agenda

Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	**2025-05-01**
Scheduled Start:	1300h
Scheduled End:	1500h
Location:	Microsoft Teams

SECTION 1 NGĀ KUPU ARATAKI | PRELIMINARIES

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

SECTION 2 STANDING ITEMS

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

SECTION 3 MEA HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

1. Unitec Scholarly Communication Guidelines Review

SECTION 4 WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

N/A

SECTION 5 NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

1. Updating Guidelines for Pacific Social Cultural Responsiveness
2. Research Centre Update – Centre of Research in Education for Healthcare Professionals
3. 2024 Research Centre Report - Applied Molecular Solutions Research Centre
4. 2024 Early Career Researcher Final Report – Dr Caralyn Kemp

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

Item 1.2 Mihi Whakatau | Welcome from the Chair

Item 1.3 Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec Membership

Hadley Brown (Chair)	Nominee of Director Research & Enterprise
Daisy Bentley-Gray (Emerging)	Nominee of Interim Manager Pacific Success
Hinewaimarama Reihana-White (Early Career)	Nominee of Taharangi | Director Māori Success
Dr Helen Gremillion (Professor)	Healthcare and Social Practice
Xinxin Wang	Architecture
Kambiz Borna	Building Construction
Dr Lian Wu (Associate Professor)	Healthcare and Social Practice
Dr Hamid Sharifzadeh (Professor)	Computing, Electrical and Applied Technology
Dr Leon Tan (Associate Professor)	Creative Industries
Dr Kristie Cameron (Associate Professor/ Early Career)	Environmental & Animal Sciences
Khaled Ibrahim	Applied Business
Dr Norasieh Md Amin (Subject Librarian)	Library
Kathryn George	Student Representative
Arun Deo (Research Advisor)	Tūāpapa Rangahau
In attendance: Brenda Massey (Acting Secretary)	Tūāpapa Rangahau
Up to two members from the MIT Research Committee	MIT

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 2025-04-10.

Section 2.3 Mahia Atu | Matters Arising

refer to pg13

SECTION 3 MEI HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

Section 3.1 Unitec Scholarly Communication Guidelines Review

refer to pg14

SECTION 4 WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

N/A

SECTION 5 NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

Section 5.1 Updating Guidelines for Pacific Social Cultural Responsiveness
refer to pg37

Section 5.2 Research Centre Update – Centre of Research in Education for Healthcare Professionals
refer to pg38

Section 5.3 2024 Research Centre Report – Applied Molecular Solutions Research Centre
refer to pg39

Section 5.4 2024 Early Career Researcher Final Report – Dr Caralyn Kemp
refer to pg44

SECTION 6 KUPU WHAKAMUTUNGA | CLOSING

Section 6.1 Ētahi Kaupapa Anō | Any Other Business

Section 6.2 Komiti Self-Assessment
refer to pg56

Section 6.3 Karakia Whakamutunga | Closing Karakia

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

minutes

Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date:	2025-04-10
Scheduled Start:	1300h
Scheduled End:	1500h
Location:	Microsoft Teams

MEETING OPENED: 1300h

SECTION 1 – NGĀ KUPU ARATAKI | PRELIMINARIES

Item 1.1 Karakia Tīmatanga | Opening Prayer

Item 1.2 Mihi Whakatau | Welcome from the Chair

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

SECTION 2 – STANDING ITEMS

Item 2.1 Ngā Whakapāha | Attendance, Apologies & Quorate Status

Members Present

1. Hadley Brown (Chair)
2. Kristie Cameron
3. Hinewaimarama Reihana-White (until 1.45pm)
4. Arun Deo
5. Kathryn George
6. Hamid Sharifzadeh
7. Nora Md Amin
8. Kambiz Borna
9. Xinxin Wang
10. Lian Wu
11. Daisey Bentley-Gray
12. Geoff Bridgman (proxy for Helen Gremillion)
13. Leon Tan
14. Khaled Ibrahim

Total members represented: 14 members

Apologies

1. Helen Gremillion

Total apologies: 1 member

MOTION

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

Moved: Kristie Cameron
Seconded: Kathryn George

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
2. Jamie Smiler, Pounuku Rangahau | Director Rangahau and Research, Te Pūkenga
3. Aiono Manu Fa'aea, MIT Research Committee

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

MOTION

That the committee approves the minutes of the 2025-03-13 meeting as a true and accurate record.

Moved: Hamid Sharifzadeh
Seconded: Nora Md Amin

MOTION CARRIED

Item 2.3 Mahia Atu | Matters Arising

Agenda Item(s)	Action	Responsible	Outcome
2.3	Establish a working group to scope the mahi required to update the current Unitec Scholarly Communication Guidelines. Present the results of the scoping work to the committee mid-2025.	Nora Md Amin / Arun Deo / Hamid Sharifzadeh	In progress. Input is still required from Ngā Wai a Te Tūī. Hadley Brown will follow up with them on that.
2.3	Invite committee members to attend a workshop to discuss and respond to the SSAG Phase 2 submission questions.	Brenda Massey / Hadley Brown	Complete. Agenda item 5.1 refers.
3.1	Advise the nominator of the approval of Artem Tolstykh as an Honorary Research Fellow.	Brenda Massey	Complete

4.1	Report the committee's feedback on Research Groups to Tūāpapa Rangahau for consideration.	Brenda Massey	Complete
4.2	Contact Penny Thomson asking that the Pacific Research Fono be given a web presence alongside Unitec's other Research Groups and asking that the Fono is kept appraised of any opportunities available for Research Groups, such as the writing retreats.	Daisy Bentley-Gray	Complete
6.1	Form a small working group to consider and respond to a question about Individual Research Plans in which it says: *"How will your research impact Māori research leadership, capability, excellence, partnership, processes and governance? "* The question is, can this question be broadened to include Pacific or Indigenous research? The working group should report back to the committee next month.	Hadley Brown	In progress. A working group of Hadley Brown, Hinewai Reihana-White and Daisy Bentley-Gray has been formed to progress this action. Daisy confirmed that she is in favour of broadening the question from a Pacific perspective.

SECTION 3 – MEA HEI WHAKAAE | ITEMS TO APPROVE

There we no items to approve this meeting.

SECTION 4 - WHAKAWHITI KŌRERO | ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Section 4.1 Supporting Research at Unitec – Jamie Smiler

The Chair warmly welcomed Jamie Smiler to the meeting. Jamie acknowledged the research leadership that this committee provides to Unitec and to the wider Te Pūkenga network. Unitec is one of the leading sites of research across the business divisions of Te Pūkenga.

Jamie gave the committee a brief overview of his role and what he's currently working on. His main responsibilities are around research revenue and research productivity and promoting

improvements in both areas. We can't avoid the fact that we need to generate revenue in order to undertake research. Jamie is also responsible for providing leadership around research, in terms of what research is and how it can benefit our organisations and communities and how it can enrich our roles as kaimahi. Some business divisions really understand this, while some are developing their understanding.

For 2025 Jamie is also focussing on a stream of work he's calling "E tū tātou, e tū mana motuhake", helping business divisions prepare to become standalone entities, finding out what things are meaningful and matter to each business division and supporting them to help achieve that.

Jamie has been engaging with the research leadership at Unitec about what sort of things he can support us with. He has identified that Unitec is doing things well, and that other business divisions are trying to achieve similar things. His aim is to link likeminded business divisions up so they can hopefully achieve things together.

It was queried whether there will be resourcing for an ITP Research Symposium this year in view of the disestablishment of Te Pūkenga. Jamie responded that he has been championing a network wide Research Symposium. Last year a five-day event was held across the country. Over 500 people achieved a research output. The potential of the event was much bigger than what was able to be delivered, as we were only able to get quite late confirmation of the event, and we probably didn't give enough time for researchers to be able to put something together. There will be another event this year. A South Island event has been confirmed for early December. A business division in the North Island has indicated that they're willing to host a North Island iteration. The form the symposium will take will hopefully come together in the next month.

Last year the symposium was partly funded through a national cost code, which has now been closed. For the medium-term survival of these events, Jamie is aiming to pull together a consolidated budget across all Te Pūkenga business divisions, asking each organisation to contribute. That way, rather than one business division having the cost burden of hosting the symposium, everybody will contribute a little every year, which will make it more manageable to the network.

It was queried whether post-Te Pūkenga there will be a commitment to someone taking leadership of an ITP research network. Jamie responded that we have the Rangahau Research Forum (RRF), with membership from each business division. The forum meets once a month as a community of practice. The aim is to try to retain that, and to find some budget for it. The forum has fed back on what things should be included in its mahi and some money has been forecast to contribute to those activities. But first the RRF has to decide, is that an activity we want to do together? At the next meeting the forum will discuss this further. Some activities include the administration of journals (there are ~12-15 journals across Te Pūkenga) as well as events like the symposium.

Do we put together some money for someone to be an advocate for the sector, either as an operational amount of money or an FTE amount? It may take some time for the new entities to mature to establish a role like that, however Jamie can see immense value in someone who has a platform for the sector and who has a little bit of resourcing to be able to use that platform. It will be a decision that each individual business division will need to make whether or not they want to aggregate their platform together to provide a perspective that represents the sector. While one person won't be able to represent every business division to its fullest on every issue, an aggregate perspective would still be quite useful.

It was queried how strong the RRF will be once Te Pukenga is fully disestablished, and how realistic it will be for individual business divisions to contribute a sum of money towards something for which

there is no core administrator with a specific whole network role. Jamie responded that the RRF will change and adapt and mould to the conditions of the time. The RRF was very strong prior to Te Pūkenga. However, as with many things, structure helps. Often the decisions and the leadership of individual people will determine how things happen and work. Jamie has been trying to encourage within the forum good leadership around that. The RRF has enough maturity to lead the way together.

It was queried whether programmes with a research component, e.g. the Master of Applied Practice, are adequately funded in order to produce the kind of graduates we want. Other programmes seem to get a better funding deal than what research programmes do. Jamie responded that he has been trying to work with business division leadership on understanding the different income streams provided by different research degrees. It is not well understood in some areas that when you deliver a research degree you get paid for the delivery but also for a completion. So that needs to be considered in the funding model of those programmes. Most programmes are evaluated on the delivery component. We need to be thinking how does the research degree completion (RDC) component get reinvested back into that programme in an appropriate way. It could be reinvested in different kinds of ways, e.g. an FTE to EFTS ratio, more discretionary money to support research in that programme, directly to ākonga for completions, scholarships etc.

At Unitec RDCs are not part of Finance's calculation when they do their programme profitability calculations. The learning outcomes are great in the postgraduate space, but when Finance does the numbers, they don't have the full picture. Jamie has been working on some of these things with Finance team leaders. We have seen the development of more taught master's programmes because there's a perception that they're easier and more cost-effective to deliver. That may be the case, but if you're not including all revenue streams in your calculations, you're not making a fair evaluation. Also, those taught master's degrees are terminal qualifications. If we're not communicating that with our learners when they enrol, they don't know that's the end of their academic progression. They may want to go on to do a PhD, for example, so those pathways are very important to clarify up front. A lot of universities delivering postgrad programmes funnel their RDC money back into supporting the learner directly, but this isn't something that's going to necessarily improve our performance. If it helped us to attract more students into the programme in the first place, then we could think about using that mechanism. Unless you are literate around the topic it's very hard to think strategically about it.

At Unitec we've seen a sizeable drop in external research income (ERI) and we understand the correlation between winning ERI and the retention of top researchers who have credibility within the research landscape. There is a strong case for researchers from the different ITP business divisions to work together. Ongoing collaboration and networking on external research grants is key. But there needs to be some sort of coordinating body, like a research office, to be able to do all the contracting and to negotiate with the Heads of Schools from the different institutions because it affects workload.

The sector has seen a decrease in demand. As a general observation, some of the offices that exist to support the old scale of our organisations are about the same. As we stand up as new entities one of the discussions is rather than building your own research office, why don't you contract in or partner with some of the existing entities in the network to provide what service you need, rather than bringing in everything yourself. Thinking about the need to diversify income streams from research, we need to be engaging more and becoming more competitive in external research grants. One of the ways you can do that is to work with others. If you don't have the capacity internally to

manage contracts and your researchers are isolated, they don't have a team around them. You can build a team across institutions and partner more, rather than trying to do everything by yourself. The external grant market is very competitive, with a reduction in public funding and the cancellation of some funds. What funds that do still exist are even more competitive than they used to be. There is also a growing cost to compete. To be successful you have to have more brilliant teams, and you need to build them across institutions.

It was queried whether, with the hyper competition for external research grants, we should be turning our focus more towards mission led applied research, using our industry contacts and focussing on that type of research where a specific problem has already been defined for resolving.

Jamie responded that we should indeed be partnering and working directly on solving problems that communities and industries have identified. That's where we already have a bit of an advantage over other research organisations. We're in every community and every location across the country. We do very well in that space when we do get those contracts and we're very cost effective. People want a solution to their problem, and they don't necessarily care who delivers it. They just want someone who can respond to an issue in a timely and cost-effective way.

It was raised that one problem that seems to be unique to Unitec is around sensitive expenditure. It might seem like a very operational question, but it's also quite important to strategy, and that's our ability, particularly with community based and kaupapa Māori research, to be able to host and show manaaki and have an efficient way of doing that.

Jamie responded that this issue is probably more acutely felt at Unitec for some reason. The way most other business divisions operate is that if the expenditure has been approved as part of a project, then the approval of the project endorses the spending of the money, and so it's a relatively simple process to get costs processed. At Unitec it seems that every expenditure is scrutinised, and it slows everything down. Te Pūkenga will be delegating the procurement function back to business divisions so at that time the procurement and sensitive expenditure policies will be reviewed. Jamie has asked Hadley Brown to provide him with some notes for when the consultation for that arises. However, often issues like this can be solved through relational means. Even though there's policy there, it often comes down to the application and interpretation of it. Sometimes when an organisation goes through extensive change there's often a conservatism that creeps in. Obviously, that is necessary for a certain period of time to control costs, but it needs to start to flex a bit with time. It should also be noted that some other business divisions have the opposite problem where things are far too loose.

In summing up, Jamie reiterated that the more diverse our research income streams are, the more resilient we will be. He also asked that when the ITP Research Symposium is announced, can the committee please be sure to provide strong advocacy for the event.

SECTION 5 - NGĀ TUKUNGA | ITEMS TO RECEIVE

Section 5.1 Science System Advisory Group Consultation Phase 2

Kristie Cameron, Hamid Sharifzadeh, Hadley Brown and Brenda Massey met to discuss the Science System Advisory Group (SSAG) consultation questions. Their feedback, as well as additional

feedback from Research Partner Enterprise, Gregor Steinhorn, was conveyed to Prof Martin Caroll and Jamie Smiler. Martin confirmed that the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) would make a submission on behalf of Unitec and that while it would include a summary of the working group's feedback, it was unlikely to include all the issues in the working group's notes.

Unitec was the only business division to provide feedback. Te Komiti Mātauranga Chair initiated a vote of thanks to the committee, acknowledging its work on the consultation.

This demonstrates that when the committee does get involved in these things we do have some impact, at least at a Unitec level.

Section 5.2 2024 ECR Contestable Funding Final Reports

The committee received final reports from Kristie Cameron, Mary Yan and Hinewaimarama Reihana-White. The committee's student rep, Kathryn George, undertook a student internship as part of Hinewai's project and she spoke a little about that.

Each of the projects achieved significant impact, and the Chair conveyed his thanks to each of the grant recipients for their reports.

SECTION 6 - KUPU WHAKAMUTUNGA | CLOSING

Section 6.1 Ētahi Kaupapa Anō | Any Other Business

Kristie Cameron, who was part of the committee's working group that fed back a response to Unitec's SLT on the SSAG's consultation, expressed her concern that the response the SLT went on to submit did not incorporate all the issues captured in the notes from the working group.

The working group's response was serious and strong and showed our facility in the research space, in competition with the universities. The changes made to the group's submission seemed to trivialise our strength as researchers, therefore undermining our capacity to win grants. It reframed Unitec as being just a vocational educational provider rather than also a serious research provider.

When you have members of a professoriate and people who are experts in their field work on something, it is not conducive to having those experts and professoriate members actively engaging in these kinds of consultations if their responses are going to be changed. The working group's response was very forthright on what support our researchers need, but the response that went on to be submitted weakened the position the group were aiming to advocate for. The working group engaged in providing feedback above their workloads, yet their feedback was modified and diluted.

Hamid Sharifzadeh felt that the SLT were trying to make clear Unitec's point of difference as a vocational training provider. Those preparing for upcoming professorial addresses have been urged to pitch their talks from a vocational perspective. He suggested Martin Carroll could be invited to a future meeting to further elaborate around this, and that it would have been good for the SLT to have had some kind of discussion with the working party before the submission was made. When we talk about vocational research, what are we really referring to? Is positioning Unitec as a vocational education provider a strength or a weakness when it comes to our ability to compete for external research revenue streams?

The Chair responded that he thinks the concern expressed may be a consequence of part of the process required to aggregate thoughts and sentiments and then in choosing a particular tone. Some of the original sentiment can get lost through that process of filtering.

Section 6.2 Komiti Self-Assessment

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: 1415 h

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Agenda Item(s)	Action	Responsible	Outcome
2.3	Establish a working group to scope the mahi required to update the current Unitec Scholarly Communication Guidelines. Present the results of the scoping work to the committee mid-2025.	Nora Md Amin / Arun Deo / Hamid Sharifzadeh	
2.3	Form a small working group to consider and respond to a question about Individual Research Plans in which it says: *"How will your research impact Māori research leadership, capability, excellence, partnership, processes and governance? "* The question is, can this question be broadened to include Pacific or Indigenous research? The working group should report back to the committee next month.	Hadley Brown	

MATTERS ARISING

Agenda Item(s)	Action	Responsible	Outcome
2.3	Establish a working group to scope the mahi required to update the current Unitec Scholarly Communication Guidelines. Present the results of the scoping work to the committee mid-2025.	Nora Md Amin / Arun Deo / Hamid Sharifzadeh	Complete and on agenda (item 3.1 refers)
2.3	Form a small working group to consider and respond to a question about Individual Research Plans in which it says: *"How will your research impact Māori research leadership, capability, excellence, partnership, processes and governance? "* The question is, can this question be broadened to include Pacific or Indigenous research? The working group should report back to the committee next month.	Hadley Brown	In progress

Unitec New Zealand Limited

Meeting of Unitec Research Committee

Date of Meeting: 2025-05-01

Title	Unitec Scholarly Communication Guidelines review
Provided by:	Working group (Norasieh Md Amin, Arun Deo & Hamid Sharifzadeh)
Authored by:	Norasieh Md Amin
For:	**APPROVAL**

Recommendation

That the Committee approves the reviewed Unitec Scholarly Communication Guidelines

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to provide the scope regarding the Guidelines and present the reviewed version of the Guidelines for URC approval.

Justification

As indicated in the Library memo to URC, the following were justifications to review the Guidelines:

1. The current guidelines may not represent current scholarly communication practices.
2. The current guidelines do not refer to the most recent Unitec documents/guidelines.
3. Improvement in the readability of the guidelines is needed.

Background

The Scholarly Communication Guidelines, dated 2016, requires updates. The Guidelines are owned by the Library and the Research Office, and can be retrieved from Te Aka - see https://thenest.unitec.ac.nz/TheNestWP/wp-content/uploads/2

The Library took the initiative and presented a memo to URC (see minutes dated 2024-11-14). A working group was then formed by URC to discuss scoping of the review of the guidelines.

The scope:

- Maintain the original main ideas and structure, as well as contents that are relevant
- Add/omit/edit guidelines to reflect current practices where applicable
- Add/omit/edit relevant hyperlinks
- Edit relevant names of groups/committee
- Improvise readability and include relevant citations where applicable
- Include recent Reference Documents

Out of scope:

- Make any changes to Reference Documents

With regards to section 4.7 Māori Culture and Identity of the Guidelines, Ngā Wai a Te Tūī was contacted to give feedback. From the Library perspective, the section is fine. No changes were made to the section.

Next Steps

- If changes are deemed necessary to Section 4.7, the Research Office to take the necessary action to address changes.
- URC approve the reviewed Scholarly Communication Guidelines
- The approved Guidelines are uploaded to Te Aka - https://thenest.unitec.ac.nz/TheNestWP/policies-and-forms/guidelines/
- Communication to Schools and relevant staff and students is made

Contributors

- Norasieh Md Amin
- Arun Deo
- Hamid Sharifzadeh

Attachments

The reviewed Scholarly Communication Guidelines

The current Scholarly Communication Guidelines

Scholarly Communication Guidelines

Table of Contents

1. PURPOSE

These guidelines advise Unitec staff and students on the nature, policies and processes of Scholarly Communication and dissemination at Unitec, including recommendations on how and when to make research and teaching materials available on the web. They provide the framework for several Unitec's policies and guidelines, particularly the Conduct of Research, Conduct of Student Research, Documenting Research Outputs, Intellectual Property and Research Outputs policies. These policies should be consulted along with these guidelines and links to them are provided throughout.

2. APPLICATION AND SCOPE

These guidelines apply to all Unitec staff and students. They focus on formal, public examples of Scholarly Communication and not informal and private examples, such as blog or social media posts. Examples are wide range and include books, chapters in books, conference presentations, musical compositions, creative works (e.g. dance performances), exhibitions, films and videos. Unitec's Guidelines on Research Output Type Evidence provide a good list of 'output categories' considered to be Scholarly Communications. Journal articles are the most common Scholarly Communication output, whether in print or electronic format. Research shows that publishing in peer-reviewed journals is still important, particularly those that have a readership that authors/creators wish to reach, those that have higher prestige and those that their peers regular read (Niles et al., 2020). However, there is a growing call to "de-centre" the journal article as the sole scientific output that counts (Brembs et al., 2023).

3. DEFINITIONS

Article Processing Charge (APC)	a charge paid by an author to a publisher enabling research (usually a journal article) to be made available to all without access barriers (e.g. access only available subscribers). Also called "author pays".
Creative Commons	an international nonprofit organisation that "empowers individuals and communities around the world by equipping them with technical, legal, and policy solutions to enable sharing of knowledge and culture in the public interest (Creative Commons, 2024)
Open Access	Free availability of research literature on the pubic internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself (Budapest Open Access Initiative, 2002)

Open Educational Resources (OER)	learning, teaching and research materials in any format and medium that reside in the public domain or are under copyright that have been released under an open license, that permits no-cost access, re-use, re-purpose, adaptation and redistribution by others (UNESCO, 2024)
Post-Print	the version of an academic article that has been accepted by a publisher after peer review but has not yet been formatted according to the publisher's style guide; essentially, it's the author's final accepted manuscript, ready to be published with final formatting changes applied by the publisher (*SHERPA RoMEO Colours, Pre-Print, Post-Print, Definitions and Terms*, n.d.)
Research Output(s)	research outputs included in and defined by Unitec's Guidelines for Documenting Research Outputs.
Scholarly Communication	the system through which research and other scholarly writings are created, evaluated for quality, disseminated to the scholarly community, and preserved for future use. The system includes both formal means of communication, such as publication in peer-reviewed journals, and informal channels, such as electronic mailing lists. It is created as a public good to facilitate inquiry and knowledge and many scholars develop and disseminate their research with no expectation of direct financial reward (ACRL, 2025)

4. GUIDELINES

4.1 Overview

The creation and dissemination of scholarly research is a major mechanism to produce knowledge that increases knowledge in academic fields and adds to our understanding of our world. It tests laws and theories and leads to creative projects that grow our understanding of humanity and its stories and how we interact (Beck et al., 2019). There are strong community calls that publicly funded research is made accessible for the public good.

These guidelines recognise that researchers are authors (or creators) as well as readers (or users) of knowledge; and that attitudes towards communication may vary depending on whether they are author or reader.

4.2 Scholarly Communication

The nature of scholarly communication is changing. Researchers have noted that scholarly communication is now a more global enterprise and interest in tools such as bibliometrics and citation analysis have grown significantly (Donthu et al., 2021). The commonality of English as the most common language of Scholarly Communication has led to unintentional equity and diversity biases (Bowker, 2024). In the past, formal communication usually meant publication in peer-reviewed journals or books,

conference papers and proceedings, reports and creative works of art. Today, scholarly communication practices have been transformed by the internet, enabling unprecedented possibilities for dissemination that affect scholarly publishing by enabling new publishing models, such as open access. Sierra (2024) notes that a better understanding of how knowledge building itself has evolved and continued to adapt to contemporary challenges through the recognition of different forms of expanding and communicating knowledge. Through this process we can strengthen what research can be. Different forms of output do not replace traditional scholarly publications but supplement them.

4.3 Responsibilities

Unitec will seek to facilitate these guidelines by:

1) Contributing to government strategy and policy frameworks to improve access to scholarly information.
2) Incorporating scholarly dissemination and community access to scholarly work into Unitec strategic plans.
3) Advocating and implementing policies to ensure fair use of copyrighted information for educational and research purposes.
4) Staffing the repository to identify and abide by publishers' policies relating to copyright.
5) Promoting dissemination of scholarly findings to staff and postgraduate students through Research Office and Research Leaders in respective Schools.
6) Ensuring that mentoring and training of research students incorporates discussions about scholarly dissemination.
7) Recognising the increasing availability of parallel dissemination options when publishing scholarly work, to reach the widest audience.
8) Collaborating with other researchers, research institutions and publishers to raise awareness of scholarly communication principles and practice, including the benefits of open access publishing.
9) Working with researchers to enable appropriate open access to both their published works and their primary research data.
10) Applying a Creative Commons license to open access materials, when appropriate, to determine how materials may be used, reused or repurposed.
11) Retaining and filing their final post-peer reviewed and corrected version of articles sent for publication.
12) Considering the outcomes of the Treaty of Waitangi claim WAI 262 of 2011, affecting Māori culture and identify (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011).

Unitec Research Office staff will seek to facilitate these guidelines by:

13) Ensuring Unitec's research community is familiar with relevant policies.
14) Ensuring research students and academic staff are aware of current issues in scholarly publication and dissemination.

15) Developing infrastructure within Unitec, including ePress, that will facilitate access to scholarly information.
16) Providing a consistent form of institutional affiliation and address for author/s when submitting work for publication, so that Unitec's output will be able to be easily identified and retrieved.

Unitec Library staff will seek to facilitate these guidelines by:

17) Developing infrastructure within Unitec, entitled Research Bank, that will facilitate access to scholarly information.
18) Providing a sustainable repository for the deposit and dissemination of scholarly work.
19) Maintaining and retaining content submitted to the repository.

4.4 Authorship and Publication Practice

Unitec's Conduct of Research Policy, Conduct of Student Research Policy, Intellectual Property Policy, and Guidelines for Research Outputs discuss authorship and publication practice, including dissemination.

4.4.1 Advice about authorship and publication

While Unitec supports the freedom of academics to choose the best publication venue for their research outputs, one aspect of professional development in scholarships is mentoring and advice in respect of publishing and disseminating scholarly research.

The Research Office and Research Leaders in respective Schools will lead in providing this mentoring and advice. Members of Unitec's ePress Advisory Committee, Research Advisors and Research Partners can advise on researchers publishing options.

Mentoring and advice includes:

1) Recommending the choice of publication outlet (journal, conference, website etc).
2) Assisting with the development, structure and writing of an article, paper or presentation.
3) Advising on approaches to dealing with the editors and assessors of scholarly work.
4) Providing support in the face of rejection and critical attacks in the discipline.

In addition, supervisors of undergraduate and postgraduate research students have a responsibility to inform them about the meanings and processes of Scholarly Communication and dissemination. These are outlined in Unitec's Conduct of Student Research Policy, particularly Guideline 12/10 'Guidelines for publication from a thesis or dissertation or research project.'

4.4.2 Solicitations to publish / Paying to publish

Staff may receive emails from journals or book publishing houses soliciting their publications. They need to assess the validity of these offers as the quality and

legitimacy of these publications can be questionable. For example, predatory publishers - those who lack transparency, deceive or otherwise fail to follow industry standards - publish substandard and often disputable research to exploit the open-access, author-pays model. Other publishers scam researching staff by soliciting their work and invoicing them only after publication. The credibility of a journal soliciting publication should be assessed by reviewing previous publications, assessing membership of editorial committees and discussing the request with colleagues. When deciding on a publisher, consider thinkchecksubmit.org. This site is backed by many reputable bodies including the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). There are also reputable resources for identifying predatory publishers; such as Beall's List https://beallslist.net/ and Cabells' Predatory Reports https://www2.cabells.com/predatory.

All research dissemination funding applications go through the Research Advisor and Research Partners. The dissemination platform is thoroughly investigated before funding is approved by the Research director.

There are some reputable journal or book publishing houses that require payment for publication. The most common requirement is an Article Processing Charge (APC), in which the publisher requires payment by the author to publish. This is an integral element of ‘Gold Open Access’ publishing. See section 4.8 on Open Access publishing for more information. Staff should discuss possible APC with their school’s Research Leaders and Research Advisors before committing to paying the charges as reimbursement by Unitec is not guaranteed.

4.5 Ownership and Copyright

Copyright is a way to recognise your authorship or creatorship over a work/mahi. In New Zealand, copyright is created automatically with original work, like artwork, books, websites, computer programs, drawings, plays, films, music, and sound recordings. You may use the symbol © to help you demonstrate that you claim copyright in a particular work, but you do not need to. Copyright lasts for the lifetime of the creator plus 50 years (New Zealand Intellectual Property Office, 2025)

The ownership and copyright of Scholarly Communications, Research Outputs and research data, is held by the author or creator unless it has been signed over to a third party (for example, a journal publisher).

Ownership of work created by a Unitec staff member, in the course of their employment with Unitec, is retained by the individual, except in situations where it is agreed that commercialisation of that material should be pursued as detailed out in Unitec’s Intellectual Property Policy.

4.6 Assigning Copyright

While theses, conference papers, posters and working papers are normally acceptable in their final format, copyright is often an issue when it comes to making journal articles openly accessible via the web. In most cases, copyright over an article is transferred to the journal publisher. Despite this, journal publishers do allow authors to make their work open access, albeit with some restrictions on the format of the paper you use. Usually, publishers do not allow authors to post the

final, published version of a paper on the Internet. However, large publishers can allow you to use your final draft version of the paper (also known as a post-print). This should be identical in content to the published version, although the formatting may be different. In almost all cases where the use of the final draft is permitted, the publisher requires a link to their authorised version.

When the published version of a journal article isn't clear about copyright policy, there is also a useful tool called Search Sherpa Services. This platform lists exactly what the policy is together with conditions (such as embargo times). Formerly called Sherpa-Romeo, Search Sherpa Services can be found at: https://beta.sherpa.ac.uk/search

Unitec recommends authors retain copyright of their work where possible by not assigning copyright to a publisher. While many publishers' agreements request transfer of copyright, authors can attach an addendum which modifies the publisher's agreement and allows authors to keep key rights to their works, including placement into Unitec's Research Bank. When it comes to Research Bank, staff research outputs are not self-submitted, therefore copyright compliance on that platform is handled by the library. See also: paragraph 4.11 below.

4.7 Māori Culture and Identity

Ko Aotearoa Tenei is the Waitangi Tribunal's report into the claim known as Wai 262 and concerns the place of Maori culture, identity and traditional knowledge in New Zealand's law, and in government policies and practices (*Wai 262 Report*, 2011). It reports on the control of Maori traditional knowledge, who controls artistic and cultural works such as haka and waiata, and who controls the environment that created Maori culture. Wai 262 contains definitions of 'taonga works' and 'taonga-derived works' and recommends how these works may be used. We need to consider the intellectual property in 'taonga works' and the role of *kaitiaki* (cultural guardians).

The dissemination and use of Indigenous Knowledge should be discussed at consultation stage, particularly with reference to digital dissemination. For more see the Guidelines for Maori and Community Social and Cultural Responsiveness.

4.8 Open Access

An overview of Open Access is available in a Library Guide. Additionally, Open Access Australasia provides a toolkit designed to guide researchers through the process of making their journal articles Open Access.

These guidelines endorse the principle of Open Access and Unitec recommends researchers to make their work available in Open Access format. To this end Unitec has established the Research Bank. Researchers do not submit their work directly to Research Bank; their entries in Unitec's Research Outputs Management System (ROMS) provide details which the Library uses to make their research output available to the public.

This does not mean that researchers must make their work available in an open access format. Unitec recognises that researchers are best placed to choose the

publication and dissemination option of their choice and that there will be circumstances when it would be inappropriate to make research or other content openly accessible.

An item record in ROMS has a way for researchers to indicate when they do not want to make their work available on an open access platform. When considering open access publishing researchers also need to be aware of predatory publishers. See section 4.4.2 for more information.

Most discussion on Open Access recognises the two main mechanisms for achieving open access. The gold route, often referred to as the “author pays” route, involves payment of an article processing charge to publishers enabling the article to be made available to all without subscription or charge barriers. The alternative green route, often referred to as the “self-archiving” route, entails authors submitting manuscripts to traditional journals but maintaining the right to mount a version of their work on an open access repository. Unitec currently follows the ‘green route’ of open access publishing.

4.9 Open Educational Resources

Creative Commons Aotearoa New Zealand works with the Open Educational Resources (OER) movement. By having Creative Commons licenses, teachers can reuse, remix and share their own lesson plans, courses, textbooks and a growing range of digital and print resources (*Creative Commons NZ*, n.d.).

The Open Education Resources Foundation, based at Otago Polytechnic, is an independent, not-for-profit organisation that provides leadership, international networking and support for educators and educational institutions to achieve their objectives through Open Education.

Unitec has been an OER Anchor partner since 2013 (*OER Foundation*, 2020) and will continue to support staff who want to make their teaching materials OER.

4.10 Creative Commons

The Creative Commons provide free licenses and tools that copyright owners can use to allow others to share, reuse and remix their material, legally. The licenses give everyone from individual creators to large companies and institutions a simple, standardised way to grant copyright permission to their creative work resulting in a vast and growing digital commons (Creative Commons, 2013).

There are six types of licenses. See the Creative Commons website for more details. Unitec staff should be aware of the different types of Creative Commons licenses and apply them to their work then making that material freely available on the internet. The Unitec Library and Research Office staff will assist in this if required.

4.11 Documenting Research Outputs

Unitec takes responsibility for ensuring accuracy in reporting research activity and the resulting outputs undertaken at Unitec. To this end Unitec will provide a comprehensive list of research and academic output types to categorise and report

on this activity. This will be managed through a centralised database (ROMS), in which staff are required to record all research-related outputs. This database will be regularly checked to ensure information provided to the public domain is complete and accurate. For more information see Guidelines on Research Outputs Management System (ROMS) and Research Output Type Evidence.

4.12 Storing and Preserving Research Outputs

Unitec's Research Bank is the digital repository in which research carried out at Unitec is stored and made available to the world. The purpose of the Research Bank is to make Unitec research as widely available as possible, by providing free access to it over the Internet, and making it easily found by Internet search engines.

The repository was developed using DSpace, an open-source software platform, as part of a Library Consortium of New Zealand project. The contents of the repository are listed on the National Library's DigitalNZ platform.

The Research Bank is administered by Unitec library staff. The Research Office and Library staff work together to make information recorded in ROMS available in open access format within the Research Bank where possible. Copyright restrictions may limit the availability of material held in ROMS and Research Bank.

Digital preservation is a significant problem facing institutional repositories such as Research Bank and at Unitec we have yet to determine the intent and methodology of a digital preservation programme for research outputs. The uncertain timeframes around the deterioration of digital storage media and technological obsolescence are examples of issues common to all preservation agencies that deal with digital formats. How we define adequate access and preserve commonly supported text, image and audio file formats (such as .pdf, .xml, .jpg, .wav, .tiff or .avi) are questions a preservation programme will need to address. Conversations around digital preservation and the role Unitec's digital repository will take regarding this are on-going.

4.13 Academic Integrity

With regard to scholarly communication, the policy requires all students and staff "to undertake their academic work with academic integrity", which is defined as "intellectual honesty with regard to the use of information and in the pursuit of knowledge and understanding". Using information would also mean its publication and dissemination. Refer to the latest Unitec Procedures on Academic Integrity (2023).

4.14 Theses

A common part of postgraduate study is the completion of a research thesis or research project. At Unitec, it is a requirement of completion for students to provide a digital copy of their thesis to the Research Office. The library will then deposit the thesis into the Research Bank for public access, unless restricted by an embargo.

Theses completed by Unitec staff at other academic institutions and awarded by those institutions are considered their institutions' research outputs. Therefore, unless it is a

joint award, this work goes into the research repository of that other institutions. At the Library's discretion, access to that work, when awarded by other another institution, can be provided by a catalogue link in the Library Catalogue.

5 References

ACRL. (2025). Principles and Strategies for the Reform of Scholarly Communication 1 | Association of College and Research Libraries. https://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/whitepapers/principlesstrategies

Beck, S., Mahdad, M., Beukel, K., & Poetz, M. (2019). The Value of Scientific Knowledge Dissemination for Scientists—A Value Capture Perspective. Publications, 7(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7030054

Bowker, L. (2024). Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication: How Far Can Technology Take Us and What Else Can We Do? The Journal of Electronic Publishing, 27(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.3998/jep.6262

Brembs, B., Huneman, P., Schönbrodt, F., Nilsonne, G., Susi, T., Siems, R., Perakakis, P., Trachana, V., Ma, L., & Rodriguez-Cuadrado, S. (2023). Replacing academic journals. Royal Society Open Science, 10(7), 230206. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.230206

Budapest Open Access Initiative. (2002). Read the Declaration – Budapest Open Access Initiative. https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read/

Creative Commons NZ. (n.d.). Retrieved March 6, 2025, from https://creativecommons.org.nz/

Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Mukherjee, D., Pandey, N., & Lim, W. M. (2021). How to conduct a bibliometric analysis: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 133, 285–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.070

New Zealand Intellectual Property Office. (2025). Copyright. Intellectual Property Office of New Zealand. https://www.iponz.govt.nz/get-ip/copyright/

Niles, M. T., Schimanski, L. A., McKiernan, E. C., & Alperin, J. P. (2020). Why we publish where we do: Faculty publishing values and their relationship to review, promotion and tenure expectations. PLOS ONE, 15(3), e0228914. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228914

OER Foundation. (2020). https://wikieducator.org/OERF:Home

SHERPA RoMEO Colours, Pre-print, Post-print, Definitions and Terms. (n.d.). Retrieved April 24, 2025, from https://web.archive.org/web/20200205104556/https://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeoinfo.html#prepostprints

Sierra, M. (2024, September 17). Non-traditional research outputs: Explainer. Research. https://research.unimelb.edu.au/strengths/updates/news/explainer-what-are-non-traditional-research-outputs,-and-why-do-they-matter

Wai 262 Report: Protecting and Nurturing Taonga Māori. (2011). https://www.wai262.nz/ko-aotearoa-tenei

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

1. Academic Integrity - 2023
2. Conduct of Research Policy - 2021
3. Copyright Procedures for Staff – March 2020
4. Copying of Copyright Works for Educational Purposes – March 2020
5. Intellectual Property Policy – Sept 2018
6. Guidelines for Maori and Community Social and Cultural Responsiveness – April 2020
7. Guidelines on Research Output Type - Evidence Guide
8. Guidelines on Research Outputs Management System (ROMS)
9. Conduct of Student Research Policy - 2021

Note: Retrieve reference documents from Te Aka
https://thenest.unitec.ac.nz/TheNestWP/policies-and-forms/guidelines/

DOCUMENT DETAILS

Version:	3	**Issue Date this Version:**	May 2025
This Version Approved by:	Unitec Research Committee	**Date of Approval:**	??
Document Owner:	Library / Research Office and Postgraduate Centre	**Document Sponsor:**	Unitec Research Committee
Date of Next Review:	??		
Date first version issued:	4 March 2014	**Original Approval Body:**	Unitec Research Committee

AMENDMENT HISTORY

Version	Issue Date	Reason for Revision	Approved by
2	March 2016	Small amendment Maori Culture & Identity section	Dean Research and Enterprise
3	May 2025	Remove outdated information; cite recent sources of information; and link to recent reference documents	Unitec Research Committee (URC)

Scholarly Communication Guidelines

Table of Contents

1. PURPOSE

These guidelines inform Unitec staff and students about the meanings and processes of Scholarly Communication and dissemination and about how and when to make research and teaching materials available, including open and free access on the web. They provide the framework for a number of Unitec's policies and guidelines, in particular the Conduct of Research, Conduct of Student Research, Documenting Research Outputs, Intellectual Property and Research Outputs policies. These policies should be consulted along with the guidelines and links to them are provided throughout.

2. APPLICATION AND SCOPE

These guidelines apply to all Unitec staff and students. They focus on the formal, public examples of Scholarly Communication and not informal and private examples, such as blogs. Examples are wide ranging and include books, chapters in books, conference presentations, musical compositions, creative works (e.g. dance performance), exhibitions, films and videos. Unitec's Guidelines for Documenting Research Outputs provides a good list of 'output categories' considered to be Scholarly Communications. Most often they are journal articles, whether in print or electronic format. Research shows that published journal articles remain the preferred way for researchers to disseminate their research and that peer-review retains a 'central' role in both communication and research practice (Spezi, Fry, Creaser, Probets, & White, 2013).

3. DEFINITIONS

Article Processing Charge (APC)	Means a charge paid by an author to a publisher enabling research (usually a journal article) to be made available to all without subscription of charge barriers. Also called "author pays".
Creative Commons	Means the non-profit organisation devoted to expanding the range of creative works available for others to build upon legally and to share. The organisation has released several copyright licenses free of charge to the public (Creative Commons, 2013)
Open Access	Means "the practice of providing unrestricted access via the internet to peer-reviewed scholarly research (Open Access, 2013)
Open Educational Resources (OER)	Means "freely accessible, usually open licensed documents and media that are useful for teaching, learning, educational, assessment and research purposes" (Open educational resources, 2013)
Research Output(s)	Means outputs included in and defined by Unitec's Guidelines for Documenting Research Outputs.
Scholarly Communication	Means knowledge transmission: it is about creating, disseminating and preserving scholarly research. Scholarly communication covers the full spectrum of communicative practices, from 'traditional' publication to newer internet-mediated forms, for example, digital media. Scholarly publishing is a subset of scholarly communication and is mediated through the use of a durable medium to fix knowledge.

4. GUIDELINES

4.1. Overview

The creation and dissemination of scholarly research "is an important part of academic work, passing on the knowledge and benefits to other scholars, professional practitioners and the wider community" (Australian National University, 2010). There are strong community calls that publicly-funded research is made accessible for the public good.

These guidelines recognise that researchers are authors (or creators) as well as readers (or users) of knowledge; and that attitudes towards communication may vary depending on whether they are author or reader.

4.2. Scholarly Communication

Scholarly communication is about creating, advancing, disseminating and preserving knowledge. Scholarly communications processes see scholars communicating in a range of ways, using practices that vary within and across disciplines and that include formal and informal modes of communications (Mabe, 2010). In the past, formal communication usually meant publication in peer-reviewed journals or books, conference papers and proceedings, reports and creative works of art. Today, scholarly communication practices have been transformed by the internet, enabling "unprecedented possibilities for dissemination…[that] affect scholarly publishing by enabling new publishing models", such as open access: "These models usually are 'new' because they offer a new genre (or form) of presentation, a new mode for interaction (between authors, between readers, or between authors and readers), a new business model, a new approach to peer review, or some combination of these" (Hahn, 2008). These forms of dissemination do not replace traditional scholarly publications, but supplement them.

4.3. Responsibilities

Unitec will seek to facilitate these guidelines by:

1) Contributing to government strategy and policy frameworks to improve access to scholarly information;
2) Incorporating scholarly dissemination and community access to scholarly work into Unitec strategic plans;
3) Advocating and implementing policies to ensure fair use of copyrighted information for educational and research purposes;
4) Staffing the repository to identify and abide by publishers' policies relating to copyright.

Unitec staff will seek to facilitate these guidelines by:

5) Promoting dissemination of scholarly findings through Faculty Research Committees to staff and postgraduate students;
6) Ensuring that mentoring and training of research students incorporates discussions about scholarly dissemination;
7) Recognising the increasing availability of parallel dissemination options when publishing scholarly work in order to reach the widest audience;

8) Collaborating with other researchers, research institutions and publishers to raise awareness of scholarly communication principles and practice, including the benefits of open access publishing;
9) Working with researchers to enable appropriate open access to both their published works and their primary research data;
10) Applying a Creative Commons licence to open access materials, when appropriate, to determine how materials may be used, reused or repurposed;
11) Retaining and filing their final post-peer reviewed and corrected version of articles sent for publication;
12) Considering the outcomes of the Treaty of Waitangi claim WAI 262 of 2011, affecting Maori culture and identify (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011).

Unitec Research Office staff will seek to facilitate these guidelines by:

13) Ensuring Unitec's research community is familiar with relevant policies;
14) Ensuring research students and academic staff are aware of current issues in scholarly publication and dissemination;
15) Developing infrastructure within Unitec, including ePress, that will facilitate access to scholarly information;
16) Providing a consistent form of institutional affiliation and address for author/s when submitting work for publication, so that Unitec's outputs will be able to be easily identified and retrieved.

Unitec Library staff will seek to facilitate these guidelines by:

17) Developing infrastructure within Unitec, Research Bank, that will facilitate access to scholarly information;
18) Providing a sustainable repository for the deposit and dissemination of scholarly work;
19) Maintaining and retaining content submitted to the repository.

4.4. Authorship and publication practice

Unitec's Conduct of Research Policy, Conduct of Student Research Policy, Intellectual Property Policy and Guidelines and Guidelines for Documenting Research Outputs discuss authorship and publication practice, including dissemination.

4.4.1. Advice about authorship and publication

One aspect of professional development in scholarship is mentoring and advice in respect of publishing and disseminating scholarly research.

The Chairs of the Faculty Research Committees and staff of the Research Office and Postgraduate Centre will lead in providing this mentoring and advice. Members of Unitec's ePress Advisory Committee, Faculty Research Committees and Departmental Research Committees are able to advise on researchers publishing options.

Mentoring and advice includes:

1) Recommending the choice of publication outlet (journal, conference, web-site etc);

2) Reviewing the implications of certain choices, for example journal impact factors, or being aware of the relatively scholarly prestige of conferences or journals;
3) Assisting with the development, structure and writing of an article, paper or presentation;
4) Advising on approaches to dealing with the editors and assessors of scholarly work;
5) Providing support in the face of rejection and critical attacks in the discipline.

As well, supervisors of undergraduate and postgraduate research students have a responsibility to inform them about the meanings and processes of Scholarly Communication and dissemination. These are outlined in Unitec's Conduct of Student Research Policy, particularly Guideline 12/10 'Guidelines for publication from a thesis or dissertation or research project.'

4.4.2. Solicitations to publish / Paying to publish

Staff may receive emails from journals or book publishing houses soliciting their publications. They need to assess the validity of these offers as the quality and legitimacy of these publications can often be questionable. For example, predatory publishers - those who lack transparency, deceive or otherwise fail to follow industry standards - publish substandard and often disputable research, in order to exploit the open-access, author-pays model. Other publishers scam researching staff by soliciting their work and invoicing them only after publication. The credibility of a journal soliciting publication should be assessed by reviewing previous publications, assessing membership of editorial committees and discussing the request with colleagues.

Unitec recommends staff and students resist the temptation to publish quickly and to use scholarly social networks to identify and share information on predatory publishers. A blog maintained by Jeffrey Beall, University of Colorado, Denver '*Scholarly Open Access: critical analysis of scholarly open-access publishing'* provides information about predatory publishers (Beall, 2013).

There are some reputable journal or book publishing houses that require payment for publication. The most common requirement is an Article Processing Charge (or APC), in which the publisher requires payment by the author to publish: this is an integral element of 'Gold Open Access' publishing. See section 4.8 on Open Access publishing for more information. At Unitec the Faculty of Social and Health Sciences introduced a faculty policy concerning APC's in 2013, and staff in this faculty should refer to this when faced with APC's. Staff should discuss possible APC's with their departments and faculties before committing to paying the charges as reimbursement by Unitec is not guaranteed.

4.5. Ownership and Copyright

Copyright is a part of an area of the law known as intellectual property (IP). Copyright is "a set of exclusive property rights given to owners in relation to their creations … Copyright protection is automatic … there is no formal system for copyright registration … You don't need to put a copyright notice on your work, publish it, or do anything else for your work to be protected … it is protected from the time it is first recorded, either in writing or in some way" (Copyright Council of New Zealand, 2009).

Thus the ownership and copyright of Scholarly Communications, Research Outputs and research data, is held by the author / creator unless it has been signed over to a third party (for example, a journal publisher).

Ownership of work created by a Unitec staff member, in the course of their employment with Unitec, is retained by the individual, except in situations where it is agreed that commercialisation of that material should be pursued as detailed out in Unitec's Intellectual Property Policy.

4.6. Assigning copyright

When an author sends their final peer reviewed corrected version of a paper (referred to as the 'accepted version') to a journal publisher, they commonly assign their copyright to that publisher. Most publishers, including Elsevier and Springer, allow authors to deposit the accepted version in open access repositories (such as Unitec's Research Bank). Others, such as Wiley-Blackwell, allow authors to deposit the original (pre-peer review) version they sent to the publisher (the 'submitted version'). Some outlets embargo open publication before critical dates.

Unitec recommends authors retain copyright of their work where possible by not assigning copyright to a publisher. While many publishers' agreements request transfer of copyright, authors can attach an addendum which modifies the publisher's agreement and allows authors to keep key rights to their works, including placement into Unitec's Research Bank, a form of self-archiving. The *Scholar's Copyright Addendum Engine* (HTTP://SCIENCECOMMONS.ORG/PROJECTS/PUBLISHING/SCAE) will help you generate a PDF form that you can attach to a journal publisher's copyright agreement to ensure that you retain certain rights.

Unitec supports publishing and copyright agreements that allow authors to retain copyright by only taking a licence to publish or by allowing authors to self-archive in Research Bank.

Unitec accepts responsibility for managing the copyrights of deposited work in Research Bank. Wherever possible, an item in the Research bank will have a link to the published edition.

4.7. Maori culture and identity

KO AOTEAROA TENEI is the Waitangi Tribunal's report into the claim known as Wai 262 and concerns the place of Maori culture, identity and traditional knowledge in New Zealand's law, and in government policies and practices. It reports on the control of Maori traditional knowledge, who controls artistic and cultural works such as haka and waiata, and who controls the environment that created Maori culture. Wai 262 contains definitions of 'taonga works' and 'taonga-derived works' and recommends how these works may be used. We need to take into account the intellectual property in 'taonga works' and the role of *kaitiaki* (cultural guardians).

The dissemination and use of Indigenous Knowledge should be discussed at consultation stage, particularly with reference to digital dissemination. For more see the Guidelines for Maori and Community Social and Cultural Responsiveness.

4.8. Open access

Open Access means that “the full text results of scholarly research are made promptly, freely and permanently available to anyone with access to the internet” (Australian National University. 2010). An overview of Open access is at HTTP://LIBGUIDES.UNITEC.AC.NZ/OPENACCESS.

These guidelines endorse the principle of Open Access and Unitec recommends researchers make their work available in Open Access format. To this end Unitec has established the RESEARCH BANK and encourages researchers to submit their work to it.

This does not mean that researchers have to make their work available in an open access format. Unitec recognises that researchers are best placed to choose the publication and dissemination option of their choice and that there will be circumstances when it would be inappropriate to make research or other content openly accessible. When considering open access publishing researchers also need to be aware of ‘predatory publishers’. See section 4.4.2 for more information.

“Most discussion of Open Access recognises the two main mechanisms to achieving open access. The gold route, often referred to as the “author pays” route, involves payment of an article processing charge to publishers enabling the article to be made available to all without subscription or charge barriers. The alternative green route, often referred to as the “self-archiving” route, entails authors submitting manuscripts to traditional journals but maintaining the right to mount a version of their work on an open access repository. Much debate has focussed on the most effective way to achieve Open Access” (Spezi, Fry, Creaser, Probets, & White, 2013). Unitec currently follows the ‘green route’ of open access publishing.

4.8.1. Open Educational Resources

Open Education Resources (OER) are “digitised materials offered freely and openly for educators, students and self-learners to use and reuse for teaching, learning, and research. OER includes learning content, software tools to develop, use and distribute content, and implementation resources such as open licenses” (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, 2007).

Creative Commons Aotearoa New Zealand works with the Open Educational Resources (OER) movement. By applying Creative Commons licenses, teachers can reuse, remix and share their own lesson plans, courses, textbooks and a growing range of digital and print resources.

The OPEN EDUCATION RESOURCE FOUNDATION, based at Otago Polytechnic, is an independent, not-for-profit organisation that provides leadership, international networking and support for educators and educational institutions to achieve their objectives through Open Education.

In 2013 Unitec became an OERu Anchor partner and Unitec will support staff who want to make their teaching materials OER.

4.9. Creative Commons

The Creative Commons (WWW.CREATIVECOMMONS.ORG.NZ/) provide free licences and tools that copyright owners can use to allow others to share, reuse and remix their material, legally. The licenses give everyone from individual creators to large companies and institutions a simple, standardised way to grant copyright

permissions to their creative work resulting in a vast and growing digital commons (Creative Commons, 2013).

There are six types of licence. See website for more details.

Unitec staff should be aware of the different types of Creative Commons licences and apply them to their work then making that material freely available on the internet. The Unitec Library and Research Office staff will assist in this if required.

4.10. Documenting research outputs

Unitec takes responsibility for ensuring accuracy in reporting research activity and the resulting outputs undertaken at Unitec. To this end Unitec will provide a comprehensive list of research and academic output types in order to categorise and report on this activity. This will be managed through a centralised database (ROMS), in which staff are required to record all research related outputs. This database will be regularly checked in order to ensure information provided to the public domain is complete and accurate. For more information see Documenting Research Outputs Policy and Guidelines.

4.11. Storing and preserving research outputs

Unitec's Research Bank is the digital repository in which research carried out at Unitec is stored and made available to the world. The purpose of the Research Bank is to make Unitec research as widely available as possible, by providing free access to it over the Internet, and making it easily found by Internet search engines.

The repository was developed using DSpace, an open source software platform, as part of a Library Consortium of New Zealand (LCoNZ) project. The contents of the repository are listed on the National Library of New Zealand's Kiwi Research Information Service (KRIS).

The Research Bank is administered by staff in Unitec library. To access Research Bank go to unitec.researchbank.ac.nz. The Research Office and Library staff work together to make information recorded in ROMS available in open access format within Research Bank where possible. Copyright restrictions may limit the availability of material held in ROMS and Research Bank. Staff should contact the library and provide copies of articles recently published directly to the Research Bank as copyright allows.

Digital preservation is a significant problem facing institutional repositories such as Research Bank and at Unitec we have yet to determine the intent and methodology of a digital preservation programme for research outputs. The uncertain timeframes around the deterioration of digital storage media and technological obsolescence are examples of issues common to all preservation agencies that deal with digital formats. How we define adequate access and preserve commonly-supported text, image and audio file formats (such as .pdf, .xml, .jpg, .wav, .tiff or .avi) are questions a preservation programme will need to address. Conversations around digital preservation and the role Unitec's digital repository will take regarding this are on-going.

4.12. Academic integrity

A draft policy on academic integrity is currently being circulated for feedback. Its approach is to promote a culture at Unitec based on the values of honesty, integrity and respect. With regard to scholarly communication the policy requires all students and staff "to undertake their academic work with academic integrity", which is defined as "intellectual honesty with regard to the use of information and in the pursuit of knowledge and understanding". Using information would also mean its publication and dissemination.

4.13. Theses

Part of the requirements of many levels of postgraduate study is the completion of a research thesis. At Unitec it is a requirement of completion for students to provide a digital copy of their thesis in addition to their final bound printed copies, one of which will be deposited in the library. Unitec will then deposit the thesis into the Research Bank for public access, unless restricted by an embargo. Theses completed by Unitec staff at other academic institutions may also be deposited in the Research Bank, unless copyright has been assigned to another institution. Unitec encourages depositing full, electronic copies of theses in open access repositories.

4.14. References

Australian National University. (2010). *Code of practice for scholarly publication and dissemination at ANU*. Retrieved from HTTPS://POLICIES.ANU.EDU.AU/PPL/DOCUMENT/ANUP_000391

Beall, J. (2013). Scholarly open access: Critical analysis of scholarly open-access publishing. Retrieved from HTTP://SCHOLARLYOA.COM/

Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. (2007). *Giving knowledge for free: The emergence of open educational resources.* Paris, France: OECD. Retrieved from HTTP://WWW.OECD.ORG/EDU/CERI/38654317.PDF

Copyright Council of New Zealand. (2009). Information sheet: An introduction to copyright in New Zealand. Retrieved from HTTP://WWW.COPYRIGHT.ORG.NZ/VIEWINFOSHEET.PHP?SHEET=29

Creative Commons. (2013). *Wikipedia the Free Encyclopedia.* Retrieved August 16, 2013 from HTTP://EN.WIKIPEDIA.ORG/WIKI/CREATIVE COMMONS

Hahn, K. L. (2008). Talk about talking about new models of scholarly communication. *Journal of Electronic Publishing, 11*(1). doi: 10.3998/3336451.0011.108

Mabe, M. A. (2010). Scholarly communication: A long view. *New Review of Academic Librarianship, 16,* 132-144. doi: 10.1080/13614533.2010.512242

Open access. (2013). *Wikipedia the Free Encyclopedia.* Retrieved August 16, 2013 from HTTP://EN.WIKIPEDIA.ORG/WIKI/OPEN_ACCESS

Open educational resources. (2013). *Wikipedia the Free Encyclopedia.* Retrieved August 16, 2013 from HTTP://EN.WIKIPEDIA.ORG/WIKI/OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

Spezi, V., Fry, J., Creaser, C., Probets, S., & White, S. (2013). Researchers' green open access practice: A cross-disciplinary analysis. *Journal of Documentation, 69*(3), 334-359. doi: 10.1108/JD-01-2012-0008

Waitangi Tribunal. (2011). *Ko Aotearoa tēnei: A report into claims concerning New Zealand law and policy affecting Māori culture and identity.* (Wai 262). Retrieved from HTTP://WWW.WAITANGI-TRIBUNAL.GOVT.NZ/REPORTS/DOWNLOADPDF.ASP?REPORTID=BF981901-5B55-441C-A93E-8E84B67B76E9.PDF

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

[1] Conduct of Research Policy

[2] Copyright Procedures for Staff

[3] Copying of Copyright Works for Educational Purposes

[4] Documenting Research Outputs

[5] Intellectual Property Policy

[6] Guidelines for Maori and Community Social and Cultural Responsiveness

DOCUMENT DETAILS

Version:	1	**Issue Date this Version:**	April 2014
This Version Approved by:	Unitec Research Committee	**Date of Approval:**	4 March 2014
Document Owner:	Library / Research Office and Postgraduate Centre	**Document Sponsor:**	Unitec Research Committee
Date of Next Review:	April 2015		
Date first version issued:	4 March 2014	**Original Approval Body:**	Unitec Research Committee

AMENDMENT HISTORY

Version	Issue Date	Reason for Revision	Approved by
2	March 2016	Small amendment Maori Culture & Identity section	Dean Research and Enterprise

Unitec New Zealand Limited

Meeting of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date of Meeting: 1 May 2025

Title	Updating Guidelines for Pacific Social Cultural Responsiveness
Provided by:	Daisy Bentley-Gray
Authored by:	Daisy Bentley-Gray
For:	**INFORMATION**

Recommendation

That the committee be advised that Daisy Bentley-Gray, Interim Manager Pacific Success and Associate Professor Dion Enari in consultation with Tūāpapa Rangahau will be updating the Guidelines for Pacific Social Cultural Responsiveness.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to report to the committee that the current Guidelines for Pacific Social Cultural Responsiveness was last updated in 2016. Hence, there are details in the guidelines document, which are no longer accurate. A revised and updated guidelines document will be important and reflective of current practices.

Key Points

Dion and Daisy are prepared to lead this work in consultation with Tūāpapa Rangahau to ensure they have a guidelines document that reflects relevant and current details pertaining to the following.

Unitec New Zealand Limited

Meeting of Te Komiti Rangahau o Unitec | Unitec Research Committee

Date of Meeting: 1 May 2025

Title	Research Centre Update – Centre of Research in Education for Healthcare Professionals
Provided by:	Brenda Massey, Acting Secretary
For:	**INFORMATION**

Recommendation

That the committee is advised of the closure of the Centre of Research in Education for Healthcare Professionals.

Purpose

Founded by A/P Samantha Heath, the Centre of Research in Education for Healthcare Professionals became inactive in the wake of her departure from Unitec at the beginning of 2024. With the approval of this committee, the operations of the centre were paused for one year in order to ascertain whether the centre could continue operating without its Founder and Director.

The Head of the School of Healthcare and Social Practice, Linda Aumua, and the Director of Research and Enterprise, A/P Marcus Williams, have mutually agreed to close the centre, as the school does not have the capacity or capability to retain it.

Information/Background

The Centre of Research in Education for Healthcare Professionals was accredited as a research centre in 2022 under the directorship of A/P Samantha Heath from the School of Healthcare and Social Practice. Samantha left Unitec in January 2024.

2024 UNITEC RESEARCH CENTRE REPORT

Unitec's Research Centre Procedure requires Unitec's Research Centres to report annually to the Unitec Research Committee.

Research Centre:	Applied Molecular Solutions
Centre Director:	Dr. Sarah Wells

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

This year new goals were developed for the research centre, in line with TPR's push for the creation of new research groups within schools; of which AMS is one such group. Consequently, the goals of AMS were redeveloped, and more formally include the goals of the Unitec Herbarium as well as those of researchers within the AMS lab, to reflect the inclusion of the herbarium within AMSRC (see annual report 2023). The new goals are:

1) Build AMSRC's capacity for industry-funded research services and initiatives.
2) Conduct Te Tiriti-informed kaupapa o te taiao.
3) Develop and apply rapid diagnostic molecular tests to aid in species detection, identification, and biodiversity assessment.
4) Apply ecological genetics to inform our knowledge of species ecology, demographics, and evolutionary adaptations.
5) Utilize morphological and molecular approaches to resolve the taxonomic and conservation status of New Zealand's flora and fauna.

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

AMSRC remains strong in the field of Vision Mātauranga. We have retained collaborations in multiple ongoing projects with Dr Nick Waipara, a Unitec Honourary Research Fellow at Plant and Food Research, and Te Roroa iwi and Taoho Patuawa who is the co-PI along with Dr. Sarah Wells on the nga roimata o Tohe project. New collaborations have also been initiated with Ngāti Kuri, with AMS staff Prof. Peter de Lange, Ass. Prof. Marleen Baling and Dr Dan Blanchon conducting joint field work with Ngāti Kuri around North Cape/Te Paki in April 2024. For this kaupapa, AMSRC staff conducted biodiversity inventories for Ngāti Kuri in areas of land that they manage. This led to much information exchange and relationship building which resulted in Ngāti Kuri inviting the Auckland Museum and Unitec botany teams to come again in 2025.

Nga roimata o Tohe

In 2024, Sarah and Peter de Lange (who is an AI on the project) were invited to Waipoua for two hui to 1) plan the project and to later 2) have korero on the initial results. Additionally, as part of this kaupapa, five representatives from Te Roroa came to

the AMSRC lab to take part in a workshop alongside Sarah and Erin to extract DNA from the nga roimata o Tohe specimens that they brought with them from their nursery in Waipoua (see Te Roroa and the Applied Molecular Solutions Research Centre: A Partnership in Conservation Genomics –for more information). This mahi kotahitanga between Te Roroa and AMSRC ensured Te Roroa retained rangatiratanga over their taonga, and also led to knowledge and skill transfer of molecular techniques to the iwi that can be used by them on future iwi-led projects. This kaupapa was recently featured in the 2024 annual report of Genomics Aotearoa who funded the project: GA-AnnualReport2024 Digital Final.pdf (page 21). Sarah Wells and Taoho Patuawa also continued their mahi kotahitanga by giving a joint keynote address for the 2024 New Zealand Plant Conservation Network conference in Whangarei detailing the results and significance of this study.

New research collaborations with Te Roroa

This mahi on nga roimata o Tohe led to new long-term avenues of collaboration between AMSRC and Te Roroa in 2024. Te Roroa is is now also involved in Sarah's project on Northland gecko hybridization. Sarah was invited for a hui with Te Roroa in Waipoua to discuss the kaupapa, resulting in Taoho Patuawa assisting in field work with Sarah to find the geckos. Future trips are also planned in 2025.

Additionally, Te Roroa have stated how much they have enjoyed and valued collaborating with AMSRC over the past few years, and consequently Sarah and Taoho are currently having korero about applying for funding for new and future genomics projects within Te Roroa's remit and rohe.

Northland gecko project

Relationships with hapu on the east coast of Northland have also been strengthened within Sarah's Northland gecko project. In particular, many fieldtrips in 2024 were conducted in Ipipiri, each time with a representative on the local hapu onboard. In particular, Rana and Deliah who are kaitiaki o te taiao for Ngati Kuta joined us on multiple occasions and allowed us to conduct fieldwork on their properties. Whilst in the field with Deliah, she also showed us a skeleton of a green gecko she found on her property. To honour her contribution, with her permission, we submitted this specimen to the Auckland Museum under her name as rangatira. These collaborations are all ongoing.

Asbestos bioremediation project

Mātauranga Māori objectives were included in the Asbestos project's Endeavour Fund 2024 application. Mana Whenua ki Mōhua (MWkM) (Ngāti Rārua, Ngāti Tama and Te Ātiawa) gave their support to our research being carried out in their rohe (Kahurangi National Park), resulting in approval of a DoC research permit (Authorisation Number: 93501-GEO). Māori researchers (Drs Nick Waipara and Hinekura Smith, Tanya White and Veraneeca Taiepa were integral to the project.

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

Sarah Wells supervised a third year BASci student conducting his research project for Negotiated Research. This project was partly-funded by AMSRC seed funding, and also by Sarah Wells's post-parental leave grant. This project attempts to reveal the true phylogeny of Sphaeromatidae marine isopods in New Zealand. The students work builds on Sarah's initial work by sequencing a second gene region to complement the first. The

student successfully conducted all molecular lab work in the AMS lab. The project is currently being written up as a paper for publication.

While not officially a student (yet), Kate Harder, a lecturer within EAS received ECR funding from TPR to conduct a project in the AMS lab investigating parasites in cats. Sarah will be Kate's mentor on the project which is due to begin in 2025. This project has already led to international collaborations because Kate has been invited to become a PhD candidate (part-time) at James Cook University, Australia. Sarah Wells will be Kate's co-supervisor, with lab work for her doctoral thesis being conducted both in the AMS lab and at the lab at JCU.

The herbarium also supports teaching, as well as training students on herbarium curation. In 2024 there were five student volunteers helping curate the collection.

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

Erin Doyle, the permanent research associate at AMSRC applied for and secured a PhD candidature at Cranwell University in the UK. Consequently, we said goodbye to Erin in 2024 and wish her all the best for her doctoral studies. In late 2024, we consequently hired a new research associate to replace her, Dr. John Yan. John joins us from the Plant Health and Environment Lab at MPI where he worked as a senior scientist. He joins us with a vast wealth of experience in molecular analysis and we look forward to collaborating with him on future AMS projects. See AMS welcomes Dr. John Yan – for further details.

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

These are reflected in the new goals above. Specifically, taxonomy is now included to include the research performed within the UNITEC Herbarium.

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

Most internal and external partnerships outlined in the AMSRC Centre Application are still active. Relationships with Genomics Aotearoa, Auckland Zoo, Auckland Museum, Auckland Council, Massey University, Project Island Song, Babbage Consultants, the Department of Conservation, HRV, Wakatū Incorporated, and Mana Whenua ki Mōhua have been strengthened. New collaborations with staff at Landcare Research, the Rega Institute for Medical Research at Ku Leuven, University of Otago, and MPI have been formed. As part of the asbestos bioremediation project, collaborations with Professor Mike Manefield at the University of New South Wales, and existing partnerships have been strengthened with the University of Turin (Italy) and Fox Chase Cancer Center (USA). Sarah Wells has been in discussions with MPI in 2024 regarding a new contract for research involving the eradication of broad-tailed geckos on Rangitoto Island. Funding was delayed in 2024 due to budget cuts at MPI, but discussions to continue this in 2025 are ongoing. Dr. Dan Blanchon (Auckland Museum and an AMSRC research associate) also secured future research contracts with AMSRC for 2025 and beyond in partnership with Auckland Council on biocontrol of climbing asparagus and Selaginella.

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

Funding source	Amount applied for	Project	Result
2024 Endeavour Fund Research Programme	$9,564,006.20	Asbestos remediation	Unsuccessful
Society for Research on Amphibians and Reptiles in NZ small grants	$1,500	Northland geckos	Successful
Auckland Council	$154,519	Mycoherbicide research - climbing asparagus and African clubmoss	Successful, funding over four years

Please report on the Centre's annual budgeted versus actual income from the year of commencement of the Centre to the year ended 31 December 2024 (expand the table accordingly, or alternatively this information can be appended if you have it in a different format):

Income Source	Year Ending	Budgeted Income $	Actual Income $
RE19017 Climbing Asparagus	December 2024	$34,616	$34,616
OT24001 Leptospermum*	December 2024		$36,422
RE23012 Nga Roimata	December 2024	$45,041	$45,041

Briefly account for any difference between budgeted and actual income:

* Note, this project is a continuation of RE19022 and therefore is the reason why there is no budgeted income for this project.

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

Publications:

Berry, T-A.; Wallis, S.L.; Doyle, E.J.; de Lange, P.J.; Steinhorn, G.; Vigliaturo, R.; Belluso, E.; Blanchon, D.J. 2024: A Preliminary Investigation into the Degradation of Asbestos Fibres in Soils, Rocks and Building Materials Associated with Naturally Occurring Biofilms, *Minerals 14*: 1–15.

Blanchon, D.: de Lange, P.J.: Doyle, E.: Tang, T.: Waipara, N.: Berry, T-A. 2024: Siderophore production in fungi from asbestos biofilms: The first step towards bioremediation of a carcinogenicmineral. *Perspectives in Biodiversity 2*: 1–9.

de Lange, P.J., James, C.J. 2024: New combinations in *Anthoxanthum* (Poaceae) for Aotearoa / New Zealand taxa earlier placed in *Hierochloe*. *Ukrainian Botanical Journal 81*: 259–262. https://doi.org/10.15407/ukrbotj81.04.259

de Lange, P.J.; Renner, M.A.M.; Braggins, J.E.; von Konrat, M.J. 2024: A checklist of the hornwort and liverwort flora of the Kermadec Islands, New Zealand Botanical Region. *Telopea 27*: 147–163.

James, C.; de Lange, P.J. 2024: A taxonomic re-evaluation of *Pittosporum roimata* Gemmell & S.N.Carter (Pittosporaceae R.Br., Apiales Nakai). *Ukrainian Botanical Journal 18(5):* 307–327.

Jiménez-Mejías, P., Manzano, S., Gowda, V., Krell, F-T., Lin, M.Y., Martín-Bravo, S., et al., & de Lange, P.J. 2024: Protecting stable biological nomenclatural systems enables universal communication: A collective international appeal and 1543 additional coauthors. *BioScience*: 1–6.

Marshall A.J.; Aptroot A.; Blanchon D.J.; James C.J.; de Lange P.J. 2024: New Zealand *Lithothelium* (Pyrenulaceae) — description of a new species *Lithothelium kiritea* sp. nov., with notes on *L. australe*. *Ukrainian Botanical Journal 81*: 145–154.

Marshall, A.J., Aptroot, A., Blanchon, D.J., de Lange, P.J. and West, V.S., 2024. A new species of *Dictyomeridium* (Trypetheliaceae) from Aotearoa/New Zealand and an updated key to species of the genus. *Perspectives in Biodiversity*, *2*, pp.69-76.

Tang, T.; Blanchon, D.J.: Wells, S.; Fisher, L.K.M.; Cox, H.; Waipara, N. 2024: First record of *Fusarium cortaderiae* on climbing asparagus (*Asparagus scandens*): an invasive plant species in New Zealand*. Plant Pathology & Quarantine 14*:143–148.

Conference presentations

Patuawa, T., Wells, S. J., Calder, M., Townsend, A., & de Lange, P. (2024, September). *Ngā roimata ō Tōhe (Pimelea eremitica) - Innovative strategies for conservation (joint Keynote address by T. Patuawa and S. Wells)* [Paper presentation]. New Zealand Plant Conservation Network, Whangarei.

2024 UNITEC EARLY CAREER RESEARCHER FUND
Final Report

Email your completed report to bmassey@unitec.ac.nz before **5pm on Friday, 28 March 2025.** Instructions in red italics may be removed before submission.

Researcher:	Caralyn Kemp
Project Title:	Use and Benefits of Dog Parks for Dogs
Amount of Grant:	$11,510

Executive Summary

Summarise the highlights of your project, including findings, achievements, and conclusions.

This past year has been a productive and successful year for this project. We have built on the foundation set in 2023, after years of setbacks due to Covid-19 and other issues. The continued funding provided by Tuapapa Rangahau has allowed us to move from foundational data collection to more in-depth studies which allow us to develop a better understanding of how dog parks in Auckland are being used. This past year, we have focused on observation of dog behaviour in dog parks, with a particular focus on social behaviour. This phase of our project allows us to assess how much time dogs spend being social with other dogs, their guardian, or with other people, and if these interactions are positive or negative. The other main focus of research has been on GPS tracking dogs in the dog park and surrounding reserves. This phase of the project helps us to understand how much of the park is used by dogs, where the focal points of interest are for dogs, and additional information which supports our previous studies, such as if the dog is on or off leash in the right areas, and how much time is spent in the park. We have had much better weather in 2024 compared to 2025, and being able to collect data in the 2024-2025 summer period has allowed us to conduct comparisons in dog park use between poor and good weather. The 2023/2024 summer period was unfortunately quite wet, so the continued support of Tuapapa Rangahau in 2024 has been instrumental in ensuring the data we have collected is an accurate representation of dog park use.

The funding provided for this project allowed us to employ a Research Assistant. We said goodbye to our 2023 RA, a graduate of the Bachelor of Applied Science, and in 2024 hired a current BASci student. This employment has not only benefitted our project, as the RA has done a wonderful job, but also assists a current undergraduate student with developing their CV as they look to apply for Masters programmes in animal behaviour upon graduation or take up other employment opportunities with animals. It was a wonderful opportunity to be able to provide them with the opportunity to learn more about what goes into research, how to troubleshoot research problems, and how research projects are built.

We also invested in training another undergraduate BASci student, who assisted in data collection on dog social behaviour. This student conducted their training as part of their NSCI7731 Negotiated Research course and is due to graduate in April. The student was instrumental to helping this phase of the project get started and did a fantastic and enthusiastic job. We also had the opportunity to bring onboard two Diploma of Veterinary Nursing students who assisted with additional data collection over summer. As a result,

they have received experience in research, which has fuelled their interest in completing the Bachelor of Veterinary Nursing.

Our data collection is still on-going. However, preliminary findings show that:

- Nearly 60% of dog guardians claim to confidently know the leash rules at their park.
- On average, 58% of dog guardians have their dogs off leash in on leash areas surrounding off leash dog parks. The number does differ significantly between dog parks, with one park being as low as 13% and one as high as 98% of dog guardians.
- 50% of dog guardians claim they always play with their dog at the dog park.
- On average, only 27% of dog guardians were observed playing with their dog at the park. Hobsonville, which is the smallest of our parks, and is fenced, has the highest proportion of dog guardians playing with their dogs (50%).
- 85% of dog guardians think they stay at least 45mins typically.
- The mean stay time at the parks is 24 mins. Most of any additional time is spent walking outside the off-leash bvcdog park.
- Dog guardians view the surrounding reserves as part of the dog park.
- Over 60% of dog guardians have some concerns for their dog's safety in the park.
- Dogs spend between 26-32% of their time in dog parks playing with other dogs.
- However, the majority of play behaviour between dogs is within the first 10 minutes of entering the park.
- Dogs spend about 20% of their time engaging in self-directed behaviours.
- Dogs in fenced dog parks engage in more interactive behaviours with other dogs than dogs in unfenced parks.
- Negative interactions between dogs are infrequent but guardians are showing a poor ability to recognise behavioural indicators of dog anxiety and uncomfortableness, which should be their cue to step in and remove their dog from the situation.
- GPS data suggests that dogs use less than 50% of dog parks, except at the smallest dog park. As people tend to stick to the paths, dogs, even off leash, tend to keep near their guardian, meaning that a lot of space is wasted and could be developed to create more engaging spaces.

Anecdotal evidence shows that dog parks are not being utilised by guardians for much more than exercise opportunities for their dog, despite dog trainers and behaviourists recommending a range of use. There is a heavy reliance on dog-dog social interactions and so many guardians are stand offish and do not manage their dog's experiences when at the park. We have had some guardians tell us that they went to the park but there were no other dogs so they just left; there was no consideration to play with their own dog, to engage in training activities, or encourage sniff-based stimulation.

We also continued our analysis of additional dog parks across Auckland. There are 3,492 places where dogs can be walked in Auckland; only 1,852 of these allow dogs off leash at least some of the time. Only 21 are considered "dedicated exercise areas for dogs". We are analysing size, fence height (if provided), other resources such as benches, water bodies, drinking facilities, toilets, parking, shade, walking paths, sniffing opportunities, and agility equipment. This information has been useful in our discussions with Auckland Council and Local Board staff. We were consulted with by park managers from the North Shore regarding the development of a new dog park.

There has also been a recent review of the dog bylaws throughout the Auckland region. I presented briefly at one of the community sessions, presenting our research and current findings. The committee was very interested in our project and have invited us to submit a written report which could be utilised to better understand the current issues.

In 2024, our initial findings were presented to the companion animal community in NZ (Companion Animals New Zealand); the project was very well received and highly popular, with many people approaching to discuss their excitement and their own experiences with dog parks, including the Chair of the CANZ board. This showcased how important this study is and how much potential we have to improve an essential facility for a common companion animal, and ultimately improve the welfare of our beloved dogs. We are looking to present at this conference again in the future. Unfortunately, it is not being hosted in 2025. We are also investigating other avenues for public dissemination – the Zoological Society of Auckland has requested a talk, but we are also looking at research conferences, especially in Australia, so that we can engage with others who investigate dog park and dog welfare. We have reached out to one well known dog researcher from Australia – Dr Mia Cobb – who recently reviewed Melbourne's resources and experiences for dogs. She is interested in discussing our research further. We also connected with a former Unitec BASci student, now a Team Leader in Central Auckland Animal Management, who is very interested to work with us to better understand dog experiences in Auckland, as well as the Team Leader of Proactive Animal Management at Auckland Council, who was able to provide us with some information regarding registered dogs in Auckland. We hope to use this information to map out dog concentrations across Auckland and compare this to the distribution of dog parks.

Background

Summarise the background to the project, the need for it and why it was important.

Thirty-four per cent of Aotearoa New Zealand households have at least one dog, with 574,349 across the country (Companion Animals New Zealand, 2020; Department of Internal Affairs, n.d.). This statistic holds true in Auckland, with 32% of households having at least one dog. Increased urbanization across cities in Aotearoa New Zealand has not put off dog guardianship, with reports showing an increase from 27% of households in 2015 to 37% in 2020 (Companion Animals New Zealand, 2016; 2020). This then presents challenges to Councils and Local Boards as to how to provide for the space needs of these animals.

In Auckland alone, there are nearly 3500 places where you can walk your dog (Auckland Council, n.d.). However, only half of these (1852) allow the dog to be off leash. Only 22 are dedicated dog areas, meaning that dogs have priority in these spaces. Therefore, 99% of places where dogs can be taken in Auckland are multi-functional spaces, because green areas are a rare commodity. Dog parks are traditionally landfills which have been turned into reserves. These reserves encourage endangered and taonga species back to urban areas, but are also utilized for children's playgrounds, sportsgrounds, family bicycle paths, and jogger and walker routes. Dog parks tend to come about due to community demand. This is a reactive approach to a basic need for exercise, off-leash opportunities, play and social activities. As a result, dog parks are often barren lawn deserts, providing limited options for dogs and encouraging a strong reliance on dog-dog social interactions by guardians.

There have been numerous high-profile incidents between dogs in dog parks. Fights, injuries and even attacks leading to deaths occur (for example, see REF). As a result, many dog trainers do not recommend dog parks (personal communication). While it is expected that the owners themselves police and guide their dogs through safe, appropriate and positive social interactions (Glasser, 2013), anecdotal evidence suggests that guardians do not manage their dog's social interactions, and struggle to read dog body language, leading them to misinterpret play and aggression. A study by Jackson (2012) indicates that dog owners may only understand aggressive behaviours based on prior experience; as a result, owners may miss negative behaviours where interference is needed, and early interference would have prevented concerning end results. It may also be difficult for dog guardians to understand that their dog does not want to make friends with every other dog they meet. Instead, dog parks are considered places where "dogs can be dogs", and thus the societal rules governing dogs elsewhere collapse and there is little oversight. This can impact dog park etiquette and is a factor in the proper functioning of dog parks (Jackson, 2012). Therefore, knowing whether prominent interactions between dogs with other dogs, their owners, and human strangers within the dog park are positive or negative can provide insight for dog owners regarding dog welfare and the benefits of the dog park (Ottenheimer Carrier et al., 2013).

Further to this, dog park design can influence the kinds of interactions seen within the dog park; poorly laid out dog park designs can increase the risk of negative interactions occurring (Glasser, 2013). Park design may also impact general use. A lack of features may imply to unimaginative or uninformed dog guardians that exercise is the only purpose to a park. Also, Auckland parks are either fenced or unfenced. Fenced parks tend to be particularly limited in design features but may be considered safer by guardians as dogs are confined and there is no fear they can run off. However, 90-degree angles in fencing and the placement and design of gates can result in dogs being overwhelmed or cornered by other dogs.

Aims and Objectives

List the aims and objectives of the project and note if they changed during the project.

The aims of this study were, and still are, to:

- Investigate the prevalence of positive and negative interactive behaviour occurring between dogs with other dogs, their owners, and human strangers across four dog parks.
- Compare observational data with the owners' perception of the benefits of the dog park for their dogs and themselves
- Compare the social behaviours occurring between different dog parks to determine whether the design of the dog park influences the behaviour of owners and the socialisation of the dogs within these spaces.
- Determine how much of each park is actually being utilised by the dogs to help inform a more engaging design which will maximise usage.

Methodology

Summarise the overall approach taken and why this approach was chosen over other options considered.

This study is being carried at Hobsonville Dog Park, Meola Reef Dog Park, Auckland Botanic Gardens off-leash area, and Waiatarua Reserve. Two of these parks are fully enclosed, while the other two are unfenced spaces, but are sign posted. The main focus of 2024 was Phase 3,

but Phase 1 and 2 are detailed below to demonstrate the initial and wider landscape of this long-term project.

- Phase 1 – 100 surveys of dog guardians at each park (400 in total). The survey questions covered the dog's demographics (e.g. age and sex) and the use of the dog park. This phase was aimed at gaining an initial insight into the intended use of the dog park, which could then be compared to the actual use.
- Phase 2 – Observations of dog guardian behaviour, 100 per park (400 in total). Observations included 1) their use of the leash inside and outside the official designated off leash dog park, 2) incidents of play with their dog inside and outside the park, and 3) total length of time stayed in the park. These observations were directly catered to questions asked in the survey which could be compared to dog guardian intentions and thoughts about their behaviour in the park.
- Phase 3 –
    - Study 1: Observations of dog social behaviour, 100 per park. This phase allowed us to move from a human-centric perspective of how dog parks are being used to a dog-centric approach. We observed dog behaviour, with a focus on social interactions (including with other dogs, their guardian and human strangers), to identify how much time dogs are actually being social in the park. Given the anecdotal evidence of reliance by guardians for dog-dog social interactions in parks, it is important to understand how much time dogs actually spend engaging with other dogs versus being self-directed or with people. This phase also allowed us to identify positive and negative social interactions, to determine if the time dogs spend being social is of benefit to them, or if there are concerns with the lack of social management by guardians.
    - Study 2: GPS tracking of dogs both within the off-leash park and in the surrounding areas (if accessed), 100 per park (400 in total).

Surveys and direct observations of people and dogs are the most useful ways to help us achieve our aims as the former gives us insight into how human users of dog parks view these spaces and how they think they use them, while observations showcased behavioural trends. Consistent methodology across all parks also allows us to make comparisons and determine how park design influences use and dog behaviour. We will be able to use these findings to determine behaviour change strategies which can be trialled at a later stage of the project which might assist in more varied dog park use.

GPS tracking was included to allow us to understand how entire spaces are being used. As all our dog parks are set within reserves or gardens, and dog guardians are viewing the entire space as part of the dog park, it is important to understand how the entire setting is being used and how much of it is used. Given the size of some of these spaces, how much area off leash dogs can cover, and how long people stay, it is not feasible nor efficient for us to individually track each dog with a researcher following. This would likely also alter the behaviour of the dog and their guardian. By GPS tracking, we can remotely observe their behavioural patterns. Our GPS trackers also provide additional data, including speed of movement, which we might be able to utilise later.

Project Milestones

Translate the Project Milestones from your approved application into the table below and state what is completed, in progress, or ceased (will no longer complete). If these differ

from those anticipated in your original application, please provide an explanation for the variation. Where the proposed achievement or milestone is yet to take place, please provide a proposed timeline for completion in the revised due date column.

Achievement	**Agreed Date due**	**Status** (Completed, in progress or ceased)	**Revised Due Date** (if still in progress)
Training of undergraduate student in Phase 3 begins	November 2023	Completed	
Final reports of two of the 2023 undergraduate students completed	November 2023	Completed	
EAS Research symposium presentation on project	November 2023	Completed	
Phase 3 Study 1 data collection begins	December 2023	In progress	Research on-going, with animal ethics approval into 2026.
Phase 3 Study 2 data collection begins	February 2024	In progress	Research on-going, with animal ethics approval into 2026.
Analysis of combined data of Phase 2 data across all parks in preparation for publication	April 2024	In progress	June 2025
2023-2024 Undergraduate student data collection completed	May 2024	Completed	
2023-2024 Undergraduate student final report completed	July 2024	Completed	
Phase 1 is completed at 4th dog park	July 2024	Completed	
Analysis of combined data of Phase 1 data across all parks in preparation for publication	August 2024	Completed	
Continuation and completion of Phase 3 will require additional undergraduate students and funding in 2025-2026		In progress New funding has been sought	2026
Estimated completion date	July 2026	In progress	

Outcomes/findings

Explain the end result of your research. Did you achieve against the aims and objectives set? Depending on the project, it might include research results, findings, evaluation results, data, etc. If the project created something tangible like software, an artwork or a piece of equipment, describe it or include a photo. Where your reported outcomes differ from those proposed in your original funding application, please outline the reasons for the variation.

With this research still in progress, there is no current "end" result. However, the ultimate end result is that we were able to continue this project with support from Tuapapa Rangahau by employing a Research Assistant, being supported in travel costs between parks which has made the project much more feasible, and purchasing GPS trackers which has allowed us to expand the scope of the project. As a result, we are on track to addressing our 4 main aims we initially set out to investigate:

- Investigate the prevalence of positive and negative interactive behaviour occurring between dogs with other dogs, their owners, and human strangers across four dog parks. – *Phase 3 addresses this aim. This phase began late in 2023 due to delayed animal ethics approval as well as poor weather conditions, but progress is now running smoothly. This phase is anticipated to continue into 2026 due to the high number of dogs required. Results so far are surprising, and have implications for dog park design.*
- Compare observational data with the owners' perception of the benefits of the dog park for their dogs and themselves – *Phases 1 and 2 are helping us investigate this aim. We have completed these phases. We have been able to now collect data in both summer and winter of dog park use, play behaviour between guardians and dogs, and leash use. Data analysis is about to begin but preliminary results suggest there may be little difference in park use across seasons, but between parks we see large differences. This will have implications for park design. Our results demonstrate that the dog handlers' perceptions of their park use and the benefits their dogs are getting from their experiences in the park do not align with actual behaviour. Indeed, the results of the behavioural observations of dog guardians, such as time spent in the park and guardian play behaviour with dogs, demonstrates that dogs may not be getting much benefit from dog parks beyond exercise. That is not to say that exercise is not beneficial, but parks can be utilised in a variety of ways and dogs may highly benefit from increased interactions with their guardian, sniffing opportunities, and mental stimulation when at the park.*
- Compare the social behaviours occurring between different dog parks to determine whether the design of the dog park influences the behaviour of owners and the socialisation of the dogs within these spaces. – *All phases are assisting us in our understanding of how park design impacts use and allows for positive social interactions for the dogs, with other dogs and with people. We are noting differences in park use between our four parks, including different attitudes regarding leash use, play behaviour, and time spent. For example, unfenced parks have longer stay times than fenced parks, but they are also larger. However, we have noted that guardians view the entire reserve as part of the park, even though Auckland Council defines the park as a specific off-leash area. Stay times will therefore be longer but were not*

included in our study as we focussed on the off-leash spaces, which guardians should be mostly utilising. Guardians observed playing with their dog, engaging in positive social activities, were highest in one fenced park but lowest in the other. This suggests there may be environmental or cultural differences in the perception of these parks, dependent on set up, community engagement, and the demographics of the users. Furthermore, as most dog social behaviour seems to be in the first 10 minutes, this may be a result of the guardian continuing their walk, rather than allowing their dog to return to social behaviour, or suggest that parks need to engage dogs in other ways to encourage longer stay times.

- Determine how much of each park is actually being utilised by the dogs to help inform a more engaging design which will maximise usage. – *Phase 4 is the GPS tracking of dogs in the 4 dog parks and their surrounding reserves. This data adds to our stay time data, but provides additional information on common routes, movement on and around the paths, and demonstrates that the movements of people largely dictate the movement of dogs. As people use paths, and dogs stick with their guardians, there are large patches of open grass that are not being utilised within the off leash spaces. However, when set up well, these patches can becomeuseful areas for dog-dog socialisation and opportunities to play fetch without people having to move far. When most of the park is open grass, this becomes wasted space and is not well used by dogs, suggesting that the environment could be altered to become better utilised and more engaging.*

Impact

Indicate who/what has benefitted (or will benefit) from this research. What form do these benefits take and why are they important?

This research benefits a wide community, but first and foremost dog guardians and Local Boards. Beyond this, dog trainers and behaviourists, Companion Animals New Zealand, the SPCA and other shelters, animal management teams, Auckland Council, veterinarians, urban planners, conservationists, and the non-dog owning members of society. The information and insight we generate from this project is helping us to design educational resources for dog guardians, instruct them on different ways to use dog parks, conduct workshops on reading dog's body language, and utilizing dog trainers to work with guardians on how to manage a dog's experiences in the park. Importantly, it will also help dog guardians understand that not all dogs like the park and it is okay not to go. We have been invited to give a presentation on dog parks, dog behaviour and dog training for the Zoological Society of Auckland, for example, who sees a benefit for the Auckland community from the work we are doing.

Our study is also being utilised to inform Local Boards and Councils on how people are currently using these facilities, what is and is not working, and in help with the development of new, and more effective, parks. We have been in discussions with John McKellar and Melissa Johnstone who are preparing to propose new dog parks on the north shore. While none of our dog parks are located in that area, our findings can be generalised to help them understand what dog guardians are looking for in a park and what dogs need from one. They have been very interested in our research although there are limitations with their budget. However, upon discussion we have found ways to help mitigate some of the cost of features which would greatly enhance their parks.

The above highlights the main benefits, but there are other ways our study will provide insight to other important members of the dog community in Aotearoa New Zealand. For example, the reserves surrounding many of the dog parks are important areas for conservation. Finding ways to mitigate inappropriate behaviour, such as dogs being off leash in these areas, could help to improve relationships with the non-dog owning community and conservationists. Furthermore, many parks also have walking/cycling paths, children's playgrounds and sportsgrounds nearby; there's obviously concerns with dogs being off leash in the wrong areas as it may pose a threat to other users of these green spaces. Keeping dogs on leash and having a community attitude towards this behaviour will improve societal views on dogs in our community.

Our students are also benefitting from this research. Firstly, we have been able to invest in the training of 4 undergraduate students in this project. We were also able to employ a former student and recent graduate and help progress their career. We are also utilizing our findings in our teaching, and showing current students how our research informs general knowledge, some of the challenges in companion animal welfare, and areas that they could go into in the future.

Conclusions

Briefly summarise any conclusions that can be drawn from the research.

Overall, our results show that dog guardians are over-estimating their use of dog parks. Dogs may not be getting as many benefits from these spaces as could be generated. The design of the park does have some influence over use and an interesting and engaging set up could inspire a broader range of activities. Unfortunately, dog parks in Auckland are increasingly barren lawn deserts and the vast majority are set in multi-functional areas with competing needs. There is a heavy reliance, by guardians, on dog-dog social interactions to be the main purpose of visiting the dog park, despite safety concerns for dogs. Improved design could help provide non-social dogs with alternative outlets.

Next steps and Ongoing Research Possibilities

Detail what your intended next steps are for this research, speaking to any future steps you had planned in your approved application (e.g. phase 2 of the project, seeking external funding and growing external partnerships etc). Consider the future implications of your project and how you or others can build on it. What future plans do you have for research in this area? What work needs to be undertaken to realise these plans? Are there ongoing possibilities for other stakeholders? What opportunities are there for further industry partnership and external funding? What external, industry, community, iwi partners are you working with?

This study is on-going. In 2025, our focus is on completing Phases 3 and 4 and identifying our next steps. We have investigated and applied for funding through Healthy Pets New Zealand to continue our employment of our RA, to complete Phases 3 and 4. The co-investigator on this project, Jo Thorne, will also be working on a literature review regarding dog park design, to develop her skills as an independent researcher and because this is an identified literature gap. We aim to publish this work in 2026. In 2025, we are also hoping to take on another undergraduate student who will assess preferred dog park

features by dog guardians, so that we can inform ideal design with an evidence-based approach.

Beyond 2026, we have identified the next two phases of this project, in which we will expand our analysis of Auckland dog parks beyond our 4 key spaces, and begin to apply human behaviour change theory to identify key ways we can encourage people to play with their dogs, identify positive and negative dog social behaviour, and improve dog park etiquette.

Recommendations (optional)

List any specific recommendations for the teaching, learning, or research communities.

1.1 Publications and dissemination

Detail below the status of the research outputs planned and state whether they are completed, in progress or ceased in the table below (using the outputs table from your Terms & Conditions funding agreement). If these differ from those anticipated in your original application, please provide an explanation for the variation. Where the proposed publication etc is yet to take place, please provide a timeline for future publications in the Revised Due Date column. Detail concerns you may have had with predatory or vanity publishing, if any. Include internal dissemination activities (eg participation in Unitec's Research Symposium). In addition, provide details of any dissemination back to community, iwi or related external groups.

Kemp, C. & Thorne, J. (2024). Who's having fun at the dog park? Companion Animals New Zealand conference, Hamilton NZ, March 2024.

Output type	**Agreed Date due**	**Status** (Completed, in progress or ceased)	**Revised Due Date** (if still in progress)
EAS Research Symposium student presentation	November 2023	Completed	
Undergraduate student reports	End 2023 and mid 2024	Completed	
Companion Animals New Zealand conference presentation	2024	Completed	
Phase 1 and 2 written up and submitted to a peer-reviewed journal, potentially Landscape and Urban Planning	End 2024	In progress (due to issues with data collected in Phase 1 and continuation of Phase 2)	End 2025

International Society of Applied Ethology (Australasia) conference presentation	2025	This conference has not been announced yet	

Financial Reconciliation

- *Comment on the final status of your project's budget, including the reason for any underspend or overspend if applicable (NB: it is not anticipated that you would have overspent your budget).*
- *If your expenditure does not match the final income and expenditure statement produced by PeopleSoft, provide an explanation for the discrepancy.*

Item	Amount Approved	Actual spend in PeopleSoft ($)
Personnel – Research Assistant (10 hours p/w x 40 weeks x $23.65)	$9,460	11,554
Travel stipend for Key Researcher as will need to travel frequently between dog parks across Auckland	$1,000	0
GPS trackers (x6)	$850	854
Heat shrink wrap tubing (for waterproofing GPS devices)	$200	0
Total	**$11,510**	**$12,408**

The heat shrink wrap tubing was not purchased. Alternative water proofing of the GPS trackers was sought to ensure they could be safely attached to the dogs' collars. We ended up using finger condoms, electrical tape, waterproof key bags, and Velcro zip ties. The cost of these were absorbed by the researcher. The travel stipend was absorbed into the RA salary. The GPS trackers were slightly more expensive than planned due to an increase in shipping fees and the dollar exchange. The RA salary was overspent. Finance was paying the RA $26/hr as opposed to the $23.65/hr budgeted originally due to an increase in living wages. I checked in regularly through the project with Tuapapa Rangahau to ensure I'd stay on budget; however, there seemed to have been miscommunication between Finance/Payroll and TR, which resulted in numbers being incorrect at the time requested due to needing more adjustment to incorporate the latest pay for the RA. I could only work with the numbers given.

References (if applicable)

List any references to the work of others you have cited. Provide URLs for any materials available on the web.

Companion Animals New Zealand. (2020). Companion animals in New Zealand 2020 report. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5d1bf13a3f8e880001289eeb/t/5f768e8a17377653bd1eebef/1601605338749/Companion+Animals+in+NZ+2020+%281%29.pdf

Department of Internal Affairs. (2020). Currently registered dogs in New Zealand. https://figure.nz/chart/Rf5rYwXnAzAbbs0z

Glasser, M. R. (2013). *Dog Park Design, Development, and Operation*. Human Kinetics.

Gomez, E., Baur, J. W. R., & Malega, R. (2017). Dog park users: An examination of perceived social capital and perceived neighborhood social cohesion. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 40*(3), 349–369. https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1343634

Jackson, P. (2012). Situated Activities in a dog park: Identity and conflict in human-animal space. *Society & Animals, 20*(3), 254–272. https://doi.org/10.1163/15685306- 12341237

Lee, H. S., Shepley, M., & Huang, C. S. (2009). Evaluation of off-leash dog parks in Texas and Florida: A study of use patterns, user satisfaction, and perception. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 92*(3-4), 314–324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2009.05.015

Ottenheimer Carrier, L., Cyr, A., Anderson, R. E., & Walsh, C. J. (2013). Exploring the dog park: Relationships between social behaviours, personality and cortisol in companion dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 146*(1-4), 96–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2013.04.002

Rayment, D. J., De Groef, B., Peters, R. A., & Marston, L. C. (2015). Applied personality assessment in domestic dogs: Limitations and caveats. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 163*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2014.11.020

Walsh, C. J., Howse, M., Green, C., Butler, L., & Anderson, R. E. (2011). “Stop that!”: People interrupting behaviours in a dog park setting. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior, 6*(1), 77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2010.09.015

Westgarth, C., Christley, R. M., Pinchbeck, G. L., Gaskell, R. M., Dawson, S., & Bradshaw, J. W. S. (2010). Dog behaviour on walks and the effect of use of the leash. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 125*(1-2), 38–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2010.03.007

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?