

Academic Board (Poari Akoranga)	Agenda
October 14 2020	9am-10.30 Wintec meeting room 37 G block

	<p>Karakia Welcome to Angela Beaton and Merran Davis and Ana Morrison Whanaungatanga</p> <p>Apologies</p>	Page
1	<p>Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)</p> <p>1.1 Scheduled Meeting - 09 September 2020 (<i>attached</i>)</p> <p>1.2 Matters Arising – previous action items</p>	2
2	<p>September Academic Report to Council – Chris Collins</p> <p>Update from Council</p> <p><i>For information</i></p>	8
3	<p>Update from NZQA advisory group – verbal -Chris Collins</p> <p><i>For information</i></p>	
4	<p>PBRF review – ITP Research group – Natalie Waran</p> <p><i>For action</i></p>	9
5	Information to go into October Pānui	
6	Next Meeting November, Wellington	
	Closing Karakia	

Poari Akoranga - Academic Board

Minutes

Wednesday 9 September 2020

10:00am-12.30pm

ZOOM

Welcome and Attendance

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and opened the meeting with a Karakia.

Present

Chris Collins (Chair), Glynnis Brook, Neil Carroll, Greg Durkin, Lorna Gillespie, Jeanette Grace, Kieran Hewitson, Nita Hutchison, Oonagh McGirr, Sue Smart, Luana Te Hira, Stephen Town (ex Officio), Natalie Waran, Deborah Young

In Attendance

Phil Alexander-Crawford
Eve McMahon (NZQA)
Julia Parrott (NZQA)
Vikki Roadley (NZIST
interim GM)
Chris Williams
Jeanette Fifield (minute
taker)

Apologies/Absent

No apologies were received.

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

a. Scheduled Meeting

The minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 12 August 2020 were approved as a true and correct record.

Matters Arising

Carried

Action Items

	Detail	Owner	Due Date
0720-1	Determine new timeline for excellence project for academic regulations	CC/PK/ST	September 2020
0720-2	Provide workstream overview document for Academic Board information	VR	October 2020
0720-3	Determine principles and framework for an audit/stocktake of current subsidiary and ITO networks	All	October 2020
0820-1	Terms of reference to be considered alongside Letter of Expectation, Charter and developed in partnership with Māori Partnership and Equity workstream	CC	October 2020
0820-2	Communications to CEs and Academic Managers/Subsidiary Academic Committees to establish interim staff and learner voice	VR	October 2020

0920-1	Review terms of reference and potential structures (Workshop) – Poari Akorangi/Māori Partnership & Equity	All	October 2020
0920-2	ITO Learner nominations – Interim staff and student voice	LG/GD	October 2020
0920-04	NZQA Advisory group updates/reports	CC	October 2020
0920-5	Invite DCE Academic and Delivery to October workshop Invite DCE Transformation and Transition to October workshop	CC/VR	October 2020
0920-6	Accountancy pilot for common programme	SS	November 2020
0920-7	Panui – timeline and guidelines re: Poari Akorangi submission of agenda items	VR	October 2020
0920-8	Provide template document for priorities and work activity	VR	October 2020

2. Academic Reports to Council August

The Chair spoke to this agenda item.

Members noted the key points from the meeting.

Stephen Town spoke to the inclusion of the word excellence: “Regulations for excellence project” Agenda Item 9, presented for information.

3. Terms of Reference Poari Akorangi | Māori Partnership and Equity workstream feedback

The Chair introduced this agenda item and opened it up to members for discussion.

The following points were noted:

- Further work still required to align the draft ToR Academic Board with the draft NZIST Te Tiriti o Waitangi Excellence Framework.
- Further considerations required to how Te Tiriti principles will be articulated at subsidiary levels.
- There is an opportunity to distribute leadership/champions across the subsidiaries to implement the framework.
- Support a broader philosophy approach to the context.
- Further consideration required in regard to the work and reporting of Academic Board
- What will this look like for work-based learning? Support approaches that are meaningful.
- Strategies will need to be worked through, with an overarching framework.
 - o Focus on future, in particular post 2023 on NZIST’s approach, moving forward.
- Look to operational matters starting, once, Dr Angela Beaton, DCE Academic and Delivery is on-board.
 - o Start thinking about establishment of national academic committees and development of their terms of reference.
 - o Appoint “leads” for areas of national committees.
 - o Start to look at structures and what these may look like, including academic governance.
 - o Important to have frameworks (ToW and NZIST frameworks) and acceptance to work in alignment with these frameworks.
 - o Do not want to duplicate layers of what is already in place.

Stephen Town then spoke to existing academic committees, in particular, that they continue their current practice(s). The following points were noted:

- Where practical, existing committees may be involved in feeding into the co-design of NZIST structures.
- As new designs are developed, a cohesive and consistent approach across NZIST is key.

ACTION: Review Terms of Reference and potential structures (Workshop).

4. Terms of Reference Poari Akoranga | Tertiary Education Union (TEU) feedback

The Chair introduced this item and opened it up to members for discussion.

The following feedback was noted:

- There is a lack of clarity in regard to the functions of Poari Akoranga vs subsidiary academic committees.
- Timing is critical to be able to respond effectively with agility to pivot, when other structures are put in place.
- Establishment and curation of a national repository of NZQA approved programme document portfolios.
- Membership selection.
- Appointment of members.
- Adequate resourcing of time.

The following comments were noted:

- Question raised whether WDCs have submitted feedback on the ToR.
- WDC setup has been extended to the end of the year, in particular, coverage, functions and nationwide representation.
- Engagement with RSLG groups are taking place in respective regions.

5. Interim staff and student voice

The Interim GM gave a verbal update on this agenda item.

The following points were noted:

- NZIST will work to ensure that there is an interim staff and student voice fed through to Poari Akoranga while the Staff and Student Committees are established.
- A proposal is ready. Vikki Roadley will prepare the communications to socialise to CEs, Academic Committees and ITOs. **ACTION: Vikki Roadley**
- Provide nominations to Vikki Roadley of ITO learners willing to participate in a forum, from which a representative may be nominated. Lorna Gillespie and Greg Durkin will follow this up and keep liaison with Vikki Roadley. **ACTION: Lorna Gillespie, Greg Durkin**
- Mechanisms are place in both ITOs and ITPs to collect learner voices.
- For information: A virtual student voice symposium is being held at Otago Polytechnic later in the month. Oonagh McGirr will send out communications to members. **ACTION: Oonagh McGirr**
- Clarification provided in regard to the learner journey mapping.
- Processes to establish these committees are being developed noting the delay due to COVID-19 (updated timeframe: mid-November).

6. Working group verbal reports

The Chair invited Deborah Young and Sue Smart to speak to their respective agenda items.

1. Programme change process update

Deborah Young informed members this item is now completed. NZQA will be working with subsidiaries through to 2022.

2. New programme development framework

Sue Smart provided an update of the NZIST Pilot Accountancy scheme.

The following points were noted:

- Draft guidelines have been sent out for response. Sue Smart will collate responses.
- Noted the working group were innovative and engaging throughout the development.

- Consultation has been undertaken with ITOs.
- Guidelines will be published on 30 September 2020.
- Sue Smart will wait for leadership from Dr Angela Beaton, DCE Academic and Delivery to take forward for implementation. **ACTION: Sue Smart**

7. Regulations Project update

Members reviewed the updated report from Phil Ker, provided for information.

The following points were noted:

- Feedback has been submitted to the group, in particular the need to strengthen the language so that the Principles are reflected and the regulations tested against the Principles.
- Principles are portable and accessible for learners.
- Encourage collaborative and portable systems between NZIST and universities to develop programmes and pathways for learners to continue higher study.

Stephen Town left the meeting 11.25am

Eve McMahon and Julia Parrott joined the meeting and gave a brief introduction.

8. NZQA session – Update on qualification framework

Eve McMahon introduced this agenda item, providing an update, for information.

Discussion was held, and the following points were noted:

- Work has begun in regard to the best way forward in working with NZIST in a sensible manner.
- Further thinking around ideas to simplify the qualification system has also begun based on feedback received following the Sandbox session held in March.
- Ideas will be tested through feedback received and discussions held.
 - o Suggest NZIST engage with ITOs to test examples.
- A workshop will be held to discuss “transfer of accreditations” to NZIST.
 - o A staged approach is desired to minimise processes in a sensible way.
- Pilot test qualifications that may work (ITPs and ITOs) to see how it may look in practice and whether it will be a workable model, suggested.
 - o Include input from WDCs and NZIST in the process.

Phil Alexander-Crawford joined the meeting at 11.55am.

- Discussion on the governance role of Poari Akoranga throughout the process, in particular to understand the opportunities, challenges and insight, going forward.
- Strategic guidance from NZIST requested.
 - o A transitional plan or interim plan, to provide clarity.
- Consolidated list of programmes delivered across ITPs desirable.
- For consideration, TANZ have a list, as a starter.
- NZQA support straight forward solutions to NZIST’s priorities.
- NZQA will be submitting to the NZQA Board that a simple process is supported.

Eve McMahon gave an update of processes undertaken to date. The following points were noted:

- Overall the process is slow.
- Encouraged that testing will provide an opportunity to sort out ‘bugs’.
- This piece of work will be a long change process consisting of:
 - o Qualification framework
 - o Lift and shift of qualifications from subsidiaries to NZIST.

The Chair thanked Eve McMahon and Julia Parrott for their attendance and update and to NZQA for their ongoing consultation and engagement.

Eve McMahon will take today’s discussion back to NZQA staff and to the ITP Advisory group meeting.

Eve McMahon and Julia Parrott left the meeting at 12.15pm.

The Chair spoke to the role of the ITP Advisory group, for clarification. It was accepted updates from this group be received for information. **ACTION: Chris Collins**

9. Regulations for Excellence report (cont.)

Phil Alexander-Crawford gave an overview of his attendance to the meeting, providing advice to the group and is providing advice on the Regulations for Excellence project.

10. October workshop

- Revisit Purpose and Scope of Poari Akoranga.
- Brief incoming DCE Academic and Delivery on projects in progress.
- Invitation to incoming DCE Academic and Delivery to attend October meeting. **ACTION: Chris Collins to follow-up with Stephen Town**
- Invitation to Merran Davis, DCE Transformation and Transition. **ACTION: Vikki Roadley**
- Clarification of roles and responsibilities of subsidiary academic committees.
- Discussion re national committees and terms of reference(s).
- Discussion on responsibilities of academic governance.
- Lift and shift of all accreditations – what does this mean, processes to put in place.
- Archive space for retirement of programmes (future).
- Flesh out questions to put to NZQA and invite NZQA to November meeting.
- Development of a draft outline of activity/priorities for Poari Akoranga **ACTION: Vikki Roadley to provide template document**

11. Information to go into September Pānui

Items for the September Pānui would include:

1. Terms of Reference work.
2. Staff and student voice
3. Timeline and guidelines on submission of agenda items for Poari Akoranga meetings. **ACTION: Vikki Roadley**

12. Closure and Next Meeting

Next meeting date: 14 October 2020, NZIST office, Hamilton.

The next meeting is intended to be a face to face meeting subject to alert levels.

The Chair thanked members and staff for their contribution.

The Interim GM closed the meeting with a Karakia.

Future Meeting Dates

14 October 2020	NZIST office, Hamilton
11 November 2020	Location tba
9 December 2020	Location tba

Summary of Action Items

	Detail	Owner	Due Date
0720-1	Determine new timeline for excellence project for academic regulations	CC/PK/ST	September 2020
0720-2	Provide workstream overview document for Academic Board information	VR	October 2020
0720-3	Determine principles and framework for an audit/stocktake of current subsidiary and ITO networks	All	October 2020
0820-1	Terms of reference to be considered alongside Letter of Expectation, Charter and developed in partnership with Māori Partnership and Equity workstream	CC	October 2020
0820-2	NZIST to establish an interim process to ensure staff and learner voice is heard while Student and Staff Committees are established	VR	Completed
0820-3	Working group to report on new programme development parameters/principles/framework progress	SS	Completed
0820-4	Communication to be provided to subsidiaries on the use of common seals	VR	Completed
0820-7	Pānui on key points from meeting to be sent to subsidiaries	VR	Completed
0820-9	Pilot for accountancy collaboration to be initiated and this work added to the NZIST workstream activity for support and monitoring	VR	Completed
0920-3	Review terms of reference and potential structures (Workshop) – Poari Akorangi/Māori Partnership & Equity Workshop	All	October 2020
0920-3	Learner nominations – Interim staff and student voice	All/VR	October 2020
0920-6	Bringing new DCE Academic and Delivery up to speed re new programme development framework	SS/AB	October 2020`
0920-07	ITP Advisory group updates/reports	CC	October 2020
0920-10	Invite DCE Academic and Delivery to October workshop Invite DCE Transformation and Transition to October workshop	CC/ST	October 2020
0920-11	September panui – timeline and guidelines re: Poari Akorangi submission of agenda items	VR	October 2020

Te Pūkenga Council Meeting

6 October 2020

Agenda item number:	5
Provided by:	Chris Collins, Chair Poari Akoranga (Academic Board)
Title:	Academic Report and minutes 090920
For:	Noting

Recommendation

1. It is recommended the Council:
 - a) Note the academic report from the meeting 09 September 2020.

Situation

The September meeting of the NZIST Poari Akoranga was held on 9 September 2020 by zoom.

Key points

- The group considered feedback from the Māori Partnership and Equity workstream and TEU and will re-develop terms of reference and review national academic architecture at October workshop. The group will continue to seek advice on Terms of Reference and membership and Poari Akoranga activity. Will Workman and/or Phil Alexander-Crawford, and Angela Beaton will join the October workshop.
- An interim process prior to establishment of committees to ensure staff and student voice reaches Poari Akoranga was agreed to be socialised and tested. Possible process to use existing staff and student representatives on subsidiary Academic Committees as a forum. Will need to analyse for the 'missing voices' and ensure this voice is captured through an interim process. For example Māori, Pasifika, disability. Work will need to seek input from the Māori Partnership and Equity workstream.
- The NZQA DCE, Quality Assurance Division and Manager, Approvals and Accreditation presented and discussed the 'simplification of qualification framework' work. An outline of the testing and feedback to be undertaken by NZQA was provided.
- The possible pathways for the transfer of accreditations and approvals were discussed. Both parties desire a sensible, simple and staged approach to the work by developing lists of priorities. NZIST to work with NZQA and WDCs as appropriate.
- Poari Akoranga considered the Regulations for Excellence Project progress and noted the work was being supported by Phil Alexander-Crawford.
- Poari Akoranga will all come together face-face for the first time in October in Hamilton.

Poari Akoranga

14 October 2020

Agenda item number:	4
Provided by:	Natalie Waran
Title:	ITP response to proposed PBRF changes
For:	

Please find attached a paper for discussion by Board members regarding the ITP collective response to proposed changes in PBRF.

Note there are two highlighted sections regarding the timing of the proposed changes and there are some differences in opinion from our research directors (RDs).

A decision is required on this section by Poari Akoranga. The remainder of this document has been agreed by all who have fed back.

Three research directors have not provided feedback (Ara, NorthTec and NMIT) – but all RDs have been given plenty of time and have been contacted via email and phone to engage them.

Recommendation

2. It is recommended that Poari Akoranga;
 - a) Discuss the document, agree on the wording of the highlighted sections and
 - b) Approve any changes that can then be incorporated prior to this being submitted on behalf of Te Pūkenga by Stephen as previously agreed

Report of the PBRF Review Panel: Proposed Changes and Options for Strengthening the Performance-Based Research Fund

Submission by: Te Pūkenga-New Zealand Institute of Skills and Technology

1. Introduction

This submission follows the structure provided by *the PBRF Review Written Submissions Template*.

Te Pūkenga is intending to participate in the 2025 PBRF round and subsequent Quality Evaluation rounds. The focus of the Te Pūkenga submission is on the potential impact of the proposed PBRF changes on Te Pūkenga's current and future research focus and research capability. Where considered relevant, comment is also provided in respect to the broader context of the PBRF review.

2. Background: Te Pūkenga-New Zealand Institute of Skills and Technology

Te Pūkenga is progressively bringing together the 16 Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics and the 11 Industry Training Organisations into one organisation. Te Pūkenga will be the largest tertiary education provider in New Zealand and the only tertiary provider to span competency-based skills training (including apprenticeships and on the job training), academic education through to postgraduate level and applied research.

The Education and Training Act 2020 (Section 315), requires Te Pūkenga to, *inter alia*, conduct research, with a focus on "applied and technological research". Schedule 13 of the Act (Charter) requires Te Pūkenga to, *inter alia*, "be responsive to the needs of all regions of New Zealand", and "reflect Maori-Crown partnerships in order to ensure that its governance, management, and operations give effect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi; and recognise that Māori are key actors in regional social, environmental, and economic development". Te Pūkenga must also "ensure teaching and learning is supported by research, evidence, and best practice".

Research will be a key focus of Te Pūkenga in performing its statutory functions.

3. Summary of our Submission

Te Pūkenga endorses the need for the PBRF to deliver outcomes for learners, businesses, communities and New Zealand as a whole.

1. We agree in principle with all the recommendations in the Report.
2. We support broadening the concept of research excellence but are concerned changes need to be implemented only after thorough consultation and having regard for research institution (including Te Pūkenga) regulatory and statutory definitions of research. This is unlikely to be possible if undertaken during the current round.
3. We have concerns about the proposed timing of some of the other changes and do not support making substantive changes¹ to the Quality Evaluation part-way through a round.

1. ¹ We would like to bring forward the recommendations related to equity and diversity to be implemented during the current Quality Evaluation round.

4. Te Pūkenga Response in Respect to Proposed Changes to PBRF

The following comments are provided to support the strengthening of the Performance-Based Research Fund. The comments reflect consideration of the proposed changes to the PBRF by Te Pūkenga, with input from the Te Pūkenga subsidiary research directorates. Individual Te Pūkenga subsidiaries may also make individual submissions.

General Comment in respect to the timetable for the proposed changes: We have concerns about the proposed timeframe for making changes to the 2025 Quality Evaluation. We agree with TEC (as stated in the 'Education Report: Seeking Decisions on the PBRF Review') that the change process will take upwards of 2 years to complete and consult on and, if substantive changes are implemented during the current round this would make it unclear for the sector as we are already 3 years into the assessment period and it seems unfair to change the goal posts halfway through, particularly at a time when institutions have had many other issues to deal with as a result of Covid19. In addition, researchers at Te Pūkenga subsidiaries will also be adjusting to progressive organisational change during the current evaluation period.

We suggest reversing what are proposed as short-term and long-term changes and making the change of objectives and name along with EREs a long-term goal for the subsequent round after 2025 thereby having the new focus heralded by a new name in a new Quality Evaluation round. Conversely work on the equity issues of re-evaluating the subject weightings, diversity of panels, special circumstances and definition for new and emerging in the short term should be applied to the current round. We believe these changes can be achieved without disrupting the current Quality Evaluation and would be less disruptive to TEOs and importantly researchers in the current round.

General Comment in respect to COVID-19: COVID-19 has impacted research and research-led teaching in many ways. Te Pūkenga is acutely aware of this and wishes to highlight the differing effects across research-led teaching, which may impact PBRF portfolio submissions. Applied subject areas (for example early childhood education and primary teaching, nursing, social work, viticulture and wine science, sport and health science) which are prominent in Te Pūkenga subsidiaries, are particularly affected as they have had to adjust practicums and placements to New Zealand's changing Covid-19 alert levels. Consideration may need to be given to the impact of COVID-19 in the 2025 Quality Evaluation, beyond simply extending the review period by 12 months.

4.1. Key objective one: Broadening the PBRF concept of research excellence

Modifying the current objectives of the PBRF

Review Panel Proposal: Adding a new objective, that *"the PBRF ensure a flourishing and inclusive system for developing and sustaining research excellence in New Zealand"*.

Te Pūkenga Response: The proposed change to the current objectives of the PBRF is supported. We support the proposed addition of the new objective "the PBRF ensure a flourishing and inclusive system for developing and sustaining research excellence in New Zealand". How inclusiveness is defined and measured will be important to the strengthening of PBRF. For Te Pūkenga, inclusion of

research that addresses community needs provides some recognition of the need to value different contributions to research that are tailored toward the unique and distinctive needs of different regions.

We support wording that emphasises excellence; encompasses the production of research, engagement and impact relating to that research; and support for vibrant, diverse research cultures. As part of this, emphasis needs to be given to research that is responsive to Aotearoa's demographic and geographic diversity and broad range of research achievement. We suggest the following amendment to the wording be considered:

*“...the PBRF ensure a flourishing and inclusive system for developing and sustaining research excellence in New Zealand that **supports excellence at all levels of research achievement including emerging researchers and is responsive to demographic and geographic diversity in Aotearoa New Zealand**”.*

Refreshing the PBRF's definition of research excellence

Review Panel Proposal: Rewording the PBRF definition of research to emphasise excellence; encompass the production of research, engagement and impact relating to that research; and support for vibrant, diverse research cultures.

Te Pūkenga Response: The proposed change to the definition is supported in principle. We agree that the PBRF definition of research and concept of research excellence needs to be broadened and that diversity and inclusion must feature strongly in New Zealand's tertiary education research system.

The PBRF concept of research needs to encompass the full range of research activity and diverse research cultures in our tertiary education system, all of which contribute to research excellence and research impact.

The PBRF definition of research also needs to align with international standards (such as OECD) and needs to be consistent with enabling research institution regulation and statute. In the case of Te Pūkenga, the Education Act 2020 requires the organisation to focus on applied research and technology development. Importantly, the notion of excellence needs to be unpacked as to expectations for researchers, including early career and mid-career forms of excellence. This will be particularly important in respect to Te Pūkenga as ITPs have tended to employ significant numbers of early and mid-career researchers.

We consider the development of a more capacious definition of excellence will require extensive consultation and we are concerned the adoption of new definition during the current PBRF cycle would be confusing for researchers and would disadvantage researchers and institutions whose research may not respond directly to this definition and would have no time to refocus their research plans.

We recommend the adoption of a new definition of research excellence is deferred until the 2025 Quality Evaluation has been completed.

Review Panel Proposal: Replacing the Nominated Research Outputs (NRO) component with *Examples of Research Excellence (ERE)*.

Te Pūkenga Response: We support the proposed change of terminology from Nominated Research Outputs (NRO) to Examples of Research Excellence (ERE) with a focus on research excellence across

research production, engagement, impact, and support for research cultures. **To ensure there is no confusion, we recommend retaining the existing nomenclature and NRO/ORO/RC definitions for the 2025 Quality Evaluation.**

We also suggest a reframing of the evidence portfolio for the subsequent PBRF round after 2025 to make the Evidence Portfolio easier to read for panellists and more focused for researchers. We recommend this includes reducing the number of Research Contributions and a review of the use of the commentary/ description sections. We recommend including in this work clear guidance and procedures as to how researchers can best describe their work where it has two or more distinct strands. This would need detailed work and consultation with TEOs.

Review Panel Proposal: Replacing the Other Research Outputs (ORO) component with *Other Examples of Research Excellence (OERE)* and reducing the maximum number from twelve to six.

Te Pūkenga Response: We support the proposed change of terminology from Other Research Outputs (ORO) to Other Examples of Research Excellence (OERE) and reducing the maximum number from twelve to six. We do not envisage any extra costs from this and consider the more accessible language used for these categories will benefit for both users and end-users/stakeholders. However, as discussed above in respect to changing from NROs to EREs, we do not consider this is something that can be actioned for the current round and if this was adopted this round it would add significant compliance cost to TEC and TEOs to make significant changes in the current round.

Review Panel Proposal: Refocusing the Research Contributions section on the best examples of activities that contribute to the sustainability and viability of the research system.

Te Pūkenga Response: We support the proposed refocused Research Contributions section in Annex 3. A key component of the EP should be impact and knowledge transfer to professions/ industry/ communities. As with the change of terminology proposed to NROs and OROs, we do not envisage any extra costs from this unless this was to be implemented in the current round. The more accessible language used for these categories will benefit for both users and end-users/stakeholders. The descriptors however appear to be orientated at the A/B end of the scale and these should be more inclusive to acknowledge contributions that are expected FROM early or mid-career researchers. There could be merit in reducing the number of RCs, asking researchers to provide, for example, their six top examples of CR section and retaining some of the breadth of the current descriptors to include for example post-graduate supervision and citations that are achievable for early -mid career researchers . This would obviously need much work to develop an inclusive descriptor which would not be possible within the context of the current round.. This will, however, enable even more junior researchers to be given credit for activities such as adjudicators/judges of Secondary School Kapa Haka Regional Competitions, of Regional or National Wine Awards.

Reviewing subject areas

Review Panel Proposal: Reviewing subject area weightings to ensure they accurately reflect the costs to TEOs in undertaking a full range of research.

Te Pūkenga Response: We support a review of subject area weightings. Central to any review should be a recognition of the significant costs associated with doing research in partnership with deprived communities, hard-to reach sectors, and geographically distant communities in order to achieve meaningful knowledge transfer and impact where there are limited external funding sources for this kind of research. The TEC report from 2018 found that C researchers had more of an impact locally than B/As. Te Pūkenga had a high proportion in the C category in the 2018 round and given our geographic locations this puts us an important place to support local and regional knowledge transfer. . For many researchers in Te Pūkenga_subsidaries this has been an ongoing key challenge which has not been acknowledged in subject area weightings. In addition, this review should also consider the costs of research support and scaling of research in areas such as humanities which are chronically underestimated. This should be implemented for the current round.

4.2. Key objective two: Enabling a more sustainable and diverse research workforce

General Comment in respect to enabling a more sustainable and diverse research workforce. We strongly support initiatives to support equity, diversity, and inclusion in our tertiary education research system for both our researchers and their work. The Te Pūkenga_subsidaries make a significant contribution to building a more representative and diverse workforce and strongly endorse the need for action to direct resources to areas where research excellence has been undervalued. Applied research and regionally focused development are two of these areas. Covid-19 has underscored the importance of research that has a regional focus. The fragility of regional economies and regional well-being as a result of New Zealand’s dependence on international visitors and migrant workers has created significant challenges for regions and for education and training.

We fully support the objective of enabling a more sustainable and diverse research workforce, in particular increasing the focus on Māori and Pacific researchers and researcher development. We also consider diversity must be interpreted in the broader context of supporting the overall research focus and capability of the increasingly diverse research workforce in Aotearoa New Zealand. While the changes to the weightings are supported, clarity will be required as to how collaborations will be evaluated as part of the Quality Evaluation.

Te Pūkenga is well-placed to carry out research and develop innovative responses that are regionally relevant, industry specific and which transform communities. This is only possible if it can be sustained and supported by equitable access to support from the Performance-Based Research Fund. It will be important that the changes to PBRF recognise that, given a key role for Te Pūkenga is to contribute to regional and industry development, the concept of Te Pūkenga through research giving back to its key stakeholders is a key enabling factor in building a more sustainable diverse research workforce. This occurs through the visibility of research in community, in industry and in partnership.

Improving support for mātauranga Māori and Pacific research, and Māori and Pacific researchers

Review Panel Proposals:

1. **Increasing the subject area weighting for EPs assessed by the Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) and Pacific Research (PR) panels from 1 to 2.5;**
2. **Assigning an additional funding weighting of 2 for EPs submitted by staff who identify as Māori or Pacific;**
3. **Adopting both of the above options.**

Te Pūkenga Response: We support adopting both of the above proposals for the 2025 Quality evaluation. We also consider a higher weighting should also be applied to any research that directly addresses Māori and Pacific disadvantage.

Improving support for mātauranga Māori and Pacific research, and Māori and Pacific researchers is inherent in the Te Pūkenga Charter. Te Pūkenga subsidiaries currently provide significant support for mātauranga Māori and Pacific research, and Māori and Pacific researchers. Greater recognition of the (often currently unrecognised) support provided by Te Pūkenga subsidiaries is required, in conjunction with a fundamental reorientation of the research system in Aotearoa New Zealand to begin to rebalance the longstanding lack of support for mātauranga Māori and Pacific research, and Māori and Pacific researchers.

Reviewing qualifying criteria

Review Panel Proposal: **Reviewing the extraordinary circumstances qualifying criteria², to introduce a ‘merit relative to opportunity’ concept to be exercised by peer-review panels.**

Te Pūkenga Response: Te Pūkenga supports the introduction of a ‘merit relative to opportunity’ concept to be exercised by peer-review panels. We consider this should be implemented during the current round. Specific recognition of a researcher’s access to research funding is needed to ensure that researchers in ITPs are not disadvantaged. As noted by the PBRF Review Panel, how this would work in practice would need to be determined following the consultation and in collaboration with the sector. We also recommend criteria take into account factors such as: part time staff (including industry-based part-time staff), leave for significant illness, caring for family members for significant periods of time, parental leave and secondment to temporary higher duties, restructuring among other things.

Review Panel Proposal: **Reviewing the new and emerging qualifying criteria³ with a view to simplification.**

Te Pūkenga Response: We recommend the New and Emerging criteria should move away from the substantive degree teaching measure and focus on the date when the researcher began independent research publication subsequent to the attainment of their first research degree (i.e. Level 9). Typical career pathways for Te Pūkenga staff are commonly to come into teaching as experienced professionals who then have to attain research qualifications. The current model disadvantages these staff who, in terms of research are new and emerging, but who take a number

² [Guidelines for tertiary education organisations participating in the 2018 Quality Evaluation](#) – page 94

³ [Guidelines for tertiary education organisations participating in the 2018 Quality Evaluation](#) – page 19

of years completing research qualifications while teaching. This should be implemented for the current round.

4.3. Key objective three: Improving how Government supports tertiary sector research

Progressing work that builds tertiary sector research capability and capacity

Review Panel Proposal: Supporting the NZIST to focus on researcher support and research capability and development, during its transition period

Te Pūkenga Response: We support the PBRF actively supporting the new organisation to enable the focus on researcher support and research capability and development, to be maintained and developed during the transition period.

Review Panel Proposal

- 1. Co-designing with wānanga an appropriate and sustainable funding solution to meet their research aspirations, including through the WRA project;**
- 2. Working across Government to support a sustainable Māori and Pacific research workforce and a diverse research system, including linking in with MBIE's Equity, Diversity and Inclusion work programme.**

Te Pūkenga Response: We support the provision of support for wānanga and the development of a sustainable Maori and Pacific research workforce. This should be implemented for the current round.

Funding backstop for the NZIST in the next Quality Evaluation

Review Panel Proposal: Fixing the minimum proportion of funding to be allocated to the NZIST (*Te Pūkenga*) in the next QE as the proportion allocated through the 2018 QE to ITPs, contingent on the NZIST participating in the QE (*Te Pūkenga*).

Te Pūkenga Response: We confirm Te Pūkenga is intending to participate in the 2025 Quality Evaluation. We would like to acknowledge the PBRF Review Panel recommendation that support be provided to Te Pūkenga to assist with a managed transition from the pre-RoVE 16 Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics, to Te Pūkenga. We support fixing the proportion allocated in the 2018 Quality Evaluation as a minimum level of Quality Evaluation research funding support. We also note that we expect that the establishment of Te Pūkenga will facilitate an increase in quality research output by Te Pūkenga researchers. However, we also acknowledge this increase will be a function of developing national research capability which may take several years to implement and mature.

Reflecting the strengthened PBRF

Review Panel Proposal: Renaming the PBRF in English and/or te reo Māori

Te Pūkenga Response: We support renaming the PBRF in te reo Māori and/or English. The use of te reo recognises the indigenous language of Aotearoa New Zealand, which is an official language, and signals the aspiration for an authentic bicultural partnership between Crown and Māori based on Te Tiriti o Waitangi. We recommend renaming PBRF in te reo Maori, although we suggest retaining the English name of PBRF until the end of the 2025 round to avoid potential for confusion.

Review Panel Proposal: **Modifying the guiding principles to better reflect *partnership, inclusiveness, and equity***

Te Pūkenga Response: We support modifying the guiding principles to better reflect partnership, inclusiveness, and equity.

Rebalancing the components of the PBRF

Review Panel Proposal:

- 1. Discontinuing the ERI component via a full discontinuation starting after the next QE, or a phased discontinuation starting after the next QE over four years.**
- 2. Subject to the above, redistribution of ERI funding into the QE component, or a new component to replace the ERI, or a mixture of the QE component and a new component.**

Te Pūkenga Response: We support discontinuation of the ERI component of the Quality Evaluation after the next Quality Evaluation, commencing 2025 and distributing to the Quality Evaluation. This component is fundamentally biased to large programmes of nationally significant research undertaken primarily by Universities and therefore inherently disadvantages Te Pūkenga which has a statutory focus on applied research and technological research. We agree with TEC that the timing of the removal of the ERI measure should be done in one step at the end of the round after 2025.

Comment in respect to the calculation of the RDC. We also recommend a simplification of the calculation of the RDC measure. There is no justification for the use of a 3-year rolling average. We consider it would be simpler to simply count a single completion, providing an accuracy report one year before to correct errors in recording in subsequent SDRs before the funding payment is actioned, this would relieve institutions and TEC of considerable a compliance cost and could be implemented at the same time as the ERI change after 2025.

Seeking new PBRF metrics

Review Panel Proposal: **Replacing the AQS metrics with a more appropriate measure of quality.**

Te Pūkenga Response: AQS was unfair for ITPs as it included non-degree teaching staff in the matrix who were a substantive proportion of staff in our institutions and implicitly compared researchers in ITPs against colleagues in universities. We support replacing the AQS metrics with a more appropriate measure of quality. We note it will be important the metrics recognise distinctiveness of much research undertaken by Te Pūkenga researchers in terms of community connectedness, applied research and vocational education focus.

Researching and assessing the PBRF

Review Panel Proposal: Establishing an ongoing programme of research into, and evaluation of, PBRF processes and impact on the sector and research workforce.

Te Pūkenga Response: We support the establishment of an ongoing programme of research into, and evaluation of, PBRF processes and impact on the sector and research workforce, with a particular focus on entities which are not universities (Te Pūkenga, wānanga, PTEs) in order to recognise the research undertaken by these institutions which is otherwise hidden.

4.4. Operational changes to the PBRF

Building on the successes of the PBRF

Review Panel Proposal: Ensuring the peer-review panels reflect the epistemological and demographic diversity of the research workforce, including ensuring gender parity, significant representation of Māori and Pacific researchers and a broad representation of researchers and other experts across career stages, TEOs and other research institutions.

Te Pūkenga Response: We support operational changes to the PBRF that will ensure the peer-review panels reflect the epistemological and demographic diversity of the research workforce, including ensuring gender parity, significant representation of Māori and Pacific researchers and a broad representation of researchers and other experts across career stages, TEOs and other research institutions. We consider this should be implemented during the current round.

Review Panel Proposal:

- 1. Ensuring the peer-review panels are well supported with a programme of training to strengthen their capacity to take into account the diversity of research excellence and apply ‘merit relative to opportunity’ approaches.**
- 2. Improving understanding of the PBRF and addressing myths about the QE in its communications.**

Te Pūkenga Response: We support ensuring panels are provided with adequate training to strengthen their capacity to take into account the diversity of research excellence and apply ‘merit relative to opportunity’ approaches, and communication to improve understanding of the PBRF.

Review Panel Proposal: Adopting the Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID) as the unique identifier for PBRF-eligible staff.

Te Pūkenga Response: We support adopting the Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID) as the unique identifier for PBRF-eligible staff. However, we note further use of the ORCID ID to capture research published by Te Pūkenga researchers has very limited value due to the reliance on international aggregators. There may also be an unintended consequence if the review panel uses information linked to an ORCID ID beyond the portfolio submitted for evaluation and ranking. The PBRF guidelines for panels will need to protect against this.

Review Panel Proposal: Consulting the Sector Reference Group for the next QE on the implementation of all proposals for changes that are approved.

Te Pūkenga Response: We support consulting the Sector Reference Group for the next Quality Evaluation on the implementation of all proposals for changes that are approved.