



agenda

Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	2023-10-12
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 MEĀ HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

1. 2024 Unitec Research Committee Terms of Reference

SECTION 4 WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

1. PBRF Quality Evaluation 2026 – Consultation on Panel-Specific Guidelines

SECTION 5 NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

1. Update: Rangahau and Research in Te Pūkenga
2. NVivo Update

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

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

Item 1.2 Mihi Whakatau | Welcome from the Chair

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
Tanya White	Nominee of Director, Māori Success
Dr Helen Gremillion (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 (Professor)	Computing and Information Technology
Dr Leon Tan (Associate Professor)	Creative Industries
Dr Kristie Cameron (Associate Professor/ Early Career)	Environmental & Animal Sciences
Vacant	Applied Business
Carly Van Winkel	Bridgepoint
Dr Norasieh Md Amin (Subject Librarian)	Library
Kate Zeng (Student Rep)	Nominee of Student Council
Arun Deo (Research Advisor)	Tūāpapa Rangahau
In attendance: Brenda Massey (Acting Secretary)	Tūāpapa Rangahau

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.
- 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 2023-09-14.

Section 2.3 Mahia Atu | Matters Arising

refer to [pg12](#)

SECTION 3 MEI HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

Section 3.1 2024 Unitec Research Committee Terms of Reference

refer to [pg13](#)

SECTION 4 WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Section 4.1 PBRF Quality Evaluation 2026 – Panel-Specific Guidelines

refer to [pg15](#)

SECTION 5 NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

Section 5.1 Update: Rangahau and Research in Te Pūkenga

refer to [pg146](#)

Section 5.2 NVivo Update

refer to [pg147](#)

SECTION 6 KUPU WHAKAMUTUNGA | CLOSING

Section 6.1 Ētahi Kaupapa Anō | Any Other Business

Section 6.2 Komiti Self-Assessment

refer to [pg148](#)

Section 6.3 Karakia Whakamutunga | Closing Karakia

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



minutes

Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	2023-09-14
Scheduled Start:	1300h
Scheduled End:	1500h
Location:	Microsoft Teams

MEETING OPENED:	1330h
------------------------	-------

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.

SECTION 2 – STANDING ITEMS

Item 2.1 Ngā Whakapāha | Attendance, Apologies & Quorate Status

Members Present

1. Marcus Williams (Chair)
2. Daisy Bentley-Gray
3. Nora Md Amin
4. Helen Gremillion (until 2pm)
5. Arun Deo
6. Hamid Sharifzadeh
7. Tanya White
8. Becca Wood (proxy for Leon Tan, until 2pm)
9. Lian Wu
10. Kristie Cameron

Total members represented: 10 members

Apologies

1. Yusef Patel
2. Leon Tan

3. Kate Zeng
4. Helen Gremillion (for early departure)
5. Becca Wood (for early departure)

Total apologies:

5 members

MOTION

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

Moved: Hamid Sharifzadeh

Seconded: Daisy Bentley-Gray

MOTION CARRIED

Quorate Status

A minimum of seven 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 2023-08-10 meeting as a true and accurate record.

Moved: Kristie Cameron

Seconded: Lian Wu

MOTION CARRIED

Item 2.3 Mahia Atu | Matters Arising

Four online workshops, open to all Unitec and MIT researchers, have been scheduled to review the new PBRF portfolio format and discuss the changes that are the result of the 2019 PBRF review. These are significant changes, and it is important that MIT Academic Leads (Research) and Unitec Research Leaders are familiar with them.

AL(R)s and RLs have been asked to forward the workshop details to the researchers in their teams. There are no limits to how many people can attend, but AL(R)s and RLs have been encouraged to exercise discretion because beginner researchers are not likely to benefit from an investment of time in the workshops. The workshops are all the same, it is not necessary to attend more than one workshop.

Marcus Williams (Director of Research) and Arun Deo (Research Adviser) are happy run workshops for schools or centres on request, where a reasonable attendance is expected. Enquiries to Marcus or Arun please.

Agenda Item(s)	Action	Responsible	Outcome
3.1	Distribute the 2022 Unitec Research Report to the following stakeholders: - Research Leaders - Heads of School	Arun Deo	In progress. The report needs to be accepted by TKM before it is

	• Senior Leadership Team • Executive Leadership Team • Supervision Register • ECR Forum • Academic Programme Managers • Te Rōpū Mataara (via Tanya White) • Pacific Centre Director • The six Research Centre Directors • Ngā Kaitiaki (via Tanya White)		distributed and TKM did not make it through its last agenda. It will be re-tabled at the next TKM hui.
3.2	Draft a definition of an emerging researcher at Unitec for tabling at the next meeting. Add emerging researchers to the scope of the ECR Forum ToR and arrange for the ToR to be published on Te Aka The Nest.	Kristie Cameron / Marcus Williams Brenda Massey	Complete – on agenda Complete – on agenda
4.1	Develop and implement a communications strategy for staff who will be participating in the 2026 Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) Quality Evaluation (QE) based on the committee's feedback.	Marcus Williams	Complete
5.1	Table School Research Plans at the next committee meeting along with a visual schematic of all of Unitec's research groups.	Arun Deo	Complete – on agenda

SECTION 3 – MEA HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

Section 3.1 Definition of an Emerging Researcher at Unitec

At its last meeting, the committee approved the Unitec Early Career Researcher Forum Terms of Reference, whose purpose includes ensuring that emerging researchers are also supported and included where practicable. The committee determined that, for clarity, an emerging researcher at Unitec should be formally defined.

Kristie Cameron and Marcus Williams have worked together to develop a definition, attempting to be as inclusive as possible. It is not intended that anyone who does not fit the definition of either an emerging or early career researcher at Unitec be excluded from doing research. The definitions have been established in order to provide clarity on who is able to access Unitec-funded research resources (e.g., ECR funding, PD, research dissemination funding etc). A summary of the committee's discussions is as follows:

- Q: How can non-degree teaching staff who are doing research be supported? A: There is the [Non-Degree Teaching Research Track](#) (NDTRT), which exists to ensure that all staff who are achieving excellence in research can be supported. Research Partner Penny Thomson can assist eligible staff who are interested in accessing this mechanism.
- Q: If a staff member is not teaching at degree level or higher then they do not meet the inclusion criteria for the RPTL and in order to be defined as an emerging researcher they would need to be able to show they're working towards submitting a competitive PBRF portfolio. Is this too high a bar? A: Resourcing, especially funding, for research at Unitec is limited and needs to be prioritised for those who are required by statute to do research. Not being defined as an emerging researcher does not exclude you from doing research, it

simply means that you will not be on a mailing list to receive information about opportunities that you are not eligible for.

- All staff have access to research related PD opportunities, except for the research writing retreats which are contestable.
- The NDTRT is only available to Unitec staff. Tūāpapa Rangahau does not have the capacity to bring new policy in at MIT at this juncture.
- Limited tenure staff are normally not eligible and casual staff are not eligible to apply for NDTRT and other of Unitec's funded research products. This does not prevent them from undertaking research. Several ECR funding applications have included limited tenure and casual staff on research project teams. This is also true of sub-degree teachers and students.
- One of the benefits of having a formal definition of different types of researchers is clarity, especially for Research Leaders who support a range of researchers.

MOTION

That the committee approves that the definition of an Emerging Researcher at Unitec as follows:

An emerging researcher at Unitec is a person who:

- Meets the inclusion criteria for the Research Productivity Traffic Light or has been accepted onto the Non-Degree Teaching Research Track.
- Has an approved Individual Research Plan which identifies clear effort toward a recognised research output within the next 12 months.
- Is a named member of a Research Group in an approved School Research Plan.
- Has an ORCID number.

Moved: Kristie Cameron

Seconded: Daisy Bentley-Gray

MOTION CARRIED

Action: Brenda Massey to add the definition of an early career researcher and an emerging researcher at Unitec as an appendix to the Early Career Researcher Forum Terms of Reference and arrange for the updated document to be placed on Te Aka | The Nest.

Section 3.2 2024 ECR Contestable Fund GAC Membership

The committee was asked to approve the membership of the 2024 ECR Fund Grants Advisory Committee (GAC), a sub-committee of the Unitec Research Committee, who will assess applications for 2024 Early Career Researcher Contestable Funding.

A couple of members of the committee are intending to submit applications for ECR funding. The committee did not consider that these members should be excluded from considering the motion below, as members are not being asked to determine who will be selected by Tūāpapa Rangahau to assess specific applications.

It is important that the GAC includes someone with mātauranga Māori and kaupapa Māori expertise. Jamie Ihimaera Smiler is an experienced research manager and an active kairangahau from Weltec. He has been asked to participate as there are very few staff at Unitec with the appropriate expertise and those that there are, are either unavailable or will have a conflict of interest.

MOTION

That the committee approves the membership of the 2024 Grants Advisory Committee as follows:

GAC members who will consider every application: A/P Marcus Williams, Jamie Ihimaera Smiler, A/P Evangelia Papoutsaki.

GAC members who will consider specific applications: 2 x academics specifically selected by Tūāpapa Rangahau for each applicant, chosen from outside the applicant's school where possible, but with relevant discipline or transdisciplinary expertise.

Moved: Becca Wood

Seconded: Tanya White

MOTION CARRIED

SECTION 4 - WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Section 4.1 PBRF Quality Evaluation 2026 – Consultation on Guidelines and Audit Methodology

The draft TEO PBRF Quality Evaluation 2026 Guidelines, Assessment Guidelines and the revised audit methodology were presented to the committee for feedback. They incorporate the in-principle decisions made by the TEC on the basis of feedback provided by the sector during the consultation process which this committee has actively participated in.

The Guidelines for TEOs participating in the Quality Evaluation now classify Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) into six types (pg 80). The committee provided specific feedback on this as follows:

- The definitions provided for the six types are a bit broad. For example, one of the six types of CRE is “Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce”. Previously researchers would detail all of their supervision assignments and what resulted from those (e.g., graduation) in the CRE section. It is not clear from the new guidelines whether this information still needs to be provided. Staff are currently carefully tracking this information and if they're no longer required to do so it would be good to know.
- It would be useful to know what, if anything, counted before but does not now count as a CRE since CREs have been reduced to six types. A comparison between the previous and new guidelines around CREs would be useful.

The committee's feedback will be conveyed to the Rangahau Research Forum (RRF). The RRF will collate a response for input/submission to TEC by Te Pūkenga. Individual submissions, as always, can also be made.

The committee was reminded that the four PBRF workshops that Marcus Williams and Arun Deo are running start next week (refer to 'matters arising' above for further information).

Action: Brenda Massey to convey the committee's feedback to the RRF via Megan Allardice (EIT).

SECTION 5 - NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

Section 5.1 School Research Plans

The committee received School Research Plans for the period 2023-2024 and the visual schematic of research groups at Unitec.

The plans are an important resource for when moderators visit, and programme reviews occur. They contain productivity data and also articulate schools' aspirations, particularly around Vision Mātauranga.

The Chair thanked Arun Deo for leading this piece of work.

Section 5.2 2023 Early Career Researcher Funding Progress Reports

The committee received progress reports from each of the 2023 ECR funding recipients.

Unitec's ECRs continue to operate in a challenging environment. Despite this, each of the PIs are doing well, managing often complex projects, developing their leadership expertise, and engaging with external partners including community groups, councils, businesses and iwi/hapū. The committee were pleased with each project's progress.

Action: Brenda Massey to draft letters to each of the report writers thanking them for their reports.

Section 5.3 Research Related Documents on Te Aka | The Nest

Brenda Massey led a demonstration of where all Unitec's research related guidelines, policies, and procedures are located on Te Aka | The Nest and where information, application forms and guidelines can be found for Tūāpapa Rangahau's research support offerings (e.g. funding and PD opportunities).

Current policies, procedures and guidelines around research will remain in place until they are eventually superseded by Te Pūkenga policies, procedures and guidelines.

Action: Brenda Massey to thank Penny Thomson on behalf of the committee for creating the research documents repository, and to ask her to schedule a similar demonstration at a future Research Leaders hui.

SECTION 6 - KUPU WHAKAMUTUNGA | CLOSING

Section 6.1 Ētahi Kaupapa Anō | Any Other Business

The committee sought an update on progress towards a structure for the management of research in Te Pūkenga. While the confirmed structures for Tāraia te anamata | Creating our futures will be announced next week, research is not within its scope and therefore there is no update at this juncture.

Section 6.2 Komiti Self-Assessment

An opportunity was given for the committee to reflect on their self-assessment provocations. The committee is reminded that feedback on any aspect of the committee's operation can be emailed to the Chair or the Secretary at any time (in confidence if requested).

Section 6.3 Karakia Whakamutunga | Closing Karakia

MEETING CLOSED: 1420 h

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Agenda Item(s)	Action	Responsible	Outcome
3.1	Add the definition of an ECR and an emerging researcher at Unitec as an appendix to the ECR Forum ToR and arrange for the updated document to be placed on Te Aka The Nest.	Brenda Massey	
4.1	Convey the committee's feedback on the latest SRF PBRF consultation to the RRF via Megan Allardice (EIT).	Brenda Massey	
5.2	Draft letters to each of the 2023 ECR progress report writers thanking them for their reports.	Brenda Massey	
5.3	Thank Penny Thomson on behalf of the committee for creating the research documents repository and ask her to schedule a demonstration of how to locate the repository, and research related policies, procedures and guidelines, at a future Research Leaders hui.	Brenda Massey	

MATTERS ARISING

Agenda Item(s)	Action	Responsible	Outcome
2.2	Distribute the 2022 Unitec Research Report to the following stakeholders: • Research Leaders • Heads of School • Senior Leadership Team • Executive Leadership Team • Supervision Register • ECR Forum • Academic Programme Managers • Te Rōpū Mataara (via Tanya White) • Pacific Centre Director • The six Research Centre Directors • Ngā Kaitiaki (via Tanya White)	Arun Deo	Complete
3.1	Add the definition of an ECR and an emerging researcher at Unitec as an appendix to the ECR Forum ToR and arrange for the updated document to be placed on Te Aka The Nest.	Brenda Massey	Complete
4.1	Convey the committee's feedback on the latest SRF PBRF consultation to the RRF via Megan Allardice (EIT).	Brenda Massey	Complete. Unfortunately, with the timing of the committee's last meeting, the RRF had already submitted feedback, so the committee's feedback was submitted to the TEC separately.
5.2	Draft letters to each of the 2023 ECR progress report writers thanking them for their reports.	Brenda Massey	Complete
5.3	Thank Penny Thomson on behalf of the committee for creating the research documents repository and ask her to schedule a demonstration of how to locate the repository, and research related policies, procedures, and guidelines, at a future Research Leaders hui.	Brenda Massey	Complete

Unitec New Zealand Limited

Meeting of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date of Meeting: 12 October 2023

Title	2024 URC Terms of Reference
Provided by:	Brenda Massey, Acting Secretary
For:	Approval

Recommendation

That the committee approves a roll-over of its current Terms of Reference into 2024.

Purpose

The Terms of Reference define the powers, functions and purpose of the committee. As per the Conduct of Research Policy they shall be outlined to Te Komiti Mātauranga | Academic Committee each year.

Information/Background

In December 2020 the committee reviewed and approved revised Terms of Reference. These are as follows:

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.

Next Steps

The approved Terms of Reference will be outlined to Te Komiti Mātauranga | Academic Committee.

Contributors

A/P Marcus Williams, Director Research & Enterprise

Unitec New Zealand Limited

Meeting of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date of Meeting: 12 October 2023

Title	PBRF Quality Evaluation 2026 – Consultation on Panel-Specific Guidelines
Provided by:	A/P Marcus Williams, Director Research and Enterprise
For:	Feedback/Discussion

Recommendation

That the committee reviews, considers and provides feedback on the draft Panel-Specific Guidelines for the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) Quality Evaluation 2026.

Key Points

The Panel-Specific Guidelines have been developed by peer-review panels to support staff members submitting their Evidence Portfolios (EPs) for assessment in Quality Evaluation 2026.

Along with the *Guidelines for TEOs participating in Quality Evaluation 2026* (TEO Guidelines) and the *Guidelines for the Quality Evaluation 2026 assessment process* (Assessment Guidelines), the Panel-Specific Guidelines provide panel- and subject-specific guidance for participating tertiary education organisation (TEO) staff members. They incorporate the in-principle decisions on EP design made by the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) on the basis of the Sector Reference Group's consultation process and recommendations since September 2021.

The TEC is consulting on the draft Panel-Specific Guidelines to ensure the guidance serves TEO staff submitting EPs for assessment.

Next Steps

Consultation on the draft Panel-Specific Guidelines is open from **29 September to 10 November 2023**. The committee's feedback will be conveyed to the Rangahau Research Forum (RRF) for review/discussion, along with any other feedback received from within Te Pūkenga. The RRF will collate a response for input/submission to TEC by Te Pūkenga. Individual submissions can also be made via this [online survey: Panel-Specific Guidelines](#).

The peer-review panels and TEC will carefully consider all feedback. The final guidelines will be published in December 2023.

Attachment

- Draft Panel-Specific Guidelines

**Tertiary
Education
Commission**
Te Amorangi
Mātauranga Matua



Performance-Based Research Fund

Panel-Specific Guidelines for Quality
Evaluation 2026

Consultation Draft, September 2023

Contents

Contents	1
Providing feedback on this document	2
How to use these guidelines	3
Biological Sciences	5
Business and Economics	12
Creative and Performing Arts	19
Education	30
Engineering, Technology and Architecture	39
Humanities and Law	54
Health	62
Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology	71
Mātauranga Māori	80
Medicine	89
Pacific Research	96
Physical Sciences	106
Public Health	114
Social Sciences and other Cultural/Social Sciences	121

Providing feedback on this document

This document is a consultation draft of the *Panel-Specific Guidelines for Quality Evaluation 2026*. It is one of four guidelines documents that will be produced by the TEC as part of the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) Quality Evaluation 2026 round.

The document updates the equivalent 2018 version of the Panel-Specific Guidelines. Each of the 14 peer-review panels have developed subject- and panel-specific advice and guidance that elaborates on the TEO and Assessment Guidelines.

The purpose of consultation on these guidelines is to ensure that they accurately and clearly reflect the in-principle decisions on changes to Evidence Portfolio (EP) design, are consistent with the main TEO and Assessment Guidelines, and provide accurate and clear panel- and subject-specific guidance that will assist TEOs and staff members in completing and submitting EPs.

The TEC invites feedback on this draft, which can be provided via an online survey:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/M9SYC2D>

The survey is open from 29 September 2023 to 5pm on 10 November 2023. All feedback received will be carefully considered by the TEC and the panel members, and the final version will be published in December 2023.

If you have any questions about this consultation, please contact PBRF.Help@tec.govt.nz.

How to use these guidelines

The Panel-Specific Guidelines provide advice relevant to the subject areas within each of the 14 peer review panels to help tertiary education organisations (TEOs) and their staff members with the processes of developing and submitting EPs.

This document contains 14 sections – one for each of the 14 panels, with content relevant to that panel. These sections are subdivided into specific topics that reflect the structure of an EP and are relevant to each particular panel.

The 14 panels are:

- › Biological Sciences
- › Business and Economics
- › Creative and Performing Arts
- › Education
- › Engineering, Technology and Architecture
- › Health
- › Humanities and Law
- › Mātauranga Māori
- › Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology
- › Medicine
- › Pacific Research
- › Physical Sciences
- › Public Health
- › Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences.

The guidelines have been developed by each panel with the primary purpose of providing subject- and panel-specific advice and guidance to TEOs and their staff members to ensure submitted EPs receive the best possible assessment.

Panels have focused on providing information that:

- › is practical, useful and relevant
- › indicates what should be included as content in the different sections of the EP
- › advises on aspects of research that are non-typical for the subject area or discipline but will be considered by the panel
- › elaborates on rather than duplicates the TEO Guidelines.

To enable the best evaluation of an EP, panels encourage the use of quantified and verifiable supporting data as evidence to support the submission whenever possible.

For topics where these panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO and Assessment Guidelines is considered sufficient.

There will be variations between the 14 sections of the Panel-Specific Guidelines in terms of the amount or type of advice given. This reflects that there are significant differences in the research

approaches and practices of the subject areas covered by the 14 panels. It also reflects that the research activities of some areas are more closely aligned than others with the general advice contained in the TEO Guidelines, and that this creates variation in the amount and type of advice required in the Panel-Specific Guidelines.

The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. These guidelines are supplementary to and should be read in conjunction with the main guidelines, which have been split into three audience-specific documents:

- › *Guidelines for tertiary education organisations participating in Quality Evaluation 2026 (draft released for consultation)*
- › *Guidelines for the Quality Evaluation 2026 assessment process (draft released for consultation)*
- › *A guide for staff members participating in Quality Evaluation 2026 (not yet published)*

The table below shows the main audience for each document. A tick (✓) indicates that the document also contains information relevant for that particular audience.

Audience	Guide for staff	Guidelines for TEOs	Guidelines for the assessment	Panel-Specific Guidelines
Peer review panels			Main audience	✓
TEOs	✓	Main audience	✓	✓
Staff members	Main audience	✓	✓	✓

The document *Guidelines for tertiary education organisations participating in Quality Evaluation 2026* (TEO Guidelines) provides information that TEOs need to determine staff eligibility, complete EPs, understand and participate in the TEC audit process and understand the reporting of results. It also provides information about other related processes, such as submitting conflict of interest notices and complaints to the TEC.

The document *Guidelines for the Quality Evaluation 2026 assessment process* (Assessment Guidelines) is focused on providing information about the assessment process undertaken by the 14 peer review panels. This includes information on the responsibilities of the panel, the scoring system and detailed scoring descriptors for EPs, the stages in the assessment process, the moderation process and information about conflicts of interest and confidentiality.

Consultation on the draft TEO Guidelines and Assessment Guidelines closed on 22 September 2023. The final guidelines will be published in November 2023.

The document *A guide for staff members participating in Quality Evaluation 2026 (Staff Guide)* will provide staff members with an overview of the process, their responsibilities and the responsibilities of their employing TEO and the TEC. It will provide information and guidance on completing the EP that will be specifically aimed at supporting submitting staff members. The guide will direct staff members to the relevant areas of the other guidelines. The guide will be published by the end of 2023.

Biological Sciences

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with broad expertise in:

- › Agriculture and other applied biological sciences
- › Ecology, evolution and behaviour
- › Molecular, cellular and whole organism biology.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where these panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain Mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and the Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chair Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Ao Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Biological Sciences (BIOS) panel will assess EPs that span the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide. They are not intended to be exhaustive.

Agriculture and other applied biological sciences

Agriculture and other applied biological sciences includes food science; biotechnology; bioactives; agricultural science; pest and weed control; crop production; post-harvest biology; plant and animal breeding; farm management; animal husbandry; agronomy; wool and fibre science; aquaculture; horticulture; viticulture; forestry; ethnobotany; and fisheries science.

Ecology, evolution and behaviour

Ecology, evolution and behaviour includes animal, plant and microbial ecology; landscape ecology; restoration ecology; marine ecology; biogeography; biodiversity; phylogenetics; systematics and taxonomy; evolution; population biology and genetics; animal behaviour; conservation biology; biostatistics and modelling.

Molecular, cellular and whole organism biology

Molecular, cellular and whole organism biology includes animal and plant physiology; cell biology; synthetic biology; animal and plant biochemistry; molecular biology; microbiology; virology; host-microbe interactions; plant and animal molecular genetics; genomics; bioinformatics; animal and plant pathology; immunology; pharmacology; neuroscience; developmental biology; and structural biology.

Cross-referrals

It is expected that most cross-referrals to and from this panel will be with the Medicine, Public Health and Physical Sciences Panels. Staff members who consider significant aspects of their research to be in subject areas covered by other panels (for example, either those with one or more Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) that fall clearly outside the coverage that sits within the Biological Sciences Panel, or whose work is interdisciplinary across the subject areas of different panels) should use the Field of Research to indicate that they also work in another discipline; they

should also identify the relevant ERE(s). Panel Co-Chairs will use information entered in this field to help with assigning the EP to appropriate panel members and making decisions about cross-referrals. It is important that staff members include sufficient information in their EP to enable the panel Co-Chairs to determine whether an EP should be cross-referred to another panel.

Note: Both the Medicine Panel and the Biological Sciences Panel recognise the importance of the following disciplines: physiology, pathology, immunology, pharmacology, biochemistry, molecular biology, genetics, cell biology, microbiology, neuroscience, developmental biology, and bioinformatics.

Staff members should note that the former Medicine and Public Health panel has now been split into two panels, the Medicine Panel and the Public Health Panel. Please refer to the panel-specific guidelines of each for an understanding of the subject area coverage of each panel.

EPs with research outputs that are being used primarily in medical science and clinical practice will be assessed by the Medicine panel, while those focused on public health and health interventions should go to the Public Health Panel.

EPs with a science/biology education focus should be submitted to the Education Panel. EPs in veterinary studies and large-animal science should be submitted to the Health Panel. EPs with a farm management focus may go either to the Business and Economics Panel or the Biological Sciences panel, depending on the EP content and the match between the majority of EREs and relevant panel subject areas. The panel Co-Chairs will confer on those EPs where the primary focus of the research outputs is unclear.

- › Specific advice about requesting cross-referral of an EP to the Mātauranga Māori or Pacific Research panel can be found in the TEO Guidelines.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

The BIOS Panel consider the TEO Guidelines sufficient and has no further elaborations upon the new PBRF Definitions of Research, research excellence, or impact. The Mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research Panel-specific guidelines include elaborations of the articulation of mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research which apply across all panels. Researchers should refer to those elaborations in order to determine whether a cross-referral request to either the Mātauranga Māori or Pacific Research panels should be made.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research, professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce,

- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., Mātauranga Māori and Western approaches, either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels,
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period,
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

The BIOS Panel considers the TEO Guidelines on the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary sufficient and has no specific further guidance.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional Research Outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

An assessment of the scientific importance and quality of the work will be the overriding criterion for assessing an ERE. The narrative should clearly address this criterion, for example, by explaining how the ERE Output addresses one or more scientific questions and/or makes an impact on the scientific discipline.

The panel would like to see information added to each ERE that helps with the assessment of research excellence such as citations, journal impact factors, altmetrics, and any evidence of use of new discoveries, technologies, and methods by peers. Such information can be summarised in the Contextual Narrative and/or submitted within EREs as Supplementary Items. However, the panel emphasises that while such information may provide helpful context, ERE quality and significance will be determined through an examination of the ERE Output itself.

For those EREs based on journal articles, information on the journal's quality, such as the relative ranking of a journal in its subfield, may offer useful contextual details. If such a ranking is quoted, the source used for such a ranking should be made explicit. The panel will be aware that raw impact factors and other bibliometric measures can vary significantly between subject areas and so such numbers need to be put in context.

Evidence of the impact of an ERE should be provided; for example, favourable citation of the ERE Output or the uptake of the research results by end-users (noting that examples of impact outside academia may also be included in the ERE as Supplementary items). Staff members completing EPs may wish to quote the number of citations the work has received. If so, the number should be put in context and the source used for this number should be made explicit. This number may be checked by the panel. In assessing the impact of an ERE, the panel will only use information submitted in the EP.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book

- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

It is expected that most ERE Outputs in the Biological Sciences panel will come in the form of peer-reviewed publications, book chapters, and books, including published peer-reviewed technical reports and conference presentations.

All ERE Outputs included in EPs must be consistent with the PBRF Definition of Research, as set out in the TEO Guidelines, and should be accompanied by evidence of quality assurance.

Guidance on expected Quality Assurance

Quality assurance for this panel normally means that a research output has been peer reviewed. Please see the TEO Guidelines for further guidance on other forms of quality assurance.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

For ERE Outputs with more than one author, an indication of what is implied by the position of the staff member in the list of authors should be given, because different subject areas and journals have different conventions.

For multi-authored papers where listing all authors would exhaust the character limit, staff members should note at least the first three author names and indicate their own position in the author list, for example, third in 20 authors, or seventh in 35 authors.

Individual researcher contribution

The BIOS Panel emphasises the importance of jointly authored papers and recognises that joint research is likely to be the norm. For jointly authored papers it is expected that each staff member provides a clear description explaining their substantial and distinctive contribution as an author on each ERE Output. Qualitative descriptions are useful in addition to more quantitative measures, such as percentage contributions, to give the panel information to assess an individual's contribution to a research output. Some journals require co-authored articles to include a statement on the relative contribution of each author. These statements can be used in the Individual Contribution field if available.

Description

When a book is submitted as an ERE Output, it will be important to identify the contribution to original research in the Description field.

Except for standard refereed journal publications, EPs should be explicit about the peer-review process used, providing sufficient detail to assure the panel that the process results in a quality-assured ERE Output. In-house reviewing processes would not normally be considered to provide quality assurance. Note that outputs which are not quality-assured may be subject to more scrutiny by the panel.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

Where three EREs have been submitted in an EP, the Biological Sciences panel will examine a minimum of two out of three of the ERE Outputs. Where two or fewer have been submitted, all ERE Outputs will be examined.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026, Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OEREs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

The BIOS Panel considers the TEO Guidelines on Research Activities sufficient and has no specific guidance to add. For more details about the description of each of these activity types, please refer to pages 147 - 150 of the [draft TEO Guidelines](#).

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, iwi, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, or other networks

- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing the research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.

The panel advises that where staff members submit items under the Facilitating, Networking and Collaboration type, evidence should be provided about the role of the researcher in groups, and what outcomes were achieved during the time of involvement (capability development, increase in research esteem, or evidence for contributions to a research discipline).

For a detailed description of the six CRE types please see pages 151- 155 in the [draft TEO Guidelines](#).

Business and Economics

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in:

- › Accounting and finance
- › Economics
- › Management, human resources, industrial relations, international business and other business
- › Marketing and tourism.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (EREs) and Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Business and Economics (BEC) panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

The panellists recognise the cross-disciplinary nature of business and economics research and expect that EPs could cross traditional disciplinary boundaries. The membership of peer review panels is designed to enable panels to assess the quality of research in most areas, including those that have a professional or applied outcome.

Accounting and finance

Accounting includes, but is not limited to: accountability, accounting information systems, auditing, financial accounting, governance, management accounting, sustainability accounting, and taxation.

Finance includes, but is not limited to: asset pricing, banking, capital markets corporate finance, derivatives, fintech, personal finance, risk management, sustainable finance, and insurance.

Economics

Economics includes, but is not limited to: econometrics; theoretical and applied micro- and macro-economics. Sub-fields include, but are not limited to: labour economics; development economics, urban economics, health economics, monetary economics, economic growth, policy analysis and evaluation, political economy, agricultural economics, economic history, history of economic thought, industrial organisation, international trade, and public economics.

Management, human resources, industrial relations, international business and other business

Management includes, but is not limited to: management/organisational communication; critical management studies; employment relations; human resource management; management science, including operational research, operations and services management; decision sciences; knowledge management; organisation studies including organisational behaviour and organisation theory, public sector management, risk management, small business management and strategic management; leadership; Māori and Indigenous business, Māori management; business development; business ethics; business history; corporate governance; innovation and entrepreneurship; international business and cross-cultural business studies; property studies; business and society; sustainability; and sustainable management.

Marketing and tourism

Marketing includes, but is not limited to: marketing management; marketing strategy; consumer behaviour; social marketing; marketing science; marketing theory; international marketing; marketing communications; services marketing; retailing; marketing education; consumer culture theory; and social marketing.

Tourism includes, but is not limited to: tourism management; tourism marketing; tourism system; tourism policy and planning; tourism development; sustainable tourism; tourist behaviour; tourism studies; critical tourism; cultural tourism; food tourism; ecotourism; tourism and hospitality education; tourism and hospitality innovation and entrepreneurship; hospitality management; event management; hospitality studies; critical hospitality.

Cross-referrals

The BEC Panel anticipates receiving interdisciplinary EPs that cross the boundaries with other panels, for example a business and economics subject area and:

- › health economics, health services research or public health (Medicine, Health, and Public Health Panels)
- › psychology (Social Sciences and Other Cultural/ Social Sciences Panel)
- › business education (Education Panel)
- › history (Humanities and Law Panel).

When significant material in the EP falls within the subject areas covered by another panel, Panel Co-Chairs may request to cross-refer EPs to one or more panels. Cross-referral may also occur when it is appropriate to supplement panel members' expertise. Cross-referrals may arise in relation to nearly all other panels. Examples include:

- › an EP with a communications focus may be cross-referred to the Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences Panel
- › an EP with a farm management focus may be cross-referred to the Biological Sciences panel
- › EPs focussing on taxation may be cross-referred to the Humanities and Law Panel
- › an EP with a strong kaupapa Māori approach and/or focusing on mātauranga Māori may be cross-referred to the Mātauranga Māori Panel.

These are just examples, and other combinations are also likely to occur.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

The BEC Panel considers the TEO Guidelines sufficient and has no further elaborations upon the new PBRF Definitions of Research, research excellence, or impact. The Mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research Panel-specific guidelines include elaborations of the articulation of mātauranga Māori and

Pacific Research which apply across all panels. Staff members should refer to those elaborations in order to determine whether a cross-referral request to either the Mātauranga Māori or Pacific Research panels should be made.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP, and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., Mātauranga Māori and Western approaches, either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

The BEC Panel considers the TEO Guidelines on the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary sufficient and has no specific further guidance.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

For more details about the new design of EPs, please refer to the TEO Guidelines.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

It would be useful to detail the reason(s) for choice of ERE Output and any associated Supplementary Items. The narrative should also explain the relationship between the ERE Output and any Supplementary Items.

Additional information that can provide further context includes any prizes/awards or external funding associated with the ERE Output, as well as any relevant evidence of impact, even where such activities are included in the ERE as Supplementary Items. This includes information on quality indicators that signal relative ranking/reputation of each research output/research activity.

Examples of such indicators for research outputs include, but are not limited to, the ABDC journal ranking; Clarivate journal impact factor and the Scimago journal quartile. Note that such information may offer useful contextual details, but the primary assessment of quality will occur through scrutiny of the ERE Output itself.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution – Other
- › Conference Contribution – Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

For more details about the description of each of these output types, please refer to pages 135 – 146 in the [draft TEO Guidelines](#).

The majority of research outputs submitted to the BEC Panel are likely to be quality assured. Typical research outputs would include journal articles, research reports, research books, book chapters, conference contributions and discussion and working papers. Textbooks and consulting reports are acceptable types of research outputs, provided they meet the PBRF Definition of Research. EPs presenting non-standard research outputs should make clear how the work meets the PBRF Definition of Research using the ERE Output Description field.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026 Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity

- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

For more details about the description of each of these activity types, please refer to pages 147 – 150 in the [draft TEO Guidelines](#).

In terms of research funding and support, information on the type of funding and the researcher's role is useful context to include, such as whether principal or associate investigator; whether internally or externally funded (and if the latter, who the commissioning body was).

In general, with respect to all forms of research activities, it will be helpful to include in the Description field any contextual information which details the esteem associated with said activity.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types. They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Granted patents.

EPs need to clearly explain the nature and extent of quality assurance for research output types where quality assurance may vary significantly and/or is unlikely to be common knowledge, for example, book chapters, conference contributions and reports. This information should be included in the Description field for the ERE Output.

In the case of a higher-degree thesis, additional information on the quality of the output could include comments provided by examiners in their reports.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

Business and economics research is frequently a collaborative activity such that outputs will often have multiple authors. There are differing conventions for author listings in different disciplines/research outlets, such as alphabetical ordering, and the Panel will find it helpful to know the convention for co-authored outputs

Individual contribution

In Business and Economics for many research outputs the contribution is likely to be broadly equal between co-authors. In these cases it is sufficient to state that contributions were equal. However, explanations of the actual and specific contribution made by the author should be provided if they differ from broadly equivalent. Examples of when this would be appropriate include large multi-authored papers (i.e. more than five or six co-authors) or work stemming from a doctoral thesis or cases where data was produced by a non-author. In such cases, the author can use relative contribution frameworks that are suggested by some journals.

Description

Where a thesis is submitted as an ERE Output and the thesis is in partial fulfilment of a higher degree that includes coursework, the proportion of the qualification attributed to original research should be identified. For example, if a Master's thesis is 90 credits rather than 120 credits, this information should be provided.

Where the ERE Output has been through a non-standard quality assurance process, details should be given in this field.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

Where three EREs have been submitted in an EP the panel will examine a minimum of two out of three of the ERE Outputs. Where two or fewer EREs have been submitted the panel will examine all EREs.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce.

The BEC Panel considers the TEO Guidelines on the CRE component sufficient and has no specific further guidance. Please refer to pages 151 -155 of the [draft TEO Guidelines](#) for detailed descriptions of the six CRE types.

Creative and Performing Arts

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in:

- › Design
- › Music, Literary Arts and Other Arts
- › Theatre, Dance, Film, Television and Multimedia
- › Visual Arts and Craft.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and the Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Creative and Performing Arts (CPA) Panel welcomes EPs that present original research produced by practitioners who are independently or collaboratively engaged in the creation or performance of artistic works in the subject areas of design; music; literary and other arts; theatre; dance; film, television and multimedia; visual arts and crafts.

The panel expects to evaluate EPs containing creative work that embodies original research. The research element may include creative practice; performance; analytical, applied, ethnographical, historical, interdisciplinary, pedagogical, scientific, technological and/or theoretical approaches; and advancements in designs, policies and processes across the creative and performing arts.

The Panel will consider EPs from a wide range of disciplines. Accordingly, membership of the CPA Panel will enable the panel to evaluate the quality of research taking place across the breadth of its constituent subjects and types and modes of investigation, including research based on traditional and contemporary Māori and Pacific world views created for and shared in culturally specific contexts.

The panel seeks to recognise quality research wherever it lies and acknowledges that the outcomes of creative arts research may enter the public domain in a range of traditional, experimental and commercial contexts. Examples include, and are not limited to, public or private galleries; museums; the Internet; marae; theatres and concert halls; print media; private, alternative or virtual spaces; as well as a broad range of public, social and culturally specific contexts.

The panel will adopt assessment processes that enable it to recognise, and treat on an equal footing, excellence in research across the broadest spectrum of applied, practice-led, discovery and strategic research, wherever that research is conducted and disseminated. The panel seeks to identify

excellence in different forms of research endeavour, including interdisciplinary and collaborative research.

The panel asks all staff members to attend to the preceding paragraphs, note the inclusive intention of the review process and the requirement for all staff members to clearly articulate their platform of research and the research imperative underpinning each ERE regardless of the type of work it is.

The CPA Panel will assess EPs that present research in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are high-level and intended to be inclusive.

Design

Design includes all forms of design in the widest sense, including advertising, illustration and marketing, and including design history, theory, criticism, and pedagogy.

Music, literary arts and other arts

Music includes both performance and composition in the widest sense, as well as music history, theory, criticism and pedagogy. Literary arts include all forms of creative fiction and non-fiction, drama, poetry and prose, as well as literary history, theory, criticism and pedagogy. Non-visual arts include all forms of sonic, text, web-based, live, performance or other artistic practices, as well as their history, theory, criticism and pedagogy.

Theatre, dance, film, television and multimedia

Theatre and dance include development/choreography and performance in the widest sense, as well as history, theory, criticism and pedagogy. Film, television, and multimedia include development/writing, performance, recording, production and distribution in the widest sense, as well as history, theory, criticism and pedagogy.

Visual arts and crafts

Visual arts and crafts include all visual art and craft forms and practices in the widest sense, including visual art/craft history, theory, criticism and pedagogy.

Cross-referrals

The panel expects to review EPs that include publications in the domains of creative and performing arts history, theory, criticism and pedagogy. EPs that contain outputs in any of these areas will be examined to determine if cross-referral to another panel is appropriate – for example, Humanities and Law; Education; and Engineering, Technology and Architecture.

The panel expects to receive cross-referrals primarily from the Humanities and Law, Engineering, Technology and Architecture, Mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research Panels.

New and emerging researchers

In Aotearoa New Zealand, the terminal research degree in the creative and performing arts is normally a Master's degree. More recently, the practice-based PhD and other doctorates have been added to the suite of research degrees for creative and performing arts. They are not, however, the terminal norm for most postgraduate students. Because the customary degrees required for employment in a tertiary education organisation in Aotearoa New Zealand include the MFA, MDes, MMVA, Dmus, DMA and, more recently, the DocFA and PhD, a new and emerging researcher in the creative and performing arts may submit the outcomes of any of the above or other relevant research degrees as valid research outputs.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

Elaboration of the PBRF Definition of Research

The CPA Panel will adopt an inclusive interpretation of the PBRF Definition of Research regarding all domains of creative and performing arts practice, including practices traditionally viewed as professional practice. The PBRF Definition of Research specifically includes the experimental development of design or construction solutions, applications, software, new programming languages and new operating systems – all of which may well take place within the context of consultancy or professional practice. The panel thus recognises that research processes may be embedded in professional design activity and that commissioned design research can involve the reinterpretation of existing knowledge for the aesthetic refinement of existing products, services or communications.

The outcome of a commercial design commission is considered research where there is evidence of a research enquiry underpinning it and, as the PBRF Definition of Research states, the research process involves the use of existing knowledge to produce new or substantially new or substantially enhanced creative outputs, materials, products, designs, policies, and granted patents. The same requirement to evidence the validity of the research applies to some art commissioning processes where the client sets the brief. In each such case, the panel will be looking to find evidence of the research processes and the research content that distinguishes it as research, in accordance with the PBRF Definition of Research.

The CPA Panel recognises that researchers in many of the subject areas under review will be extending and testing the boundaries of research, forms of publication and the conventions of dissemination in their field. Consistent with the TEO Guidelines, the panel will not advantage or disadvantage any type of research or form of output, whether it is in physical or virtual, textual, or non-textual, visual or sonic, static or dynamic, digital or analogue form.

Elaboration of the definition of impact

Because of the practice-based nature of much creative and performing arts research, the panel anticipates receiving EPs showcasing impacts on artistic practice and cultural life. However, the potential impact of creative and performing arts research also includes social, wellbeing, economic, and policy benefits for individuals and communities, and the panel welcomes EPs which evidence such impacts. The list below is intended to provide some examples. They are indicative only, because, in practice, much of the effect will cross boundaries or go beyond them:

- › Increased public understanding of and engagement with the arts
- › The role of creative practice in increasing public understandings of social, political, or economic issues
- › Increased community access to and enrichment of cultural experiences and the arts and associated wellbeing and social benefits
- › Contributions to processes of commemoration, memorialisation, reconciliation and cultural development
- › The impact of customary Māori art forms on the recovery and advancement of Māori knowledge and development
- › The impact of creative and performing arts on the profile of Aotearoa New Zealand culture internationally
- › Contributions to innovation and entrepreneurial activity through the design and delivery of new products and services

- › Economic benefits to communities, organisations, local areas, or regions through events, exhibitions, performances or installations
- › Contributions to national economic prosperity via the creative sector, including publishing, music, theatre, museums and galleries, film and television, fashion, tourism and computer games
- › The role of design in improving services, practices and policies of organisations.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary enables staff members to provide an overview of how their work across the period of the assessment reveals a critical and cohesive domain of inquiry and how it contributes to the relevant contexts, discourses, and wider cultural domains of the creative and performing arts. It is also the place to describe how the body of work may have challenged or advanced modes of practice and contexts of dissemination or challenged methodologies or theories in historical and theoretical scholarship. Staff members may also use this section to highlight relevant research activities and contributions to the research environment where these have not been submitted in the EP as either Supplementary Items, OERs, or CREs.

This section also provides the staff member with an opportunity to include information about their specific research context that may be relevant to the assessment.

The panel will disregard self-evaluative commentary on the perceived quality of the EREs and CREs, except where evidence that clearly supports the perceived quality of the research outputs and contributions is supplied.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs and must relate to the ERE Output. For example, if an artwork is an ERE Output, an invitation to exhibit that artwork in a public gallery that attracts funding support and includes an artist's talk are Research Activities that may be used as Supplementary Items. If the exhibition is shown at other venues, either as a travelling exhibition, or through curatorial inclusion of components in group or solo exhibitions the reiteration is an example of a presentation, sharing and dissemination Research Activity, as is the accessioning of the works for public collections. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

In addition, the ERE component may include up to eight standalone Other Examples of Research Excellence (OERs) which may be either Research Activities OR research outputs. Any OERs do not need to be related to the EREs or to each other.

All EREs and OERs require a detailed and accurate bibliographic description of the work, regardless of the type of work, medium or the context. Panel members will need to know the broad discipline a work belongs to, as well as the relevant details of each output and its publication context. For example, an artwork that has a social dimension might be described as live art or social sculpture and it would need a clear description of the event, the context, the participatory processes, the participants and any other information needed by panel members to recognise and understand the type, scope, scale, location, publication context and other inherent qualities of the work. This is

expected as an objective description no different from that required for a craftwork where the emphasis might be on medium, materials and scale.

Research Activities demonstrating impact must have occurred within the assessment period to be eligible, but the underpinning research output does not have to have been published within the assessment period (as in Quality Evaluation 2018). Impacts which were first claimed in a previous Quality Evaluation are not eligible for submission in Quality Evaluation 2026.

Guidance on completing the contextualising narrative

Each contextual narrative should accurately describe the work and elucidate the nature of the enquiry and the research processes involved, as well as provide the evidence necessary for panel members to assess its quality. Evidence of any relevant external peer-review processes should be provided.

The panel will find the following kinds of information useful in understanding the reach, significance and rigour of the research presented in the ERE, noting that some may also be included in the ERE as a Supplementary Item. The panel expects the contextual narrative will also articulate the relationship between the ERE Output and any Supplementary Items included in the ERE.

- › Overview of the research enquiry, the research processes and the research context.
- › New insights or new discourses embodied in the work/s presented in the ERE.
- › Recognition through inclusion in collections, programmes or festivals, numbers of repeat exhibitions or performances, number of reprints, and other evidence that can contextualise the assessment of its quality (may also be included as a Supplementary Item).
- › Research recognition, prizes and awards (may also be included as a Supplementary Item)
- › The funding sources gained to undertake the research, including formal and informal, institutional contributions, external funding and external in-kind support (may also be included as a Supplementary Item).
- › Summary of any social, cultural, or economic impacts of the research (Uptake and Impact activities may also be included as a Supplementary Item).

The ERE contextual narrative should only include evidence that is relevant to the ERE Output and any supplementary items. Not all of the examples listed above or in the TEO Guidelines need to be included. For example, impact is more relevant to some disciplines than others.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution – Other
- › Conference Contribution – Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation

- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

Research outputs in the creative and performing arts include publications such as scholarly books, reviews, articles and contributions to exhibition catalogues, as well as other nationally and internationally published outputs and presentations that offer new, recovered, reinterpreted, re-centred or revitalised knowledge.

Edited volumes, including compilations of historical material or critical readings or anthologies, will be considered by the panel as research where there is a clear contribution to and advancement of the intellectual underpinning of different ontologies and epistemologies, and where in selecting, commenting on, and analysing the material included the volume moves beyond the synthesis of existing research to embody novel insights.

In the case of festival or exhibition curation, the panel seeks to distinguish between creative, research-led curatorial work and organisational or facilitation activities although both may result in exhibitions and other kinds of creative works. The panel requires evidence of research enquiry underpinning all curatorial or festival programming activities including the recentring and revitalisation of knowledge, and the synthesis and analysis of existing works to the extent that the insights generated are new. This can be expressed in the ERE narrative and evidenced in digital documentation of catalogues, catalogue essays or programme introductions, published in print form or online and available to the panel for review.

Creative works or historical or theoretical scholarship that embody research may include, but are not limited to, those types of research in the subject area described in the Description of Panel Coverage section above. The CPA Panel will expect to receive a range of outputs that might be presented to other panels, and all research outputs appropriate to and recognised by the discipline will be considered.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

Quality assurance norms will vary considerably across the CPA panel's subject areas. Staff members should use the ERE Output Description field to provide the panel with sufficient information to understand what quality assurance processes the output has been subject to.

Guidance on output eligibility

For the purposes of the PBRF, the publication date of a creative work is the date that it first enters the public domain. The emphasis here is on availability: the work must have been shared with audiences.

Creative works completed during the assessment period but not yet available in published form to audiences and reviewers are not considered valid publications. For example, the manuscript of a novel, a screenplay or a theatre play that has an agent but has not been published or produced are not valid outputs. Screenplays or theatre plays must have been produced or presented publicly in some form during the assessment period to be considered valid research outputs. Completed orchestral, operatic, chamber or any other musical works not yet published or performed in public are not valid publications and works of art that might have been made in advance of being exhibited are only eligible for inclusion as research outputs once they have been exhibited or otherwise made available in appropriate public contexts.

There will be occasions where whaikōrero as oratory within a marae context, and especially during tangihanga, cannot be recorded because local tikanga may prohibit the use of audio or video recording devices. In such cases, other forms of evidence will be required to substantiate the research, such as transcription, commentary, or attestation from kaumātua or peers who were present during the oral presentation.

In the case of creative works that may be performed or exhibited over a number of iterations and in different types of venues, the researcher can choose which instance of the output to nominate. This need not necessarily be the first, but the first public presentation of the work must be within the assessment period. Presentation in other venues can be included as Supplementary Items to provide additional evidence of its reach. If there is evidence of significant new content or refinement of a work made during the assessment period, it can be submitted as another research output although staff members are advised to consider such cases carefully in order to avoid duplication.

Standard citation methods are expected for text-based research outputs, such as books, journal articles, book chapters and papers published in conference proceedings.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

Where outputs are co-authored/co-produced the panel will expect to see an ordering of contributors in accordance with the conventions of each discipline. The roles of each contributor must be clarified in the Individual Contribution field of the ERE Output section.

If two or more researchers claim the same output as an ERE, the panel recommends that the staff members confer to ensure the contribution statements align.

Individual contribution

In the case of co-authored, co-produced or collaborative works, the panel will assess the quality of the work regardless of the number of contributors. In this section of the EP, a brief outline of the staff member's substantial and distinctive contribution to the research process needs to be provided, as well as a description of the distinctive contributions of each of the other co-authors, co-producers, or collaborators. If it is an interdisciplinary project, it is important to distinguish the nature of each researcher's discipline-specific research contribution and how it underpins the collaboration.

Once the panel has determined that there has been a substantial individual contribution to the output, it will assess the quality of the output as a whole, taking no further regard of each individual collaborator's contribution. If the panel members are not clear about the individual contributions of each of the researchers to the research process and the research output, they may raise an audit query.

If an artwork is a contribution to a festival, a curated programme of performances or a curated exhibition, a note about the specific contribution of the research output to the larger research context is relevant.

Description

This field should be used to provide information about any quality assurance processes the output has been through. Where it is not immediately clear, staff members may also wish to explain how the output meets the PBRF Definition of Research.

Minimum evidence requirements for ERE Outputs

The standard of evidence supplied to the panels is expected to be high. Many outputs cannot be viewed in their original form, so the panel expects to see the highest quality reproductions of the work possible. We recognise that this is not ideal, because the research output may have been a live

performance, an event, or an exhibition. For that reason, however, high-quality still images of individual works and their installation, still and video recordings of temporal and site-based work, and quality sound recordings of performances or equivalent should be provided wherever possible for each ERE Output submitted.

The TEO Guidelines set out guidance and expectations for outputs where digital documentation is not possible, but the panel expects to be able to access the majority of ERE Outputs submitted for assessment in digital form. For consistency and equity, the panel recommends a digital portfolio in which the entire work itself (rather than proof of publication) is available to review. This might be presented in one well-crafted PDF document or an equivalent online repository. It must be easily accessible, and the panel expects to find high-quality reproductions of the work itself, documentation, and recordings of performances as well catalogue essays, programme notes, CD booklets, design drawings, musical scores and links to web-based presentations of the works as appropriate. Text-based outputs, including books, monographs, journal articles, conference proceedings and book chapters should also be accessible in electronic form.

Evidence of quality assurance can be submitted as supporting information. The panel expects documentation or a digital version of the entire work, not an excerpt from it.

Documentation of an artwork or exhibition would include images or video showing its scope, scale and complexity as well as high-quality reproductions of each work included. The panel will disregard any additional material, such as reviews that include evaluative commentary on the perceived quality of a research output.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

It is intended that the CPA Panel will examine all ERE Outputs in each EP.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026, Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

In addition to the guidance in the TEO Guidelines, the CPA panel notes the following:

Research funding and support

The panel is also interested in internal and external funding achieved during the assessment period and recognises that external funding for the arts is sometimes in the form of considerable in-kind logistical support. Independent verification and evidence of this will be considered.

Uptake and impact

The panel is interested in community and end-user engagement and impact that arises out of, and through high-quality research, where a genuine cultural, economic, societal or educational impact can be identified and evidenced. Staff members should refer to the elaboration on the PBRF

definition of impact above for more information on the forms of impact that may be particularly germane.

Claimed impact could be supported through activities and evidence such as:

- › statements from clients, commissioners, galleries, or end-users that independently verify the reach of the work and any social or cultural impacts
- › Visitor or audience numbers and feedback
- › Reference to policies, reports, guidelines or other documents that draw on the research
- › Public events, lectures, performances, presentations or exhibitions
- › Reviews, interviews, media and press engagement
- › Provision of expert advice to national and local government bodies, non-governmental organisations, charities and the private sector that influences policy and/or practice
- › Ticket sales, product or service sales, or other evidence of economic impact.

The panel recognises the limits to measuring and reporting on impact over such a short timeframe and will consider evidence of the impact of research produced before the assessment period where it is clearly relevant to the platform of research of the staff member and the impact occurs within the period of the assessment.

All sources to verify claims of impact need to be described in the Description field for Research Activities. It is up to the staff member to demonstrate the independence of any source of evidence and its authenticity.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The CRE component is the place to showcase disciplinary leadership within and beyond the TEO and to highlight contributions to the creative and performing arts sector, and the historical and/or theoretical analysis of artistic works, at local, regional, national, and international levels. The CPA Panel will consider a broad range of research contributions across the full breadth of subject areas.

CREs must align with one of the following six types:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce.

The CRE component must contain a minimum of one and a maximum of ten items clustered by type (except for New and Emerging researchers). Each item will comprise a brief description containing sufficient information to enable audit.

Types of evidence will vary across disciplines and art forms and have different discipline emphases.

When providing information about contributions to the postgraduate environment, the panel recommends providing the following information, where applicable:

- › Numbers of completions in the period by type of degree
- › Level of supervision (for example, co-supervision, first or second supervisor)
- › Exhibitions, performances or publications by students you have supervised
- › Awards, residencies or prizes awarded to postgraduate students you have supervised
- › Co-exhibition, co-performance or co-publication with postgraduate students
- › Involvement of postgraduate students in conferences, symposia or public I as co-organisers or participants
- › Research assistantships or scholarships achieved for postgraduate students
- › Other research opportunities created for postgraduate students.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the CRE component

The CPA Panel recognises there are world-class venues and publication contexts within Aotearoa New Zealand and that research generated for local and regional Aotearoa New Zealand, Māori and Pacific contexts may rank with the best of its kind in the world.

Education

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in the subject area of Education.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain Mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Education (EDU) Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

Adult education; alternative education; arts in education; assessment; applied professional ethics, behaviour management; bilingual education; bicultural education, child development; community education; comparative education; continuing education; critical pedagogy; curriculum studies including studies in any subject areas taught in initial teacher education and Aotearoa New Zealand schools; disability and inclusion studies; distance education; early childhood education; economics of education; educational counselling and guidance; educational evaluation; everyday learning; educational leadership and management; educational linguistics; educational methodologies; educational politics and policy; educational psychology; educational research methods/design/data analysis; educational technology; e-learning; environmental education; gender and education; gifted education; health and physical education; history of education; ICT in education; inclusive education; kaupapa Māori education; learning, informal learning, language and literacy education; Māori and Indigenous Education; mātauranga Māori education; multicultural education; Pacific education; parent education; philosophy of education; primary education; professional learning and development; secondary education; sexuality education; sociology of education; special education and exceptionality; sport and coaching education; teacher education; teaching and learning; teaching English as a second language; tertiary and higher education; and other areas of educational research.

Cross referrals

It is expected that most cross-referrals between the EDU Panel and other panels will be with: Creative and Performing Arts; Health; Humanities and Law; Mātauranga Māori; Pacific Research; Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences.

It is important that staff include sufficient information in their EP to enable the Panel Co-Chairs to determine whether an EP should be cross-referred to another panel. Just as an EP should be submitted to the EDU Panel where education is the major focus of the work, it will generally be more appropriate for an EP with a different subject area as the main focus to be submitted to that subject specific panel unless education-related research is the major focus of the EP. For example, an EP with a focus on Human Development or Social Psychology submitted for review by the Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences Panel (which includes the discipline of Psychology) could potentially be cross-referred to the EDU Panel where evidence of at least one ERE related to

education has been documented in the EP and the Field of Research signals an education focus for some work.

Where an EP has a focus on the creative and performing arts such as art, drama, dance, etc., and/or a curriculum subject area such as English, social science, science, mathematics, physical education etc., but where the context is primarily education/teacher education, the following guide should apply:

- › If the Examples of Research Excellence (EREs) are primarily concerned with the pedagogy of education in relation to the particular curriculum area, even in the context of an exhibition or a performance, the EP should be assessed by the EDU Panel and the Co-Chairs will determine whether a cross-referral to another relevant subject specific panel is warranted based on the evidence provided.

As noted above, TEOs and staff members working in areas of Mātauranga Māori or Pacific education research submitting their EPs to the EDU Panel may request cross-referrals to either the Mātauranga Māori or the Pacific Research Panel. The TEO Guidelines contain further information on how to make a cross-referral request to either panel.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

A revised PBRF Definition of Research has been agreed for Quality Evaluation 2026. The EDU Panel offers the following elaboration:

In education, some research may emphasise an applied focus on informing professional practice within and across education and related sectors, and educational systems in Aotearoa New Zealand and/or in international arenas. Such work is entirely appropriate, but staff members should ensure the research meets the PBRF Definition of Research, and that they have articulated its scholarly significance and how it has been quality-assured.

A report of classroom practice would not be counted as research unless the output is analytical, carried out systematically and set in the context of other research. An example would be a research-led, systematic investigation into professional practice (for example, using action research or design-based implementation research). This could possibly also include evidence of impact on educational, school, classroom and home practices with regards learning and education nationally and/or internationally.

In contrast, and not meeting the PBRF Definition of Research, would be, for example, a description of classroom activities or an initiative where there is no evidence of a systematic research approach or critical analysis. Preparation or revision of curriculum documents is not normally regarded as research, but an investigation of the intellectual processes involved in their development and the consultation of other research literature may be counted as research.

Preparation or revision of a standard text—particularly one intended for teaching undergraduates not engaged in research—lacking evidence of critical analysis and innovation, or explicit consideration of different ideas, is unlikely to meet the requirements of the PBRF Definition of Research. Preparation of a text—particularly one intended for use by postgraduate students engaged in research—that analyses and synthesises the latest information in the field, discusses controversies, guides student understandings in critical analyses, is underpinned by authoritative referencing, and which constitutes novel insights is likely to count as research.

Evidence of the quality of a research text prepared for postgraduate students may include information about adoption as recommended reading at postgraduate level in institutions of higher education in Aotearoa New Zealand and internationally. Preparation of a series of professional learning and development modules—particularly one intended for use by educators and specialists that analyses and synthesises the latest research in the field, discusses controversies, guides

individual's understandings in critical analyses, is underpinned by authoritative referencing, and which constitutes novel insights, is likely to count as research when it is evidenced.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary enables staff members to elaborate how their work across the assessment period forms a cohesive, critical, and original area of inquiry that contributes new knowledge and understandings in education. For applied areas of educational research in particular, this section should highlight how published work builds systematically on previous research, is guided by theory, and contributes to knowledge and understanding relevant to education in Aotearoa New Zealand but also internationally.

This can also be the place to showcase how research on policy and practice carried out within Aotearoa New Zealand schools and other education-related systems has been conducted to make original contributions to knowledge and understandings internationally. An example of this could be analysis of Māori education research in the context of developments in Indigenous education internationally.

Staff members may also wish to highlight educational roles or responsibilities undertaken in Aotearoa New Zealand and/or internationally that represent recognition of their contributions to scholarship, (noting that such activities can also be submitted as Contributions to the Research Environment). Such contributions do not need to be singular or disciplinarily bound—interdisciplinary work is also acknowledged and recognised. How such work contributes and/or links to a wider research platform should be made clear.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

The ERE contextual narrative should describe the significance of the ERE Output and discuss the nature of the research and the research processes involved, as well as the status of the publication/dissemination output.

The panel will find the following kinds of information useful in understanding the reach, significance and rigour of the research presented in the ERE. The panel expects the contextual narrative will also articulate the relationship between the ERE Output and any supplementary items included in the ERE:

- › Overview of the research topic, the research processes, the research context, and the publication/dissemination output, along with impact on the field (e.g. via subsequent citations)
- › New insights or new discourses embodied in the ERE Output and their links to Supplementary Items
- › Any funding sources gained to undertake the research, including formal and informal, institutional contributions, external funding, and external in-kind support

- › Impact on policy, strategy, or practice change as a result of the research.

The ERE contextual narrative should only discuss evidence that is relevant to the ERE output and any Supplementary Items. Not all of the examples listed above or in the TEO Guidelines need to be included, only those that are relevant.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

The EDU Panel considers the TEO Guidelines sufficient and has no further specific guidance to add. Please see pages 135 – 146 of the [draft TEO Guidelines](#) for detailed descriptions of the eligible output types.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

In the EDU panel, it is expected that most research outputs submitted will be quality-assured. Such quality assurance includes the usual formal review processes for journal articles, for example, and/or evidence of appropriate/robust quality assurance processes for other outputs. The quality assurance process in education will reflect the different ERE Output types and may also vary based on the funding source for the research. Evidence of quality assurance will include peer review for journals and conference papers, peer review and referee reviews of books, exhibitions, and so on, and other equivalent quality assurance processes. For journal articles, information about the rigour of the editorial review process and standing of members of the editorial board may provide needed information regarding quality assurance. Similarly, a commercial book publisher is likely to employ independent reviewers with internationally recognised expertise in the research area prior to publishing authored or edited books and collections.

Where research has been sponsored by external funding bodies, both internal expert and external peer review prior to publication of reports may provide evidence of quality assurance. For example, research funded by the Ministry of Education or other government bodies is likely to be subjected to an internal agency quality assurance process such as being reviewed independently by subject

experts within that agency. Quality assurance for funded research reports may be supported more strongly by information that the funding agency has contracted with nationally and/or internationally recognised experts from outside the agency to review work prior to its release and publication. Final published research reports will likely hold more weight than interim project reports that are less likely to have been subjected to a rigorous quality assurance process.

In summary, researchers are expected to explain in the Description field precisely how quality has been assured for each ERE Output. This is particularly important where a non-standard quality assurance process has been used, for example, in relation to a practice-based research output (e.g., a commissioned report) or creative research output (e.g., film, video, or exhibition).

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

Different areas of education differ considerably with respect to whether publications are sole-authored, co-authored, or reflect collaborative research conducted by a team of researchers. In certain areas of education, most research outputs are likely to be sole-authored, reflecting the nature of critical synthesis and analysis (e.g., philosophy of education). Additionally, some expectation regarding at least a proportion of sole authorships may be appropriate for all areas within education, particularly for senior scholars to reflect the researcher's original, theoretical, and/or critical independent contributions to knowledge and understanding in the field.

It is important to emphasise, however, that much research in education is likely to be co-authored by two or more scholars given that research in education is often collaborative, labour intensive, and involves multiple research sites and participants, thus requiring a collaborative team working together and sharing intellectual property. Where there are multiple authors on a research output, the order of authorship generally reflects conventional practice in the social sciences (rather than in the natural sciences), with the first author having primary intellectual responsibility for that output and co-authors reflected in descending order for contributions from second to last authorship.

There may be exceptions to this, however, so that someone publishing in a field adhering to conventional authorship ordering in the sciences (e.g., Health) may be the primary author as final author—signifying that the work was carried out in that person's laboratory. Where authorship order does not reflect a conventional social sciences approach, the researcher should provide an explanation for that ERE to enable the panel to judge authorship order appropriately. There may also be instances where supervisors publish with postgraduate students on some aspect of the thesis research, in which case the supervisor usually assumes second authorship.

Individual Contribution

For the EDU panel, it will be crucial that EREs include qualitative information regarding the specific research-related, intellectual contributions of each author on co-authored publications. Collaborative research requires diverse contributions throughout both the research and publication processes, so that there should be agreement across authors (and their EPs) regarding the nature of the different contributions each co-author has made to the final research output.

Each co-author should describe in narrative form (not as percentages) the specific contributions they have made to the research and/or publication process for that ERE Output. Where more than one co-author claims a particular ERE, panel assessors may check these contribution statements for alignment to ensure that scoring accurately reflects intellectual input into a research output.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the ERE component

In the EDU panel, an EP receiving an ERE component score of six or above would provide evidence that the EREs have made substantial, significant, and original contributions towards the

development of new knowledge, understandings, theoretical interpretations, and/or methodological advances in their field.

For EPs receiving ERE component scores of four or above, they must comprise research at an international or equivalent level of excellence along with evidence of commensurate impact on their field, policy and/or practice; postgraduate degree level training; and recognition by others.

Meeting the criteria for A and B Quality Categories does not specifically require publishing internationally but does require, in all instances, publishing at a level meeting international standards for an area (for example, research in teacher education, Pacific education, Māori education). Māori education research may be specific to Aotearoa New Zealand but can also be shown to have an impact on the Indigenous education research literature internationally; similarly, Pacific education research can also have an influence both within and outside Aotearoa New Zealand. Published research may be specific to Aotearoa New Zealand policy and/or practice but nevertheless have clear international reach and impact as well as reflect a high level of research by internationally recognised scholars.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

Where three EREs have been submitted in an EP the EDU Panel will examine a minimum of at least two of the ERE Outputs.

For EPs with one or two EREs, the panel will examine all the ERE Outputs submitted.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026, Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

The EDU Panel considers the TEO Guidelines sufficient and has no further specific guidance to add. Please see pages 147 – 150 of the [draft TEO Guidelines](#) for detailed descriptions of the eligible research activity types.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.

Types of Contributions to the Research Environment

Staff members need to ensure that the CREs listed in the EP relate specifically to their research activity and research publications, rather than relating to one's professional practice and/or teaching. This principle relates to each and every type of CRE and to all items submitted in an EP under one of the six CRE types. Thus, an award or other recognition for excellence in teaching should not be listed in the EP under the CRE component, just as leading the development of a degree programme in a particular area is not a research contribution.

A leadership role in a postgraduate programme with a research focus could be appropriate for inclusion, as might be a major role on an ethics review committee for the approval of research with human participants. Similarly, an invitation to take up a particular position or appointment must be clearly tied to one's research rather than for one's administrative or management expertise, regardless of how prestigious the recognition might be.

Staff members must make clear how each item included in the EP in this section is indeed a CRE to ensure that items will not be confused with performance in another area (such as teaching) or standard professional practice.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the CRE component

In the EDU panel, EPs receiving CRE component scores of six and above would provide evidence that they have made substantial, significant, and sustained contributions resulting in enhanced capability for research in education that meets international standards of excellence. This requires evidence of consistent research leadership, mentoring for colleagues and students, leadership contributions to the development of the field nationally and/or internationally, and providing research leadership support towards growing research capacity in various educational contexts in Aotearoa New Zealand and New Zealand TEOs. For example, having major academic editorial responsibility for an international journal or encyclopaedia would be considered as a piece of evidence.

EPs receiving a score of six or more in this component would normally be expected to demonstrate a strong record in supervising doctoral and post-doctoral students to completion with evidence that graduates have gone on to become productive researchers and educational leaders. Staff members whose EPs receive a score of four or five would normally be expected to have successfully supervised a number of postgraduate research thesis students to completion. Even if there may be institutional or sub-discipline contextual constraints on opportunities to engage in postgraduate supervision, staff members at both A and B Quality Category levels can be expected to be involved in mentoring New and Emerging Researchers and less senior colleagues towards enhancing their overall research profile.

EPs that receive a component score of two or three also require some evidence of CRE items that evidence activity towards enhancing capability in educational research. Staff members who are not New and Emerging Researchers will be expected to show appropriate and growing CRE items such as involvement in reviewing for scholarly journals or postgraduate supervision (at the masters and sometimes doctoral levels) during the assessment period. In all cases, a C Quality Category requires CRE items beyond expected membership on research or postgraduate education-related committees regardless of the quantity of entries.

Engineering, Technology and Architecture

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in:

- › Architecture, design, planning and surveying
- › Engineering and technology.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where these panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This

elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Engineering, Technology and Architecture (ETA) Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

The specialisations listed for one area may also be relevant for other areas. All areas can include pedagogic research and research with Māori, Pacific and/or other indigenous perspectives.

Architecture, design, planning and surveying

This subject area includes but is not limited to:

Architecture including design; history/theory/criticism; professional practice; urban design; construction management and technologies; digital design; structures and materials; manufacturing processes; ecology; communication; exhibition; and social, cultural, economic and human factors.

Architectural Engineering including building design and analysis; energy efficiency and sustainability; building information modelling (BIM); façade (impact on energy efficiency and building performance); carbon zero design and methodologies; building performance analysis; indoor environmental quality; building automation and control systems; green building design and certification; life cycle assessment; sustainable materials and construction methods; water and waste management in construction building envelope design; energy-efficient HVAC and building systems.

Urban and regional planning and Design including history/theory/criticism; professional practice; sustainability; ecology; urban design and morphology; urban development and regeneration, transportation planning and mobility, land use planning and zoning, smart cities and urban technologies, governance; and social, cultural, economic and human factors.

Interior architecture/design including spatial and furniture design; history/theory/criticism; professional practice; exhibition; performance; construction management and technologies; structures and materials; manufacturing processes; sustainability; communication; social, cultural and human factors; and facilities management.

Industrial/product design including design; history/theory/criticism; professional practice; manufacturing processes; interactive design; sustainability; communication; and social, cultural, economic and human factors.

Landscape architecture including design; history/theory/criticism; professional practice; construction technologies; structures and materials; landscape planning and assessment; sustainability; ecology; communication; and social, cultural, economic and human factors.

Building economics and management including professional practice; construction management and technologies; structures and materials; sustainability; facilities management; and social, cultural, economic and human factors.

Building science including design and assessment; construction management and technologies; structures; manufacturing processing; sustainability; ecology; facilities management; and social, cultural, economic and human factors.

Surveying and geospatial science including terrestrial and aerial 2D and 3D imaging techniques and methodologies; terrestrial and aerial surveying and mapping; geographical information systems (GIS); remote sensing; geodetic and topographic surveying.

Engineering and technology

This subject area includes but is not limited to:

Chemical and process/materials engineering including biomedical; biochemical; bioengineering; biotechnology; chemical reaction; transport phenomena; food and bioprocessing; fibre and textile processing; fuel technology; energy processes; sustainable processing; petrochemical; mining; particle technology; nanotechnology; extractive metallurgy; thermo-physical processes; materials science and characterization; structural materials and composites; nanotechnology and advanced materials; corrosion prevention and control.

Civil engineering including construction technology; project management; fluid mechanics; hydraulics; hydrology; geotechnical; structural analysis and design; earthquake engineering; bridge and tunnel engineering; reinforced concrete and steel structures; traffic engineering and management; urban transportation planning, intelligent transportation systems; sustainable transport solutions; pavement; resource management; river and coastal; natural resources; forestry; fire; urban infrastructure; energy generation; and natural hazard mitigation.

Electrical and electronic engineering including communications (such as mobile, satellite, networks); electronic materials and devices; micro-electronics; electronic systems and circuits; optoelectronics and optical communications systems; multimedia; video and audio processing and coding; signal processing; radio frequency; microwave and millimetre wave techniques; sensors; mechatronics; robotics; biomedical; electrical power; machines and drives; computer engineering; power electronics; embedded systems; instrumentation; and microtechnology and nanotechnology.

Mechanical industrial and production engineering including acoustics; noise and vibration; aerodynamics and aeronautics; biomedical; energy conversion; automation; fluid power and fluidics; dynamics; engineering design; engineering management; hazards; heat transfer; industrial design; manufacturing; product design; production systems and optimization; manufacturing process design; supply chain management; quality control and six sigma; lean manufacturing and continuous improvement; solid mechanics; structural integrity; fatigue and failure analysis; thermodynamics and fluid mechanics.

Environmental engineering including water and wastewater management; air pollution control; environmental impact assessment; sustainable resource management; climate change adaptation; strategies; resilient infrastructure Design; risk assessment and management.

Humanitarian engineering including engineering for developing communities; disaster response and relief; accessibility and inclusive design; engineering ethics and social responsibility; resilient infrastructure; resilient communities.

Marine engineering including ship design and naval architecture; offshore structures and engineering; marine renewable energy; port and coastal Engineering; Sustainable coastal management.

Software engineering including software development methodologies; software development process management; software verification and validation; software architecture and design; software and application security; cybersecurity; applications of human centric computing, artificial intelligence and machine learning to the development of an engineering solution.

Energy and Renewable Technologies including solar energy systems; wind energy systems; hydroelectric power systems; geothermal; biomass and bioenergy; energy storage and grid integration.

Engineering science including mathematical modelling; computational methods; probability and statistics; continuum mechanics; optimisation; and theoretical fluid mechanics.

Technology including food technology; fibre and textile technology; production technology; product development; quality systems; logistics and supply chain technology; and agri-tech.

In all of the above areas, specialisations include ethics, safety, control and systems engineering.

Cross-referrals

Panel Co-Chairs can cross-refer EPs to one or more other panels. It is expected that most cross-referrals to this panel will come from the following panels: Biological Sciences; Creative and Performing Arts; Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology; and Physical Sciences. This panel expects cross-referrals from the Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology Panel for EPs with EREs and significant Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) items in the software engineering field if a focus of the research is embedded systems, computer hardware or software development that results in, or is part of, a product or artefact.

It is expected that most cross-referrals from this panel will be to the following panels: Business and Economics; Creative and Performing Arts; Education; Mātauranga Māori; Pacific Research; Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology; and Physical Sciences. This panel will consider cross-referral to the Creative and Performing Arts Panel for an EP with EREs and key CRE items in the industrial design field where there is a significant aesthetic, as well as a functional aspect, to the research. This panel will consider cross-referral to the Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology Panel for an EP with EREs and major research contribution items in the computer science field where the research focus is algorithmic development, programming languages, software interfacing and/or formal verification. This panel will consider cross-referral to the Education Panel for an EP with research outputs that focus predominantly on pedagogy rather than discipline-specific aspects of education.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

Research undertaken individually or collectively, leading to the definition or refinement of standards or performance criteria, is an accepted form of research. Research involving the discovery, development and novel application of analytical techniques is also accepted. Please refer to the Mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research panel-specific guidelines for an overview of the articulation of mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research. A guideline to the evaluation of mātauranga Māori in ETA portfolios is provided below.

Client-sponsored (industry) research, whether professional practice or consultancy, is recognised as an integral component of the engineering, technology and architectural disciplines. For these activities to be considered research, the original contribution needs to be documented, for example, establishing new methods, policy, guidelines, paradigms, benchmarks and/or standards that extend relevant bodies of knowledge. Rigorous and transparent evidence to show the activity meets these requirements must be supplied (for example, peer review in the form of publication by third parties, deliberate and planned assessment of the improvement developed, prizes, testimonials noting the assessor's status, relationship to the researcher and any conflicts of interest).

Where the client-sponsored research activity results in new designs (either conceptual designs or physical artefacts) or performance works, such outputs must be clearly identified as innovative contributions to an area of design or technology, including aesthetic innovation or refinement, with evidence given as to how they depart from established concepts and practice. The aspect of creativity and innovation should be demonstrated (for example, through publication by third parties, award of patents, prizes, published peer review or public exhibition of works, and/or the successful commercialisation of the design or technology). Routine production of designs following established concepts will not normally qualify.

There is a growing trend of using qualitative methodologies in engineering, technology and architecture research. Researchers increasingly employ mixed methodologies to understand and solve complex problems. EPs employing qualitative research practices should provide a robust contextualisation of such practice, clearly articulating the research question, theoretical framework, sampling strategies, data collection method and analytical techniques employed.

Protection of intellectual property developed in research, (e.g., via patents) is a form of research output and potentially an indication of impact which might be included in some ETA portfolios. Potential societal impact might result as companies holding patents are more likely to invest in R&D and increased R&D investment leads to the development of new technologies, products, and processes, which can drive economic growth and productivity gains. Patents can be considered integral to the startup/entrepreneurship ecosystem. However, the significant costs of patenting can be a limiting factor. The panel further acknowledges that the impact from patents might take some considerable time to eventuate. The inclusion of patents in a portfolio should be accompanied by a clear indication of the innovative contribution of the author and evidence to support any claims of actual or expected impact.

Developing databases of routine engineering, technology or architecture information and practices would not generally be acceptable as research without a demonstrable research component being involved in producing some particular innovative feature and peer review or other independent validation of quality (which should be clearly outlined in the Description field of the ERE Output).

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.

Assessing mātauranga Māori in the ETA panel

The following factors will be used to evaluate work submitted to Engineering, Technology and Architecture Panel which draws upon mātauranga Māori principles or methodologies. It is not anticipated that all work will meet all of these criteria. Here they are offered as a checklist of factors the panel will consider:

Collaborative Partnerships: Assess the extent and quality of collaborative partnerships between researchers and Māori communities, iwi, or hapū. Consider the depth of engagement, mutual respect, and co-creation of knowledge in research projects.

Māori Design Principles: Evaluate the incorporation of Māori design principles, values, and aesthetics in architectural and technological outputs. This could include the integration of traditional Māori architectural concepts or sustainable technologies rooted in mātauranga Māori.

Innovation and Indigenous Knowledge: Evaluate the degree to which research outputs demonstrate innovation that arises from the integration of mātauranga Māori and engineering/technological practices. Assess how indigenous knowledge contributes to novel solutions and approaches.

Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship: Consider how research outputs are aligned with mātauranga Māori values of sustainability, environmental stewardship, and holistic wellbeing. Evaluate how projects have contributed to the preservation and enhancement of natural and cultural landscapes.

Cultural Impact: Evaluate the cultural impact and significance of architectural and technological designs within Māori communities. Evaluate the contributions to cultural identity, sense of place, and community empowerment.

Māori Language and Communication: Assess the extent to which research outputs engage with te Reo Māori and effectively communicate with Māori communities. Evaluate the use of culturally appropriate communication strategies.

Integration of rangahau Traditions: Consider how research outputs incorporate rangahau traditions such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori methodologies. Evaluate the depth of engagement with these methodologies in the research process.

Community Engagement and Impact: Evaluate the impact of research outputs on Māori communities, including improvements in quality of life, wellbeing, cultural expression, and empowerment. Assess how architectural and technological solutions address community needs. Assess the potential long-term benefits of research outputs for Māori communities, including economic, social, cultural, and environmental outcomes.

Indigenous Ethics and Protocols: Evaluate the extent to which research activities and projects involving Māori communities have adhered to tikanga Māori, indigenous ethics and protocols.

Incorporation of Tangata Whenua Perspective: Evaluate the extent to which research outputs incorporate the tangata whenua perspective in architectural and technological design decisions.

External Recognition and Validation: Consider external recognition and validation of research outputs by Māori communities, leaders, or organizations. Assess endorsements, partnerships, and support from Māori stakeholders.

The goal is that the evaluation of mātauranga Māori is culturally sensitive, relevant, and meaningful within the engineering, technology, and architectural context.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP, and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., mātauranga Māori and Western approaches, either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

Information in the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should be used to clearly identify the main strengths of the EP and to help assignment to panellists. This can also signal components of the EP that may require assessment by panellists with commercial, environmental, professional practice or social impact knowledge and experience and possible cross-referral to other panels.

The panel recognises disciplines and specialisations beyond the lists provided. If a research focus is not listed, the appropriate keywords can be included in the Field of Research. In addition, while the items within each ERE must be related, there does not need to be a relationship between different EREs, or between EREs and OERs. For instance, in architecture, an EP might be submitted that includes EREs based on both theory and sustainability.

In addition to the list above, the ETA Panel would consider the following useful to judge the full platform of research, noting that not all examples will be relevant to all EPs:

- › a brief summary of the total publication record for the assessment period (including research outputs not included in the EP). This may use metrics such as total number of research outputs and categorisation by research output type (taking into consideration the 1,500 character limit of the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary field).
- › a summary of research and research-related activities focusing on evidence of peer esteem, contributions to the research environment and impact of the research. Summary metrics such as h-index or similar may be provided.

- › a discussion of the alignment with mātauranga Māori, and engagement with mana whenua and Māori stakeholders, if relevant.

If metrics are cited, the EP should contextualise the citation within a discipline or subdiscipline. Staff members should provide such relevant contextual information, because there is no agreed list of journal rankings in Aotearoa New Zealand or Australia in most disciplines.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE must include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output)

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

Staff members may choose to include citation and publication metrics as Supplementary Items in their EREs. However, the panel emphasises that while such information may provide helpful context, ERE quality and significance will be determined through an examination of the ERE Output itself.

For those EREs based on journal articles, information on the journal's quality, such as the relative ranking of a journal in its subfield, may offer useful contextual details. If such a ranking is quoted, the source used for such a ranking should be made explicit. The panel will be aware that raw impact factors and other bibliometric measures can vary significantly between subject areas and so such numbers need to be put in context.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

The ETA panel expects that the contextual narrative for each ERE should be used to summarise evidence of the quality and impact of the research and research-related activity presented in the ERE. Evidence could include some or all of the following (noting that many of the examples below could also be included in the ERE as Supplementary Items):

- › demand for consultancy or professional practice based on the research outcomes or knowledge
- › how the research has led to further research developments or has been applied
- › funding support for the research or its continuation including co-investment by a relevant business (magnitude relative to the business size)
- › commercialisation of the research including licensing, formation of spin-out companies and IP protection
- › use of the research in standards, codes of practice or design guides
- › maintenance and defence of patents and other IP and/or expansion of coverage to other jurisdictions
- › commercialisation expenditure by the licensee or commercial revenue for IP
- › adoption of the research outcomes by other research groups
- › policy, strategy or statutory change introduced as a result of the research

- › change to professional practice in the relevant practice community including codification of the change with evidence of the degree of uptake and level of use
- › positive citations of the research
- › exhibition of the research by others, such as curated events
- › national or international competitions, prizes or awards
- › the rigour of the peer-review process (including by the client for commissioned research), for example, as indicated by article acceptance rates if relevant and available
- › incorporation of the research findings into standard textbooks and industry handbooks or guides
- › commercial, environmental or social success of the research across a range of indicators, such as reduction in resource use or environmental impact (all of air, land and water), cost savings, sales of products or services, improved health, higher productivity, improvements to existing businesses, establishment of new businesses, new processes, new products, new services, improvements to existing products, improved quality or new employment. Evidence might include the scale and time span of the impact and industry, business or community perceptions and responses to the impact
- › quoted testimony from clients or end-users of the research that succinctly and independently verifies the impact of the research (for example, a senior industrialist might indicate the industry significance of the research outcomes); in such cases, the name, role and professional standing of the source and their relationship to the staff member should be declared to allow confirmation of independence and significance of the evidence
- › the interaction between the researcher and the industry, business or community including responsiveness and/or awareness of industry, business or community needs.
- › evidence of efforts you have made to grow enduring partnerships with community or industry, with direct respect to the research. Examples might include significant hui or meetings (significant meaning an expanded attendance beyond yourself and a community/industry partner), hosted or co-facilitated seminar/ wānanga/ symposia, workshops provided to community/industry.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation

- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

The panel has identified the following specific examples within the main eligible types as output sub-types that may be particularly germane:

Creative works:

- › Interactive Architectural Installations: the creation of immersive and/or interactive installations that blend art and technology, allowing viewers to engage with architectural concepts in novel ways. Examples could include interactive light installations or responsive kinetic structures that transform the built environment.
- › Digital Fabrication and 3D Printing: These outputs demonstrate the fusion of artistic expression and advanced manufacturing/fabrication techniques.
- › Sustainable Architectural Design: Installations or structures that utilise eco-friendly materials, energy efficient or sustainable energy sources, or address environmental concerns.
- › Virtual and Augmented Reality Experiences to create immersive experiences that allow users to explore (for example) architectural spaces and concepts in virtual environments. These outputs illustrate new mechanisms in which architectural design can be experienced and perceived. Pertinent examples include Māori social housing, marae design, social housing for immigrant families, the active shooter and fire evacuation and training.
- › Collaborative Art-Engineering Projects: Interdisciplinary collaborations between artists, engineers, and architects that involve the integration of engineering principles into artistic installations or the application of artistic sensibilities to engineering challenges.
- › Textural creative works including collections of professional journal or magazine articles that show a sustained and original contribution to critical architectural and design practice discourse.
- › Scholarly contributions to published exhibition catalogues.
- › Critical reviews of built and conceptual works where they move beyond review to provide novel interpretive findings.

Journal article:

- › Review articles in journals would be applicable as research outputs only if they critically review a body of work to provide an original interpretative synthesis, practice roadmap or consensus statement for the field or discipline.

Products and Processes:

- › Design standards or other standards, codes of practice, or design guidelines that are attributable to individuals and contain, or are based on, original research. The term “standard” is restricted to outputs promulgated through an international or national process administered by an authoritative body; the term “code of practice” refers to a method accepted, promulgated and applied widely within a professional practising community; and the term “design guideline” is used to describe a practice identified and recommended by a

formal group of practising professionals as being a good practice. If the research is separately reported, then its use in developing the standard, code of practice or design guideline may be considered as a research contribution item.

Changes and Trends

The ETA panel is anticipating that the Generative AI area will expand rapidly and infuse many of the approaches and methodologies that are current when the guidelines were laid down. We would expect portfolios that include the use of such Generative AI to explicitly acknowledge this. A clear explanation of the author's contributions to the research and how the AI was used is required. Novel use of AI techniques to an engineering, technology and/or architecture problem, could constitute original research. The onus is on the author to make such contributions explicit.

Where the same work has multiple outputs covering the same material (for example, a technical report on a commissioned piece of research **or** a conference contribution **and** a peer reviewed journal publication), only one should be included in the EP as a research output.

Where the same work has related outputs that are different (for example, one research study with multiple publications), it will often be most appropriate for those publications to be presented as a single ERE (for example, one publication may form the ERE Output, with additional related publications included as Supplementary Items within the ERE). It may also be appropriate to submit related outputs across multiple EREs. The panel, however, still recommends care in ERE selection to avoid duplication and facilitate assessment of the breadth of the staff member's platform of research.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types. They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies
- › Review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums and broadcasters
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Granted patents.

For all refereed research outputs, evidence of the extent and rigour of the review process should be provided. Reviewing processes within the author's organisations (in-house) would not normally be considered to provide quality assurance unless their independence from the authors and disciplinary expertise can be demonstrated.

While the panel's primary focus will be on the quality of the output itself, outputs that are not accompanied by evidence of standard quality-assurance or impact may be subject to greater scrutiny. Staff members should particularly note the following:

- › For conference contributions, greater scrutiny will be given to non-refereed papers (especially if not published in proceedings), poster presentations (where not published in proceedings), abstracts (where submitted alone and not as a full paper and not refereed), non-refereed papers and solely oral presentations that are not refereed. The exact type of contribution to a conference should be made clear in the submission.

- › For invited keynote and plenary addresses (Conference Contribution – Other), evidence of the degree of exclusivity and importance of the forum and invitation should be provided. This might include the number of attendees at the conference, total number of invited keynote or plenary speakers, basis for the invitation and/or selection, and financial and/or other support for the invitation.
- › For journal articles, if direct evidence of quality and impact is not provided, greater scrutiny will be given to professional journal or magazine articles under editorial scrutiny, and non-refereed articles.
- › For a higher degree thesis, evidence could include examiners' comments, if available. Where a higher degree includes coursework, the proportion of the qualification attributed to original research should be identified.

Where the research output assessed is non-quality-assured or non-traditional, further reliance may be placed on the actual or potential downstream impact of the completed work, for example, through its influence on practice and standards in the profession, or through commercial outcomes such as new design paradigms, products and businesses. This must, however, have been measured and evidence must be supplied by the staff member either as a Supplementary Item or in the Contextual Narrative, rather than in the Description field. In such cases the staff member may wish to use the Description field to elaborate how the research output meets the PBRF Definition of Research.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

The Engineering, Technology and Architecture Panel will not make any assumption of contribution based on author order. Where there are multiple authors, staff members must ensure that their contribution to the research output is clearly defined in the Individual Contribution section. In cases where co-authors include the same research output in their EPs, staff members are encouraged to confer about the details of their contributions, to ensure there is no conflict in the information provided.

Individual Contribution

The Engineering, Technology and Architecture Panel will equally value both sole-authored and collaborative authorship research outputs. In the case of outputs with collaborative authorship, staff members should articulate the nature of their intellectual or creative contribution to the output. Note that roles such as data collection are unlikely to be considered sufficient.

Description

The ETA Panel considers the TEO Guidelines on completing the Description field sufficient and has no specific guidance to add.

New and emerging researchers

PhD theses are considered the norm, but research Master's theses – i.e. at least 90 credit equivalent of research would be acceptable as a research output for new and emerging researchers.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

Where three EREs have been submitted in an EP the Engineering, Technology and Architecture will examine a minimum of two out of three of the ERE Outputs. Where two or fewer EREs are submitted, the panel will examine all EREs.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026 Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

The ETA panel considers the following examples of Research Activity as valid, in addition to the descriptions and examples listed in the TEO Guidelines:

Uptake and impact:

- › industry adoption of an output of the staff member as standard practice, for example, a type of design (engineering or architectural), an analytical method, a textbook, a research-based engineering or architectural standard. This can include recent adoption of outputs produced outside this assessment period
- › client-sponsored professional practice or consultancy that draws on research expertise and knowledge and leads to significant economic, environmental or societal impact for the client may be a valid research contribution item if it demonstrates the practical impact of the research (even if the work itself does not meet the Definition of Research)
- › leadership in research commercialisation, spin-off companies and incubators
- › leading or participating in policy development activities that have a national or international impact on the way in which research-investment or research-funding decisions are made by government or private sector agencies
- › numbers, coverage and significance of granted patent families
- › maintenance, uptake, defence and use of IP including licensing and creation of royalty income streams.

If submitting a research activity under the **Uptake and Impact** type, the Panel would recommend noting the following points:

- › Factual evidence is preferred, but where subjective evidence is provided, the onus is on the staff member to demonstrate, insofar as is possible, the independence of the evidence source and its authenticity.
- › The panel is cognisant that there may not be sufficient time for significant commercial outcomes (impacts) to be achieved for research and research outputs produced in the assessment period (for example, from IP such as patents). In such cases, the EP should provide evidence of commercial support for the research and progress towards commercialisation.

The section on competing the Contextual Narrative above also provides examples of evidence of the type of uptake and impact information that could be provided.

If providing submitting a research activity under the **Research Funding** type, the Panel would recommend providing information including (any of the following that are applicable):

- › total number and value received in the period
- › list of funders
- › your role in the funded project (for example, principal investigator, associate investigator)
- › contribution to preparing the grant application
- › success rates in the grants won or rarity of winning funding from the external body or company, or any other indicator of the rigour of the application and assessment process (competitive, peer reviewed)
- › whether it was continuing or first-time funding from the body, company or external group.

If providing submitting a Research Activity under the **Research Prizes, Fellowships, Awards and Appointments** type, the Panel would recommend providing information including (any of the following that are applicable and noting that statements need to be verifiable and objective):

- › rarity or difficulty of achieving the prize or fellowship (for example, number awarded, frequency given, size of field)
- › rigour of nomination, application and/or assessment process.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks, or industry engagement
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce.

The ETA Panel considers the following examples of CRE items as valid, in addition to those examples listed in the TEO Guidelines. They are grouped below under the standard CRE type categories.

Contribution to research discipline and environment:

- › research and disciplinary leadership, such as membership of research teams, contributions to disciplinary development, and debate and public understanding of the discipline
- › contribution to institutional vitality, that is, supporting the development of research both within and across institutions (for example, hosting visiting researchers) – may also be categorised as facilitation, networking and collaboration
- › number of postdoctoral fellows or equivalent working under supervision of the staff member – may also be categorised as researcher development
- › directorships of research centres or research groups (such as stating how many researchers working in a centre or group, and the budget) – may also be categorised as peer esteem.

Peer Esteem and Research Recognition:

- › invitation to serve on government, tertiary institution, business or industry task forces, commissions of enquiry, review panels or governance boards, on the basis of the staff member's research esteem in the relevant field.

Reviewing, refereeing, judging, evaluating and examining:

- › participation on relevant degree or professional qualification-accreditation panels
- › participation in research funding agency review panels.

If providing information about **postgraduate supervision** under the **Student Development and Support** type, the ETA Panel would recommend providing information including (any of the following that are applicable):

- › numbers supervised in the period by type (doctoral, research Master's, professional or taught Master's, honours, postgraduate diploma)
- › numbers completed in the period by type
- › numbers of Māori and Pacific postgraduate supervisions if relevant
- › level of supervision (number in a primary or lead, joint or co-supervising or assistant, adjunct or secondary supervising role, in line with institutional norms)
- › numbers of publications in the period co-authored with students
- › how postgraduates have contributed to the main area or areas of your research (for example, 10 of 12 in Area A and 2 of 12 in Area B; or by listing titles of research undertaken by students supervised) to link supervision to your overall research profile
- › prizes won by postgraduates under your supervision
- › names of postgraduate students should not be provided.

Humanities and Law

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in:

- › English language and literature
- › Foreign languages, literature and linguistics
- › History, history of art, classics and curatorial studies
- › Law
- › Philosophy
- › Religious Studies and theology.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess the quality of research in the areas of research that are submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

The panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (EREs) and the Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definition of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. The aim of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances.

An EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies as part of the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They are a New and Emerging Researcher

- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE
- › They declare Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Humanities and Law (HAL) Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. The descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive:

- › English language and literature
- › Foreign languages and linguistics, including: foreign languages, literatures and cultures, translating and interpreting, English for speakers of other languages, applied linguistics and linguistics
- › History, history of art, classics and curatorial studies
- › Law, including: public law (including but not limited to constitutional law, Te Tiriti o Waitangi Treaty of Waitangi law, human rights), private law (including but not limited to contract, torts, restitution, commercial law), alternative dispute resolution processes, comparative law, competition law, criminal law and criminal justice, environmental law, family law, intellectual property law, international law, intersections with tikanga including Māori laws and philosophies, jurisprudence, law and economics, natural resources law, real and personal property law, regional law systems (including but not limited to European Union law) and tax law.
- › Philosophy
- › Religious studies and theology.

In relation to area studies, women's studies, cultural studies, gender studies, media studies and other multidisciplinary studies, the HAL Panel will only consider EPs that are primarily concerned with research outputs generated out of humanities or law paradigms. Criminology EPs should be submitted to the Social Sciences and other Cultural/Social Sciences Panel.

If you are unsure as to whether to submit to the HAL panel or one of the other panels, you should review their panel-specific guidelines to determine which of the panels represents the majority of your Examples of Research Excellence (EREs).

EPs that contain research which primarily contributes to a better understanding of issues relating to language learning and teaching (for example, learner-oriented grammars and lexicographic research, and applied linguistics research with implications for language teaching practices) should be submitted to the Education Panel. Examples of research outputs that should be assessed by the Education Panel include:

- › second language learning theory with implications for language teaching and learning
- › corpus analysis identifying academic word lists for language learners
- › grammatical analysis identifying problematic structures for language learners
- › analysis of linguistic features of different writing genres and their implications for language learners.

EPs that primarily contribute to linguistic theory and methodology and the better understanding of linguistic issues, where “linguistic” includes sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic issues, as well as those illuminated by discourse analysis, should be submitted to the Humanities and Law Panel.

Examples include:

- › language variation and change
- › the structure of language (phonology, syntax, morphology, lexis)
- › the use of language in different social contexts
- › the use of language in interaction
- › discourse analysis
- › the psycholinguistic processes involved in language production and comprehension.

Literary translations must show evidence of research input, with an introduction, notes or other evidence of scholarly apparatus; translations that are to be viewed as forms of creative output should be contextualised as such and may be cross-referred to the Creative and Performing Arts Panel.

EPs on the border of linguistic research that could form the basis for language teaching texts, but where language teaching implications are not the primary focus of the output (for example, research involving discourse analysis of interaction), should be submitted to the HAL Panel.

Cross-referrals

It is expected that most cross-referrals from the HAL Panel will be to the Education Panel; Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences Panel; Mātauranga Māori Panel; Pacific Research Panel; and Creative and Performing Arts Panel.

EPs submitted to the HAL Panel that contain one or more creative outputs, such as literary or artistic works, may be cross-referred by the panel Co-Chairs to the Creative and Performing Arts Panel.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

Professional practice outputs such as opinions (including legal opinions), legal policy papers for government agencies or other professional organisations, submissions to parliament or government on law and policy, book reviews, bibliographies, dictionary entries, exhibition curating, film or video production may fall within the PBRF Definition of Research. While routine professional practice in language teaching does not fall within the PBRF Definition of Research, research-based commentary on language teaching and pedagogy, as well as research-based curricula and products, may be considered research. Staff need to explain the research component of these types of outputs and specify in the Description field of the ERE Output how the output meets the PBRF Definition of Research.

Digital humanities cross the boundaries between computer science and humanities disciplines, such as archaeology, classics, English, history, modern languages and literatures, and the arts. Digital scholarship possesses a technical component, is interdisciplinary in form and substance, and is often (and necessarily) pursued through collaborative efforts. EPs featuring digital humanities research should make clear the research significance and achievement of EREs centred on digital humanities and specify how the digital component of an ERE contributes to its originality, research quality and impact.

In combination, mātauranga Māori and rangahau form a research culture that draws upon diverse ontological, epistemological, and methodological traditions of critical inquiry, experimentation, knowledge-creation and design distinctive to Aotearoa New Zealand. In the academic context, mātauranga Māori and rangahau inform and are informed by the majority of disciplines and include multiple Māori ways of knowing and being and multiple forms of praxis that can transform disciplinary knowledge by re-centering, revitalising and generating new mātauranga Māori.

Rangahau traditions and processes include but are not limited to kaupapa Māori, mātauranga Māori and te Reo Māori revitalisation. Mātauranga Māori methodology is typically collaborative and

practice-led with community stakeholders. Rangahau outcomes usually embody new insights of direct relevance to the specific needs of iwi, hapū, marae, communities, government, scholarship and teaching, industry, and commerce.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present the assessors and the peer review panel with information that will allow them to contextualise the items submitted in the ERE, OERE, and CRE components.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP, and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary allows researchers to describe the overall trajectory of their research and show how their work in the assessment period reveals a cohesive domain of critical inquiry. The contextual summary also shows how a researcher's work contributes to the relevant contexts, discourses, paradigms and intellectual underpinnings of the discipline and of the wider domains of humanities and law.

This section of the EP is the place to describe how the body of work presented in the EP as a whole may have challenged or advanced modes of practice through, for example, contributions to theory and methodology, research-based creative, literary or curatorial works, research-based professional practice, such as opinions, bibliographies and book reviews, and contributions to new law (legislation or precedent) and policy. If relevant, researchers should also make clear the significance and achievement of digital humanities research and specify how the digital component contributes to the overall domain of inquiry. If the work is interdisciplinary, the researcher should describe how it contributes to a wider research platform.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary enables researchers to elaborate on contexts of dissemination.

Examples of Research Excellence (EREs) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

Within humanities and law disciplines, citation metrics are not typically used to assess the quality or impact of an output. However, staff may choose to include in the ERE contextual narrative information on the citation of an output, the outlet quality, such as the relative ranking of a journal in its subfield, or acceptance rates of articles for journals. There is no agreed list of journal rankings in Aotearoa New Zealand or Australia in most disciplines. The Australian ranking system for law is not applicable in Aotearoa New Zealand and should not be relied on as an indicator of quality. The panel confirms that peer assessment of individual output quality on a case-by-case basis is an essential aspect of the evaluation.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume including edited special issue of a journal
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

Research outputs generated in the fields of humanities and law are diverse.

Applied research outputs could include exhibitions, film or video, or professional law practice (such as reports and paid advocacy). While all outputs will be assessed for quality regardless of type, staff submitting non-typical research outputs (such as digital or creative works) should ensure such outputs make use of humanities and law paradigms and meet the PBRF Definition of Research.

A book published to accompany an exhibition that is a major stand-alone research publication in its own right with a shelf-life longer than the exhibition may be considered a separate output and be submitted as an authored (or edited) book. The researcher should indicate the connection between the book and the exhibition.

Textbooks and handbooks in humanities and law may comprise important research within the discipline where it can be demonstrated that they embody new insights. This may include a contribution to the intellectual infrastructure of the discipline, or the development of new paradigms. Similar specific referencing and commentary is required when the claim is made in respect of a new edition or the updating or adaptation of an existing text. Similarly, an edition of

collected essays may be a strong research output if it can be shown that it contributes to the intellectual infrastructure of the discipline, or introduces new paradigms into the discipline. In such cases the onus is on the staff member to clearly demonstrate how the output embodies original research or new insights.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types.* They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies
- › Review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums and broadcasters.
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Selection of research by Parliament and the Courts to influence law and policy.

*Granted patents are considered to be quality assured research outputs.

It is expected that, for the majority of disciplines covered by the HAL Panel, research outputs submitted will be quality assured. Quality assurance will include peer review for journals, referee reports for conference papers and/or a documented process of competitive selection, referee reports and/or pre-publication peer reviews for books, and other equivalent quality-assurance processes. If a non-standard quality-assurance process has been used, for example, in relation to practice-based research outputs (such as a commissioned report) or creative research outputs (such as a film, video or exhibition), staff members are expected to explain in the Description field precisely how quality has been assured.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

A range of conventions may be used to order the authors in the bibliographic record. In humanities and law these are most often alphabetical or contributive. The convention chosen should be stated in the Author section.

Individual contribution

Where there is more than one author, staff members must ensure their contribution to the research output is clearly defined in the Individual Contribution field for the ERE Output. Staff are encouraged to confer with co-authors to ensure that there is no conflict in the information provided.

Description

Where there are research outputs that may not obviously meet the PBRF Definition of Research, such as those generated by professional or creative practice, the Description field should explain how they meet the Definition of Research.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the ERE component

The HAL Panel will use the same standards to assess all types of research outputs. The panel will specifically consider the extent to which the research:

- › is recognised by those in the field as being of high quality
- › is original, representing an intellectual advance or a significant contribution to knowledge

- › exhibits intellectual and methodological rigour and coherence
- › demonstrates intellectual and/or disciplinary impact
- › may demonstrate impact in the wider community, for example, through influencing the direction of policy or practice.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

Where EPs contain three EREs, the HAL Panel will examine a minimum of two ERE Outputs. Where EPs contain one or two EREs, the Panel will examine all ERE Outputs.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026 Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

In addition to the descriptions and examples listed in the TEO Guidelines, the HAL Panel makes the following observations:

Uptake and impact

Impact may be demonstrated in the humanities through disciplinary change where this occurs outside the academic context, as in the uptake of research in school curricula. There may also be a range of other impacts including policy impact, social or cultural impact, political, environmental or economic impact, which may be evidenced through media engagement or other forms of public dissemination, or through other professional activities such as involvement with professional or external bodies, providing advice and commentary to public bodies, law commissions and government.

Examples of uptake and impact should include a brief description of the underpinning research. Staff members should explain impacts with examples and may include an appropriate measure of assessment.

In law, impact may be demonstrated through law-making processes including citation in policy documents, legislation, and citation by courts and tribunals.

Contributions to the Research Environment

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows

them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wananga, fono, or networks
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research cognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.

The HAL Panel recognises that a number of activities contribute to the research environment in humanities and law, including but not limited to: translations; significant language teaching materials; academic writing and commentaries on existing works and research; academic writing, media commentaries; advice, opinions and expert evidence to courts and tribunals; book reviews; peer reviewing journal articles and book manuscripts; membership of editorial boards; refereeing and reviewing; assessing research grant applications; external examining of theses; leadership in conference planning; hosting department and/or professional colloquia; research related collegial activities and supervision of students; mentoring students and support of postgraduate students including honours and honours-equivalent students, particularly in law; and invitations to sit on expert panels or advisory boards.

Staff members should ensure that their description of these activities clarifies the status and importance of the invitation or contribution.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the CRE component

Reference to the descriptors and tie-points should facilitate selection and description of CRE types. Identification of a range of different types of contribution is likely to allow a richer picture of that contribution to be portrayed.

Health

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in:

- › Dentistry
- › Nursing
- › Other health studies (including rehabilitation therapies)
- › Pharmacy
- › Sport and exercise science
- › Veterinary studies and large animal science.

These guidelines are supplementary to the TEO Guidelines and must be read in conjunction with these. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide adequate guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and the Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has further elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has further elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation as this relates to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Health Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

- › Audiology
- › Dentistry
- › Health psychology and mental health
- › Māori health
- › Midwifery
- › Nursing
- › Nutrition and dietetics
- › Occupational therapy
- › Optometry and vision sciences
- › Pacific health
- › Pharmacy
- › Physiotherapy
- › Speech and language therapy
- › Sport and exercise science
- › Veterinary science

- › Educational research associated with the above disciplines
- › Other health studies.

EPs in the above subject areas may involve an intersection with areas considered in other panels. The Health Panel anticipates receiving EPs that cross the boundaries with other panels. Some examples are provided below, but this list is not exhaustive:

- › Māori health research which intersects between a health subject area of this panel and mātauranga Māori and/or community-based participatory research with Māori to design health services for Māori.
- › EPs that include public health medicine (including but not limited to population health and epidemiology) should be submitted to the Public Health panel. The Health panel is for portfolios that may have a public health approach within other health disciplines.
- › Pacific health research which intersects between a health subject area and includes Pacific methodologies, extensive Pacific community engagement and focus on specific Pacific communities.
- › A health subject area (such as nursing, allied health, dentistry, sport and exercise science) intersecting with public health, health promotion or health services research (Public Health Panel) or psychology (Social Sciences, Behavioural and Other Cultural/Social Sciences Panel, but not Clinical Psychology).

These are just examples, with other combinations likely including music therapy and research in other design disciplines that cross between health and work considered by the Creative and Performing Arts Panel.

The Health Panel would expect that EPs that primarily relate to subject area descriptions of the other panels would be submitted to that panel. If you are unsure whether to submit to the Health Panel or one of these panels, you should review their panel-specific guidelines to determine which of the panels represents the majority of your Examples of Research Excellence (EREs).

The Health Panel anticipates that the degree to which research in an EP is discipline specific and/or interdisciplinary will vary and both will be assessed on their merits.

Cross-referrals

The Health Panel will make cross-referrals if important material within an EP is considered to be insufficiently covered by the Health Panel expertise. Cross-referrals are predominately anticipated between the Health Panel and: Mātauranga Māori; Pacific Research; Public Health; Medicine; Education; Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

A revised PBRF Definition of Research has been agreed for the 2026 Quality Evaluation. Additional information, specific to the subject areas relevant to the Health Panel, is provided below.

- › Health research involves a wide range of processes of investigation or inquiry leading to new, recovered, or reinterpreted knowledge or understanding. Health research in Aotearoa New Zealand draws on diverse ontological, epistemological, and methodological traditions of critical inquiry, experimentation, and knowledge creation. This includes Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori; and diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. We recommend staff members refer to the Mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines for the articulation of mātauranga Māori and Pacific research definitions.

- › Health research may produce new knowledge or understanding in the subject area, and new insights of direct relevance to the specific needs of iwi, hapū, marae, communities, government, scholarship and teaching, industry, and commerce, which may be developed through collaborative and practice-led processes involving stakeholders from those constituencies.
- › Health research may also lead to a methodological advance and/or the advance of theory, including mātauranga Māori and Pacific knowledge.
- › Health research may occur in a range of settings both in Aotearoa New Zealand and internationally: within communities, including on marae or other culturally meaningful gathering places such as, but not limited to, Fale, in clinical settings such as hospitals, in policy settings, and in laboratories.
- › Health research 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.
- › All staff members should provide sufficient information to ensure it is clear how their work meets the Definition of Research.
- › Health research may include the use of existing knowledge to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products, communications or processes and/or comprise the synthesis and analysis of previous research (for example, a systematic review or metasynthesis) as long as it meets the Definition of Research (see section below on research outputs).
- › Health research does not usually include activities that are part of routine teaching practice and evaluation, for example preparation for teaching that does not embody original research (for example, collation of existing research and research outputs into handbooks or textbooks where this does not embody new insights).
- › Health research does not usually include activities that are part of routine health professional activities, such as routine testing and data collection lacking analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation. To be considered research, professional activities of this nature must meet the Definition of Research, for example: development and evaluation of innovative practice.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the EREs, research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP, and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on describing how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce

- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., mātauranga Māori and Western approaches; either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but provides important contextual information.

The Health Panel encourages full use of this section to provide a rich context to support interpretation of the information provided in other sections of the EP. It is helpful for this section to make connections between evidence contained in different aspects of the portfolio and we encourage cross-referencing where appropriate. Staff members may use this section to highlight the nature and overarching contribution of their research platform and, if relevant, the different research themes their research addresses.

Staff members may also want to comment on their chosen methods of research dissemination, for example in relation to use of wānanga/hui/fono and/or creative modes of dissemination, such as infographics. It could also be useful to clarify the context within which they are working, for example the research group or collective they belong to, and their approach to authorship, for example whether they prioritise first authorship for early career research colleagues or postgraduate research students. We recognise that markers of excellence in research vary between research fields and this could be helpful to discuss. We recommend that staff members consider the tie-point descriptors in guiding the issues they wish to emphasise in this section.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

The Health Panel encourages staff members to make full use of the contextual narrative field to describe the significance and value of each of their chosen EREs. The following information, discussed in more detail below, might usefully be included here if relevant:

- › rationale for selection of the ERE Output
- › Citation rates, journal impact factors and quartile rankings
- › Favourable reviews, and impact of the ERE, for example in terms of practice, policy, or education at a global, national or community level
- › Explanation of how any Supplementary Items (maximum of three) are linked to the ERE Output.

This list is not exhaustive and the Panel encourages staff members to think carefully about what information they can include to highlight the importance and excellence of the ERE. Tie point descriptors will be useful in guiding this selection.

Information on citation rates and journal impact factors and quartile rankings can be included if relevant; these are best discussed in relation to norms for that discipline. The panel also recognises the limitations of these measures for capturing research excellence, for example, when the research has been published in Aotearoa New Zealand journals, or in a discipline with lower citation rates.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

The research outputs most commonly submitted to the Health Panel are likely to be journal articles, chapters, books or theses, although all other types of eligible research outputs can be included.

The panel recognises that criteria for research quality differ between disciplines. When choosing a research output for the EP, the researcher should consider their authorship position and role alongside quantitative metrics. For example, a first author publication in an Aotearoa New Zealand journal with high local impact, but low international impact, could be considered to be of higher quality than an output in a high impact international journal to which the author has made a small contribution.

An edited book may meet the Definition of Research where the editorial role has a clear research component (for example, writing a substantial introduction that advances novel insights or findings, or where the solicitation, arrangement, and editing of the contributions can be clearly shown to embody new or recovered knowledge). Editorial roles that do not meet the Definition of Research may be described as Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE).

Articles that only provide commentary without a research component, or deal with issues of policy without providing either novel data or analysis, would not usually be considered research but may be described as Research Activities or contributions to the research environment.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types. They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies
- › Review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums and broadcasters
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Granted patents.

Quality assurance processes used will vary between the different discipline areas within health and the output types that may be submitted. For journal publications, information concerning the ranking of a journal within a discipline and an explanation of ERE Output citation rates or specific citations of importance may provide useful context for the panel, but the assessment of quality will not be based on this type of information.

The panel is not in a position to assume knowledge of the specific quality assurance process used for a number of output types because these may vary widely (for example, some conference papers and abstracts, books and technical reports). To that end, the process of quality assurance for such ERE Outputs should be clearly articulated. Where research has been sponsored by external funding bodies, specificity concerning the type of review before publication of reports may provide evidence of quality assurance.

In addition the panel notes that the absence of quality assurance will not of itself be taken to imply low quality but the onus is on the submitter to provide evidence of quality and non quality-assured outputs may be subject to greater scrutiny. Evidence of research outputs having been reviewed through peers is one measure of quality, noting that the appropriate peers and peer review processes may in some contexts or fields be external to the academy. Other quality-assurance processes, including but not limited to referees, commissioning processes, and community, iwi or marae endorsement will also be given regard.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

For multi-authored papers where listing all authors would exhaust the character limit, staff members should note at least the first three author names and indicate their own position in the author list, for example, third in 20 authors or seventh in 35 authors.

Individual Contribution

Health research is frequently a collaborative enterprise so outputs will often have multiple authors. The panel does not assume authorship position (for example, first or last) reflects a leadership role or a specific contribution although it may do so. Clear explanation of contribution will help the panel in its assessment. Qualitative descriptions are more likely than percentages to give panels the detailed information they need to assess an individual's contribution to a research output.

The Health Panel recognises that more than one staff member may submit the same ERE Output in their respective EPs. This is acceptable but it is recommended that care be taken when describing each staff member's contribution to the ERE Output and where possible staff members should confer, to avoid conflict between EPs.

Description

Where the output type for an ERE is not a peer-reviewed publication in the scientific literature, the description field should provide an evidence-based account of the quality of that output including

the nature of the quality assurance process. Where it is not immediately clear how outputs meet the Definition of Research, the Description field may also be used to clarify.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

The Health Panel will examine all of the ERE Outputs submitted in EPs.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026, Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

In addition to the guidance in the TEO Guidelines, the Health panel notes the following:

Presentation, Sharing, and Dissemination of Research or Similar

Presentation at conferences is a common way of disseminating research. Given the proliferation of new meetings, including those established by commercial organisations, the status of meetings should be specified, including whether this is a long-established conference and whether it is organised by an academic institution or society.

Research funding and support

Research funding should make explicit the funding source and whether the process was competitive or not; providing the amount may be helpful, but the Panel recognises that different research fields require different amounts of funding to conduct their research and that in some areas excellent research can be conducted without research grant funding.

Uptake and impact

Research uptake and impact may include significant changes in professional, policy, organisational, artistic, or research practices, commercial developments, processes, and applications, public discourse, capacity building, or other outcomes which have significant benefits for communities, public stakeholder groups, private sector or commercial enterprises. An explanation of how the underpinning research meets the Definition of Research should be included in the description to facilitate assessment of the portfolio.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, policy, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and

grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.

In health, a wide range of contributions may be referred to. The panel notes that in relation to refereeing of papers and grants, editing journals and invitations to write editorials, details of which journals and grant organisations a researcher referees for, and the frequency of reviewing or other activities should be supplied.

Invited presentations at conferences can be an important measure of peer esteem, especially where the invitation derives from a researcher's standing within a discipline or field. Given the proliferation of new meetings, including those established by commercial organisations, the status of meetings should be specified, including whether this is a long-established conference and whether it is organised by an academic institution or society.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the CRE component

Reference to the descriptors and tie-points should facilitate selection and description of CRE items. Identifying a range of different types of contribution is likely to allow a richer picture of that contribution to be portrayed.

Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in:

- › Computer science, information technology, and information sciences
- › Pure and applied mathematics
- › Statistics.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and the Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology (MIST) Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

- › Level 1 of the 2020 American Mathematical Society Mathematics Subject Classification with specificity being delivered at levels 2 and 3 in the hierarchy, including all of pure mathematics, applied mathematics and statistics but subject to the caveat about education below.
- › Level 1 of the 2012 ACM Computing Classification System, with specificity delivered at lower levels of the hierarchy but subject to caveats regarding education and hardware engineering below.
- › Management of both tacit and recorded knowledge, including librarianship and information science, record and archive studies and information management.

EPs should be submitted to the Education Panel rather than the MIST Panel if the motivation and focus of the EP is primarily pedagogical.

EPs should be submitted to the Engineering, Technology and Architecture Panel rather than the MIST Panel if the focus of the EP is on hardware aspects of technology.

Cross-referrals

Panel Co-Chairs can cross-refer EPs to one or more other panels. It is expected that most cross-referrals to this panel will come from the following panels: Engineering, Technology and Architecture; Business and Economics; Physical Sciences or Biological Sciences. Cross-referrals would

most likely be triggered by a need to assess the technical or theoretical sophistication, novelty or appropriateness of the methods employed in the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) in the EP being evaluated.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

We refer staff members to the Mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research Panel-specific Guidelines for the articulation of Mātauranga Māori and the Pacific research definition.

All outputs that are completed as part of standard professional activities will need to be calibrated and authenticated against the PBRF Definition of Research.

Some professional activities do not embody original research and therefore should not be included. We expect that such activities include:

- › routine software development and management that is not an integrated component of a research project
- › routine statistical support and applications of established statistical methods to support research in client disciplines such as Life, Health, or Earth Sciences.

Outputs of professional activities may meet the Definition of Research when for example they:

- › introduce a mathematical or statistical approach that is new for the client discipline and has the potential to underpin or influence future studies in the field
- › are an integrated component of a research project, such as designing software to solve complex modelling problems or extract new knowledge from data sets
- › enable theoretically generalisable insights into software development processes
- › create software to cater for novel or distinctive use cases.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP, and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., mātauranga Māori and Western approaches, either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

The MIST Panel views the Contextual Summary as an opportunity to provide a holistic context for the activities of the staff member: a chance to outline the context of the research work conducted, its motivation, impact and significance. It provides an opportunity to summarise related activities and to identify subject areas that benefit from research discoveries and outcomes.

The Quality Evaluation assessment is not based on metrics. However, a staff member may choose to provide summary career information about overall performance during the assessment period. These may include a summary of citation rates or an indicator such as h-index. Such indicators often depend on input data sets; for example, an h-index computed using Google Scholar, MathSciNet, Scopus, or the Web of Knowledge often differ. If numerical summary data is included, an EP should state which data set it is based upon. Since norms for quantitative indices vary greatly among and within disciplines, a staff member should contextualise any numeric metrics used, for example by describing disciplinary norms.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE must include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE may include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

As discussed above, EREs based on research outputs arising from professional activities should include detailed evidence attesting to the quality, research impact, influence, and applications or uptake of the work beyond the field. These may be included in the ERE as Supplementary Items (see section below on eligible Research Activities) and/or may be discussed in the contextual narrative.

Examples of research impacts could include the following:

- › Development of models of physical, biological or social phenomena
- › Development or proof of conjectures, theory and other research discoveries that impact the development and direction of a research field
- › Development of software that influence the way humans or machines interact
- › Development of tools or applications that have significant uptake nationally or internationally.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

Staff members can use the contextual narrative to summarise information relevant to the ERE Output, including where appropriate any metrics such as citation rates, journal rankings and impact factors, or acceptance rates. The contextual narrative should also be used to articulate the relationship between the ERE Output and any Supplementary Items.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other

- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

The panel notes the following, in relation to the eligible ERE Output types:

- › For most subject areas covered by the MIST Panel, a wide range of refereed journals and refereed conference proceedings is available for publishing research outputs. While it is expected that most ERE Outputs will appear in such quality-assured outlets, this does not preclude EREs incorporating other forms of research outputs.
- › Research monographs and research-informed books are valid research outputs. An authored textbook must have a demonstrated research component for it to be considered as a research output.
- › Disseminated software implementing new research methods will be considered legitimate research outputs. These may also be included as Supplementary Items supporting EREs.
- › Research conducted to address a specific research enquiry raised by a reputable national or international organisation, will be considered as a legitimate research output. Evidence that the work constitutes research of scientific standing should be included.

Information on citation rates, publications and journal rankings etc

- › Research outputs will be considered on their merits. Accompanying information such as the publication platform or associated metrics will be considered in context and not as the primary indicator of quality.
- › The MIST Panel recognises that publication rates, journal impact factors, and citation rates are generally lower than those of other disciplines. Hence considerable care should be exercised in over-interpreting various metrics, and comparisons between diverse fields should be avoided because they are often misleading.
- › The standing and impact of the journals and conference proceedings covered by the panel are diverse. The reputation of the medium in which the research is published may provide ancillary endorsement of the quality of the research presented. If such comments are made, then the staff member may wish to reference specific quality evaluations that are commonly accepted in the discipline. The absence of such comment will not be viewed negatively.
- › Where outputs are published in subject-specific outlets such as conference proceedings, a contextualisation of such outputs and evidence of quality of the outlet should be provided. This may include evidence of high citation rates relative to disciplinary norms, or ranking of

the conference by an official body, or conference acceptance rates where these are clearly linked to the quality of the work submitted.

- › Citation figures often vary significantly depending on the chosen source. Hence the citation source quoted should be identified.
- › Information on citation rates, publications and journal rankings may be discussed in the ERE contextual narrative and/or included as a Supplementary Item.

Guidance on expected Quality Assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types. They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies
- › Review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums and broadcasters
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Granted patents.

The MIST Panel offers the following additional comments:

- › Quality assurance of the outputs listed in EPs submitted to this panel will typically be achieved by peer review, because refereed journal articles and conference proceedings papers are the most common media used to present research productivity in this field.
- › If software is listed as an output, then the nature of the quality assurance must be explicitly stated. Simple compliance of software with submission standards of software repositories is not evidence of quality assurance.
- › Where research has resulted in a commercial product for an organisation, the quality-assurance process used by the organisation to evaluate the research results should be described.
- › Evidence about the impact of non-quality-assured outputs, which could for example include software or mathematical or statistical tools, should be provided. These could include: citations, favourable reviews, or the inclusion of methods in software, applications, and analyses. Note that impact beyond the academy may also be included in an ERE as a supplementary item.
- › Conference proceedings and software arising from any of the subject areas covered by the Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology Panel are areas that may entail non-standard quality assurance. Staff members should provide sufficient supporting information to justify their inclusion in the EP as a quality output.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

The MIST Panel acknowledges that a range of conventions are used to order the authors in its research outputs, for example:

- › equal contributions

- › alphabetical
- › placing the project head last
- › listing graduate students or post-doctoral researchers first.

The chosen convention should be stated in the Author field.

Individual contribution

In the staff member's qualitative description of their substantial and distinctive contribution to a research output, the detailed information may include leadership elements that have led to the research outcome. For example, a project leader may have:

- › obtained funding to do the research
- › had the specific idea for the paper and have contributed to its scholarship through the technical development, guidance, removal of roadblocks and mentoring of junior researchers or students
- › shared the writing and other tasks.

Some disciplines will not recognise the concept of project leader: the project is viewed as a collaboration among equal contributors.

As the general guidelines indicate, a researcher should avoid stating percentage contributions, and instead give qualitative descriptions which identify specific contributions and ideas.

Description

Where the ERE Output is a non-standard research output and/or the quality assurance process is non-standard, staff members should use this field to describe how the output meets the PBRF Definition of Research and provide details of the quality assurance process.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

Where three EREs have been submitted in an EP the MIST will examine all of the ERE Outputs.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026, Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

The MIST Panel identifies the following as a non-exhaustive list of Research Activities which are particularly germane to the disciplines covered by the panel:

- › Participation by invitation in research programmes, summer schools, or workshops run under the aegis of leading national or international organisations.

- › Invitations to deliver invited lectures at conferences, both nationally and internationally.
- › Gaining external support for research projects and activity, including competitive or other funding.
- › Research prizes, fellowships, awards and appointments during the assessment period, particularly those pertaining to specific EREs.
- › Demonstrated influence and impact of research beyond the academy is recognised as a valuable research activity. We expect this kind of contribution to occur predominantly in Applied Mathematics, Applied Statistics, Information Sciences and Technology. Evidence of the uptake and of the level of influence the contribution has on the sector to which it has been applied should be provided to allow the panel to determine the scope and significance of the impact.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.

Within the six types of CRE item described above, the MIST Panel identifies the following as a non-exhaustive list of activities which are particularly germane:

- › Reviewing and evaluating activity including expert assessment of journal and conference submissions; research reviews published in databases such as MathSciNet or zbMATH Open; evaluations of funding proposals for funding agencies; membership of selection panels for fellowships and scholarships
- › Editorial roles for conferences and journals
- › Editorials and Issues & Opinion pieces in research journals
- › Organisation of conferences, research programmes, summer schools, or workshops, both nationally and internationally

- › Significant service roles in research organisations or professional associations
- › Membership of conference programme committees, invitations to contribute to conference panels, and membership of standards committees
- › Supervision and mentorship of graduate students or post-doctoral researchers
- › Items which indicate the researcher's individual standing and peer esteem in their discipline, within or outside academia. These may include awards, prizes, and honours associated with a career or with a significant research focus advanced over many years. An example is elected Fellowship of an Academy.
- › It is the responsibility of the staff member to include evidence to support claims e.g. by providing links to websites, or by listing the names of PhD students or post-doctoral researchers supervised.

Mātauranga Māori

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in mātauranga Māori.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and the Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

Below the Mātauranga Māori Panel has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

Across all the PBRF panels, mātauranga Māori and rangahau, in combination, form a research culture that draws upon diverse ontological, epistemological, and methodological traditions of critical inquiry, experimentation, knowledge-creation and design distinctive to Aotearoa New Zealand. In the academic context, mātauranga Māori and rangahau inform and are informed by the majority of disciplines and include multiple Māori ways of knowing and being and multiple forms of praxis that can transform disciplinary knowledge by re-centering and/or revitalising mātauranga Māori.

Rangahau traditions and processes include but are not limited to kaupapa Māori, mātauranga Māori and te reo Māori revitalisation. Mātauranga Māori methodology is typically collaborative and practice-led with community stakeholders. Rangahau outcomes usually embody new insights of direct relevance to the specific needs of iwi, hapū, marae, communities, government, scholarship and teaching, industry, and commerce.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel welcomes EPs that cover a wide range of original research areas by practitioners who are independently or collaboratively engaged in research based on Māori worldviews, both traditional and contemporary. This includes Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori. While other methodologies may be evident in a staff member's Platform of Research, the inclusion of Māori methodologies is an essential component of this panel's coverage. The breadth of mātauranga Māori is likely to extend across all subject areas, however, EPs that include some Māori components (for example, in their subject area) but do not involve Māori methodologies will not be assessed by the panel. They will be assessed by the panel that best covers the subject area of the staff member's EP.

The Mātauranga Māori panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive:

- › Te Reo Māori
- › Tikanga Māori
- › Hauora
- › Toi Māori
- › Te Taiao

- › Tātai Arorangi
- › Whānau, Hapū and Iwi Cultural, Social, Economic, and Political Transformation
- › Education
- › Indigenous Studies
- › Communications and Media

It is expected that all or at least the majority of the submitted EREs will primarily investigate issues of importance to Māori, with Māori-specific measures and processes. EPs assessed by this panel are likely to show significant involvement with Māori and outcomes that are relevant to and of importance for Māori while also demonstrating new insights of direct relevance to the specific needs of iwi, hapū, marae, communities, government, scholarship and teaching, industry, and commerce.

EPs will be accepted for assessment according to the research method employed rather than the language used. Where an EP is written in te Reo Māori but is fundamentally within another subject area, it will be transferred to the Panel relevant to its subject, where Māori members in other panels will be able to advise the panel further.

Ethnicity of the staff member is not a factor in the submission of EPs to the Mātauranga Māori Panel. EPs compiled by Māori and non-Māori researchers will be assessed by the panel if the EP consists of research primarily underpinned by Māori worldviews and methods.

Cross-referrals

Cross-referral to the Mātauranga Māori Panel can be requested either by the Co-Chairs of another panel, or by TEOs when submitting the EP. Cross-referral can be requested by TEOs by completing the Mātauranga Māori cross-referral request section in the EP. Staff members should refer to the panel elaboration of the PBRF Definition of Research below, as well as to the panel coverage description above, to determine whether to request cross-referral.

Mātauranga Māori and rangahau inform and are informed by the majority of disciplines and include multiple Māori ways of knowing and being, and multiple forms of praxis. However, the Mātauranga Māori Panel will only consider cross-referral requests where the researcher has primarily employed mātauranga Māori methodologies. It is expected that most cross-referrals to this panel will come from the following panels: Creative and Performing Arts; Education; Health; Humanities and Law; Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Studies.

Note: An EP that is wholly or partially in te Reo will not necessarily be accepted for cross-referral by the Mātauranga Māori panel. Requests for cross-referral will only be accepted where the EP is consistent with the Mātauranga Māori panel coverage described above.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

PBRF Definition of Research

The new PBRF Definition of Research recognizes that Aotearoa New Zealand has distinctive research cultures and environments that draw on diverse ontological, epistemological, and methodological traditions of critical inquiry, experimentation, and knowledge-creation. This definition of research includes Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori. Although rangahau has multiple definitions pertaining to specific environments, in the PBRF context it can be defined as research that leads to new, recovered, or reinterpreted knowledge or understanding which is effectively shared and capable of rigorous assessment by appropriate experts.

Rangahau assessed by the Mātauranga Māori panel will be a collective process co-designed with Māori communities, and will proffer new insights of direct relevance to the specific needs of iwi, hapū, whānau marae, communities and relevant sectors. The panel will be specifically analysing if the research has significantly impacted or has potential to significantly impact on the lives of Māori and Māori communities, whether that be through the revitalization of mātauranga, the improvement of whānau health, or hapū economic transformation. However, rangahau can also be an individual process where, for instance, new mātauranga is being generated, theory is being created and/or Māori ontologies, epistemologies and practices are being intellectualized.

The panel acknowledges that Indigenous knowledges generally and mātauranga Māori specifically are forming an unprecedented nexus within the Western academy, which is extending and challenging the boundaries of what comprises research, and the conventions of dissemination. As an example, Māori culture's oral tradition lends itself to methods like pūrākau, yet the centrality of 'objectivity' to the Western academic tradition has problematized qualitative and narrative approaches. This panel's position is that oral accounts of history and narratives are valid forms of rangahau.

This panel also acknowledges the impact of colonization on Indigenous knowledges and, therefore, it recognizes the important role that rangahau can have in re-centering and revitalizing mātauranga Māori, for example, toi Māori, tātai arorangi, the study of raranga, whakapapa narratives, waiata composition, and navigational knowledge. Outcomes of mātauranga Māori and rangahau may enter the public domain in a wide range of academically conventional (e.g., peer-reviewed published outputs) and non-conventional venues (e.g., Te Matatini).

The Mātauranga Māori Panel will adopt an inclusive interpretation of the PBRF Definition of Research with regard to all outputs that cover a wide range of original research areas by practitioners who are independently or collaboratively engaged in research based on Māori worldviews, both traditional and contemporary. It is also important, however, to define what cannot be counted as research. As an example, Indigenous data sovereignty is a relatively recent phenomenon that does count as PBRF defined research where the rangahau includes analysis, interpretation, reinterpretation and/or evaluation, yet data collection by itself does not meet the definition of research. Similarly, the collection of previously published material to create a compendium for teaching a series of lectures or within a wānanga also does not meet the definition of research.

Definition of Research Excellence

The Mātauranga Māori panel will assess research excellence in terms of originality, rigour, reach, and significance, with reference to appropriate international Indigenous research quality standards and to the unique nature of rangahau Māori. The latter includes the production and creation of knowledge unique to Māori and particularly rangahau that re-centers and revitalizes Māori ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies. The panel considers that research excellence in a mātauranga Māori context is inseparable from impact because, as described above, excellent rangahau is a collective process co-designed with Māori communities, and will proffer new insights of direct relevance to the specific needs of iwi, hapū, whānau marae, communities and relevant sectors. When evaluating quality, the panel will consider the extent to which the creation and design of mātauranga excellence is impactful (i.e., manifests a positive effect on, change, or benefit to society, culture, the environment, or the economy at any level, outside the research environment) and sustainable within and across academic, non-academic and/or other community domains). Leading-edge Māori research outputs are those that rank with the best regardless of the topic, theme or location. Research outputs that deal with Māori topics or themes of primarily community-specific, regional or national focus or interest can be of world-class standard, and they may rank with the best research of its discipline conducted anywhere in the world. Research could be considered leading-edge where the esteem of peers considered as experts in their field can be demonstrated.

Similarly, a staff member can demonstrate a contribution to a world-leading research environment. Along with conventional academic methods, the panel also considers that leading-edge excellence may be found in non-conventional dissemination approaches whether that be, for instance, an eminent woven kākahu or a waiata ranked excellent by esteemed Te Matatini judges.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP, and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing. Staff members can provide information and emphasis on how the research has impacted on the discipline itself, and this may include its innovative nature in the context of Indigenous Studies when considered in local, national and/or global contexts.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › in relation to the research environment, it is important for the Mātauranga Māori panel assessment, where applicable, that the process of working with Māori communities is explicated in relation to co-design, collaboration and community mana motuhake
- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, (e.g., mātauranga Māori and Western approaches), either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

Supplementary Items could be wide and varied, including a presentation at a co-design hui with community. Given the nature of rangahau, Supplementary Items provide staff members submitting to the Mātauranga Māori Panel with the opportunity to explicate the underpinning processes of excellent research within the Māori world that are often not recognized by typical academic standards.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

If appropriate, the contextual narrative may include how the ERE was grounded in mātauranga Māori and or kaupapa Māori including the co-design process with Māori communities and what the impact or expected impact is for Māori.

The panel welcomes commentary on any impact or esteem indicators relating to the ERE Output. Where applicable, information on citation rates, publications and journal rankings etc. can be referred to in the contextual narrative or included as Supplementary Items. The panel is aware that 'world-class' in the Māori context refers to excellence via Māori and thus national standards and, therefore, the panel will take into account that internationally high-ranking journals are often not the most appropriate venues for Māori research to be published. The quality and impact of Māori research can be acknowledged in ways unique to te Ao Māori; for instance, the performance of a creative piece of work, such as haka or waiata-ā-ringa, in multiple venues or sites could be considered analogous to multiple journal citations. Similarly, the esteem of the site or event where the research/creative work is performed and/or presented could be considered analogous to the varying esteem afforded to publication sites, such as journal rankings. Staff members may wish to discuss such indicators in the contextual narrative.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

Given the diverse nature of the subject areas covered, the Mātauranga Māori Panel expects to receive a broad range of ERE outputs that, as outlined above, may or may not adhere to conventional academic standards. Nonetheless, it is important that the research components of EREs are explained, firstly, broadly via the ERE contextual narrative and then, specifically, through each ERE Output description field. In many of the academically non-conventional outputs outlined below, the research component can be explained by explicating the kaupapa which led to the output; that is, the approach, practice and process that helped manifest the output.

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution – Other, including presentations at hui or wānanga
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work, including
 - › new toi Māori and mahi hoahoa artefacts including visual and material culture creations such as whakairo, whare, moko, raranga, film and digital forms
 - › composition and performance of haka and waiata-ā-ringa, both traditional and contemporary
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation, including whaikōrero and waiata
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new), including new kai.
- › Report, including reports for external bodies; for instance, submissions to the Māori Land Court and Waitangi Tribunal, or research for iwi rūnanga

- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

If any ERE Output is delivered in a specific Māori context (such as an artwork, whakairo or karanga, whaikōrero), the evidence of the ERE Output may be provided in alternative forms, such as a photograph, audio recording, audio visual format, transcription, commentary or attestations from kaumātua or peers. For example, there may be occasions where whaikōrero as oratory within a marae context, and especially during tangihanga, cannot be recorded because of local tikanga that may prohibit the use of audio or video recording devices. In such cases, other forms of evidence will be required to substantiate the research. However, the output must be capable of being provided in a form that enables detailed assessment by the panel.

In the case of creative works (e.g., whakairo, haka and waiata-ā-ringā) that may be performed or exhibited over a number of iterations and in different types of venues, the researcher can choose which instance of the output to nominate, and this need not necessarily be the first. However, the output must still meet the eligibility criteria as set out in the TEO Guidelines, including that it was first publicly disseminated within the assessment period. Research activities demonstrating impact must have occurred within the assessment period to be eligible but the underpinning research output does not have to be published within the assessment period. Impacts that were first submitted in a previous Quality Evaluation are not eligible for submission in Quality Evaluation 2026.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types. They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies
- › Review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums and broadcasters
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Granted patents.

It is expected that, for the majority of subject areas covered by the Mātauranga Māori Panel, ERE Outputs submitted will be quality assured. Formal quality-assurance processes are many and varied across the breadth of mātauranga Māori. The assessment process will be inclusive of innovative, experimental and culturally specific research approaches some of which may not have been through academically conventional quality-assurance processes. The panel accepts various kinds of evidence of independent peer-review. This may include whānau, hapū, iwi and kaumātua endorsements. Where this is the case, an explanation will need to be provided in the Description field. Where a researcher is unable to verify the quality-assurance process through evidence or commentary, then the panel will consider the ERE as non-quality-assured and the output may be subject to greater scrutiny by the panel.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

Given the broadness of the subject areas covered by the Mātauranga Māori Panel, it is extremely important that author order is clearly explicated especially if it does not adhere to the Humanities' convention, where the first author listed is the primary author.

Description

Rangahau Māori often involves contributions that are not formally recognised within Western institutions. For instance, cultural safety and guidance are important in rangahau contexts, which might take the form of, for example, providing karakia to open and close research team hui or the provision of whaikōrero and karanga in community research contexts. These are processes that enable research that is pono. The Mātauranga Māori panel encourages staff members to provide a clear description explaining their substantial and distinctive contribution including, where applicable, how their mātauranga grounds the research.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the ERE component

Tie-Point descriptor 6: A body of leading-edge research can refer to a corpus of work that is at the forefront of Mātauranga Māori research in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

The Mātauranga Māori panel will examine all ERE Outputs in an EP.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026, Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

The Mātauranga Māori panel will consider evidence of the development and maintenance of strong, meaningful and responsive links with end users of research, including the transfer of knowledge (in te Reo Māori and other languages) to participants and/or stakeholders in research, such as Māori communities, agencies and organisations working with Māori. Such activity could be submitted as either collaboration, outreach and engagement or uptake and impact Research Activity types.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows

them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.

Contributions to the Research Environment can be activities inside academia and society generally that are based on Māori research methodologies and methods, Māori centered-subject matter, and research that impacts on Māori. Examples of Contributions to the Research Environment that the Mātauranga Māori Panel will consider include, but are not limited to:

- › the use of research methodologies and methods developed from Māori research to expand knowledge and research practices in disciplines and subject areas outside of Aotearoa New Zealand
- › promotion of research culture and practices with Māori through capacity and capability development, facilitation and leadership
- › expanding Māori research capacity through mentoring, supervision and promoting Māori research
- › evidence of peer esteem that may include evidence unique to te Ao Māori.

In addition, Māori staff are often asked to perform various cultural duties that may or may not be related to their own research, as described above. Where relevant, it is important for staff to elaborate upon the cultural safety they provide in relation to sustaining, developing and/or growing the research environment and culture.

Medicine

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in:

- › Biomedical Science
- › Clinical Medicine.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where these panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and the Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This

elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Medicine Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

Biomedical science includes disciplines of physiology; pathology; biochemistry; molecular biology; genetics; cell biology; immunology; microbiology; genomics; developmental biology; pharmacology and bioinformatics when research outputs presented in EPs are primarily in medical science, clinical practice, public health and health interventions.

Clinical medicine includes all clinically-oriented research including research in medical disciplines such as psychiatry, surgery, obstetrics and gynaecology, general practice, paediatrics, anaesthesiology and internal medicine.

Please note the **Public Health** panel will consider research related but not limited to health promotion, epidemiology, environmental health, health policy, occupational health, health systems, biostatistics, Māori and indigenous health, kaupapa Māori research, mātauranga Māori research, Pacific health, and community health, and **the Health Panel** will consider research related but not limited to audiology, dentistry, health psychology, nursing, nutrition and dietetics, occupational therapy, optometry and vision sciences, physiotherapy, speech and language therapy, sport and exercise science, veterinary science and educational research associated with the above disciplines.

Cross-referrals

Panel Co-Chairs can cross-refer EPs to one or more other panels. It is expected that most cross-referrals to and from the Medicine Panel will occur with the following panels: Biological Sciences; Health; Public Health, and the Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology panels.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

Simple data collection and collation (for example, clinical or laboratory audit) in itself is not research, but analysis and interpretation of such data may produce research outputs. Management guidelines or descriptive reviews would not usually be considered to be research outputs, but systematic reviews that comprehensively survey the literature, particularly if they appropriately apply techniques such as meta-analysis to the resulting data, are accepted as research outputs as long as they meet the PBRF Definition of Research. For participation in large multi-investigator studies to

qualify as research, the individual must have had substantive intellectual input into the study, usually into design, analysis and interpretation, and not simply acted as a data gatherer. Articles that only provide commentary or deal with issues of policy, without providing either novel data or rigorous analysis, would not usually constitute research and would not be expected to be submitted as an ERE.

For the purposes of the Quality Evaluation, research excellence will be assessed in terms of originality, rigour, impact, such as a change in clinical practice, benefit to health care systems or health care delivery, potential for translation, and significance.

Please refer to the Mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research Panel specific guidelines for the articulation of mātauranga Māori and Pacific research definition. Kaupapa Māori research and Pacific methodologies including equal explanatory power should be highlighted.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP, and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., mātauranga Māori and Western approaches, either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

The Medicine Panel considers the TEO Guidelines sufficient and has no further specific guidance on completing the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only identifying information, with no commentary, is provided.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

The contextual narrative field should provide an impression of how the ERE fits in to the wider picture of the individual's academic career, goals, achievements, and its impact in the field. Examples of information that might be provided include editorials or commentaries on the research, research awards, citations, public commentary on the research, new collaborations, external grant funding or building capacity in NZ's research workforce etc. Impacts may include health benefits to patients, whanau, communities, reduced burden on health care system, reduced geographical or ethnic inequities, enhancing NZ's international reputation or expanding NZ's biotechnology sector.

The narrative may also include evidence of the quality, scientific importance and impact of the research. This is likely to include citation metrics, qualitative or quantitative descriptions of a journal's standing in its field. Information on citation rates, journal rankings and impact factors, book reviews, or numbers of times research output is accessed digitally help to define the quality of the output but need to be put in context of the field. For example, a niche journal may not have high impact or citations, but still be the number one journal in the field.

Note that such activities and items discussed in the contextual narrative may, but do not have to, be included in the ERE as Supplementary Items.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Report
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

The typical research outputs submitted to the Medicine Panel are peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, authored books, or theses. Other less typical research outputs include high-level evidence-based reports or presentations at a governance level, publication of evidence-based work by respected, established commercial publishers, development of evidence-based guidelines / infographics for clinical care based on a systematic review of the literature, development of data analysis tools including software, bioinformatic servers, online databases etc.

Guidance on expected Quality Assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types. They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Granted patents.

It is expected that research outputs will be quality-assured through a process of peer-provided written feedback, subsequent revision, and editorial input. For original articles in well-established or pre-eminent journals in the field, the process of peer-review can be assumed, however quality assurance processes for publications in newer or open-access journals or niche journals specific to the field need to be described in more detail for the panel.

If books, chapters, conference papers or other outputs are submitted as ERE Output then the reviewing or other quality-assurance process should be described.

It is recognised that sometimes staff members may have chosen to disseminate research findings directly to communities, to health care practitioners or in arenas that are not subject to traditional forms of refereeing. Under these circumstances, the EP should comment in the Description field on the nature of any quality-assurance process. This may include oral or written critique of the material prior to presentation by recognised experts in the field, editing, publication and/or dissemination by reputable commercial publishers. Note that outputs such as preprints which have not been through a formal quality assurance process may be subject to greater scrutiny by the panel.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

Preferably, all authors of a research output should be listed. If character limits do not permit this, then an abbreviated form that makes clear the total number of authors and the position of the staff member in the author list should be provided (for example '23rd of 59 authors'). In the medical field, the authors contributing most to the research output will usually be the first author, last (senior) author and second author. The significance of the place of authorship and the individual contribution to the work should be described.

Individual Contributions

The Medicine Panel recognises the importance of multi authored papers in the subject areas it assesses. Staff members should make clear which aspects of a research output they have contributed to (for example, study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, drafting or revision of manuscript). This should be consistent with any similar statements in the research output itself and with statements made by other researchers using the same ERE in their EP.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

Where three EREs have been submitted in an EP, the Medicine Panel will examine a minimum of two of the three ERE Outputs but may examine all three ERE Outputs if deemed appropriate or necessary by the panel. For EPs with one or two EREs, the panel will examine all the ERE Outputs submitted.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026, Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

In addition to the guidance on Research Activities in the TEO Guidelines, the Medicine panel notes the following:

Research funding and support

If Research funding and support items are submitted, the EP should make explicit the total funding and whether the staff member was principal investigator or a co-investigator. If a co-investigator, then the total number of investigators should be stated.

Uptake and impact

When considering Uptake and impact items, the panel will consider evidence of impact in relation to professional activities for example, clinical and biomedical work, where it is explicitly linked to research or research awards, or communication of the relevance of research to communities. For example, work on clinical care guidelines or public health advice may fit into this category but requires demonstration of research evidence synthesis during development of the guidelines and critical peer-review prior to publishing.

Evidence of impact might include the uptake of the guidelines, how often are they downloaded, is it deemed best practice in a clinical setting, patents, AI or other translatable technology, how many people are impacted, whether guidelines are local, national or international. Research impact (for example, reflected in changes in clinical practice or health policy, the introduction of innovative medicines or devices, or changes in health outcomes) should be documented, where applicable.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment component (CRE component) of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The CRE component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity

- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.

Within medicine and biomedical science, refereeing of papers and grants, editing journals and invitations to write editorials are important contributions. Details of which journals and grant organisations a staff member referees for, and the frequency of reviewing or other activities, should be supplied.

Invited presentations at conferences are an important measure of peer esteem. With the proliferation of new meetings (many established by commercial organisations) the status of such meetings needs to be spelt out, possibly including whether this is a long-established conference and whether it is organised by an academic institution or society. **The level of conference peer-review should be explicit.** Event organising (e.g. conferences, workshops, hui) should include whether the event is local, national or international, indicate the duration and number of people attending and state the role of the individual in organising the event. Service roles within institutions such as universities or on national or international bodies directly relevant to research should include a description of the role, time commitment, duration of appointment and the impact of the work undertaken.

The panel will consider evidence of peer esteem in relation to professional activities for example, clinical and biomedical work, where it is explicitly linked to research, research awards, contribution to the research environment such as through leadership roles, or communication of the relevance of research to communities.

Where possible, items falling within each type of CRE should be clustered together (for example, conference presentations, refereeing duties) to help the panel form a coherent view of the individual's activities.

Pacific Research

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in Pacific research.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and the Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The guidance below has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Pacific Research Panel will assess EPs in the subject area described below. This description should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

The Pacific Research Panel's description of coverage is designed to fully recognise quality in Pacific-related research, to encourage the further advancement of Pacific research capability, and to enable research to contribute to the enhancement of Pacific knowledge and expertise.

The Pacific Research Panel will evaluate EPs where there is evidence of research that reflects any or all of the following:

- › research based on Pacific research methodologies and methods
- › research that involves Pacific-related subject matter
- › research that impacts on Pacific communities.

1. Pacific methodologies and methods include:

- › Drawing on research methods, epistemic approaches and world views that are specific to Pacific cultures, languages and communities, or incorporating methodologies from studies that may be Pacific related, Pacific sensitive, or Pacific inclusive
- › Researching in ways that are meaningful to various means of grouping Pacific peoples, including Pacific, Pasifika, Pasifeka, Pasefika
- › Building the capacity and capability of Pacific peoples in research, for example, by actively involving Pacific peoples as researchers and research leaders
- › Conducting research in accordance with disciplinary and ethical standards and values and aspirations relevant to Pacific cultures.

2. Pacific-related subject matter:

- › Focuses on Pacific-related subjects or contents
- › Responds to Pacific experiences – past, present and future
- › Contributes to development in the Pacific region and advances knowledge relevant to Pacific local indigenous and global diasporic communities.

3. Impacts on Pacific communities include:

- › Identifying innovations and solutions that impact on Pacific peoples and communities
- › Delivering benefits that improve outcomes for Pacific peoples and communities
- › Using and devising research approaches that are responsive to Pacific contexts
- › Producing knowledge that has an impact on outcomes for Pacific peoples, indigenous peoples and others
- › Exploring areas not traditionally considered Pacific knowledge yet which have direct relevance to Pacific development, such as environmental, policy and security research.

The Pacific Research Panel will consider research from across disciplines and ensure equitable treatment of multidisciplinary research, along with single-discipline research. This panel welcomes EPs that include evidence written and presented in one or more Pacific languages related to the three categories of Pacific research above. Each EP will be assessed against the standards from a strengths-based perspective. Panellists with Pacific expertise on other panels may be able to advise the Pacific Research Panel further.

The Pacific Research Panel recognises that research may be transformative, critical, creative, innovative and adaptive. This includes research that is **reflective** of the changing realities and globalisation of Pacific peoples, as well as research that examines the significance of local identities, cultural ethos, and indigenous knowledge systems and their roles in sustaining Pacific communities.

The panel will take into consideration the diverse range of discourses, methods and methodologies used by Pacific-related researchers in their respective research areas. It is expected that staff will provide evidence derived from methods that are robust and that lead to validated and reliable conclusions.

Cross-referrals

The Pacific Research Panel will cross-refer where necessary. It is important that staff include sufficient information in their EP to enable the panel Co-Chairs to determine whether an EP submitted to the Pacific Research panel should be cross-referred to another panel. Staff members need to be explicit in the Field of Research and the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary about the nature of the research presented in the EP so that panel Co-Chairs can easily identify the primary orientation of the examples of research excellence.

TEOs may directly request that EPs be cross-referred to the Pacific Research Panel. The TEO Guidelines contain instructions for how to complete a cross-referral request to the Pacific Research panel. In addition, panel Co-Chairs may request cross-referral to the Pacific Research panel where they consider this necessary. It is expected that cross-referrals to the Pacific Research Panel will come from most, and potentially all, panels. For example, an EP with a focus on climate change in the Pacific submitted to the Physical Science Panel could potentially be cross-referred by those panel Co-Chairs to Pacific Research. This would occur where evidence of at least one ERE related to Pacific Research has been documented in the EP and the Field of Research description signals Pacific research methodology, method, subject matter or community impact for some work in that EP.

Where an EP has a focus on indigenous studies and/or is in an area relevant to Pacific research, the following guide should be used to determine whether the EP should be cross-referred to the Pacific Research panel.

If the EREs are concerned with any or all of the following:

- › Pacific research methodologies and methods
- › Pacific-centred subject matter
- › impacts on Pacific communities

the EP should be cross-referred to the Pacific Research Panel, for consideration by the Pacific Research Panel Co-Chairs.

The Panel Co-Chairs will also determine whether a cross-referral to the Mātauranga Māori Panel or another relevant panel is warranted based on the evidence provided. EPs that include mātauranga Māori and rangahau, and are written or recorded in te Reo Māori may be transferred or cross-referred to the Mātauranga Māori Panel where the necessary subject area expertise lies. The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines should be consulted by staff members for an understanding of the panel coverage and the articulation of mātauranga Māori.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

The Pacific Research Panel will assess the excellence of research presented in EPs with reference to the use of Pacific research methodologies and methods, the attention given to Pacific-centred subject matter and the extent to which the research impacts on Pacific communities.

The Pacific Research Panel welcomes examples of research excellence that are original research produced through professional practice or consultancy. The panel seeks to recognise quality research and its outcomes wherever they occur. The outcome of a professional practice or consultancy is considered research where there is evidence of a research enquiry underpinning it. To this end, the Panel acknowledges that outcomes of Pacific research may enter the public domain through a wide range of contexts. Examples include but are not limited to government policy development, culturally specific Pacific spaces and events, online platforms, audio and visual recordings, and commercial design.

The Pacific Research Panel will accept research that draws on professional, community and industry commissions and contracts in ways that benefit Pacific communities and meets the PBRF Definition of Research.

The Pacific Research Panel will interpret dissemination and/or publication broadly as inclusive of processes that give community and/or wider public access to the research under consideration.

Excellence in Pacific research will be assessed in terms of originality, rigour, reach, and significance, with reference to the quality standards appropriate to the subject area and to the unique nature of Aotearoa New Zealand's research cultures and needs, regardless of the topic, theme or location. Examples of research excellence that deal with Pacific topics or themes of primarily community-specific, regional or national focus or interest can be globally influential and comparable in quality.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the EREs, research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP, and reflect the

staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., mātauranga Māori and Western approaches, or Law, Pacific Research, and Business and Economics, either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

The Pacific Research Panel encourages all staff members to fully use this section of the EP to provide a rich context that allows the EP to be viewed holistically. Staff members are expected to use this section to make connections between different aspects of the portfolio, different themes of research undertaken, to address the overarching research contribution to the staff member's field, and the impact of the research during the assessment period. The contextual summary is also the place to describe how the staff member's research work may have advanced modes of practice and to note any relevant contexts of dissemination.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

The Pacific Research panel specifically notes the following in relation to the ERE component:

Pacific researchers are highly engaged in meeting community and government needs for oral research reports and presentations on Pacific development. Staff may submit evidence of repeated oral presentations associated with a specified area of Pacific development. Such bundles of oral presentations may be submitted as one ERE, identifying cumulative knowledge creation. Staff members must ensure that the first (and all subsequent) instance of the presentation was within the assessment period. In such cases, the first instance of presentation should be submitted as the ERE Output, and subsequent instances should be included as Supplementary Items. Staff members may wish to use the ERE contextual narrative to articulate the research embodied through the cumulative presentations.

Guidance on completing the contextualising narrative

The Pacific Research Panel expects to receive a broad range of EREs that reflect the breadth of Pacific research.

The contextual narrative allows staff members to elaborate how the evidence included in an ERE forms a cohesive, critical and original area of inquiry that contributes new knowledge and understandings, as well as describing any relevant social, cultural, educational or economic impacts resulting from the research (noting that staff may wish to include evidence of such impacts as Supplementary Items). For applied areas of Pacific research, in particular, this section should highlight how published work builds systematically on previous research, is guided by theory, and contributes to knowledge and understanding relevant to Pacific issues and concerns in and/or outside Aotearoa New Zealand.

Staff members may wish to use the contextual narrative to indicate in some way the relative ranking and impact factor a journal may have. Where information in the form of impact indices is available, that information may also be included. The Pacific Research Panel recognises that subject areas have different impact indices and these indices will not be used as proxy for quality. Staff members should provide such relevant contextual information, because there is no agreed list of journal rankings in Aotearoa New Zealand or Australia in most disciplines.

It is recognised that a staff member may have chosen to disseminate research findings directly to communities, to practitioners or in arenas that are not subject to traditional forms of refereeing. Under these circumstances, use the contextual narrative to explain whether any quantified measures of quality or impact of those ERE Outputs exist.

Journal acceptance rates (if known) or other useful contextual information may be provided in this section. Staff members should note, however, that the ERE Output itself will be the focus of assessment.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

The Pacific Research panel expects to receive EPs containing a wide range of research outputs. The following are examples of types of examples of research outputs that are more common within Pacific research:

- › Presentations at Pacific community gatherings
- › Oral presentations including those in Pacific languages and using Pacific cultural protocols
- › Performance
- › Reports for external bodies, including submissions to government, global organisations, such as the United Nations, or research for Pacific community bodies and nations
- › New artefacts including material cultural creations, such as fale, woven mats, tivaevae
- › Other types of research output, for example, new sustainable fisheries management processes, energy systems, food production.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types. They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers.
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers.
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers.
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies.
- › Review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums and broadcasters.
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies.
- › Granted patents.

While it is expected that most ERE Outputs submitted to the Pacific Research Panel will be quality assured, non-standard quality-assurance processes might also be included. If a non-standard quality-assurance process has been used (for example, in communities, culturally-specific settings, organisations and government agencies), staff members are expected to explain in the Description field precisely how quality has been assured, along with impact. For example, a non-standard quality-assurance process in a government agency might be that researchers who have relevant disciplinary expertise and relevant Pacific research expertise independently review a commissioned Pacific example of research excellence.

As signalled above EREs can be based on non-standard outputs. Greater scrutiny may be applied by the panel to non-quality-assured or non-standard ERE Outputs than a quality-assured and standard research output.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

Where there are multiple authors, staff members must ensure that their contribution to the ERE Output is clearly defined in the Individual Contribution section.

Individual contribution

The staff member's original research contributions to ERE Outputs should be carefully stated. Outputs that are multi-authored must be supported by a description of the contribution being claimed, such as intellectual input, planning and writing.

A description of the staff member's role and their relationship to co-authors might also be helpful, whether the co-authors are students, postdoctoral fellows, Aotearoa New Zealand or overseas colleagues or collaborators. The presence of Pacific community members as co-authors may be

evidence of enacting Pacific research methodologies (for example, actively involving Pacific peoples as researchers and research leaders and building the capacity and capability of Pacific peoples in research).

In cases where co-authors include the same ERE in their EPs, staff members are encouraged to confer about the details of their contributions, to ensure that there is no conflict in the information provided.

Description

It is recognised that a staff member may have chosen to disseminate research findings directly to communities, to practitioners or in arenas that are not subject to traditional forms of refereeing. In such circumstances, the staff member should use the Description field to set out what quality assurance processes the output has been subject to.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the ERE component

Tie-point six

The Pacific Research Panel recognises that research excellence denotes a standard, not a type, focus or location of research. Other indigenous research will also provide an opportunity for benchmarking at a level of excellence. The significant and substantial contribution of examples of research excellence to Pacific knowledge and development, in particular, will be important in demonstrating performance at this level.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

The Pacific Panel will examine all of the ERE Outputs submitted in an EP.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026 Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

In addition to the guidance in the TEO Guidelines, the Pacific Research Panel notes the following:

Factual evidence is preferred. Where subjective evidence is provided, the staff member is expected to demonstrate, as much as possible, the independence of the evidence source and its authenticity. Examples of research activities that are particularly germane to the Pacific Research Panel include:

Collaboration, outreach and engagement

- › Development and maintenance of strong, meaningful and responsive links with end users of research, including the transfer of knowledge with Pacific communities and agencies and organisations working with Pacific groups.

- › Repeated invited research presentations around a Pacific theme that provides evidence of meaningful engagement, potential cumulative impact and the end-users regard for the relevance of the research to Pacific communities.

Uptake and impact

- › Leading or participating in policy development activities that have a national or international impact on the way in which research investment or research funding decisions are made by government or private sector agencies.
- › Adoption of an output of the staff member as standard practice – for example, a type of design, an analytical method, paradigm, a textbook, a research-based standard. This can include recent adoption of outputs produced outside this assessment period.
- › Sponsored professional practice or consultancy that draws on research expertise and knowledge and leads to significant societal, economic or environmental impact for the sponsor
- › Commercialisation of research. Where there has not been sufficient time for significant commercial outcomes (impacts) to be achieved for research and research outputs produced in the assessment period (for example, from Intellectual Property such as patents), the EP should provide evidence of commercial support for the research and progress towards commercialisation.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment

Types of Contributions to the Research Environment

The Pacific Research Panel recognises that a wide range of contributions to the research environment (CRE) are relevant to the subject areas covered by the panel. The Pacific Research

Panel will consider examples of the six research contribution types as described in the Guidelines, including but not limited to the following examples.

Contribution to Research Discipline, Culture, and Environment

- › initiatives to grow Pacific knowledge bases and capacity
- › initiatives that connect with Pacific communities and foster Pacific research methodologies and methods, Pacific-centred subject matter, and impacts on Pacific communities

Peer Esteem and Research Recognition

- › Honorifics and titles, such as named Chairs or other roles, honorifics bestowed by international, national, or local Pacific groups
- › Mandated cultural leadership roles (for example, chairperson, church minister or honorific chiefly titles) where these relate to the staff member's research role/s

Researcher Development, Capability-Building and Mentoring

- › Initiatives or roles aimed at supporting and developing Pacific researchers, and growing the Pacific research workforce
- › Initiatives or roles aimed growing research methodologies and methods developed from Pacific research to expand knowledge and research practices in disciplines and subject areas outside the study of the Pacific
- › Leading or participating in Pacific research capacity- and capability-raising activities that have an impact within Pacific communities nationally or internationally through building the research knowledge of research participants, providing formal research qualification opportunities for Pacific peoples and/or providing training opportunities in research.
- › Partnering with Pacific entities and Pacific organisations on shared research priorities or to increase research capability in Pacific research and researchers
- › Initiatives to promote research culture and practices within Pacific communities through capacity and capability development, facilitation and leadership

Reviewing, Refereeing, Judging, Evaluating and Examining

- › Provision of specialist or expert advice, assessment or review to a relevant committee, task force, steering group, community, either within or outside academia

Student Development and Support

- › Initiatives to expand Pacific research capacity through mentoring, supervision and promoting Pacific research students

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the CRE component

Tie-point six

Extensive networks and/or collaborations may include those with indigenous researchers and research institutions within and outside Aotearoa New Zealand. Research and disciplinary leadership may include contributions to Pacific knowledge and the knowledge of other indigenous peoples in Aotearoa New Zealand, the wider Pacific and beyond.

Physical Sciences

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in:

- › Chemistry
- › Earth Sciences
- › Physics.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Physical Sciences (PHYSCS) Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

Chemistry and Physics

These two subject areas include but are not limited to theoretical, experimental and applied physics and chemistry. The subject areas include: inorganic, organic, physical and analytical chemistry; condensed matter physics; low temperature and cold atom physics; astrophysics and astronomy; nuclear and high energy physics; instrumentation and engineering physics; environmental physics and chemistry; biophysics; bioinorganic, bioanalytical, biophysical and bioorganic chemistry; medicinal chemistry; medical physics and chemistry and biological chemistry; optics and electronics; photonics, biophotonics and quantum physics and chemistry; atmospheric, oceanic and climate physics and chemistry; materials physics and chemistry; organometallic chemistry; forensic physics and chemistry; spectroscopy; polymers; food chemistry; computational physics and chemistry; structural chemistry; crystallography and natural products chemistry.

Earth Sciences

This subject area includes but is not limited to: meteorology and climatology; climate change; hydrology; soils; coastal processes; geomorphology; glaciology; physical geography; petrology; geochemistry; mineralogy; stratigraphy; paleontology; paleobiology; geophysics; engineering geology; volcanology; sedimentology; tectonics; structural geology; marine geology; hydrography; paleo-environmental geology; remote sensing; numerical modelling; Antarctic geosciences; and all other branches of geology and surveying.

Cross-referrals

Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary EPs will be given the same weight as single-discipline EPs. The panel is structured to optimise the assessment of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research.

Staff members with significant material in their EP in an area covered by another panel and who consider their research to be interdisciplinary should indicate in the Field of Research that they also

work in another discipline and include sufficient information in their EP to enable the panel Co-Chairs to determine whether an EP should be cross-referred to another panel.

It is anticipated that most cross-referrals to and from this panel will be with the following panels: Biological Sciences; Engineering, Technology and Architecture; and Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

The new PBRF definition defines research as “inquiry leading to new, recovered, or reinterpreted knowledge or understanding which is effectively shared and capable of rigorous assessment by the appropriate experts.”

The PHYSCS Panel recognizes excellence and impact in research that focuses upon Aotearoa New Zealand’s distinctive cultures and environments, and diverse traditions of knowledge and knowledge-creation. Work that focuses upon or includes diverse Māori or Pacific ways of knowing and conducting research relevant to iwi, hapū, marae will be welcomed by the panel.

The Physical Sciences disciplines incorporate research that is performed with industry, with an entrepreneurial focus, and/or research that influences government policies or practices. Patents and licensing agreements, reports, contracts for research, awards and changes to government policy or practice are some of the evidentiary ways for EREs to demonstrate excellence and high impact.

It is common for research in the Physical Sciences disciplines to be highly collaborative. Staff members may indicate their roles in EREs based on collaborative work through descriptions of their roles in the creative or ideation process, experimental or theoretical work, drafting and editing the peer-reviewed manuscript or conference presentation, and role in securing any research funding to support scholarly activities.

While staff members may wish to provide h-index and journal impact factors as part of the evidence associated with their EREs, the PHYSCS Panel recognizes that these metrics can be problematic measures of excellence and impact. The assessment of excellence will be based on scrutiny of EREs and CREs, and the quality of ERE Outputs.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP and reflect the staff member’s overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member’s overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., Mātauranga Māori and Western approaches, either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period

- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

The PHYSCS Panel considers the TEO Guidelines on the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary sufficient and has no specific further guidance.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

For the PHYSCS Panel, EREs will most commonly be based on research outputs that are likely to have undergone a rigorous peer-review process. The research excellence and impact of EREs will be assessed on the basis of the ERE output itself. Relevant Supplementary Items demonstrating that the research has been acknowledged as excellent and high impact by the national and/or international research community, as appropriate to the field of research, may also be provided for context. Such information could include citation rate metrics, the status of the journal in the field, research awards, external research funding, conference and lecture invitations, evidence of uptake and impact outside the academy and similar forms of evidence.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

The contextual narrative should contain a brief description of the ERE Output and its context within the broader physical sciences field, and should articulate the links between the ERE Output and any Supplementary Items. Staff members are encouraged to highlight the excellence and impact of the ERE through discussion of relevant indicators which could include funding, awards, or evidence of impact and uptake outside the research environment, as well as metrics such as the number of citations and citation rates for an output and journal impact factors, citation scores and other similar journal or press rankings. Note that these can all also be included in the ERE as Supplementary Items.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026 as described in the guidelines. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation

- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD

The PHYSCS Panel considers the TEO Guidelines on the eligible output types sufficient and has no specific further guidance. Please see pages 135 -146 in the [draft TEO Guidelines](#) for detailed descriptions of the eligible types.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types. They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees, or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pasifika research processes and/or methodologies
- › Review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums, and broadcasters
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Granted patents.

The PHYSCS Panel considers the TEO Guidelines on quality assurance sufficient and has no specific further guidance.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

The panel is aware that in the Physical Sciences there are different conventions for the order in which author names appear in journal articles. An indication of what is implied by the position and the contribution of the staff member in the list of authors should be given. A description of the staff member's role and their relationship to co-authors might also be helpful – that is, whether the co-authors are students, postdoctoral fellows, a mentor, Aotearoa New Zealand or overseas colleagues or collaborators.

Individual contributions

Where there are multiple authors, staff members must ensure that their contribution to the research output is clearly defined in this section. In cases where co-authors include the same ERE in their EPs, staff members are encouraged to confer about the details of their contributions, to ensure that there is no conflict in the information provided.

Description

The PHYSCS Panel considers the TEO Guidelines on completing the Description field sufficient and has no specific further guidance.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the ERE component

Tie point six

While assessment will be on the basis of quality, EREs demonstrating a body of leading-edge research are likely to include evidence that the staff member played a significant role in the research programme and outputs.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined.

The PHYSCS Panel will examine all the ERE Outputs submitted.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026 Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

The PHYSCS Panel provides the following guidance on useful evidence to support examples of Research Activities:

Research funding and support

Research funding should make explicit the total funding and whether the researcher was principal investigator or a co-investigator (if a co-investigator, then the total number of investigators should be stated), including any of the following that are applicable:

- › total number of research grants
- › the funding agency and the value and funding period for each grant
- › your role in the funded project
- › the extent of national and international collaboration.

Uptake and impact

The panel is particularly interested to know whether research outputs, new knowledge, or new technologies been transferred to Māori/Iwi/Hapu and/or Pacific end-users, and if so how many times this has occurred and the potential uptake.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows

them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks.
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.

The PHYSCS Panel provides the following guidance on useful evidence to support examples of CRE items, grouped below under the CRE types from the TEO Guidelines. For all CRE items, factual and quantified evidence of research leadership is preferred, but where subjective evidence is provided, the onus is on the staff member to demonstrate, insofar as is possible, the independence of the evidence source and its authenticity and its impact.

Contributions to Research Discipline, Culture, and Environment

- › Undertaking roles of responsibility such as research leadership, head of department, centre/institutional director, requires quantifying the number of researchers working within the department/centre/funded research programme as well as budget if appropriate and the number of cross-institutional formal relationships established.
- › Advocating for the discipline or field or acting in the 'critic and conscience' role will require details on how widely presented in other forums, media and policies.
- › Recognition of mātauranga Māori within the research environment will require some form of evidence of the active partnership(s) with Māori.

Facilitating, Networking and Collaboration

- › Hosting visiting researchers (including Māori/iwi kairangahau) and evidence of interaction.
- › Invitation to present research at conferences, Government agencies and iwi/Māori organisations are important measures of contribution. The status and importance of the organisation providing the invitation needs to be described.

Researcher Development, Capability-Building, and Mentoring

- › Number of postdoctoral fellows or equivalent working under supervision of the staff member and evidence of interaction.

Reviewing, Refereeing, Judging, Evaluating and Examining

- › Evidence of participation on relevant degree or professional qualification-accreditation panels and on research funding agency review panels
- › Refereeing of papers and grants, editing journals and invitations to write editorials. Details of which journals and grant organisations a researcher referees for and the frequency of reviewing or other activities should be supplied.

Student Development and Support

For the supervision of postgraduate students, do not provide the name of the students, but include information such as:

- › numbers supervised in the period by type (for example, doctoral, research Master's, professional or taught Master's, honours, postgraduate diploma)
- › numbers completed in the period by type
- › level of supervision (number in a lead, co- or secondary supervising role)
- › numbers of publications in the period co-authored with students (or alternatively as a separate research contribution student factor)
- › how postgraduates have contributed to the main area or areas of your overall research profile
- › prizes won by postgraduates under your supervision
- › Number of Māori and/or Pasifika students successfully supported
- › The extent to which mātauranga Māori, Te Ao Māori and Māori ways of knowing was recognised.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the CRE component

Tie point six

With respect to mātauranga Māori, evidence needs to demonstrate outcomes that have developed capacity and capability in the Māori research community as well as the development of mātauranga Māori in a research programme.

Tie point 4

With respect to mātauranga Māori, evidence needs to demonstrate outcomes that have developed Māori researchers and mātauranga Māori research.

Tie point 2

With respect to mātauranga Māori, evidence needs to demonstrate commitment to developing and recognising mātauranga Māori research.

Public Health

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in Public Health research.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and the Contributions to the Research Environment (CREs). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Public Health (PUB) Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive.

Public health research focuses on factors that influence the health of populations and sub-populations. This may include, but is not limited to, health promotion, epidemiology, environmental health, health policy, occupational health, health systems, biostatistics, Māori and indigenous health, kaupapa Māori research, and mātauranga Māori research, Pacific health, and community health.

Cross-referrals

Panel Co-Chairs can cross-refer EPs to one or more other panels. It is expected that most cross-referrals to this panel will come from the following panels: Health, Medicine, Pacific Research, Mātauranga Māori.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

The panel notes the following:

In Public Health, 'impact' may take many forms, including the influence of research on, for example, public opinions and behaviour, professional practice, public policy and regulations, and contribution to reducing health and social disparities. The panel recognises that it is often difficult to identify the discrete effects of research and the likelihood of impact is a judgement, based on factors such as context, specific content, and engagement of researchers with communities and population groups.

For participation in large multi-investigator studies to qualify as research, the individual must have had substantive intellectual input into the study, usually into design, analysis and interpretation, and not simply acted as a data gatherer.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component in which staff members can present the Panel with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP, and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research.

The narrative should focus on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., mātauranga Māori and Western approaches, either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

This summary describes the scope of the individual's research over the assessment period and allows the EP to be viewed holistically. Staff members may wish to highlight the following, where relevant, noting that statements made in the contextual summary should be backed up by evidence presented in the EP:

- › Details of the impact the research has had on the subject area as a whole, on other areas of research (if applicable) and on practice or policy.
- › Leadership roles they have held that represent recognition of their contributions to scholarship.
- › If publication metrics (such as the number of papers published, the number of citations received in the assessment period, h-indices) are provided in this section they should be contextualised as part of the wider story about the quality of the research. If metrics are given, their source (for example, Google Scholar) should be specified, and these may be checked by the panel.
- › Outcomes relating to implementation and/or scale-up of research should be supported by metrics that enable the scope of impact to be assessed.

Individuals can also signal components of the EP that may require assessment by members of the panel with specific expertise (for example, commercial, professional practice, social or environmental impact) or that may require cross-referral to other panels.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs, and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

Guidance on completing the contextual narrative

For EREs based on all types of research outputs, the contextual narrative should be used to summarise evidence of the quality, scientific importance and impact of the research should be provided. This may include changes in practice or health policy, citation metrics, and qualitative or quantitative descriptions of a journal's standing in its field. Where appropriate, other forms of evidence of scientific importance and impact of the research should be provided. For instance, staff members may summarise evidence of community engagement and relationship building that resulted from the research output (for example, presentation at hui or wānanga). Note that such evidence summarised in the contextual narrative may also be included in the ERE as Supplementary Items.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentations
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

The research outputs most commonly submitted to the Public Health Panel are likely to be journal articles, chapters, books or theses, but other types of outputs, as listed above, are acceptable.

The panel welcomes presentations at hui or wananga as forms of ERE Output and these should be submitted as Other Form of Assessable Output

Guidance on expected quality assurance

The Public Health Panel sees no need to add specific advice to the general guidance about Quality Assurance in the TEO Guidelines. The Description field for ERE Outputs will be critically important as a guide to quality assurance if outputs are not peer reviewed in some form.

Formal quality-assurance processes vary between different disciplinary areas and output types. They include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers

- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori research, Pacific research processes and/or other methodologies
- › Review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums and broadcasters
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Granted patents.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

Preferably, all authors of a research output should be listed. If the character limit of 2000 characters does not allow this, an abbreviated form that makes clear the total number of authors and the position of the staff member in the author list should be provided (for example, 23rd of 59 authors).

Individual contribution

The Public Health Panel recognises the importance of multi-authored papers in the subject areas it assesses. Staff members should make clear which aspects of a research output they have contributed to (for example, study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, drafting or revision of manuscript). This should be consistent with any similar statements in the research output itself and with statements made by other staff members using the same ERE in their EP.

Description

This field should be used to provide evidence of quality assurance where ERE Outputs are not peer-reviewed. It is recognised that sometimes a staff member may have chosen to disseminate research findings directly to communities, to practitioners or in arenas that are not subject to traditional forms of refereeing. Under these circumstances, the EP should comment in the Description field on the nature of any quality-assurance process.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the ERE component

The panel will consider evidence of peer esteem in relation to professional activities (for example, clinical and public health work, Māori community engagement) where it is explicitly linked to research activity.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

Where three EREs have been submitted in an EP the Public Health Panel will examine a minimum of two out of three of the ERE Outputs.

For EPs with one or two EREs, the panel will examine **all** the ERE outputs submitted.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026 Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OERs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement

- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

In addition to the guidance in the TEO Guidelines, the Public Health Panel notes the following:

- › Presentations at conferences or other for a are an important mode of research dissemination. With the proliferation of new meetings (many established by commercial organisations) the status of such meetings needs to be set out, possibly including whether this is a long-established conference and whether it is organised by an academic institution or society.
- › Research funding activities should make explicit the total funding awarded and whether the researcher was principal investigator or a co-investigator. If a co-investigator, then the total number of investigators should be stated.
- › Contributions to achieving equitable health and social outcomes for Māori, Pacific, and other groups should be included as research activities under the Uptake and Impact type.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains.

Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment (for example, media presence)

In addition to the guidance in the TEO Guidelines, the panel notes the following:

- › Invited presentations at conferences are an important measure of peer esteem. With the proliferation of new meetings (many established by commercial organisations) the status of

such meetings needs to be set out, possibly including whether this is a long-established conference and whether it is organised by an academic institution or society.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the CRE component

Local impact and relevance may be features of excellent public health: international benchmarks apply in some areas of public health, but not all.

Social Sciences and other Cultural/Social Sciences

Introduction

The panels for Quality Evaluation 2026 have developed panel-specific guidelines to assist eligible TEO staff members with the processes of developing and submitting Evidence Portfolios (EPs). These guidelines provide advice on submitting EPs for assessment by panellists with expertise in:

- › Anthropology and archaeology
- › Communications, journalism and media studies
- › Human geography
- › Political science, international relations and public policy
- › Psychology
- › Sociology, social policy, social work, criminology and gender studies.

These guidelines are supplementary to and must be read in conjunction with the TEO Guidelines. The advice in these panel-specific guidelines does not replace or supersede the requirements for EPs that are set out in the TEO Guidelines. For topics where the panel-specific guidelines do not provide guidance or information, the advice provided in the TEO Guidelines is considered sufficient.

The membership of the panels is designed to enable them to assess quality in the areas of research submitted, including EPs that contain mātauranga Māori research, Pacific research, and research with a professional or applied outcome.

Each panel will be assessing the quality of the Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) and Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE). EREs have replaced the previous Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) as the main focus of assessment.

Please note that peer review panels assess EPs without reference to Quality Categories gained by staff members in any of the previous Quality Evaluations held in 2003, 2006, 2012, and 2018.

Mātauranga Māori and Māori researchers

An important change for Quality Evaluation 2026 is the introduction of a Co-Chairing model for panels and the appointment of Co-Chairs Māori to each panel. This is one of a number of changes to ensure that the PBRF fulfils its new Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity principles arising from the most recent review of the Fund in 2019/2020.

Important changes have also been made to the definitions of research, research excellence, and impact; to criteria for panel membership; and to subject area and researcher funding weightings. A key goal of these changes is to ensure that every panel is equipped to assess the quality of research submitted by Māori researchers, thus ensuring that Māori researchers can have confidence that their research will be fairly assessed, by panellists with appropriate expertise, regardless of the panel to which they submit.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Mātauranga Māori Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Pacific research

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities are essential components of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research cultures.

The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidelines has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework

A number of other changes have been made to the design of the Quality Evaluation related to the new Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework. This framework affects submission requirements for new and emerging researchers, staff members in part-time roles, and staff members declaring Researcher Circumstances. This new approach recognises that people meeting these criteria will have had a reduced opportunity to conduct and publish research during the assessment period.

A staff member's EP must contain **three EREs**, unless one of the following applies to them under the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework:

- › They meet the criteria for New and Emerging Researchers
- › They are employed part-time at less than 0.8 FTE over the assessment period
- › They declare validated Researcher Circumstances.

Please see the TEO Guidelines for more information about the Achievement Relative to Opportunity framework.

Description of panel coverage

The Social Sciences and other Cultural/Social Sciences (SSOCSS) Panel will assess EPs in the subject areas described below. These descriptions should be considered a guide – they are not intended to be exhaustive. The key consideration for the allocation of an EP to the Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences Panel is that it primarily includes research within a social science discipline or where social science methodologies are used – this may include, for example, research in health, public health or humanities.

Anthropology and archaeology

Archaeology, biological anthropology, ethnomusicology, socio-cultural anthropology.

Communications, journalism and media studies

Communications, journalism, media studies including online/digital media, development communication, communication for social change, internet studies, public relations, audiovisual studies, film, and screen studies.

Human Geography

Political science, international relations and public policy

Political science, political theory, comparative politics, international relations and public policy studies.

Psychology

Psychology (including social, cognitive, behavioural, neuroscience, clinical and applied disciplines and methodologies).

Sociology

Sociology, social policy, social work, criminology, demography and population studies.

Other Cultural/Social Sciences

Other Cultural/Social Sciences includes area and interdisciplinary studies, such as Māori studies, Pacific studies, Asian studies, European studies; Indigenous studies; cultural studies; gender studies; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transsexual studies; family studies; sports studies; linguistics; cultural heritage; museum ethnography; tourism and leisure studies; development studies; environmental studies; and science studies.

Cross-referrals

Panel Co-Chairs can cross-refer EPs to one or more other panels. If an EP includes material (especially in EREs) that is covered by other panels, then the panel Co-Chairs will assess how significant this material is and/or whether there is appropriate expertise on the SSOCSS Panel, and whether a cross-referral is required. The SSOCSS panel expects that the contextual summary would signal if an EP contains material that may fall within another panel's subject area coverage.

The information on panel coverage above indicates the discipline and subject areas that would normally be considered by the SSOCSS Panel. However, there is considerable scope, given the diversity of EPs to be considered by this panel, for there to be intersections with the subject areas of other panels.

The SSOCSS Panel would expect to assess (as the primary panel or as a cross-referral) EPs in other subject areas or disciplines that include research that uses a social science methodology. For example, the panel may consider EPs in such areas as planning, transport, environmental studies, area studies, and labour studies if they are primarily concerned with research outputs generated using social science paradigms or methodologies. We anticipate that there may be cross-referrals from panels such as Education, Health, Public Health, Humanities and Law, Creative and Performing Arts, Mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research. Please refer to these other panel specific guidelines for their subject area coverage.

Elaboration of the revised definitions of research, excellence, and impact

The SSOCSS Panel considers the TEO Guidelines sufficient and has no further elaborations upon the new PBRF Definitions of Research, research excellence, or impact. The Mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research Panel-specific guidelines include elaborations of the articulation of mātauranga Māori and Pacific Research which apply across all panels. Researchers should refer to those elaborations in order to determine whether a cross-referral request to either the Mātauranga Māori or Pacific Research panels should be made.

Platform of Research – Contextual Summary

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary is a narrative component which provides staff members with the opportunity to present panellists with contextual information on the items submitted in the EP.

The Platform of Research – Contextual Summary should provide a clear introduction to the EREs, research outputs, activities and research-related activity presented within the EP and reflect the staff member's overall platform of research. The focus is on how the staff member's overall platform of research and research activity has contributed to their field, discipline, or area, rather than on indicators of esteem or standing.

Staff members can also use this component to provide relevant information on their research context, which may include, for example:

- › the specific research environment they are working in, such as applied research or professional practice, relevant norms associated with that environment, and how this informs the type of research outputs and activities they produce
- › the context where the EREs in an EP bridge multiple fields, e.g., mātauranga Māori and Western approaches, either within a single subject area, across multiple subject areas covered by the panel, or across panels
- › any changes in the focus of their research within the assessment period
- › any information about relevant activity carried out during the assessment period that is not submitted as an item within the EP but that provides important contextual information.

The SSOCSS Panel considers the TEO Guidelines sufficient and has no further specific guidance to add.

Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) component

The previous NROs section of an EP has been replaced by an Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) section. An ERE **must** include:

- › a brief contextualizing narrative (maximum of 1,500 characters, including spaces)
- › a single research output (ERE Output).

In addition, an ERE **may** include up to three Supplementary Items which may be either Research Activities OR additional research outputs and must relate to the ERE Output. For Supplementary Items, only bibliographic information (for Research Outputs) or a brief description (for Research Activities) is provided.

Guidance on expected types of ERE Output

There will be 16 ERE Output types for Quality Evaluation 2026. These will be:

- › Authored Book
- › Chapter in Book
- › Conference Contribution - Other
- › Conference Contribution - Published
- › Creative Work
- › Discussion/Working Paper
- › Edited Volume
- › Intellectual Property
- › Journal Article
- › Oral Presentation
- › Other Form of Assessable Output
- › Processes and products (new)
- › Report
- › Scholarly Edition/Literary Translation
- › Software
- › Thesis – Masters/PhD.

The SSOCSS Panel considers the TEO Guidelines sufficient and has no further specific guidance to add. Please see pages 135 – 146 of the [draft TEO Guidelines](#) for detailed descriptions of the eligible output types.

Guidance on expected Quality assurance

Formal quality-assurance processes include, but are not limited to:

- › Peer-review or refereeing processes undertaken by journals and book publishers
- › Other review processes employed by editors, editorial committees or publishers
- › The selection of conference papers/abstracts and the refereeing of conference papers
- › Review processes specific to Māori or Pacific research processes and/or methodologies
- › Review processes undertaken by major galleries, museums and broadcasters
- › Review processes employed by users of commissioned or funded research including commercial clients and public bodies
- › Peer-reviewed reports e.g. to the Waitangi Tribunal or other government agencies
- › Granted patents.

Staff members are expected to nominate quality-assured research outputs for the majority of disciplines covered by the SSOCSS Panel. Quality assurance will include peer review for journals (including, where appropriate, on-line and e-journals), referee reports for books and conference papers, and other equivalent quality-assurance processes. Quality-assurance processes differ considerably and each will be considered in the context of the practices of a particular discipline or sub-discipline.

If a non-standard quality-assurance process has been used (e.g. in relation to practice-based research outputs or creative research outputs such as a film, video, or exhibition), staff members should explain precisely how quality has been assured in the Description field.

Expectations for information to be provided about ERE Outputs

Authors

Staff members should provide a clear description within the 2,000 character limit of the convention for the order of author listing in their subject area, noting that these may vary or change depending on the journal/publication/output type or intended audience.

Individual contribution

The SSOCSS Panel is aware that it is common for original research papers to have more than one author and that different research disciplines or groups have varying understandings about authorship and the order of authorship. Staff submitting EPs should clearly indicate the nature of their contribution to the particular output. Where there are multiple authors, staff members must ensure that their contribution to the research output is clearly defined in the individual contribution section. In cases where co-authors include the same ERE in their EPs, staff members are encouraged to confer about the details of their contributions, to ensure that there is no conflict in the information provided.

Staff members should provide a clear description explaining their substantial and distinctive contribution. Qualitative descriptions are more likely than percentages to give panels the detailed information they need to assess an individual's contribution to a research output. Further advice and examples concerning individual contributions for preparing an Evidence Portfolio can be found in the relevant panel-specific guidelines. Some journals require co-authored articles to include a statement

on the relative contribution of each author. These statements can be used in the Individual Contribution field if available.

Description

Staff members should provide information here about any non-standard quality assurance processes.

Proportion of ERE Outputs to be examined

Where three EREs have been submitted in an EP the SSOCSS panel will examine a minimum of two of the three ERE Outputs.

For EPs with one or two EREs, the SSOCSS panel will examine **all** the ERE Outputs submitted.

Guidance on Research Activities

For Quality Evaluation 2026 Research Activities are a new type of item which can be submitted within the ERE component. Research Activities can be submitted either as Supplementary Items within an ERE, in which case it is expected that they will be related to the other items in the ERE, or as standalone OEREs, in which case they do not need to be related to other items.

The following six types of Research Activity are eligible:

- › Presentation, sharing and dissemination of research or similar
- › Collaboration, outreach and engagement
- › Recognition of research outputs, outcomes, or activity
- › Research funding and support
- › Research fellowships, prizes, awards, and appointments
- › Uptake and impact.

In addition to the guidance in the TEO Guidelines, the SSOCSS panel notes the following:

Examples of Uptake and impact might include:

- › contributions to policy development at local or national levels
- › providing advice and commentary to public bodies
- › contributing to community development, including in Māori and Pacific communities.

Examples of Collaboration, outreach and engagement might include:

- › podcasts, blogs, or public lectures.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the ERE component

The Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences Panel will use the same standards to assess all types of EREs and overall research quality will be the critical factor. The panel will specifically consider the extent to which the research:

- › is recognised as being of high quality
- › is original, representing an intellectual advance or a significant contribution to knowledge
- › exhibits intellectual and methodological rigour and coherence
- › demonstrates intellectual and/or disciplinary impact
- › demonstrates impact in the wider community, for example, through influencing the direction of policy or practice.

The scope of these judgements may overlap and the list does not imply any particular rank order.

Research outputs that deal with topics or themes of primarily local, regional or national focus or interest can be of world-class standard if they exhibit characteristics stated in the TEO Guidelines. Research outputs may be supported by peer-recognition and end-user recognition. Such works will be of the highest quality in their theoretical approach and sophistication.

Contributions to the Research Environment component

The Contributions to the Research Environment (CRE) component of an Evidence Portfolio describes the research-related contributions the staff member has made to sustaining, developing, and/or growing the research environment and culture.

The component allows for recognition of activities and outcomes that are indicative of a vital, high-quality, sustainable research environment that may exist across academic, community, industrial, public, and commercial domains. Research environments and the activity that sustains and grows them may be local, regional, national or international in orientation, and no quality distinctions will be made on the basis of geographical scale or reach in and of itself.

The CRE component provides staff members with an opportunity to demonstrate:

- › Contributions to the research discipline, culture, or environment through leadership, advocacy, oversight, or awareness-raising roles and activity
- › Facilitation, network and collaboration activity that contributes to the research environment activities such as setting up or participating in research centres, groups, wānanga, fono, or networks
- › Researcher development and capability activity such as mentoring or other staff development roles
- › Reviewing and evaluating activity
- › Student development and support activity which contributes to growing a vibrant and inclusive research workforce including initiatives aimed at the attraction, supervision and support of Māori and Pacific research students
- › Peer esteem and research recognition factors which reflect the staff member's esteem within their field or wider research environment.

The panel recognises contributions to the support of honours and honours-equivalent students, as well as support of Masters and doctoral students.

The SSOCSS Panel recognises that a number of activities contribute to the research environment in Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences, and these might include (but are not limited to):

- › published commentaries on existing works and research
- › book reviews
- › podcasts or blogs
- › reading manuscripts and providing feedback and/or an assessment
- › public lectures
- › hosting department colloquia
- › research-related collegial activities
- › influence on other researchers or community/national wellbeing
- › participation on editorial boards
- › editing of journals or books
- › acting as a referee

- › research supervision
- › invitations to conferences, especially as keynote speaker
- › elected membership or fellowships
- › awards, prizes, honours associated with a career or with significant research focus advanced over many years
- › contribution to professional societies
- › Fellowship of a professional body
- › Mandated iwi and Māori authority leadership roles or other mandated cultural leadership roles.

Elaboration of the descriptor and tie-points for the CRE component

Given the diversity of research and impact indicators in the SSOCSS fields, staff members should explain and demonstrate the impact of their contributions to the research environment at an international, national, or institutional level. We recognise that some national or regional level contributions may be of world-class standard.

Unitec New Zealand Limited

Meeting of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date of Meeting: 12 October 2023

Title	Update: Rangahau and Research in Te Pūkenga
Provided by:	A/P Marcus Williams, Director Research and Enterprise
For:	Information

Recommendation

That the committee notes the update on rangahau and research provided as part of the Tārata te anamata | Creating our futures decision.

Information/Background

On 20 September Te Pūkenga unveiled its new operating structure for delivering better outcomes for ākonga (learners) and employers through a single unified organisation. The announcement followed consultation with 10,000 kaimahi (staff), resulting in over 8,000 pieces of feedback.

Significant feedback was received regarding research functions, despite it not being in scope for the consultation. All the feedback has been collated and will be incorporated into the design of research at the relevant time. Staff will have the chance to provide feedback on any further organisational design of the rangahau and research functions through a separate consultation process.

In the interim, a Rangahau and Research Director role has been established in Academic Centre and Learning Systems (ACLS), reporting to the DCE ACLS, to focus on progressing the design and consultation for rangahau and research. Current rangahau and research kaimahi who do not hold other teaching responsibilities will be lifted and shifted into the Ako Delivery National Operations Directorate while the design and consultation for rangahau and research is undertaken.

Unitec New Zealand Limited

Meeting of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date of Meeting: 12 October 2023

Title	New Process for Nvivo Software Requests
Provided by:	Nora Md Amin, Subject Librarian
For:	Information

Recommendation

That the committee notes the new process for postgraduate students and staff to obtain NVivo software licences.

Information/Background

NVivo provides a platform for researchers to organise, store and analyse their data. Some of its features include:

- Importing data from virtually any source.
- Analysing data with advanced management, query, and visualisation tools.
- Asking complex questions of data to identify themes and draw clear conclusions.
- Achieving more robust research results in less time.

NVivo is available to staff and postgraduate students under licence at Unitec, however there is a new process to obtain access to the software.

Key Points

Previously, postgraduate students and staff could approach the AskMe Desk in Te Puna to obtain an NVivo licence key. The new process to obtain access to the software is as follows:

- **Staff:** are able to submit requests for NVivo online via IT Self Service (instructions on how to launch this service are on Te Aka | The Nest [here](#)).
- **Postgraduate students:** should contact software@unitec.ac.nz. IT will generate an account for them which will trigger and email containing installation instructions.

The rationale for this change in process is in order that IT has control over software installation/updates on Unitec devices, lowering our cybersecurity risk in alignment with Te Pūkenga security protocols.

Contributors

Anna Wheeler, Manager Library

Brenda Massey, Acting URC Secretary

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?