



# minutes

## Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	2022-02-10
Scheduled Start:	1300h
Scheduled End:	1500h
Location:	Microsoft Teams

MEETING OPENED:	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 first meeting of the year, including Adrian Jenkins (proxy for Susan Eady) and new member Dr Cat Mitchell (replacing Prof Jenny Lee-Morgan).

### SECTION 2 – STANDING ITEMS

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

##### **Members Present**

1. Marcus Williams (Chair)
2. Helen Gremillion
3. Arun Deo
4. Kristie Cameron
5. Cat Mitchell
6. Adrian Jenkins (proxy for Susan Eady)
7. Hamid Sharifzadeh
8. Lian Wu
9. Leon Tan
10. Yusef Patel

Total members represented: 10 members

##### **Apologies**

1. Robyn Gandell

2. Daisy Bentley-Gray
3. Cat Mitchell (for early departure)
4. Susan Eady

Total apologies: 4 members

#### Absent

N/A

#### MOTION

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

**Moved: Helen Gremillion**

**Seconded: Hamid Sharifzadeh**

**MOTION CARRIED**

#### Quorate Status

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

#### Hunga Mahi | Staff in Attendance

1. Brenda Massey, Acting Secretary

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

#### MOTION

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

**Moved: Lian Wu**

**Seconded: Kristie Cameron**

**MOTION CARRIED**

#### Item 2.3 Mahia Atu | Matters Arising

The Chair informed the committee of the resignations of Roger Birchmore and Maryam Mirzaei from its membership. New members are currently being sought from the Schools of Building Construction and Applied Business. A replacement Student Rep is also being sought via the Student Council.

**Action:** Marcus Williams to send Roger and Maryam formal letters of gratitude thanking them for their services to the committee.

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. Te Komiti Mātauranga has subsequently approved the committee's 2022 ToR.
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	Complete. Dan will represent AMS at the March meeting.
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. Tūāpapa Rangahau have so far delivered 70+ one-to-one sessions to researchers across the institute.
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	<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>	<p>Complete. Cat Mitchell is the new Māori representative on the committee.</p> <p>Complete</p>

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

There were no items to approve this month.

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

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

The Rangahau Research Forum (RRF) is intending to submit feedback on the consultation on behalf of Te Pūkenga. The committee’s discussion today will inform Marcus Williams’ input into the RRF’s submission. Committee members are also able to make individual submissions if they wish.

A summary of the committee’s discussion is as follows:

#### **Options for changes to PBRF definition of research excellence**

- The committee considered ‘Option 1: Add detail’ to be the preferred option.
- This section describes adding detail to the definition of research which would apply to all portfolios. Does that mean adding detail, including an explicit definition of Māori research, that would apply to all panels and all portfolios, or will the definition be simplified, kept very generic, and then panels will define research separately?
- It will be important to have some explicit definitions around Māori research in particular, and perhaps Indigenous research more broadly. The guidelines state that there will be wide consultation around this, which is important. Doing so would more clearly allow a pathway for portfolios not submitted to Māori or Pacific panels that include Māori and Pacific research engagement. It would be good if those panels have already had framed up for them a definition of an Indigenous approach to research.
- It will be important to have an overarching definition that is more capacious in the guidelines, and then the individual panels will have a place to start from.
- Option 1 articulates that it’s important that research is capable of rigorous assessment by experts in a given discipline. Option 2 doesn’t have that, so the question of how research is evaluated and whether it’s Quality Assured is quite vague. It could be problematic leaving that up to individual panels.

#### **Options for changes to PBRF definition of research excellence**

- The committee would have liked to have known why the SRG has indicated a preference for Option 2.
- As the paper is presented, it doesn’t seem as critical to have a stand-alone definition of excellence as it is to have a stand-alone definition of research.
- How long a term are these definitions likely to stand for? E.g., new technologies could lead to new types of research, is that a justification for keeping things a little more generic rather than a little more specific?
- It’s quite complex to analyse the different strengths and weaknesses of the different approaches. However, if you define research differently, i.e. the more specific and capacious definition, then it seems problematic to not have clearly articulated what research excellence looks like. There’s a risk that if there is not a standalone definition of research excellence, despite a broader definition of research potentially being adopted, that we still think about research excellence in the same way we always have. There is benefit in trying

to recognise research excellence in different kinds of researchers, and that's what defining excellence offers the advantage of. By stating 'this is what excellence looks like'. There are lots of benefits in terms of potentially, therefore, recognising different types of researchers in our institution and enabling a more diverse research community.

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

- The committee noted these options without comment.

#### **Option for changing Quality Category descriptors**

- It was noted that point 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" does not reference research of value within Pacifica.
- With reference to point b., there is a list of five things, i.e. "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". While the specific wording would be forthcoming, and it would be good to focus on all these areas, no one piece of research would likely cover all five of these things equally. There would likely be more emphasis on three or four of them. There could be an and/or in the statement, or it could be stated that all these things will be taken into account rather than it being that all five things have to be present.

The committee was in favour of aligning itself with the response being led by the Rangahau Research Forum. **Action:** Marcus Williams will ensure the committee's input is incorporated into his feedback on the RRF's draft submission.

Marcus Williams will bring any further consultation papers to the committee for discussion as they are published.

---

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

---

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

Brenda Massey presented the results of the classification of the committee's 50 2021 agenda items. Items were classified according to:

- Which of the committee's terms of reference they corresponded to.
- Whether they were forward looking (i.e. strategic).
- Whether they were backward looking (i.e. to do with compliance).

The committee was pleased to note that the majority of its business was strategic and that it is clearly operating within its terms of reference.

**Action:** The outcome of the classification of this year's agenda items should be communicated to Te Komiti Mātauranga at the end of the year. Brenda Massey to note this in the committee's 2022 Work Plan.

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

Brenda Massey presented the outcomes of the 2022 Unitec Early Career Researcher (ECR) Fund to the committee. Eight full applications were received from researchers in five different Schools; six were approved and two were declined. The smallest grant was \$3,500 and the largest grant was \$24,500. The total funding allocated was \$62,300.

Formal contracts are drawn up for all successful recipients. All recipients are required to produce one progress report and one final report on their projects for the committee's review.

---

## **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>	1420 h
------------------------	--------

---

## **SUMMARY OF ACTIONS**

---

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
2.3	Send Roger Birchmore and Maryam Mirzaei formal letters of gratitude thanking them for their services to the committee.	Brenda Massey/ Marcus Williams	
4.1	Ensure the committee's feedback on the PBRF Sector Reference Group (SRG) – Consultation Paper 2 is incorporated into Marcus Williams' response to the Rangahau Research Forum's intended submission.	Marcus Williams	
5.1	The outcome of the classification of this year's agenda items should be communicated to Te Komiti Mātauranga at the end of the year. This should be noted in the committee's 2022 Work Plan.	Brenda Massey	