



# agenda

## Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	<b>2022-02-10</b>
Scheduled Start:	1300h
Scheduled End:	1500h
Location:	Microsoft Teams

### SECTION 1 NGĀ KUPU ARATAKI | PRELIMINARIES

1. Karakia Tīmatanga | 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

N/A

### SECTION 4 WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

1. PBRF Sector Reference Group - Consultation Paper 2

### SECTION 5 NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

1. Classification of the URC's 2021 Agenda Items
2. 2022 Unitec Early Career Researcher Fund Outcomes

### 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 Catherine Mitchell (Early Career)	Nominee of Director, Māori Success
Dr Helen Gremillion (Associate Professor)	Healthcare and Social Practice
Dr Yusef Patel (Early Career)	Architecture
Vacant	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
Vacant	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 2021-11-11.

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

*refer to [pg14](#)*

## SECTION 3                      MEI HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

N/A

## SECTION 4                      WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

### **Section 4.1                      PBRF Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper 2**

*refer to [pg15](#)*

## SECTION 5                      NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

### **Section 5.1                      Classification of the URC's 2021 Agenda Items**

refer to [pg42](#)

## **Section 5.2                      2022 Unitec Early Career Researcher Fund Outcomes**

refer to [pg47](#)

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

---

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

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

refer to [pg50](#)

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

<b>TE KARAKIA WHAKAMUTUNGA</b>	<b>CLOSING 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>



# minutes

## Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	2021-11-11
Scheduled Start:	1300h
Scheduled End:	1500h
Location:	Microsoft Teams

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

### SECTION 1 – NGĀ KUPU ARATAKI | PRELIMINARIES

#### Item 1.1 Karakia Tīmatanga | Opening Prayer

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

The Chair warmly welcomed members of the committee to the meeting, Geoff Bridgman as proxy for Helen Gremillion and special guest A/P Terri-Ann Berry.

### SECTION 2 – STANDING ITEMS

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

##### **Members Present**

1. Marcus Williams (Chair)
2. Geoff Bridgman (proxy for Helen Gremillion)
3. Kristie Cameron
4. Roger Birchmore
5. Susan Eady
6. Hamid Sharifzadeh
7. Yusef Patel
8. Leon Tan
9. Maryam Mirzaei
10. Lian Wu
11. Robyn Gandell
12. Daisy Bentley-Gray
13. Cathy Zhang (from 2.30pm)
14. Arun Deo (from 2.30pm)

Total members represented: 14 members

**Apologies**

1. Jenny Lee-Morgan
2. Helen Gremillion
3. Gerald Ryan

Total apologies:

3 members

**Absent**

N/A

**MOTION****That the committee accepts the apologies for today's meeting.****Moved: Susan Eady****Seconded: Lian Wu****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
2. A/P Terri-Ann Berry, Director Environmental Solutions Research Centre (item 4.1)

**Item 2.2 Pitopito Kōrero o Ngā Hui | Minutes of Previous Meeting****MOTION****That the committee approves the minutes of the 2021-10-14 meeting as a true and accurate record.****Moved: Roger Birchmore****Seconded: Daisy Bentley-Gray****MOTION CARRIED****Item 2.3 Mahia Atu | Matters Arising**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
3.2	Change the wording of the criteria of the Student Integrated Research Output Fund from "Travel costs are not covered by this fund" to "Travel costs towards research dissemination are not covered by this fund".	Brenda Massey/ Penny Thomson	Complete
4.4	Do some more work on increasing staff accessibility to information about the research support products and report back to the committee about how access will be granted.	Brenda Massey/ Penny Thomson	Complete – on agenda (item 4.4)
4.4	Consider how to report who has received funding from each of the research support products and bring that back to the committee.	Marcus Williams / Penny Thomson	Complete – on agenda (item 4.4)
4.4	Add the definition of an ECR at Unitec to the ECR Project Funding Registration of Interest (RoI) form.	Brenda Massey/ Penny Thomson	Complete

4.4	Pass the thanks of the committee to Penny Thomson on the improvements made to the research support product application forms and guidelines.	Brenda Massey	Complete
5.2	Ensure the ECR Project Funding PIs are thanked for their progress reports.	Brenda Massey	Complete
6.1	Provide the Chair with a summary of staff that need to achieve a research output this year in order to maintain their programme's green-lit status.  Communicate with Research Leaders and Heads of Schools to help them shoulder-tap more potential symposium presenters. Add a caveat that there may be staff members on the list who have achieved adequate outputs but have yet to update their ROMS.	Arun Deo  Marcus Williams	Complete  Complete

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

#### **Section 3.1                      2022 URC Terms of Reference**

The Section 3 items were discussed after item 4.1.

The committee's Terms of Reference (ToR) are due for review before being reported to Te Komiti Mātauranga | Academic Committee.

Susan Eady proposed that the current ToR be amended, or a new ToR created, to enable the committee to make recommendations around access to, and storage of, research datasets. She further proposed that there might be an opportunity for Te Pūkenga to look to develop guidelines for the storage of datasets across the sector.

The committee discussed Susan's suggestions at length, a summary of their discussion is as follows:

- There are ethical considerations regarding access to datasets. Researchers need to specify in their ethics applications whether data will be stored, and if so how, and for how long, who will have access to data and how data will be protected from unauthorised access. Some data that is collected is sensitive and/or confidential and may only be given to researchers on the understanding that it is not shared with others. It was queried whether recommendations around access to datasets is more the purview of the Unitec Research Ethics Committee rather than this committee.
- This committee could make recommendations which could give latitude to any possible future work on the storage of datasets.
- One of the current ToR (d) could cover this kaupapa and/or could be edited to encompass the storage of, and access to, data.

The committee attempted to draft, but could not agree on, a new ToR. It was decided that Susan should assemble a working party to consider the matter more fully and present any suggestion for change to the committee for approval.

**Action:** Susan Eady to lead a working party, which should include Dr Evangelia Papoutsaki, Executive Editor of ePress/Ethics Administrator, and Arun Deo, Research Advisor, to develop a recommendation for a new ToR. The recommendation of the working party should be presented via memo to the committee at its December meeting. Susan should ensure the draft memo is provided to the Chair ahead of the agenda closing date.

**Action:** Marcus Williams to advise Te Komiti Mātauranga that the committee's 2022 ToR are still under consideration.

### **Section 3.2                      2022 URC Work Plan**

The committee reviewed and discussed the proposed 2022 Work Plan. Some minor amendments were requested, as outlined in the Motion below.

#### **MOTION**

**That the committee approves the proposed 2022 Work Plan, subject to it being amended as follows:**

- 1) That an additional column is added to the Work Plan that denotes which of the committee's ToR each task relates to.**
- 2) That the April item "Discuss further SPSS Professional Development needs" be changed to read "Discuss further professional development needs in the wake of the cessation of SPSS".**
- 3) That the review of the committee's ToR be undertaken in October not November.**

**Moved: Roger Birchmore**

**Seconded: Geoff Bridgman**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Action:** Brenda Massey to update the Work Plan to incorporate the amendments requested by the committee.

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

### **Section 4.1                      Environmental Solutions Research Centre (ESRC)**

This item was presented immediately following matters arising. The Chair warmly welcomed A/P Terri-Ann Berry, Director of the ESRC, to the meeting.

ESRC was created in 2019 and since its establishment has been working in three main areas:

1. Waste minimisation. The centre is targeting construction waste in particular. The team has been undertaking audits to quantify plastic waste generated during the construction process. Their projects have attracted awards and are generating media interest. Funding is being sought from BRANZ (the Building Research Association of NZ) and the Ministry for the Environment, in collaboration with industry, to support projects in this area. ESRC is incredibly industry focused, with industry players increasingly realising that ESRC can assist them with their real-world problems. Although industry doesn't usually have as much funding available as government grants schemes, it is generally easier to work with them, as the reporting requirements are not as onerous. It is time-consuming working with industry groups - there is a lot of liaison work involved to establish what their needs are. However, it is easier to affect change through research with industry, as knowledge is transferred directly (e.g. as an outcome of one project, Naylor Love (a commercial construction company) are no longer using plastic wrap on any of their timber products but rather reusable tarpaulins).
2. Air pollution/air quality. ESRC is working with HRV to establish whether mechanical air ventilation systems can improve indoor air quality. The results of the research will be



applicable to any mechanical air ventilation company (not just HRV). The School of Computing and Information Technology designed and developed unique sensors that can measure different types of contaminants (e.g. moulds and fungi) in homes. Some of the sensors have been sold to The University of Auckland. Longer term, the centre wishes to work with communities that can't afford mechanical air ventilation systems, endeavouring to find low-cost solutions that might work well for them.

3. Asbestos. ESRC assisted with the response to the asbestos contamination in buildings 112-115 earlier this year. The centre's early research looked at asbestos contaminated waste: where it goes and if there could be alternatives to sending it to landfill. The centre is now moving into the area of risk characterisation. Terri-Ann and Research Associate Shannon Wallis are now qualified surveyors, assessors and managers for the asbestos industry. ESRC is currently in the process of applying for MBIE Endeavour Funding with A/P Dan Blanchon, Director of the Applied Molecular Solutions Research Centre (AMS) and Head of the School of Environmental and Animal Sciences, for a project that will look at trying to identify asbestos hotspots in two urban centres. The project is a collaboration with the University of Waikato who will carry out assessments of asbestos in roof spaces using hyperspectral imagery. The project will also examine the risks to communities of possible exposure to asbestos during emergencies such as floods, earthquakes and fires. The project involves researchers from Italy, the USA and Australia.

The committee posed the following questions to Terri-Ann following her presentation:

- Tell us about your collaborations with other Schools at Unitec. The environmental space is multi-disciplinary. The ESRC team has worked with researchers from various Schools:
  - Computing and Information Technology: expertise utilised to connect and calibrate air quality sensors. Developed and designed a mobile phone app to use with a new sensor.
  - Creative Industries: designed the air quality sensors so they look good in people's homes (HRV were very impressed).
  - Environmental and Animal Sciences: together with researchers at Massey University have cultured and looked at fungal species that are naturally connected with asbestos contaminated materials. Also provided DNA sequencing which may assist with the creation of a bioremediation solution.
  - Building Construction: have assisted the team to understand the connections between indoor air quality and construction type.
  - Healthcare and Social Practice: may become involved with the asbestos projects from a health perspective.
- How is the centre engaging with Pacific and Māori communities? The centre's focus on asbestos started when a former student travelled to Rarotonga as an environmental consultant and discovered a problem with asbestos. A (then) current student was supported by Unitec to travel to Rarotonga to undertake his final year project which looked at asbestos in the community. Since then, ESRC has been looking at what options small Pacific communities have for the disposal of hazardous waste. ESRC are also trying to connect with Māori and the research community in South Auckland on the indoor air quality project with the aim of providing educational resources and low-cost solutions to improve health outcomes, especially for those who have a vulnerability to the respiratory disorders associated with poor indoor air quality.
- Would there be an opportunity for researchers from Social Practice to become involved? A/P Helen Gremillion has been assisting with the indoor air quality project, i.e. with survey design, the ethics application, ensuring that the right researchers are going into people's homes (e.g. the project has a dedicated Māori researcher). ESRC are very open to

collaboration with any researcher at Unitec, whether they wish to join an existing project or whether they want to suggest a new area of focus.

- How do you maintain impartiality when working on an industry-commissioned project? ESRC is always impartial and undertakes good quality, robust research. The centre isn't there to answer questions for industry, they are there to answer questions about the environment, provide some solutions and ask 'do the solutions proposed by industry perform as they want them to perform and if not how can they be improved'?

The committee thanked Terri-Ann Berry for her informative presentation.

**Action:** Marcus Williams to invite A/P Dan Blanchon to present to the committee at a future meeting on the work being undertaken by AMS.

## **Section 4.2 Internal Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) Quality Evaluation Review**

The committee reviewed and agreed to the amended dates for the events surrounding the Unitec Internal PBRF Quality Evaluation Review to occur.

Times and dates are already in the calendars of key Tūāpapa Rangahau staff that will enable them to provide one-on-one sessions in late January and early February to support staff participation.

**Action:** Marcus Williams and Arun Deo to articulate through relevant communication channels clear offers of the availability of one-to-one sessions to support staff to participate in the internal PBRF QE review process.

## **Section 4.3 Staff Excellence Award**

Feedback was sought from the committee on the current criteria for staff research excellence for the Unitec Staff Excellence Awards.

The committee's discussion was as follows:

- The Staff Excellence Awards are framed as teaching awards, but there is a research category within them. In terms of eligibility, should people who are not teaching be eligible for these awards?
- There's no differentiation between a new and emerging and/or early career researcher and an experienced researcher. It is difficult to compare people's achievements when they are at different stages of their careers. Should there be two categories of awards?
- There are some people doing research with no research time allocation and they are up for awards against people that do have a research time allocation.
- Should the Staff Excellence Award for Research be bestowed at the annual Research Symposium instead?
- Many APMs and HoSs don't teach or have a research allocation, although many still conduct research. Would this exclude them from being eligible for a Research Award?
- Excellence in the dissemination of research should form part of the criteria for the award.
- Research that contributes to teaching should be part of the criteria for the award.

The committee recommends the following changes:

- Excellence in research dissemination should form part of the criteria for an award.

- Research that contributes to teaching should be part of the criteria for the award.
- There should be separate awards to differentiate between a new and emerging/early career researcher and an advanced researcher
- The awards should be open to all researchers, regardless of what role they hold at Unitec, whether or not they teach and/or whether or not they have a research time allocation.

**Action:** Marcus Williams to draft a memo to the appropriate person in Unitec Corporate Communications on behalf of the committee to communicate its recommendations.

#### **Section 4.4**      **Research Support Funding Accessibility and Reporting**

The committee requested better accessibility to the research support funding products for research staff and a mechanism for reporting which staff have received support. It is proposed to have a live link on the intranet to a special Teams repository dedicated to this purpose. The reason for this approach is that these products need updating regularly and Teams is easier to update than the intranet. It was further proposed that the mechanism for reporting support received can utilise the same Teams location, also linked to the intranet.

The committee was unanimously supportive of both proposals. **Action:** Marcus Williams to implement access to research support funding and reporting via the Teams mechanism.

#### **Section 4.5**      **Rangahau Research Forum**

The Chair updated the committee on the work of the ITP Rangahau Research Forum, as outlined in his covering memo for this item.

#### **Section 4.6**      **2022 URC Membership**

There was some concern about the lack of Māori representation on the committee as Jenny Lee-Morgan is rarely able to attend. Her service to Unitec is unparalleled, but the committee does need consistent Māori representation. While Tui Matelau has occasionally attended committee meetings in a proxy capacity, it is critical that Māori are consistently represented at all meetings and have input into all the committee's discussions.

**Action:** Marcus Williams to discuss with Jenny Lee-Morgan, on behalf of the committee, whether there is a way to resolve the issue of consistent Māori representation on the committee.

The committee asked that the composition requirements of the committee be updated as highlighted below:

- Director of Research and Enterprise (Chair)
- Secretary
- Māori representation
- Pacifika representation
- Industry Workforce Development
- Knowledge Specialist
- Representation from all schools with degrees (except trades, sub-degree)
- Research Advisor

**Action:** Brenda Massey to update the composition requirements of the committee as outlined above.

## SECTION 5 - NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

### **Section 5.1**      **2022 URC Schedule of Meetings**

The committee noted the 2022 meeting dates which are scheduled to continue to occur on the second Thursday of each month from 13:00 to 15:00.

## 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**

An opportunity was given for the committee to reflect on their self-assessment provocations. The committee was reminded that feedback can be emailed to the Chair or the Secretary following the meeting (in confidence if requested).

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

<b>MEETING CLOSED:</b> 1505 h
-------------------------------

## SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Agenda Item	Action	Responsible	Outcome
3.1	Lead a working party, which should include Dr Evangelia Papoutsaki, Executive Editor of ePress/Ethics Administrator and Arun Deo, Research Advisor, to develop a recommendation for a new ToR. The recommendation of the working party should be presented via memo to the committee at its December meeting. The draft memo should be provided to the Chair ahead of the agenda closing date.  Advise Te Komiti Mātauranga that the committee's 2022 ToR are still under consideration.	Susan Eady  Marcus Williams	
3.2	Update the Work Plan to incorporate the various amendments requested by the committee.	Brenda Massey	
4.1	Invite A/P Dan Blanchon to present to the committee at a future meeting on the work being undertaken by AMS.	Marcus Williams	
4.2	Articulate through relevant communication channels clear offers of the availability of one-to-one sessions to support staff to participate in the internal PBRF QE review process.	Marcus Williams/ Arun Deo	
4.3	Draft a memo to the appropriate person in Unitec Corporate Communications on behalf of the committee to communicate its recommendations on the research category of the Staff Excellence Awards as follows:	Marcus Williams	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellence in research dissemination should form part of the criteria for an award</li> <li>• Research that contributes to teaching should be part of the criteria for the award.</li> <li>• The awards should be open to all researchers, regardless of what role they hold at Unitec, whether or not they teach and/or whether or not they have a research time allocation.</li> </ul> <p>Also request that a new award is created which would allow for the differentiation between new and emerging/early career researchers and advanced researchers.</p>		
4.4	Implement access to research support funding and reporting via the Teams mechanism.	Marcus Williams	
4.6	<p>Discuss with Jenny Lee-Morgan, on behalf of the committee, whether there is a way to resolve the issue of consistent Māori representation on the committee.</p> <p>Update the composition requirements of the committee to include representation from all schools with degrees and the Research Advisor.</p>	<p>Marcus Williams</p> <p>Brenda Massey</p>	

## MATTERS ARISING

Agenda Item	Action	Responsible	Outcome
3.1	Lead a working party, which should include Dr Evangelia Papoutsaki, Executive Editor of ePress/Ethics Administrator and Arun Deo, Research Advisor, to develop a recommendation for a new ToR. The recommendation of the working party should be presented via memo to the committee at its December meeting. The draft memo should be provided to the Chair ahead of the agenda closing date.	Susan Eady	Not progressed. After the meeting the matter was discussed further and it was agreed that the current ToR are adequate.
	Advise Te Komiti Mātauranga that the committee's 2022 ToR are still under consideration.	Marcus Williams	N/A in light of the above.
3.2	Update the Work Plan to incorporate the various amendments requested by the committee.	Brenda Massey	Complete
4.1	Invite A/P Dan Blanchon to present to the committee at a future meeting on the work being undertaken by AMS.	Marcus Williams	In progress.
4.2	Articulate through relevant communication channels clear offers of the availability of one-to-one sessions to support staff to participate in the internal PBRF QE review process.	Marcus Williams/ Arun Deo	Complete
4.3	<p>Draft a memo to the appropriate person in Unitec Corporate Communications on behalf of the committee to communicate its recommendations on the research category of the Staff Excellence Awards as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellence in research dissemination should form part of the criteria for an award</li> <li>• Research that contributes to teaching should be part of the criteria for the award.</li> <li>• The awards should be open to all researchers, regardless of what role they hold at Unitec, whether or not they teach and/or whether or not they have a research time allocation.</li> </ul> <p>Also request that a new award is created which would allow for the differentiation between new and emerging/early career researchers and advanced researchers.</p>	Marcus Williams	Complete
4.4	Implement access to research support funding and reporting via the Teams mechanism.	Marcus Williams	In progress
4.6	Discuss with Jenny Lee-Morgan, on behalf of the committee, whether there is a way to resolve the issue of consistent Māori representation on the committee.	Marcus Williams	Complete
	Update the composition requirements of the committee to include representation from all schools with degrees and the Research Advisor.	Brenda Massey	Complete

## Unitec New Zealand Limited

### Meeting of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee 10 February 2022

<b>Title</b>	PBRF Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper 2
<b>Provided by:</b>	A/P Marcus Williams, Director Research and Enterprise
<b>For:</b>	<b>Feedback/Discussion</b>

### Recommendation

That the committee considers the options and proposed definition wording set out in the attached PBRF Sector Reference Group (SRG) – Consultation Paper 2 “Towards a more holistic understanding of research excellence: PBRF research and research excellence definitions”.

### Purpose

The Consultation Paper sets out options developed by the PBRF SGR for achieving a more holistic understanding of research excellence in Quality Evaluation 2025, and is inviting feedback from the tertiary education sector and other stakeholders.

### Key Points

Research and research excellence are articulated for the purposes of the Quality Evaluation across the following three discrete but interrelated elements:

- a) The PBRF definition of research;
- b) The PBRF definition of research excellence (contained in the PBRF Funding Conditions but not included in the Quality Evaluation 2018 Guidelines);
- c) The Quality Category descriptors.

The SRG has considered and developed options in relation to each of these three elements, which are presented in the Consultation Paper. Also included are options for new definitions or descriptors along with any matters to consider.

### Information/Background

Ahead of the 2025 Quality Evaluation, the Tertiary Education Commission has appointed a SRG comprising members from across tertiary and research sectors. The SRG is to advise the TEC on the operation and design of the PBRF, contributing critical sector expertise and knowledge towards the implementation of Cabinet’s decisions on the PBRF. SRG recommendations are developed as part of a public consultation process. The SRG has just released a Consultation Paper “Towards a more holistic understanding of research excellence: PBRF research and research excellence definitions” for feedback.

### **Next Steps**

Direct feedback to can be submitted via <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/N5QSBQW>. Feedback is due 5pm, 14 February 2022.

Options for changes to Evidence Portfolio (EP) design will be proposed in the next consultation paper, due for publication in early March 2022.

### **Attachment**

---

PBRF Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper 2 “Towards a more holistic understanding of research excellence: PBRF research and research excellence definitions”.



**Tertiary Education  
Commission**  
Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua



## PBRF Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper 2

**Towards a more holistic understanding  
of research excellence: PBRF research  
and research excellence definitions**



## Contents

Purpose and structure	2
Background	2
Sector Reference Group process	3
PBRF definitions of research and research excellence	4
Options for changes to the PBRF definition of research	7
Options for changes to PBRF definition of research excellence	9
PBRF definitions of Māori and Pacific knowledges	10
Options for changes to PBRF definitions of Māori and Pacific knowledges	12
PBRF Quality Categories	14
Option for changing Quality Category descriptors	17
Next steps and consultation feedback	18

Name	Status	Distribution
<p>PBRF Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper 2</p> <p>Towards a more holistic understanding of research excellence: PBRF research and research excellence definitions</p>	CONSULTATION PAPER	<p>Public</p> <p>Direct feedback to:  <a href="https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/N5QSBQW">https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/N5QSBQW</a></p> <p>Feedback due 5pm, 14 February 2022</p>

## Purpose and structure

- 1 This paper sets out options developed by the PBRF Sector Reference Group (SRG) for achieving a more holistic understanding of research excellence in Quality Evaluation 2025, and invites feedback from the tertiary education sector and other stakeholders. Specifically, it:
  - › Sets out background information including the PBRF Review Panel’s recommendations and Cabinet’s decisions in relation to the PBRF definition of research;
  - › Provides the rationale for the proposed changes based on feedback from previous Quality Evaluation participants, PBRF Review Panel findings, and TEC officials’ analysis;
  - › Sets out options for achieving Cabinet’s direction to the TEC to broaden the definition of research and research excellence for the PBRF;
  - › Identifies where further work will be required to develop and agree wording once options are selected and explains the process for that work including further sector consultation; and
  - › Invites feedback on the options and proposed definition wording set out in this paper.
- 2 Research and research excellence are articulated for the purposes of the Quality Evaluation across the following three discrete but interrelated elements:
  - a. The PBRF definition of research;
  - b. The PBRF definition of research excellence (contained in the PBRF Funding Conditions but not included in the Quality Evaluation 2018 Guidelines);
  - c. The Quality Category descriptors.
- 3 The SRG has considered and developed options in relation to each of these three elements, which are presented in this paper as follows: for each element, the current definition or descriptors are presented, followed by information and analysis on which the SRG drew in reaching decisions on the options. This is then followed by the options for new definitions or descriptors along with any matters to consider.
- 4 Options for changes to Evidence Portfolio (EP) design will be proposed in the next consultation paper, due for publication in early March 2022. There are a number of EP design dependencies that flow directly from particular options in this paper, which will be highlighted.

## Background

### *PBRF review recommendations and Cabinet decisions*

- 5 Following the PBRF Quality Evaluation 2018, the Ministry of Education (MoE) set up an independent PBRF review panel. The review panel drew on sector feedback, PBRF data, expert analysis, and insight from Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), Ministry of Business, Innovation and Enterprise and MoE officials in developing its recommendations. The review recommendations informed Cabinet’s decisions on changes to the PBRF, announced in July 2021.

- 6 The review recommended that the PBRF adopt a ‘more capacious definition of research excellence that encompasses the production of research, engagement and impact relating to that research and support for vibrant, diverse research cultures.’<sup>1</sup>
- 7 Following consultation on the review outcomes and advice from MoE, the Minister of Education made recommendations to Cabinet on changes to PBRF. In July 2021, Cabinet released its decisions on changes. These included instructing the TEC, in consultation with the SRG, to ‘broad[en] the PBRF definition of research by:
  - a. Rewording the PBRF definition of research;
  - b. Making changes to the Evidence Portfolio submitted by staff in the Quality Evaluation to complement the new PBRF definition of research’.<sup>2</sup>
- 8 MoE has subsequently removed the existing definitions of research and research excellence from the PBRF Funding Determination issued for 2022 onwards, to enable the TEC and SRG to develop new definitions. These will be added to the Funding Conditions when the final PBRF Guidelines are published in 2023.

## Sector Reference Group process

- 11 The SRG received background information and analysis from TEC officials on previous Quality Evaluations and on other national research excellence assessment frameworks. This included the Research Excellence Framework (UK); the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA), and the Research Assessment Exercise (Hong Kong). Research definitions in New Zealand and international competitive research funds were also considered (see Appendix 1: Background material).
- 12 In developing these options, the SRG considered whether they:
  - a. Deliver Cabinet’s instructions;
  - b. Address the concerns and aspirations identified in the *Report of the PBRF Review Panel* and the *Report of the Moderation and Peer Review Panels*;
  - c. Deliver fair and equitable outcomes for all participating TEOs and their staff;
  - d. Uphold the unique nature of research produced in Aotearoa New Zealand and reflect what is distinctive about our national research environment;
  - e. Are consistent with the PBRF Guiding Principles, including the three new Principles of partnership, equity, and inclusiveness; and
  - f. Are able to be implemented and audited (legally and practically).

---

<sup>1</sup> PBRF Review Panel, 2020. *Toward the Tertiary Research Excellence Evaluation (TREE): The Report of the PBRF Review Panel*. Wellington, PBRF Review Panel, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> Cabinet Minute of Decision: Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund: Final Report (CAB-21-MIN-0175) p. 2.

## PBRF definitions of research and research excellence

### Existing PBRF definition of research

- 13 The existing PBRF definition of research, which appeared in the Quality Evaluation 2018 Guidelines, is as follows:

*For the purposes of the PBRF, research is original, independent investigation undertaken to contribute to knowledge and understanding and, in the case of some disciplines, cultural innovation or aesthetic refinement.<sup>3</sup>*

*Research typically involves inquiry of an experimental or critical nature driven by hypotheses or intellectual positions capable of rigorous assessment by experts in a given discipline.*

*Research includes work of direct relevance to the specific needs of iwi, communities, government, industry and commerce. In some disciplines, research may be embodied in the form of artistic works, performances or designs that lead to new or substantially improved insights. Research may include:*

- › *contributions to the intellectual underpinning of subjects and disciplines (for example, dictionaries and scholarly editions)<sup>4</sup>*
- › *the use of existing knowledge in experimental development to produce new or substantially improved, materials, devices, products, communications or processes*
- › *the synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative.*

*Research findings must be open to scrutiny or formal evaluation by experts within the field. This may be achieved through various forms of dissemination including, but not limited to, publication, manufacture, construction, public presentation, or provision of confidential reports.*

*Activities that are part of routine standard practice and do not embody original research are excluded, such as:*

- › *routine testing*
- › *data collection*
- › *preparation for teaching*
- › *the legal and administrative aspects of intellectual property protection and commercialisation activities.*

- 14 When the Quality Evaluation takes place, the Chairs of each peer-review panel are asked to develop a panel-specific elaboration of the PBRF research definition and additional guidance setting out the panel's expectations for Research Outputs and Research Contributions, panel coverage, cross-referrals, and any other guidance the panel deems necessary. The *Panel-specific Guidelines for the 2018 Quality Evaluation* can be found on the TEC [website](#).

---

<sup>3</sup> The term 'independent' does not exclude collaborative work.

<sup>4</sup> The term 'scholarly' is defined as the creation, development and maintenance of the intellectual infrastructure of subjects and disciplines, in forms such as dictionaries, scholarly editions, catalogues and contributions to major research databases.

### Existing PBRF definition of research excellence

- 15 The Quality Evaluation 2018 Guidelines do not include a standalone definition of research excellence. The current PBRF Funding Conditions include a definition, which was included in the PBRF Funding Determination issued by the Minister of Education and was in effect during the Quality Evaluation 2018. The definition is as follows:

*Excellence as a researcher includes all of the following activities:*

- a. the production and creation of leading-edge knowledge;*
- b. the application of that knowledge;*
- c. the dissemination of that knowledge to students, industry, iwi and hapū, and the wider community; and*
- d. supporting current and potential colleagues (e.g., postgraduate students) in the creation, application and dissemination of knowledge.*

*Excellence will be measured by a combination of external peer review, research degree completion and external research income indicators.*

### Rationale for changing PBRF definitions of research and research excellence

- 16 The PBRF Review and Cabinet decisions are clear that both the definition of research and research excellence should be broadened.
- 17 The following section sets out a series of options for changes to the PBRF definition of research and research excellence. This section draws on evidence and commentary from the *Report of the PBRF Review Panel* (2020) and the *Report of the Moderation and Peer Review Panels PBRF 2018 Quality Evaluation* (2019) to provide context for the changes sought and options proposed.
- 18 Following the conclusion of the Quality Evaluation 2018, the *Report of the Moderation and Peer Review Panels* was published in April 2019. The report includes general and panel-specific recommendations for changes to future Quality Evaluations, including a number which are relevant to the research definitions issue.
- 19 The general summary noted that in some cases panellists were not sure whether some outputs or contributions counted as research. The Creative and Performing Arts, Health, and Physical Sciences panels recommended clearer guidance for submitting staff on explaining and evidencing the research element of outputs. The Pacific Research panel recommended greater clarity about the value of community engagement-led research, and a more diverse range of eligible output types.
- 20 Broadly speaking, the general and panel-specific recommendations are reflective of panel assessors and moderators' focus on the extent to which EPs can be easily and fairly assessed. The concerns raised suggest that translation and application of the research definition across to the various elements of the EP requires clear guidance for both submitting staff and panellists.
- 21 The PBRF Review Panel sought feedback from across the sector on how the Quality Evaluation reflected and valued research excellence. The panel noted in its final report that although the PBRF definition of research was intentionally broad, there are widely-held concerns 'that the fund privileges certain kinds of research, discouraging the application of existing knowledge to problems specific to New Zealand, engagement with communities and undervaluing the impact of research.'<sup>5</sup> The panel

---

<sup>5</sup> *Report of PBRF Review*, p. 52.

considered that while some of these views were based on ‘myths’ about the assessment framework, there nonetheless remained valid criticisms that as a whole it did not adequately recognise the diversity of research excellence in Aotearoa New Zealand. The panel’s final recommendation to adopt a ‘more capacious’ definition of research excellence flows from this finding.

- 22 The panel noted that, in particular, the Quality Evaluation appeared to put less value on research which was focussed more on achieving impacts or outcomes for stakeholders than on outputs. The panel was of the view that this was partially because it ‘can be harder to explain and validate’ such research. As a consequence, the panel argued, it was likely that researchers were privileging more ‘traditional’ outputs in assembling their EPs, as these were perceived as less high risk.<sup>6</sup> It follows that this would have the effect of disadvantaging researchers who because of the nature of their research are less likely to produce such outputs, and of dis-incentivising impact, engagement, and practice-led research.
- 23 Corroborating this, in the 2018 Quality Evaluation, while the majority of the 13 panels took up the opportunity to include an elaboration of the main research definition, most were concerned to clarify the inclusion or exclusion of specific forms of activity or output. However, the Creative and Performing Arts, Education, Māori Knowledge and Development panels, and to some extent, the Engineering, Technology and Architecture and Pacific Research panels, all produced elaborations which materially expanded on and moderated the PBRF research definition. The disciplinary and epistemological norms within these panels, where research is routinely applied, practice or community-based, provide some indication of the limitations of the current PBRF definition of research.
- 24 The panel also noted that the kinds of evidence that could be included in EPs, both as research outputs and as evidence of research contributions, was a significant factor in understanding why particular types or modes of research appeared to be valued less. While research example eligibility and other EP design matters remain out of scope for this consultation, research definitions and EP design are interlinked. The EP design settings will in effect implement the intentions set by the research definitions. Accordingly, the EP design consultation paper will follow this one.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Report of PBRF Review*, p. 53. The report notes that analysis of EPs submitted in 2018 bear this assessment out.



## Options for changes to the PBRF definition of research

The SRG has identified two options for delivering Cabinet's instructions to broaden the PBRF research definition. Both options would provide a way to give effect to the PBRF principles including the new principles of partnership, equity and inclusiveness.

Both options will require that EP design, along with the Quality Category definitions (see below), are brought into alignment. This will require that the Examples of Research Excellence (EREs), Other Examples of Research Excellence (OREs), Research Contributions and eligible research outputs and evidence of research contributions are reviewed as part of the EP design consultation.

### Option 1: Add detail

Broaden the existing definition of research by explicitly including rangahau, Mātauranga Māori and kaupapa Māori, Pacific research, community, action, practice-based and applied research, as well as by specifying what is *not* included.

#### Matters to consider

Adding detail will provide greater certainty about what is eligible and what is ineligible. If this option is pursued, the SRG has determined that additional PBRF articulations of rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori, and Pacific research should also be included in the guidance. Options are detailed below under *PBRF definitions of Māori and Pacific knowledges*.

#### Proposed wording Option 1: Add detail

*In Aotearoa New Zealand our distinctive research culture and environment draws on diverse epistemological traditions of critical inquiry, experimentation, and knowledge-creation.*

*For the purposes of the PBRF, research, including rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori, and Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research, is defined as a process of investigation or inquiry leading to new, recovered, or reinterpreted knowledge or understanding which is effectively shared and capable of rigorous assessment by experts. Research includes work that embodies new insights of direct relevance to the specific needs of iwi, hapū, marae, communities, government, scholarship and teaching, industry and commerce, and may be developed through collaborative and practice-led processes involving stakeholders from those constituencies. It can be an individual or collective process, and may be embodied in the form of artistic works, performances, designs, policies, or processes that lead to novel or substantially improved insights.*

*For further clarification, research includes:*

- › *contributions to the intellectual underpinning of subjects, disciplines and epistemologies (for example, dictionaries, scholarly editions, and teaching materials that embody original research)*
- › *Applications of existing knowledge to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products, designs, policies or creative outputs*
- › *recovery and revitalisation of knowledge previously lost or suppressed (for example, the study of raranga, whakapapa narratives, rongōa, navigational knowledge, translation studies or ecological research)*

- › *the synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative.*

*It does not include:*

- › *routine testing and data collection lacking analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation*
- › *preparation for teaching that does not embody original research (for example, collation of existing research and research outputs into handbooks or textbooks)*
- › *the legal and administrative aspects of intellectual property protection and commercialisation activities.*

## **Option 2: Simplify**

Simplify the existing research definition into a high-level, generic definition which does not specify any particular type or mode of research. Instruct each Panel Chair to elaborate a panel-specific definition of research, including as appropriate the place of rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori, Pacific research, community, applied, and practice-based research within that definition. Māori Knowledge and Development and Pacific Research Panel Chairs are appointed earlier in the process to ensure rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori, and Pacific research definitions are available to inform other panel-specific definitions as required. EP design and submission settings will specify activity and output eligibility.

### **Matters to consider**

This option does not explicitly include or exclude any mode of research in the general definition, but instead enables each panel to elaborate an appropriate definition of research which reflects the disciplinary and methodological norms which characterise that panel's coverage.

This approach is informed by the understanding that submitting staff and TEOs do not read the definition of research in isolation but in conjunction with the detailed EP submission instructions and the Panel-specific Guidance. The Guidance would require careful wording to ensure this was clear.

Because the research definition is very generic, the EP design settings may need to be more detailed. The panel-specific elaborations of the research definition will also assume greater significance, and the SRG will carefully consider what additional instructions and training should be provided to panels when reviewing the panel assessment criteria and working methods issues.

### **Proposed wording Option 2: simplify**

*In Aotearoa New Zealand our distinctive research culture and environment draws on diverse epistemological traditions of critical inquiry, experimentation, and knowledge-creation.*

*For the purposes of PBRF, research is defined as a creative and systematic process of inquiry leading to new or recovered knowledge, effectively shared.*

*Panel-specific elaborations of the PBRF research definition will be developed in the Panel-specific guidelines. This definition should be read in conjunction with the relevant panel-specific elaboration, as well as the guidance on EP submissions.*

## Options for changes to PBRF definition of research excellence

The PBRF Review and Cabinet decisions are clear that both the definition of research and research excellence should be broadened. As set out above, the PBRF Funding Conditions include a standalone definition of research excellence, but this was not included in the 2018 Guidelines, and Cabinet's instructions provide scope to achieve that broadening in a range of ways.

Rather than set out features of excellent research (which might include, for example, originality, rigour, significance, or reach), the current definition articulates a set of activities through which research excellence is achieved: the creation, application, and dissemination of knowledge, as well as contributions to the research environment through supporting colleagues. These activities overlap substantially with the definition of research. At the same time, the Quality Categories and their descriptors are intended to provide guidance as to the quality, or degree of excellence that must be achieved. In the current Guidelines, therefore, research excellence is *de facto* defined through the definition of research and the Quality Category descriptors.

The SRG seeks the sector's views as to whether the 2025 Guidelines require a standalone research excellence definition, but takes the view that if a standalone definition is required, the existing one should be revised to ensure alignment with the PBRF definition of research (including PBRF Māori and Pacific knowledge definitions) and Quality Category descriptors.

### Option 1: Develop new standalone definition for the Guidelines

Develop a standalone definition of research excellence which aligns with the new research definitions and with the revised QC descriptors, including with regard to rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori, Pacific, practice-based, community and applied research. This would sit in the Guidelines alongside the definition of research, and would be developed once the new research definition is agreed, alongside the new QCs.

Wording options will be developed once a research definition option has been recommended to the TEC. Wording options will be consulted on with sector stakeholders alongside the Māori and Pacific knowledge definitions consultation process.

### Option 2: Do not develop new standalone definition in the Guidelines

As in the 2018 Guidelines, do not include a standalone definition of research excellence, but ensure that the research definition and Quality Categories collectively define and broaden research excellence in line with Cabinet's instructions. A definition of research excellence would continue to sit in the PBRF Funding Conditions and would be revised by TEC to ensure alignment with the new research definition.

*Note that this is the option recommended to the sector by the SRG.*

## PBRF definitions of Māori and Pacific knowledges

- 24 Ensuring that the Quality Evaluation 2025 is better able to recognise, value, and assess EPs drawing on Māori and Pacific knowledges is an explicit aim of Cabinet’s instructions to the TEC. Realising this aim will require changes across the design issues on which the SRG will consult, including research definitions, EP design, staff identification, panels membership and training, and panel assessment criteria and working methods. This section presents the first of a series of options designed to achieve this.

### *Rationale for developing PBRF definitions of Māori and Pacific knowledges*

- 30 In evaluating how well the Quality Evaluation recognises the diversity of research excellence in Aotearoa New Zealand, the PBRF Review Panel noted that staff from the Wānanga felt particularly that the framework did not well reflect or value their research, and that there was now an opportunity to recognise a ‘significant cohort of Māori researchers and research that used Māori methodologies and was relevant to iwi and hapū’.<sup>7</sup>
- 31 In addition to the rationale for broadening research excellence advanced by the review, MoE identified that the changes proposed would contribute to upholding the Government’s obligations under the *Education and Training Act 2020* to honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi and uphold Māori-Crown relationships, and would support Ka Hikitia outcomes. A new definition of research would also better recognise and reward Mātauranga Māori and kaupapa Māori research as well as supporting more diverse research, an aim which underpins Priority Eight of the Tertiary Education Strategy: ‘enhance the contribution of research and Mātauranga Māori in addressing local and global challenges’.<sup>8</sup>
- 32 In making its decisions Cabinet noted that the Minister of Education would direct the TEC to appoint an SRG that ‘demonstrates a strong commitment to Māori-Crown partnership and comprises a diverse membership’. In appointing the SRG, the TEC sought members with expertise in Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori research, and Pacific research, in order to ensure the group as a whole had the necessary expertise to help the TEC to deliver Cabinet’s instructions.
- 33 Changes to the PBRF definitions of research and research excellence should also give effect to the new PBRF Guiding Principles agreed by Cabinet:
- a. Partnership: the PBRF should reflect the bicultural nature of Aotearoa New Zealand and the special role and status of the Treaty of Waitangi / Te Tiriti o Waitangi;
  - b. Equity: different approaches and resources are needed to ensure that the measurement of research excellence leads to equitable outcomes;
  - c. Inclusiveness: the PBRF should encourage and recognise the full diversity of epistemologies, knowledges, and methodologies to reflect Aotearoa New Zealand’s people.

### *Submission of Māori and Pacific knowledge-based EPs outside Māori Knowledge and Development and Pacific Research panels*

- 34 It is important that the final Quality Evaluation guidance reflects the aspirations and practices of researchers working with Māori or Pacific knowledges in terms of their options for panel submission

---

<sup>7</sup> *Report of PBRF Review*, p. 52

<sup>8</sup> Ministry of Education, 2020. *The Statement of National Education and Learning Priorities & Tertiary Education Strategy*. Wellington, p. 1.

and cross-referral. In 2018, the majority of EPs based on such approaches were submitted to either the Māori Knowledge and Development or the Pacific Research panel. While this may have been the obvious place for EPs that were wholly or substantially based on Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori research, or Pacific research, given the findings of the PBRF Review Panel we cannot assume that this was the preferred outcome for everyone, particularly those who combined a Western approach with a Māori or Pacific one. Those researchers may have preferred to submit to another panel if they had confidence that the panel had the appropriate expertise and guidance to assess Māori or Pacific elements of their work.

- 35 Issues relating to specific panel working methods including membership, training, and cross-referral settings will be considered in Consultation Papers 4 and 5 (*Panels assessment criteria* and *Panels membership and working methods*). However, it is important to understand sector stakeholders' views on this issue now to ensure the guidance as a whole achieves the desired outcomes in terms of the application of definitions of Māori and Pacific knowledges outside the Māori Knowledge and Development and Pacific Research panels.
- 36 In parallel with the present consultation process on research definitions, TEC officials will carry out targeted consultation on this issue with relevant stakeholders and peak bodies. The outcomes will be fed back to the SRG and will inform relevant options as they arise.

## Options for changes to PBRF definitions of Māori and Pacific knowledges

If the preferred approach to the PBRF research definition is **Option 1: Add detail**, the SRG has determined it is necessary to consider how to include PBRF definitions of rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori research, and Pacific research in the Quality Evaluation guidance (the Guidelines and the Panel-specific Guidelines). Because these terms are included in the definition of research, and to ensure EPs based on rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori research, and Pacific research can be submitted to all panels where this is appropriate, it is important to ensure all panels, participating TEOs and submitting staff are working to common understandings. The SRG has agreed to consult on the options below for achieving this.

If the preferred definition is **Option 2: Simplify**, definitions in the guidance are not required. However, the SRG would still in that case welcome the sector's views on the options below.

### Option 1: Definitions in Guidelines

The Guidelines include, alongside the PBRF definition of research, PBRF definitions of rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori research, and Pacific research. The definitions will be developed through consultation with relevant experts including from within the SRG, the sector, and other stakeholders.

The Guidelines will note that these definitions will be understood to apply across all panels where such definitions are relevant. Panel Chairs will draw on the definitions in leading the development of panel-specific elaborations of the PBRF definition of research, and panels will refer to them to support assessment of EPs with rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori or Pacific research elements as appropriate.

The cross-referral process will continue to enable EPs with rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori or Pacific research elements to be referred from other panels into the Māori Knowledge and Development or Pacific Research panels.

### Option 2: Definitions in Māori Knowledge and Development and Pacific Research panel elaborations of research description

The Guidelines note that the Māori Knowledge and Development and Pacific Research Panel Chairs will lead development of PBRF definitions of rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori, and Pacific research as part of their panel-specific guidelines. These definitions will apply across all panels where such definitions are relevant. Other panel chairs will draw on the definitions in developing panel-specific elaborations of the PBRF definition of research, and to refer to them as appropriate to support assessment of EPs with rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori or Pacific research elements.

The cross-referral process will continue to enable EPs with rangahau, Mātauranga Māori, kaupapa Māori or Pacific research elements to be referred from other panels into the Māori Knowledge and Development or Pacific Research panels.

### Matters to consider

Both options will require direct engagement and consultation with Māori and Pacific stakeholders, alongside the general public consultation process, to ensure that any chosen approach is acceptable. It is particularly important that we understand the aspirations of researchers with regard to panel

submission.

Option 2 would require that appointment of the Māori Knowledge and Development and Pacific Research Panel Chairs is prioritised ahead of other panels to ensure definitions can be developed and made available to inform other panel-specific elaborations of the PBRF definition of research.

Both options entail articulating concepts and epistemologies that are central to and indivisible from the lived experience and worldviews of Māori and Pacific peoples. It is important to be clear therefore that any articulations and/or definitions arrived at would be arrived at in consultation with Māori and Pacific stakeholders and would be adopted solely for the purposes of the PBRF Quality Evaluation to ensure the robust peer-review of research quality of EPs submitted to the Quality Evaluation.

## PBRF Quality Categories

### Existing PBRF Quality Category descriptors

- 37 The existing PBRF Quality Category (QCs) descriptions reflect the two parts of the EP: the Research Outputs and the Research Contributions, although assessment is of the EP as a whole. They are as follows:

#### **Quality Category A**

*For an A to be assigned it would normally be expected that the EP contains evidence of research outputs of a world-class standard and research-related activity that shows a high level of peer recognition and esteem within the relevant research subject area and indicates a significant contribution to the New Zealand and/or international research environments, and may also show evidence of other significant demonstrable impact during the assessment period.*

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members including new and emerging researchers.*

#### **Quality Category B**

*For a B to be assigned it would normally be expected that an EP contains evidence of research outputs of a high quality and research-related activity that shows acquired recognition by peers for their research at least at a national level and indicates a contribution to the research environment beyond their institution, and/or a significant contribution within their institution, and may also show evidence of other demonstrable impact during the assessment period.*

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members including new and emerging researchers.*

#### **Quality Category C**

*For a C to be assigned it would normally be expected that an EP contains evidence of quality-assured research outputs and research-related activity that shows some peer recognition for their research and indicates a contribution to the research environment within their institution or the wider community during the assessment period.*

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members except new and emerging researchers.*

#### **Quality Category C(NE)**

*For a C(NE) to be assigned it would normally be expected that an EP contains evidence of quality-assured research outputs produced during the assessment period. They may have limited or no research-related activity in the RC component.*

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of new and emerging researchers only.*

#### **Quality Category R**

*An EP will be assigned an R when it does not demonstrate the quality standard required for a C Quality Category or higher.*



*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of all PBRF-eligible staff members except new and emerging researchers.*

### **Quality Category R(NE)**

*An EP will be assigned an R(NE) when it does not demonstrate the quality standard required for a Quality Category C(NE) or higher.*

*This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of new and emerging researchers only.*

- 38 The Quality Evaluation Guidelines 2018 included a definition of ‘world-class research’ alongside the Quality Categories as follows:

#### **Defining ‘world-class research’**

*The use of ‘world class’ in relation to the RO and RC component scoring descriptors denotes a standard, not a type or focus of research.*

*World-class research outputs are those outputs that rank with the best within their broader discipline, regardless of the topic, theme or location of the research, or place of publication.*

*Research outputs that deal with topics or themes of primarily local, regional or national focus or interest can be of world-class standard. For example, research that focuses on Māori or Pacific topics or themes, New Zealand history, or New Zealand culture, economy, wellbeing or ecology may rank with the best research of its discipline conducted anywhere in the world.*

*Research contributions that reflect the esteem of peers considered to be global experts in their field, or show how the staff member contributes to a world-leading research environment, can be considered of world-class standard.*

### **Rationale for changing the existing Quality Category descriptors**

- 39 The following section sets out a single option for changes to the QC descriptors. This section draws on evidence and analysis of Quality Evaluation 2018 results data which informed the development of the option.
- 40 The QC descriptors reflect the two parts of the EP, the Research Outputs and the Research Contribution. However, they function as holistic descriptions of overall EP quality, and are supplemented by the Research Output and Research Contribution Tie-Point Descriptors.
- 41 The current wording describes research output quality in terms of quality standards but does not offer any definition of what constitutes ‘quality’: an A requires ‘world-leading standard[s]’, a B requires a ‘high level of quality’, and a C or C(NE) requires ‘quality-assured outputs’.
- 42 The current wording describes research contribution quality in terms that relate largely to career stage. For example, an A requires ‘a high level of peer recognition and esteem’ and ‘a significant contribution to the New Zealand and/or international research environments’, while a B requires ‘acquired recognition by peers for their research at least at a national level and indicates a contribution to the research environment beyond their institution, and/or a significant contribution within their institution’. Despite the clarifications provided by the definition of ‘world-leading research’ in the current Guidelines, the correlation of ‘international’, ‘national’, and ‘institutional’ contributions with A, B, and C QCs additionally implies that recognition should be measured in terms of geographical impact.

- 43 The reliance on factors related to career stage and geographic reach means that the A and B QCs descriptors are weighted against by New and Emerging Researchers (NERs) and against research activity which either by design or due to disciplinary norms does not achieve reach or impact on a geographical scale.
- 44 In Quality Evaluation 2018, a total of 7,909 EPs were awarded a funded QC score. Of these, 15.6% were awarded an A QC, 39.8% were awarded a B, 29.8% were awarded a C, and 14.8% were awarded a C(NE). Scores were awarded by panels using the Quality Category descriptors above as guidelines, in conjunction with the Research Output and Research Contribution tie-point descriptors (see the *PBRF Guidelines for the 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment process*).<sup>9</sup>
- 45 Of the total number of EPs submitted in 2018, 17.6% were submitted by NERs. However, NERs made up only 0.7% of all A QCs awarded, and 5% of all A and B QCs combined. No A QCs were awarded to NERs in 37 of the 43 total subject areas. In three of the subject areas, no A or B QCs were awarded to NERs. These percentages are reflected in the breakdown of QCs awarded across the NER submissions. Of the 1,389 NER EPs awarded funding, 0.6% were awarded an A, 14.9% were awarded a B, and 84.5% were awarded a C(NE). These figures have not changed meaningfully since 2012.
- 46 Although the Guidelines are clear that EPs submitted by NERs and non-NERs are equally eligible to receive A and B QCs, these outcomes show that in practice it is exceptionally difficult for an NER EP to be awarded either score. In the absence of any other indicators that research quality in Aotearoa New Zealand is declining, it is likely these results are in part a product of the Quality Evaluation design. The original intent of the C(NE) QC was to recognise that NERs were at the beginning of establishing their research platforms, and to enable fair comparison with the output and activity of their established peers. However, these results suggest that an outcome of the current settings may be to create unintended barriers to achieving above the C(NE) QC.

---

<sup>9</sup> Tertiary Education Commission, 2016. *PBRF Guidelines for the 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment process*, Wellington, pp. 45 and 52.

## Option for changing Quality Category descriptors

Regardless of which research definition option is taken forward, the SRG proposes that the QC descriptors should be revised to bring them into line with the new definition. As discussed above, the SRG has also determined there is an additional opportunity to review the descriptors to ensure they better articulate standards of quality across the full scope of eligible research activity and career stage.

### **Option: Revise Quality Category descriptors in line with new research definition and review against intended functions**

Review and revise the Quality Category descriptors to:

- a. reflect the preferred definition of research, ensuring that the full scope of eligible research activity is reflected;
- b. ensure the Quality Categories describe overall EP quality, with the emphasis placed on rigour, originality and depth of significance, disciplinary reach, contributions to cultures of research and benefits to communities, stakeholders and partners outside the academy as well as peer esteem; and
- c. ensure the Quality Categories reflect related but distinct indicators of prestige and value within Te Ao Māori, for example mana atua, mana tangata, mana whenua, mana Tiriti.

Precise wording options for Quality Category description options will be developed once a research definition option has been recommended by the SRG. Wording options will be consulted on with sector stakeholders alongside the Māori and Pacific knowledge definitions consultation process.

Note that the Research Output and Research Contribution tie-point descriptors will be revised to reflect any changes to the QC descriptors as part of the Panels: Assessment paper.

## Next steps and consultation feedback

47 Feedback is sought on the following:

### 1. PBRF definitions of research

Do you prefer either Option 1 (detailed definition) or Option 2 (simplified definition)?

Are there any wording changes you would suggest for your preferred option?

Is there a different option you would like to propose?

### 2. PBRF definition of research excellence

Do you prefer either Option 1 (develop new standalone definition in the 2025 Guidelines) or Option 2 (as in 2018, no standalone definition in the Guidelines)?

If Option 1, do you have specific suggestions for the new definition?

*Note that if Option 1 is recommended to the TEC, there will be additional sector consultation on this issue.*

Is there a different option you would like to propose?

### 3. PBRF definitions of Māori and Pacific knowledges

Do you prefer either Option 1 (definitions in Guidelines) or Option 2 (definitions in Panel-specific Guidance)?

If Option 1, do you have specific suggestions for the new definition?

*Note that if Option 1 is recommended to the TEC, there will be additional sector consultation on this issue.*

Is there a different option you would like to propose?

### 4. Quality Category descriptors

Do you agree with the proposed option (revise descriptors to reflect new PBRF research definitions and review against intended function)?

If you agree, do you have specific suggestions for the new descriptors?

*Note that if this option is recommended to the TEC, there will be additional sector consultation on this issue.*

Is there a different option you would like to propose?

48 Feedback can be provided to the TEC via the online survey here:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/N5QSBQW>. Responses must be submitted by **5pm, 14 February 2022**.

### *Next steps*

- 49 Following the end of the consultation period, the SRG will consider the feedback, and make recommendations to the TEC on the PBRF definition of research, and the approach to Māori and Pacific knowledge definitions, research excellence, and Quality Category descriptor revisions.
- 50 The TEC will carry out additional sector consultation as indicated to develop specific wording based on the options recommended. These will then be considered by the SRG, alongside the outcome of consultation on EP design. This will provide an opportunity to ensure the research definition recommendations align with EP design recommendations.
- 51 We anticipate that the TEC's In Principle decisions on the PBRF definitions of research and research excellence, and EP design, will be confirmed in mid-2022.

## Appendix 1: International research definitions and approaches

### Definitions in existing research assessment exercises

#### *Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA)*

##### **1.2 Objectives**

The objectives of ERA are to:

1. continue to develop and maintain an evaluation framework that gives government, industry, business and the wider community assurance of the excellence of research conducted in Australian higher education institutions
2. provide a national stocktake of discipline level areas of research strength and areas where there is opportunity for development in Australian higher education institutions
3. identify excellence across the full spectrum of research performance
4. identify emerging research areas and opportunities for further development
5. allow for comparisons of research in Australia, nationally and internationally, for all discipline areas

##### **1.8 Definitions**

###### *Research*

ERA defines research as the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way to generate new concepts, methodologies, inventions and understandings. This could include the synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative.

This definition of research is consistent with a broad notion of research and experimental development comprising “creative and systematic work undertaken in order to increase the stock of knowledge – including knowledge of humankind, culture and society – and to devise new applications of available knowledge” as defined in the ARC funding rules.

#### *Research Excellence Framework (REF) (United Kingdom)*

##### **Definition of research for the REF**

1. For the purposes of the REF, research is defined as a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared.
2. It includes work of direct relevance to the needs of commerce, industry, culture, society, and to the public and voluntary sectors; scholarship; the invention and generation of ideas, images, performances, artefacts including design, where these lead to new or substantially improved insights; and the use of existing knowledge in experimental development to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products and processes, including design and construction. It excludes routine testing and routine analysis of materials, components and processes such as for the maintenance of national standards, as distinct from the development of new analytical techniques. It also excludes the development of teaching materials that do not embody original research.
3. It includes research that is published, disseminated or made publicly available in the form of assessable research outputs, and confidential reports (as defined in paragraph 261).

#### *Research Assessment Exercise (Hong Kong)*

##### **Scope of Research**

2.13 The UGC is of the view that research is not an isolated activity; rather it should support and illuminate teaching and learning. The UGC considers it important to maintain an inclusive view in defining the scope of

research for the purposes of assessment of research activities. In this regard, the broadened meaning of scholarship as defined by the Carnegie Foundation continues to be a guiding reference for the RAE 2020, that is, the discovery of knowledge, the integration of knowledge, the application of knowledge and the sharing of knowledge through teaching are regarded as different forms of scholarship on par with each other, so that high quality research in all forms of scholarship including inter-disciplinary and collaborative research will be encouraged and assessed as equally important across a broad front. This will help address any perceived bias in favour of particular type(s) of research.

2.14 In the context of the RAE 2020, research is defined as the process leading to new knowledge, insights, methodologies, solutions and/or inventions. It may involve systematic investigation, use of existing materials, synthesis, analysis, creation of artefacts or concepts, design, performance, and/or innovation.

## Definitions in national/supranational research funds and strategies

Note that none of the funds MBIE administers appear to include research definitions in their guidelines or investment plans.

United Kingdom Research and Innovation comprises eight subject area Research Councils, of which only the Arts and Humanities Research Council provides a definition of research.

The European Research Council also does not appear to include a definition in its guidance, or in the Horizon Europe Strategic Plan.

### Marsden Fund

1. The Marsden Fund invests in excellent, investigator-led research aimed at generating new knowledge, with long-term benefit to New Zealand. It supports excellent research projects that advance and expand the knowledge base and contributes to the development of people with advanced skills in New Zealand. The research is not subject to government's socio-economic priorities.

2. The Marsden Fund encourages New Zealand's leading researchers to explore new ideas that may not be funded through other funding streams and fosters creativity and innovation within the research, science and technology system.

### Australian Research Council Discovery Program funding rules (2019)

*Research* is defined, for the purposes of these Funding Rules, as the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way so as to generate new concepts, methodologies, inventions and understandings. This could include synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative.<sup>1</sup>

*Research Impact* is the demonstrable contribution that research makes to the economy, society, culture, national security, public policy or services, health, the environment, or quality of life, beyond contributions to academia.

1. This definition of research is consistent with a broad notion of research and experimental development comprising "creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man [humankind], culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications". OECD (2002), Frascati Manual: Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development, Paris (Page 30).

### New Zealand Health Research Strategy 2017 - 2027

*Research and development (R&D)*: creative and systematic work to increase the stock of knowledge – including knowledge of humankind, culture and society – and to devise new applications of available knowledge. An R&D activity must meet five criteria: (1) be aimed at new findings, ie, novel; (2) based on

original concepts and hypotheses, ie, creative; (3) be uncertain about the final outcome, ie, uncertain; (4) be planned and budgeted, ie, systematic; (5) lead to results that could be possibly reproduced, ie, transferable and/or reproducible [OECD Frascati Manual]. All R&D activities are innovation activities, but not all innovation activities are R&D activities.

*Biomedical research:* research with the goal of understanding normal and abnormal human functioning, at the molecular, cellular, organ system and whole body levels. It includes developing tools and techniques to be applied for this purpose; and developing new therapies or devices that improve health or the quality of life of individuals, up to the point where they are tested on human subjects. Studies on human subjects that do not have a diagnostic or therapeutic orientation. [Canadian Institutes of Health Research]

*Clinical research:* research with the goals of improving the diagnosis and treatment (including rehabilitation and palliation) of disease and injury; and improving the health and quality of life of individuals as they pass through normal life stages. Research on, or for the treatment of, patients. [Canadian Institutes of Health Research]

*Health research:* research that has or may have relevance to human health. [Health Research Council Act 1990]

*Health services research:* research with the goal of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of health professionals and the health care system through changing practice and policy. This multidisciplinary field of scientific investigation studies how social factors, financing systems, organisational structures and processes, health technologies, and personal behaviours affect access to health care, the quality and cost of health care and, ultimately, health and wellbeing. [Canadian Institutes of Health Research]

*Kaupapa Māori research:* an approach especially for researchers who are undertaking research with Māori. Kaupapa Māori research is based on the following principles: self-determination, cultural aspiration, culturally preferred pedagogy, socioeconomic mediation, extended family structure, collective philosophy, the Treaty of Waitangi and growing respectful relationships. [Rangahau]

*Māori health research:* research that creates knowledge essential for improving the health of Māori and creating healthy Māori communities. Māori approaches and knowledge can also inform improvements to the health of all populations. Māori health research can also encompass Māori research methodologies such as kaupapa Māori research. [Ministry of Health and MBIE]

*Pacific health research:* research that creates knowledge essential for improving the health of Pacific peoples and creating health Pacific communities. It encompasses Pacific research frameworks, such as fonofale, which is based on elements of a Samoan fale (thatched house). These research frameworks bring Pacific life and cultural dimensions to the research. [Health Research Council 'Pacific Health Research Guidelines' May 2014]

*Public health research:* research aimed at improving the health of a population, or of defined sub-populations, through a better understanding of the ways in which social, cultural, environmental, occupational and economic factors determine health status. Note that population health and public health are often used interchangeably. [Canadian Institutes of Health Research Impact Measurement Framework]

### **Arts and Humanities Research Council (UK) Funding Guidance\***

'For all schemes except Research Networking and Follow-on Funding for Impact and Engagement (FoF), the AHRC's definition of research is as follows: research activities should primarily be concerned with research processes, rather than outputs. This definition is built around three key features and your proposal must fully address all of these in order to be considered eligible for support:

It must define a series of research questions, issues or problems that will be addressed in the course of the research. It must also define its aims and objectives in terms of seeking to enhance knowledge and understanding relating to the questions, issues or problems to be addressed.



It must specify a research context for the questions, issues or problems to be addressed. You must specify why it is important that these particular questions, issues or problems should be addressed; what other research is being or has been conducted in this area; and what particular contribution this project will make to the advancement of creativity, insights, knowledge and understanding in this area.

It must specify the research methods for addressing and answering the research questions, issues or problems. You must state how, in the course of the research project, you will seek to answer the questions, address the issues or solve the problems. You should also explain the rationale for your chosen research methods and why you think they provide the most appropriate means by which to address the research questions, issues or problems.'

\*Note that of the seven research council which make up UKRI, only the AHRC includes a definition of research in its guidance.

## Unitec New Zealand Limited

### Meeting of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee 10 February 2022

<b>Title</b>	Classification of the URC's 2021 Agenda Items
<b>Provided by:</b>	Brenda Massey, Acting Secretary
<b>For:</b>	<b>Information</b>

### Recommendation

That the Committee notes the classifications assigned to its 2021 agenda items.

### Purpose

To understand whether the Committee operated according to its Terms of Reference in 2021.

To understand the balance between compliance and strategic initiatives and discussions.

### Information/Background

An exercise has been undertaken to classify all 2021 agenda items according to:

- Which of the Committee's Terms of Reference they correspond to.
- Whether they are forward looking (i.e. strategic).
- Whether they are backward looking (i.e. to do with compliance).

### Key Points

In 2021 the Committee approved, received and/or discussed 50 agenda items.

- 31 (62%) of these items were forward looking (i.e. strategic), e.g. determining the timeline and process for the internal PBRF Quality Evaluation review.
- 19 (38%) of these items related to matters of compliance, e.g. receiving early career researcher funding reports.

The table below summarises the findings of the classification exercise. A spreadsheet is attached which shows how each individual agenda item was classified.

Terms of Reference	No. of Items	Forward Looking	Backward Looking
<b>a. Foster the conduct of research, and support the achievement of Unitec's strategic research, enterprise and innovation priorities;</b>	1	1	0
<b>b. Propose and advise on strategic directions and priorities for research, enterprise and innovation;</b>	3	3	0
<b>c. Provide expert advice on institutional policy;</b>	1	1	0
<b>d. Develop protocols and guidelines and make recommendations in relation to the conduct of research, enterprise and innovation;</b>	3	3	0
<b>e. Oversee the Grants Advisory Committee and the reporting of funded projects;</b>	6	1	5
<b>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;</b>	7	4	3
<b>g. Oversee the monitoring of research outputs and research reporting; and,</b>	17	10	7
<b>h. Foster Māori and Pacific, transdisciplinary, collaborative and externally engaged research, enterprise and innovation.</b>	6	5	1
<b>All</b>	3	3	0
<b>N/A</b>	3	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>19</b>

## Attachments

---

Categorisation of 2021 URC agenda items spreadsheet

Categorisation of 2021 URC Agenda Items				
Month	Item Title	ToR Item Reponds To	Strategic/ Forward Looking	Compliance/ Backward Looking
November	2022 URC Membership	All	√	
November	2022 URC Terms of Reference	All	√	
November	2022 URC Work Plan	All	√	
May	Analysis of SWOT Sections of 2020 (Degree) School Research Plans	a. Foster the conduct of res	√	
April	2020 - 2024 Unitec Research Strategy – Action Plan (revised DRAFT)	b. Propose and advise on s	√	
March	2020 - 2024 Unitec Research Strategy – Action Plan (DRAFT)	b. Propose and advise on s	√	
March	KPI for Priority One in the 2020 - 2024 Unitec Research Strategy - Action Plan (DRAFT)	b. Propose and advise on s	√	
November	Staff Excellence Award	c. Provide expert advice on	√	
April	Definition of Early Career Researcher at Unitec (tabled item)	d. Develop protocols and g	√	
February	Definition of an Early Career Researcher at Unitec	d. Develop protocols and g	√	
October	NVivo – qualitative research software	d. Develop protocols and g	√	
August	2020 Early Career Researcher (ECR) Funding Final Reports (Heath, Woodruffe, Look, Jadresin-Milic)	e. Oversee the Grants Advi	.	√
February	2021 Unitec Early Career Researcher Fund Outcomes	e. Oversee the Grants Advi	.	√
June	Internal Research Funding Approval Processes	e. Oversee the Grants Advi	√	.
May	Annual Research Centre Reports (ESRC, AMS & NWaTT)	e. Oversee the Grants Advi	.	√
October	2021 Early Career Researcher (ECR) Funding Progress Reports (Baling, Mitchell, Jadresin-Milic, Hall)	e. Oversee the Grants Advi	.	√
October	Conference Seed Funding [report on outcomes]	e. Oversee the Grants Advi	.	√
August	Amendment to the Student Integrated Research Output Fund (tabled item)	f. Encourage and enhance	√	
August	Nomination for appointment of an Honorary Research Fellow – Dr Lynn Miller	f. Encourage and enhance	√	
February	ECR Support: Return from Parental Leave Application – Dr Hoa Nguyen	f. Encourage and enhance	√	
July	Student Integrated Research Output Fund	f. Encourage and enhance	.	√
November	Rangahau Research Forum	f. Encourage and enhance	√	.
October	Research Support Products	f. Encourage and enhance	.	√
October	Student Integrated Research Output Fund	f. Encourage and enhance	.	√
April	Reporting Against School Research Plans	g. Oversee the monitoring	.	√
April	Update: 2025 PBRF Quality Evaluation	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	
August	2021 Research Productivity Traffic Light (RPTL) Report	g. Oversee the monitoring	.	√

August	2021 Unitec Internal PBRF Quality Evaluation	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	.
February	Reaccreditation of the Centre for Computational Intelligence and Cybersecurity (CCICS) and the Centre of Computational Intelligence for Environmental Engineering (CIEE)	g. Oversee the monitoring	.	√
February	Research Centre Annual Report Template	g. Oversee the monitoring	.	√
July	PBRF Update	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	.
June	Internal PBRF Review	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	.
March	Annual Updates to School Research Plans [format for reports]	g. Oversee the monitoring	.	√
March	Research Bank Changes 2021	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	.
March	Research Centres Update – CIEE & CCICS	g. Oversee the monitoring	.	√
March	School Research Plans [plans presented to Committee]	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	.
May	Internal PBRF Timelines (tabled item)	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	.
May	PBRF Review Outcome and Unitec Internal PBRF Review	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	.
November	Internal Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) Quality Evaluation Review	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	.
October	2020 Unitec Annual Research Report	g. Oversee the monitoring	.	√
October	2021 Internal PBRF Quality Evaluation	g. Oversee the monitoring	√	.
April	2021 Unitec Research Symposium	h. Foster Māori and Pacific	√	.
August	2021 Joint EIT/Unitec Early Career and Emerging Researcher Seminar	h. Foster Māori and Pacific	√	.
August	2021 Unitec/MIT Research Symposium	h. Foster Māori and Pacific	√	.
August	Cybersecurity R&D as a Service	h. Foster Māori and Pacific	√	.
November	Environmental Solutions Research Centre (ESRC)	h. Foster Māori and Pacific	√	.
November	Research Support Funding Accessibility and Reporting	h. Foster Māori and Pacific	.	√
February	Update on research undertaken into non-completing students at Unitec	N/A	.	√
November	2022 URC Schedule of Meetings	N/A	.	√
October	Appointments to the PBRF Sector Reference Group	N/A	.	√

### Key

#### All

- 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;
  - g. Oversee the monitoring of research outputs and research reporting
  - h. Foster Māori and Pacific, transdisciplinary, collaborative and externally engaged research, enterprise and innovation.
- N/A

## Unitec New Zealand Limited

### Meeting of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee 10 February 2022

<b>Title</b>	2022 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 2022 Unitec Early Career Researcher (ECR) Fund.

### Key Points

- Nine Registrations of Interest were received. All were given feedback and invited to submit full proposals.
- Eight full applications were received.
- Six applications were approved (three subject to modification).
- Two applications were declined.
- One of the declined applicants has been offered a small amount of funding for a mentor to assist them to redevelop the project.

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

Applicant	School	Project Title & Outcome	Amount
Cam Moore	Architecture	Gummer and Ford.	\$0
Dr Kristie Cameron	Environmental & Animal Sciences	Relative Numerousness and Absolute Number Discrimination in Dogs Part 2.	\$6,000
Kristina Naden	Environmental & Animal Sciences	Identifying biochemistry values, and the prevalence of Feline Leukaemia Virus and Feline Immunodeficiency Virus in cats of the Chatham Islands.	\$9,600 (TBC)
Dr Lata Rana	Community Studies	Enacting culturally responsive pedagogies in early childhood education.	\$0
Dr Mary Yan	Healthcare and Social Practice	Yacon prebiotic functional drinks.	\$3,500

Dr Maryam Mirzaei	Applied Business	Supply Chains in Transition.	\$10,800
Nigel Pizzini	Healthcare and Social Practice	Investigating the supports and constraints encountered by male high school students needing to engage with the school counsellor.	\$7,900
A/P Renata Jadresin-Milic	Architecture	Digitalisation of Heritage in NZ Phase 3	\$24,500
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$62,300 (TBC)</b>

The themes that came out of this year's assessment of the applications are appended and were sent to all applicants.

### 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), to give some feedback with the aim of strengthening applicant's full proposals 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, 20 November 2021 to decide the outcome of the submitted applications. Applicants were notified of the outcome of their applications on 16 December 2021.

### Attachments

---

- 2022 ECR Funding: Themes Identified by the Grants Assessment Committee



### **2022 Early Career Researcher (ECR) Funding Themes Identified by the Grants Assessment Committee (GAC)**

The GAC were impressed by the quality of proposals received in what has been a very challenging year.

The GAC assessed applications according to the priorities of the fund which include:

- Developing ECRs' capability, capacity and career progression as a Principal Investigator (PI) on a high quality, applied research project with the potential for impact.
- Supporting research that builds collaborations with external partners and end-users.
- Supporting ECRs to produce quality outputs.

Compelling applications typically:

- Included other researchers at Unitec. Involving others provides the PI with a leadership opportunity and affords others a chance to collaborate on the production of research outputs.
- Allowed for student involvement.
- Demonstrated end-user input into the development of the project.
- Were well referenced, showing a good understanding of the current literature.
- Allowed for knowledge transfer in ways over and above publication in academic journals (e.g. through hui, exhibitions, public lectures, publication in industry newsletters etc).
- Used consistent terminology which was clearly explained.
- Clearly articulated the research methodology and explained why the particular approach was chosen.
- Clearly articulated the 'why' of the research, i.e. what would change for the better as a result of the research (improved understanding, a streamlined process etc).
- Demonstrated a clear understanding of Vision Mātauranga and described how mātauranga Māori could be incorporated into the project.
- Clearly articulated the role of any Advisory Group, including the mechanics of how it would operate and how the project would be guided by the advice provided.
- Presented a detailed budget, the expenses in which clearly and appropriately co-related to resourcing the methods identified.

Things that could be improved:

- Not all GAC members work in the same field as the applicant. Applicants should pitch their proposals to an intelligent but non-specialist audience, e.g. by avoiding jargon, explaining discipline-specific concepts, describing specialist scientific techniques etc.
- Applicants should not assume the GAC has knowledge of their previously funded research projects. GAC membership changes year to year. Any linkages to previous/related projects should be carefully articulated.
- Applications which do have a previously funded history should very clearly differentiate the new aims, questions and methods from the previous ones
- Applications should be proofread prior to submission, including checks of grammar, spelling and for repetition.

## 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?