issue Date	August 2018

	Amendment Date	Amendment/s
Version History	January 2011	First edition
	December 2015	Formal review
	August 2018	Updated as part of policy review project
Consultation Scope		
Approval Authority	Academic Board	
Original Date of Approval	January 2011	
Document Sponsor	Executive Dean: Academic Development	
Document Owner	Dean: Research and Enterprise	
Contact Person		
Date of Next Review	December 2019	





# minutes

## Unitec Research Committee e-Meeting

---

10 – 11 October 2012 at 4.30pm  
Online

### VOTING MEMBERS

Assoc Prof Simon Peel (Chair)  
Assoc Prof Helen Gremillion  
Assoc Prof Evangelia Papoutsaki  
Assoc Prof Marcus Williams  
Assoc Prof Gillian Whalley  
Prof Bin Su  
Dr Scott Wilson  
Dr Linda Kestle  
Kathryn Davies  
Peter Hughes  
Gemma Skipper (USU rep)

### IN ATTENDANCE

Kate Hiatt (Committee Secretary)

### 1. APOLOGIES

Dr Ray Meldrum  
Chris King

### 2. MOTION

**Moved:** Simon Peel

That the Unitec Research Committee approves the ***Centre for Research in Computational Intelligence and Cyber-Security (CICS)*** as a research centre at Unitec.

**Carried Unanimously**



# minutes

## Unitec Research Committee

---

Tuesday 10 June 2014 at 1pm  
Penman House, Building 55, Room 1004

Assoc. Prof. Marcus Williams (Chair)  
Dr Teorongonui Josie Keelan  
Assoc. Prof. Linda Kestle  
Assoc. Prof. Helen Gremillion  
Prof. Linton Winder  
Assoc. Prof. Christoph Schnoor  
Wayne Holmes  
Dr Scott Wilson  
Peter Hughes  
Rishit Shah

### **IN ATTENDANCE**

Katie Jones (Secretary)

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Prof. Gillian Whalley  
Assoc. Prof. Evangelia Papoutsaki  
Chris King  
Dr Fotu Fisi'iahi  
Prof. Linton Winder (for leaving early)  
Dr Teorongonui Josie Keelan (for arriving late)

The apologies were noted.

### **2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 May be confirmed as a true and accurate record of the meeting, subject to the following amendments:

Item 4: The addition of the word mainly in paragraph three to read "faculty funds could mainly focus on...".

Item 4: The second decision be changed to read "...margins of being funded".

Item 12.2: The word faulty be replaced with faculty, and the partners listed as AUT, Wintec and Unitec.

**Moved:** Linda Kestle  
**Seconded:** Linton Winder  
**Carried**

### 3. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

There were no matters arising for discussion.

### 4. STRATEGIC RESEARCH FUND ASSESSMENT

Marcus Williams introduced this item and asked the committee for feedback.

It was agreed that this was a robust and appropriate process, however a concern about how track record would be handled for new or emerging staff was raised. It was noted that the assessment mechanism needed to deal with new and emerging researchers on a case by case basis, as they may not meet all the track record requirements in the assessment criteria.

The committee discussed that new and emerging researchers would generally apply for faculty funding, not SRF, however there will be exceptions to this. It was agreed it should be identified on the application form that a staff member is new and emerging in order to allow for an appropriate assessment to take place.

Katie Jones read to the committee the general definitions of what constitutes emerging, early and established career researchers.

It was noted that item three on the scoring sheet does not match the recommendations and this needs to be updated. The committee was informed that Brenda Massey is available to come and talk to departments about the SRF.

**Action:** Brenda Massey to amend the scoring sheet and application form accordingly.

### 5. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The committee discussed the feedback presented from the Faculty of Creative Industries and Business Research and Supervision Committee (FRSC), as well as verbal feedback presented by Linda Kestle on behalf of the Faculty of Technology and Built Environment.

The committee discussed the differing views on committee size, with both two and three faculty representatives proposed. It was agreed that there should be a permanent ePress representative. Different tenure lengths were discussed, with both 2+2 year terms discussed and a three year term proposed. The committee generally considered two faculty representatives on a 2+2 year model to be appropriate.

It was suggested that nominations could be called for through the FRCs with names forwarded to the REO for consideration. It was considered important that the Chair retain final say on who is appointed to the URC.

### 6. MĀORI RESEARCH STRATEGY

Josie Keelan presented the Māori Research Strategy to the committee. It was developed in order to provide a niche for Unitec to operate within, rather than competing in spaces that are already filled by others. It was decided that there is a real lack of technology and trades presentations at indigenous conferences, and that Unitec could fill the gap in research in this area. Other research would continue at Unitec, however this area will be a priority for Māori research. A change was requested concerning the use of the term trades, and it was suggested that this be replaced by a more generic term such as vocations.

A recommendation was put to the committee to endorse this strategy and send it to the Executive Leadership Team and Academic Board for approval.

**Moved:** Wayne Holmes

**Seconded:** Scott Wilson

**Carried**

**Action:** Marcus Williams and Josie Keelan to send the updated strategy to the ELT and Academic Board for approval.

## 7. CLEAR/PREP UPDATE

Marcus Williams updated the committee on CLEARs progress and the roll out of PREP (Personal Research Engagement Portfolio). He noted that Shane Stuart has been appointed as Associate Dean, Research and Enterprise, FCIB and starts on the 1<sup>st</sup> July. He will be located in Penman House. Research professional development workshops have been developed and will be launched next week. A programme of work has just started on developing Research Plans to address red and amber lit programmes in the Research Performance Traffic Light. All HODs have been contacted and emails about implementing the plans' have been sent. The PREP will be available by September in order to be used for staff performance management this year.

## 8. RESEARCHER IN RESIDENCE APPLICATION'S AND REPORTS

### 8.1. BOJAN TEPAVCEVIC (HOST: PETER MCPHERSON, ARCHITECTURE)

It was noted that the house was not available until the 1<sup>st</sup> August, therefore the residency could not begin until then. The resident would also have to be willing to share with women and children, something he had expressed a reluctance to do. The committee noted that the application specifically spoke of becoming wary of pure teaching engagements and assurances needed to be made that the individual was here to do research, as well as teaching.

The committee agreed to approve the residency subject to the following conditions:

- The resident can only stay in the house from 1<sup>st</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> August
- The resident needs to be willing to share with non-males and children
- More information needs to be provided regarding the research the resident will be engaging in.

### 8.2. LI ZUOJIN (HOST: PAUL PANG, COMPUTING)

The committee supported this application.

**Action:** The REO to inform the applicants of the committee's decisions.

## 9. JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE FOR COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE FOR URBAN ENVIRONMENT INFORMATION SERVICES

The committee discussed this request to approve the formation of a Unitec Research Centre. It was noted that while the title of the centre discusses Urban Environment Information Services, the application does not provide any detail regarding what this means. The application focuses on computational intelligence and not how this applies to the urban environment. It was also noted that the recommendations in the memo are wrong and do not apply to this committee.

It was requested that the applicant be asked to provide more information in the memo on urban environmental information. Subject to these changes being made to the satisfaction of the REO the committee moved to approve the establishment of a new research centre.

**Moved:** Scott Wilson

**Seconded:** Helen Gremillion

**Carried**

**Action:** REO to communicate with Centre and ensure requested changes are made.

## 10. SRF REPORT FEEDBACK

### 10.1. DAVIES

This report was read by Linton Winder and Evangelia Papoutsaki. It was noted that this is an illustration of the great range of projects the committee is able to fund. Written notes were provided by Evangelia and these will be incorporated into the committee's feedback.

It was recommended that effort is put into securing a written publication from this output (the committee noted that due to time frames many reports had publications pending), and that the author should consider an eMedia publication for his work.

### 10.2. FARNWORTH

This report was read by Chris King and Linda Kestle. Written notes were provided by Chris King and will be incorporated into the committee's feedback.

It was noted that data collection for this research has really only just begun and as a result conclusions are light. A question was raised about the original stated aims of this project and whether these have been achieved. It appears the project is now relying on external funds to complete it. No budget breakdown was provided in the report.

**Action:** The committee requested the REO review the requirements and budget for this project.

### 10.3. HENWOOD

This report was read by Christoph Schnoor and Scott Wilson. It was noted that due to delays in starting the research the URC agreed to fund this project for 2014 in order to facilitate its completion. Due to this the impact is poorly formulated and publications are not clearly articulated. The report needs to be read in tandem with the interim report submitted in the agenda.

### 10.4. MALCOLM

This report was read by Marcus Williams and Gillian Whalley. It was noted that the chief investigator was unable to complete this project. It was asked if the REO was notified of this in time to reallocate the money. Katie Jones assured the committee that the funds were reused. It was also recommended that the Dean of Teaching and Learning be informed of this research, and if this project is to proceed in the future it should be done in conjunction with the Teaching and Learning team in order to maximise its relevance.

### 10.5. PANG

This report was read by Helen Gremillion and Rishit Shah. It was considered an excellent demonstration of contribution to research at Unitec. A significant external collaboration has been developed, and it was considered a good report. The future directions of the research were considered interesting.

### 10.6. RAINSBURY

This report was read by Fotu Fisi'iahi and Josie Keelan. The project was considered successful and resulted in interesting and relevant findings to the ITP sector. The investment in the research was considered justified.

### 10.7. WILLIAMS

This application was read by Peter Hughes and Wayne Holmes. It was noted that this was an excellent project report, and the objectives were clearly stated, including

whether or not these were met. The committee enquired as to how the REO follow's up on outputs that are under production.

**Action:** The REO is to write to all researchers who submitted reports with the committee's feedback.

## **11. SRF INTERIM REPORTS**

The committee discussed the process for reading interim reports and agreed that the whole committee should read all applications with the view to identifying funding concerns to be addressed before the end of the year. The review of these reports was delayed until all interim reports were submitted and will be considered at the August URC meeting.

- 11.1. DODSON
- 11.2. HENWOOD
- 11.3. THOMPSON

## **12. EARLY CAREER RESEARCHER POST CONFERENCE REPORTS**

The committee noted these reports. Unitec sent five staff to the conference and it was clear from the reports that it was a valuable opportunity for those that attended. As a result Giles Dodson has now set up an Early Career Researcher Forum at Unitec. The committee looks forward to receiving the fifth report.

- 12.1. GILES DODSON
- 12.2. JESSICA WALKER
- 12.3. LUCY PATSON
- 12.4. MAGGIE ZHONG

## **13. UPDATE ON UNITEC'S EPRESS**

The committee was alerted to the fact that ePress is now publishing under creative common licencing options, and the upcoming architecture conference proceedings will be published through ePress.

## **14. FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE UPDATES**

- 14.1. CREATIVE INDUSTRIES AND BUSINESS

Shane Stuart starts at Unitec on July 1<sup>st</sup> and he had his first orientation day last Friday. It is the express wish of faculty leadership that Shane's abilities are not limited to one faculty and he will work across all faculties that can utilise his skills.

- 14.2. SOCIAL AND HEALTH SCIENCES

This item was deferred until the next meeting.

- 14.3. TECHNOLOGY AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

The hydrogen project is moving along, with the decision to build from scratch rather than import ready-made. Transport Technology is more involved in this project now. There are three staff attending the writing retreat, and the faculty is doing a lot of work on research leadership. Research publications appear to be growing for the faculty.

## **15. UNITEC RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM 2014**

Katie Jones introduced the outline for the Unitec Research Symposium for 2014. A facilitated session has been added to the usual programme composition. It is important for members of this committee to promote the symposium once calls for papers are made.

## **16. ITP RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM 2014**

Katie Jones updated the committee on the progress of planning for the ITP Research Symposium to be held in July. Email invitations will be sent to the committee shortly. Committee members are asked to promote this important event.

## **17. GENERAL BUSINESS**

Marcus Williams highlighted the need for the committee to contribute to significant strategic discussions occurring at Unitec currently and that useful reading will be circulated prior to the next committee meeting, which will be essential in facilitating meaningful discussion

There being no further business the meeting closed at 3pm.

## **DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday, 5 August 2014, 1pm  
Research Office and Postgraduate Centre  
Penman House, Building 55, Room 1004

## Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee Self-Assessment

---

**Purpose:** NZQA requires the Committees of Unitec's Academic Board to provide evidence of self-assessment.

### Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec Self-Assessment Provocations

- Can we improve the way the committee is run?
- Is time well managed?
- Are issues under discussion well-handled and resolved?
- Are the agenda and minutes well handled?
- Are the perspectives of committee members respected and heard?
- Are actions completed and accounted for?
- Were there matters raised and dealt with in the meeting that were particularly helpful or unhelpful?
- Does the committee oversee and ensure compliance within its mandate?
- Does the committee show foresight and proactively engage in continuous improvement?
- Does the committee review and improve the relevant policies, guidelines and regulations?