



# minutes

## Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	2021-04-08
Scheduled Start:	1300h
Scheduled End:	1500h
Location:	Microsoft Teams

MEETING OPENED:	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. Marcus Williams (Chair)
2. Arun Deo (left at 2pm)
3. Roger Birchmore
4. Tui Matelau (proxy for Robyn Gandell)
5. Helen Gremillion
6. Leon Tan
7. Kristie Cameron

8. Falaniko Tominiko (proxy for Daisey Bentley-Gray)
9. Maryam Mirzaei
10. Lian Wu
11. Susan Eady
12. Iman Ardekani (proxy for Hamid Sharifzadeh)

Total members represented: 12 members

#### Apologies

1. Yusef Patel
2. Robyn Gandell
3. Hamid Sharifzadeh
4. Daisy Bentley-Gray

Total apologies: 4 member/s

#### Absent

1. Prof Jenny Lee-Morgan

Total absences: 1 member

#### MOTION

**That the committee accepts the apologies for today's meeting.**

**Moved: Lian Wu**

**Seconded: Roger Birchmore**

**MOTION CARRIED**

#### 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 approves the minutes of the 2021-03-11 meeting as a true and accurate record.**

**Moved: Tui Matelau**

**Seconded: Iman Ardekani**

**MOTION CARRIED**

#### Item 2.3 Mahia Atu | Matters Arising

Agenda Item	Action	Responsible	Outcome
3.1	Amend the draft action plan to incorporate the feedback received, and to reflect the discussions had in section 4.1. A revised iteration will be presented at the April meeting.	Marcus Williams	Complete - on agenda

3.3	Add text around the KPI associated with Priority One to the School Research Plan reporting template.  Consult with key people (e.g. Linda Kestle and Becca Wood) about the format and requirements of the School Research Plan reporting template and send any feedback received to Arun Deo for integration into the template.	Marcus Williams  Roger Birchmore/ Leon Tan/ Arun Deo	In progress  Complete – on agenda
4.1	Consolidate the committee's feedback on the KPI for Priority One in the 2020 - 2024 Unitec Research Strategy – Action Plan (DRAFT) into a memo for the next meeting.  Discuss whether the statistics the subject librarians keep on their research related interactions would be useful for School Research Leaders.	Brenda Massey/ Marcus Williams  Susan Eady/ Arun Deo	Complete – on agenda  In progress

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

#### **Section 3.1                      2020 – 2024 Unitec Research Strategy – Action Plan (revised DRAFT)**

An updated 2020 - 2024 Unitec Research Strategy – Action Plan and revised Key Performance Indicator (KPI) for Priority One reflecting feedback previously provided by the committee was presented.

The committee acknowledged that the revised KPI reflects the practicalities associated with collecting data to measure progress towards meeting the KPI, e.g. staff resourcing.

#### **MOTION**

**That the committee approves the 2020 – 2024 Unitec Research Strategy – Action Plan and KPI for Priority One.**

**Moved: Falaniko Tominiko**

**Seconded: Susan Eady**

**MOTION CARRIED**

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

#### **Section 4.1                      Reporting Against School Research Plans**

Feedback from the School of Creative Industries and the School of Building Construction on the proposed format for Schools to report annually against their Research Plans was received.

In addition to the discussion points contained in the Agenda, the following points were raised and considered:

#### **Section 4: Research Groups**

- It was queried whether information on the members and focus of research groups operating within a School is useful to anyone outside of the School. The Chair elucidated that 1) Unitec

is trying to encourage staff collaborations, and the maturation of research groups into research centres. 2) The information collected on research groups is useful for Schools when they reflect on synergies between what they are researching and what they are teaching. 3) This information can inform Schools' responses to queries arising from course moderators, five year reviews and during the accreditation of new courses.

#### Section 5: Current Staff Expertise

- It was acknowledged that information in this section can be time consuming to collate.
- It was queried whether listing individual staff's research outputs is useful in a Plan.
- There were mixed feelings about whether staff would review the Research Plans of other Schools when seeking out expertise from other areas.
- It was noted that there is some overlap between the information provided in the 'Expertise' column in this section of the report and the information that is listed in staff profiles on the Unitec website, although staff profiles appear to be focussed more on research interests rather than areas of expertise. Marcus Williams advised that the ITP Research Directors group is reviewing what information is contained in staff profiles on institutional websites across the sector and it is hoped that future platforms will incorporate more fulsome information on staff research expertise. The comment was made that the Research Partners (Gregor Steinhorn and Penny Thomson) have a good understanding of who is doing what across the institution if people are looking to be in touch with someone with particular expertise.
- Arun Deo sends Research Leaders a separate spreadsheet of staff's RPTL status (i.e. whether they are green, amber or red lit). Because of this, and because School Research Plans reach a wider audience, it was decided that this information should not be included or reported on in School Research Plans going forward.

**Action:** The completion of Section 5 of the School Research Plan review template will be optional going forward. The column '2020 RPTL Status' referencing individual's achievements in relationship to the RPTL will be removed completely. In addition, Section 5 will be moved to the end of the template and will form an appendix, rather than its own section in the body of the plan. When Tūāpapa Rangahau communicates with Schools about the review of their plans, they will be advised that they are welcome to remove the appendix, which is currently section 5, in the interests of brevity if they wish, or Arun Deo will update it according to the latest data on request.

#### Section 3: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT) Analysis

- It was felt that the committee should be paying particular attention to Schools' SWOT analyses. Responses should be collated and thematically linked so the committee can lobby on behalf of Schools to instigate change and reduce the impacts of any weaknesses and threats identified, as per its Terms of Reference.

**Action:** Marcus Williams will undertake a review of School Research Plans' SWOT analyses and report back to the URC for discussion at next month's meeting.

The committee agreed that the proposed deadline for Schools to report against their plans (late June) is achievable.

### **Section 4.2                      2021 Unitec Research Symposium**

The committee discussed the date and structure for the 2021 Unitec Research Symposium. A summary of the discussion is as follows:

- Tūāpapa Rangahau has additional resource to assist with the organisation of this year's symposium.
- The committee would like to see a dedicated stream of presentations of Pacific research from Pacific and non-Pacific staff. The Pacific team at Unitec works closely with MIT and would like to see participation from MIT in this year's symposium.
- The fact that presentations could be entered into ROMS as non-QA outputs and counted towards the RPTL seems to have attracted more submissions last year.
- It was queried whether there could be a selection process for abstracts, meaning outputs produced would be QA. Clear parameters around the requirements of abstracts would be required and teams of reviewers with relevant expertise would need to be assembled. This would take a lot of resource. Conversely, maintaining the symposium as a showcase for all-comers is valuable and it would be good to keep barriers to participation low.
- The committee was supportive of having the symposium open to external participants.
- The committee was open to the symposium being co-hosted by either MIT and/or NorthTec, but noted that logistically it would be easier to have two co-hosts, rather than three, and that a co-host would have to have meaningful input into the organisation and running of the symposium. If the symposium is co-hosted, the committee would prefer that it is hosted at Unitec, as travel can be a barrier to Unitec staff participation.
- There was general support for the symposium to be held in early December, however it was noted that this timing does not suit postgraduate students and therefore the 3MT would need to be held separately from the symposium. There were mixed feelings about this, as the 3MT is a popular part of the symposium.
- If the symposium is held over two days again, the timing should be consecutive.

---

## SECTION 5 - NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

---

### **Section 5.1                      Update: 2025 PBRF Quality Evaluation**

The Committee noted the update from TEC on the 2025 PBRF Quality Evaluation.

---

## SECTION 6 - KUPU WHAKAMUTUNGA | CLOSING

---

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

A tabled item, "Definition of an Early Career Researcher at Unitec", was presented by Helen Gremillion for approval.

It was proposed that researchers who have completed a minimum 90 credit Master's thesis should not automatically be considered to be ECRs. There are a number of staff who complete their Masters and then join Unitec more than 10 years later. Only then might they become the first author of a disseminated quality assured research output, yet as they are no longer within the 10 year timeframe, they do not then meet the current definition of an ECR at Unitec.

Clarification was sought about the eligibility for ECR funding for a researcher that meets both criterion but perhaps met the first criterion 12 years ago and the second criterion eight years ago. In

this case it was proposed that whichever criteria is met first, the 10 year window will start from then.

Clarification was also sought about researchers who may have published as a primary author while a student and whether this means they meet the second criteria or not. It was agreed that the second criteria would only be met where the output was produced outside of a supervised environment.

Following the above discussions, the committee agreed to the following revised definition:

*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 for ECR funding) of becoming an ‘independent’ researcher, which is defined as one or both of the following, whichever comes first:*

- 1. A researcher who has been awarded a PhD or a professional doctorate with a significant research component.*
- 2. A researcher who has been the primary author of an independently investigated (i.e. unsupervised), disseminated quality assured research output. This criterion excludes conference presentations and typically also excludes very short written outputs.*

*Time taken for parental leave 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 achieving criterion 1 or 2). Note that other forms of extended leave may be considered by negotiation with Tūāpapa Rangahau.*

#### **MOTION**

**That the committee approves the revised definition of an ECR at Unitec.**

**Moved: Helen Gremillion**

**Seconded: Maryam Mirzaei**

**MOTION CARRIED**

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

It was noted that the actions arising from today’s meeting around the use of School Research Plans and the work that is going to be undertaken on Schools’ SWOT analyses demonstrates the committee’s commitment to continuous improvement in its operations.

The Chair reminded the committee that additional feedback can be emailed to himself or the Secretary following the meeting (in confidence if requested).

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

**TE KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA**

*Ka wehe atu tātou  
I raro i te rangimārie*

**ENDING PRAYER**

*We are departing  
Peacefully*

<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> 1435 h
-------------------------------

### SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Agenda Item	Action	Responsible	Outcome
2.3	Add text around the KPI associated with Priority One to the School Research Plan reporting template.	Marcus Williams	
2.3	Discuss whether the statistics the subject librarians keep on their research related interactions would be useful for School Research Leaders.	Susan Eady/ Arun Deo	
4.1	The completion of Section 5 of the School Research Plan review template will be optional going forward. The column '2020 RPTL Status' referencing individual's achievements in relationship to the RPTL will be removed completely. In addition, Section 5 will be moved to the end of the template and will form an appendix, rather than its own section in the body of the plan. When Tūāpapa Rangahau communicates with Schools about the review of the plan, Schools will be advised that they are welcome to remove the appendix, which is currently section 5, in the interests of brevity if they wish, or Arun Deo will update it according to the latest data on request.	Arun Deo	
4.1	Undertake a review of School Research Plans' SWOT analyses and report back to the URC for discussion at next month's meeting.	Marcus Williams	