

Academic Board (Poari Akoranga)	Agenda
November 11 2020	10:00am-2.00pm

	Karakia timatanga Welcome and apologies Whanaungatanga	Page 1
1	Minutes of Previous Meeting(s) 1.1 Scheduled Meeting – 14 October 2020 (<i>attached</i>) 1.2 Matters Arising – previous action items	2
2	10.15am – 10.30am October Academic Report to Council – Chris Collins/Angela Beaton Update from Council <i>For information</i>	6
3	10.30am - 11.30pm Grant Klinkum and Eve McMahon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on simplification of qualifications system work with discussion to ensure Te Pūkenga’s views are reflected in our advice to the Minister, and Options for ensuring New Zealand qualifications more consistently reflect mātauranga Māori. <i>For discussion</i>	Verbal
5	11.30pm – 11.45pm Update from NZQA advisory group -Chris Collins/Angela Beaton <i>minutes</i> <i>For information</i>	7
	11.45 – 12.00pm PBRF review final submission <i>For information</i>	13
	12.00pm – 12.30pm Lunch	
8	12.30pm – 1.00pm Update from Terms of Reference working group	Verbal
7	1.00pm – 1.30pm Programme Development – Angela Beaton <i>For discussion</i>	Verbal
4	1.30pm – 1.45pm Regulations for Excellence Project report – Phil Ker <i>For information</i>	Verbal
8	1.45pm – 1.55pm Workplan for 2021 <i>For discussion</i>	Verbal
9	1.55pm – 2.00pm Information to go into November Pānui <i>For discussion</i>	Verbal
10	Next Meeting December (by zoom TBC), following meeting February (Nelson TBC)	Verbal
	Karakia mutunga	

Poari Akoranga - Academic Board

Minutes

Wednesday 14 October 2020

9am-2:45pm

Waikato Institute of
Technology Limited,
Hamilton

Welcome and Attendance

Karakia timatanga

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions and welcome to the incoming DCE Delivery and Academic.

Present

Chris Collins (Chair), Luana Te Hira (from 10.30am), Oonagh McGirr, Deborah Young, Glynnis Brook, Jeanette Grace, Lorna Gillespie, Natalie Waran, Neil Carroll, Nita Hutchison, Sue Smart, Kieran Hewitson (from 9.30am)

In Attendance

Angela Beaton (Incoming DCE Delivery and Academic, Te Pūkenga)

Merran Davis (DCE Transformation and Transition, Te Pūkenga)

Vikki Roadley (Interim GM, Te Pūkenga)

Patricia Morais (Minute taker)

Ana Morrison (DCE Partnerships and Equity, Te Pūkenga, for workshop only)

Phil Alexander-Crawford (Interim Operations Manager, Te Pūkenga for workshop only)

Apologies/Absent

Apologies for lateness Luana Te Hira (10.30am)

Te Pūkenga introductions

Angela Beaton, the incoming DCE Delivery and Academic and Merran Davis, DCE Transformation and Transition introduced themselves to the Poari Akoranga. Round table introductions followed.

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

a. Scheduled Meeting

The minutes of the Academic Board meeting held on 9 September 2020 were approved as a true and accurate record

b. Matters Arising

Action Items

	Detail	Owner	Due Date
0720-1	Determine new timeline for the Regulating for Excellence project	CC/PK/ST	October 2020
0720-2	Provide workstream overview document for Poari Akoranga information	VR	November 2020
0720-3	Determine principles and framework for an audit/stock take of current subsidiary and ITO programmes	All	November 2020

0820-2	Communications to CEs and Academic Managers/Subsidiary Academic Committees to establish interim staff and learner voice	VR	November 2020
0920-2	ITO Learner nominations – Interim staff and student voice	LG/GD	In progress
0920-4	NZQA Advisory group updates/reports	CC	November 2020
0920-6	Accountancy pilot for common programme	SS	November 2020
1410-1	Work with the Academic Directors to draft a response to NZQA on the management of the collection and storage of assessments	AB	November 2020
1410-2	It was agreed that a working group will lead the drafting of a terms of reference and bring a draft back to the Poari Akoranga with Te Pūkenga input	DY/NW/SS/GD/JG	December 2020

i. Other Matters Arising

Nothing further.

2. Academic Report to Council September - Update

Chris Collins spoke to this item. Members noted the key points arising from the Council discussion, and in particular, the discussion around issues and caution about progressing the transfer of subsidiary programme approvals and accreditation to Te Pūkenga. It was agreed that a key aspect of the Poari Akoranga discussion around this was to scope all the issues and identify what systems and processes would need to be in place before this could occur.

Workshop - Te Pae Tawhiti

The group paused the meeting at 10am to enable Ana Morrison and Phil Alexander-Crawford to present at the workshop around other commitments

Ana Morrison and Phil Alexander-Crawford led a workshop on the new Te Pae Tawhiti- Tiriti Excellence Framework. The purpose was to introduce the Framework to Poari Akoranga and for the members to explore how the principles and outcomes of the framework need to be included in the Terms of Reference and the work that Poari Akoranga is tasked with overseeing.

Group reconvened meeting at 11.45am

3. Update from NZQA Advisory Group - Chris Collins

Chris Collins spoke to this item. Chris and other Poari Akoranga members briefed Poari Akoranga on the key points arising from this meeting. A formal set of minutes from this meeting will be circulated once this has been received from NZQA.

4. ITP Response to proposed PBRF changes - Natalie Warren

Natalie Waran led the review of the paper submitted. The following points were discussed:

- Noted the next PBRF round will be completed as Te Pūkenga, not as individual subsidiary ITPs in 2025
- A key discussion point was whether Te Pūkenga should be advocating for a broadening of the definition of research to be in place for the next round, or for the change to occur after the next round. The possible benefits/disadvantages of this possible change were discussed, with agreement that the change should occur now as the definition would be broadened rather than narrowed.
- **Agreed** to support changes to PBRF as proposed in the paper with the following amendments:
 - A statement to be included to ensure researchers are not disadvantaged;
 - On page 15 Te Pukenga response to include a request to remove the first paragraph;

- On page 18, 4.4, language should be replaced by “all entities” to avoid making a distinction between entities.

The board noted and wishes to acknowledge the work of the Research Directors across the network.

- Subject to the above amendments, the paper is **Approved** (moved Kieran Hewitson, seconded Natalie Waran).

5. Requirement to collect, retain and store assessments

A late paper was received on the collection and storage of assessment materials. Glynnis Brook provided a summary of the paper. The following points were discussed:

- NZQA have confirmed all assessments should be kept for two years from January 2022 and will be the responsibility of Te Pūkenga to ensure compliance at each subsidiary.
- Subsidiaries are questioning how the information will be collected and stored.
- Consideration was given to using Moodle and physical storage.
- Noted Registration bodies have different requirements.
- Recommendation: Option C – Te Pūkenga negotiates with NZQA to defer this requirement until the institute is fully operational. **Carried**

Action: Angela Beaton to work with the Academic Directors to draft a response to NZQA

6. Transformation update

Merran Davis spoke to this item. The following points were discussed:

- The high-level transition pathway, including the timelines for a codesigned operating model will be shared with the network in the form of a communication tool over the next 1-2 weeks
- Expressions of interest for secondments will be sought from the sector to contribute to workstreams, wherever possible
- A key focus on the new operating model will be Ākonga at the centre, which we anticipate will be strengthened by a new unified funding model in 2023.
- Subsidiaries have expressed an interest in gaining further clarity on the transition.

7. Terms of reference

Following the workshop on Te Pae Tawhiti it was agreed that further work to develop the Poari Akoranga Terms of Reference (ToR) is required. The ToR were always regarded as a ‘work in progress’ and a starting point for Te Pūkenga, and that further development would be required as Te Pūkenga developed.

Action: It was agreed that a working group of Deborah Young, Natalie Waran, Sue Smart, Greg Durkin, Jeanette Grace and Angela Beaton will lead the work and bring a draft back to the Poari Akoranga for further consideration. Any changes will need to be approved by the Council.

8. Closure and Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held kanohi ki te kanohi in Wellington at the BCITO offices.

Karakia mutunga

Next meeting date: 11 November 2020

Future Meeting Dates

12 August 2020	Wellington
9 September 2020	Zoom
14 October 2020	Hamilton

11 November 2020	Wellington
9 December 2020	Nelson TBC

Te Pūkenga Council Meeting

03 November 2020

Agenda item number:	
Provided by:	Chris Collins and Angela Beaton
Title:	Chair, Poari Akoranga, DCE Delivery and Academic
For:	Noting

Recommendation

- 1) It is recommended the Council note the academic report from the meeting 14 October 2020.

Key points

The October meeting and workshop of the Te Pūkenga Poari Akoranga was held on 14 October 2020 in Hamilton.

- Dr Angela Beaton was in attendance for this first kanohi ki te kanohi meeting of Poari Akoranga and was welcomed by the group.
- Merran Davis updated the group on transition and transformation activity; and Ana Morrison and Phil Alexander-Crawford facilitated a workshop on Te Pae Tawhiti to support Te Tiriti excellence in an academic context.
- A working group has been implemented to develop Poari Akoranga terms of reference with guidance from the Māori Partnership and Equity workstream to ensure these are 'fit for purpose' and will contribute to enabling Te Pūkenga to fulfil its charter.
- Te Urikore Biddle, Director of Quality and Academic at Wintec, has been seconded to work alongside Phil Ker in the Regulating for Excellence workstream.
- A draft ITP response on the PRBF review was considered and feedback noted before submission to the Ministry of Education (MoE). The proposed changes for consultation are: (1) Broadening the PBRF concept of research excellence, (2) Enabling a more sustainable and diverse research workforce, and (3) Improving how Government supports tertiary sector research. These potential changes offer opportunities to strengthen existing research activities within our research network.
- Poari Akoranga considered concerns raised by subsidiaries regarding the NZQA requirement to collect and store assessment materials; specifically, how subsidiaries will manage this significant requirement before the original implementation deadline of 31 December 2020 alongside transition activities. Whilst NZQA has extended this deadline to 31 December 2021, this will need to be a point for further discussion between Te Pūkenga and subsidiaries to achieve a level of alignment.



Te Pūkenga Poari Akoranga

11 November 2020

Agenda item number:	
Provided by:	Chris Collins/Angela Beaton
Title:	Chair Poari Akoranga/DCE Delivery and Academic
For:	Noting

Recommendation

- 2) It is recommended that Poari Akoranga
 - a) Note the October 21 minutes from the Te Pūkenga Advisory Group (NZQA)

NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY (NZQA)

Te Pūkenga Advisory Group Meeting

Wednesday 21 October 2020

Zoom

PRESENT: Chris Collins, Eastern Institute of Technology (Convenor)
Dr Angela Beaton, Te Pūkenga
Nita Hutchinson, Western Institute of Technology
Caroline Seelig, Open Polytechnic
Kim Ulberg, Tertiary Education Commission

IN ATTENDANCE: Rebecca Boyack, NZQA
Anna Castelle-Parsons, NZQA
Mick Geraghty, NZQA
Julia Parrott, NZQA
Lily Reid, NZQA
Paul Stone, NZQA
Nicola Sutton, NZQA

APOLOGIES: Gus Gilmore, Manukau Institute of Technology and Unitec
Tony Gray, Ara Institute of Canterbury
Kieran Hewitson, Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology
Eve McMahon, NZQA
Sandra Ramsay, Tertiary Education Commission
Vikki Roadley, Te Pūkenga

1 Welcome/introductions

- Chris Collins welcomed the group and noted apologies.

- The group welcomed Dr Angela Beaton, who has recently joined Te Pūkenga as Deputy Chief Executive Delivery and Academic.

2 Minutes and actions from previous meeting

- The minutes from the 17 September 2020 meeting were accepted, with a minor amendment.
- Actions from the 17 September 2020 meeting:

Action	Details	Status
Action 1	NZQA to send Kieran information on simplifying the design of vocational qualifications.	Actioned
Action 2	Kieran to coordinate engagement between NZQA and the Academic Managers regarding simplifying the design of vocational qualifications.	Actioned
Action 3	NZQA to send A3s on simplifying the design of vocational qualifications to CEs	Actioned 22 September 2020
Action 4	NZIST and NZQA to respectively identify appropriate people for a small specialist working group regarding the transfer of approvals and accreditation to NZIST.	To discuss at meeting
Action 5	NZQA to send final EER exemption notice.	Actioned 30 September 2020
Action 6	NZQA to share further information with TEC regarding targeted evaluations.	Actioned
Action 7	NZQA to clarify position on stacking micro-credentials.	Work in progress
Action 8	Subsidiaries to discuss micro-credentials at CEs meeting.	
Action 9	NZQA to organise meeting to review micro-credentials.	
Action 10	Chris to circulate the amended Terms of Reference	Actioned 17 September 2020

3 Requirement around keeping assessment material records

- At the last Chief Executive's meeting, concerns were raised around the Rule requiring providers to keep assessment material records. An exemption for this Rule is currently in place for Te Pūkenga subsidiaries but is due to expire at the end of 2020. It was felt that this should be extended given that subsidiaries are entering into a significant period of transition.
- It was explained that NZQA wrote to Te Pūkenga subsidiaries at the end of August to notify them that the exemption would be extended to the end of 2021, in acknowledgement of the transition. This will be formalised as an extension notice in November. There will be instances where some assessment material would be required for priority areas, but only a small subset of what is usually required.

- In the meantime, NZQA will engage with Te Pūkenga in 2021 regarding the aims and fitness for purpose of the Rule going forward.
- The Rule will be discussed with Academic Directors. If they have any questions the Advisory Group or Ian Funnell will be able to answer them.
- Some thought should be given to how this Rule will work for TITOs, and what it will mean for transitional arrangements. With 10,000 trainee records this could be a significant challenge.

ACTION POINT 1	Policy and International to send the record keeping rule exemption notice for 2021 to the subsidiaries, and also to engage with Te Pūkenga in 2021 regarding the aims and fitness for purpose of this Rule going forward.
-----------------------	---

ACTION POINT 2	Nita Hutchinson to ensure the assessment material records requirement is discussed with Academic Directors.
-----------------------	---

4 Transition of TITO trainer and assessor arrangements to Te Pūkenga

- Anna Castelle-Parsons, Principal Advisor, RoVE at NZQA, spoke on the subject of the transition of TITO trainer and assessor arrangements to Te Pūkenga.
- The main challenge of the transition will be managing it under current Rule settings. While future Rule changes may accommodate these arrangements better, for the time being we need to find solutions within the current settings.
- Some of the trainer and assessor arrangements are clearly sub-contracting while others are more difficult to define and may need workarounds.
- This is the case with workplace assessors, who are usually employed by workplaces, not TITOs. Thought will need to be given to how these arrangements are carried on by Te Pūkenga.
- NZQA's Legal team has advised that one way to address this would be for Te Pūkenga's contracts with employers to state that the employer will provide staff to Te Pūkenga for assessment/training- making it a type of secondment. They would report directly to Te Pūkenga and abide by their requirements. Some TITOs have signalled some concerns about this option – employers might be hesitant as it may require a lot of paperwork.
- There is another option to issue exemptions for specific groups, but this would need further thought and implementation.
- The Advisory Group would continue the discussion at future meetings. It was suggested that the Advisory Group invite Warwick Quinn (former BCITO/Te Pūkenga) and/or Fiona Kingsford (Competenz/Te Pūkenga) to future meetings to get a TITO perspective.

ACTION POINT 3	Lily Reid to send out the table of TITO training arrangements to members of the group.
-----------------------	--

ACTION POINT 4	Chris Collins to invite Warwick Quinn and/or Fiona Kingsford to future Advisory Group meetings to discuss the transfer of TITO training and assessor arrangements.
-----------------------	--

5 Transfer of approvals and accreditations to Te Pūkenga

- NZQA has started discussions with TITOs around the transfer of approvals and accreditations to Te Pūkenga.
- TITOs do not hold accreditations for programmes, so NZQA will have to make arrangements to ensure trainees aren't disrupted or otherwise impacted.
- NZQA is proposing to grant Te Pūkenga accreditation for TITO programmes on an ongoing temporary basis until Dec 2022. After that date Te Pūkenga will retain temporary accreditation so there is no impact on learners but NZQA and Te Pūkenga will agree on how programmes will be managed going forward. By then, NZQA expects to have made decisions on current proposals around vocational qualification design, which will better inform the discussion.
- Anna will meet with the Academic Managers/Directors group to discuss this topic.
- The Advisory Group also discussed the transfer of subsidiaries' approvals and accreditations to Te Pūkenga. On December 2022, subsidiaries will be dissolved and at that point those accreditation and approvals will be transferred to Te Pūkenga. It is possible that this could take place earlier, but subsidiaries and Te Pūkenga would need a good understanding of the issues and fishhooks around this.

- NZQA noted that its approvals and accreditations data is currently very clean, which would make “lift and shift” from subsidiaries to Te Pūkenga relatively straightforward. However, if subsidiaries wanted to make changes to these programmes this could cause issues. NZQA will need to meet with subsidiaries and Te Pūkenga to get a better understanding of their data needs.
- A small, specialist focus group will be set up to deal with this issue.

ACTION POINT 5	Nita Hutchinson to organise for Anna Castelle-Parsons to attend the Academic Managers/Directors group to discuss the transfer of approvals and accreditations to Te Pūkenga.
-----------------------	--

ACTION POINT 6	Chris Collins to work with Angela Beaton to set up specialist focus group around transferring the subsidiaries’ approvals and accreditations to Te Pūkenga.
-----------------------	---

6 Offshore online delivery update

- NZQA is currently developing a broader policy around offshore online delivery approval and will keep the Advisory Group updated.

7 Targeted evaluations

- All subsidiaries that have been offered an exemption from external evaluation and review have now signed the notice, putting the exemption into effect.
- NZQA will soon conduct its first targeted evaluation, which is progressing smoothly.

Other business

- A question was raised around the infrastructure fee and how it will be calculated going forward. Julia Parrott will follow up with Finance and advise the Advisory Group of the answer.
- There was a discussion around consistency reviews and confusion from subsidiaries around what was required of them.

ACTION POINT 7	Julia Parrott to confirm with Finance on whether the infrastructure fee will remain the same until the subsidiaries are dissolved at the end of 2022.
-----------------------	---

Meeting closed at 10:00am.

Te Pūkenga Poari Akoranga

11 November 2020

Agenda item number:	
Provided by:	Chris Collins/Angela Beaton
Title:	Chair Poari Akoranga/DCE Delivery and Academic
For:	Noting

Recommendation

- 3) It is recommended that Poari Akoranga
 - a) Receive the PBRF final submission

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 will need to be implemented in a timely manner after thorough consultation and having regard for research institution (including Te Pūkenga) regulatory and statutory definitions of research.
3. We support implementing the recommendations related to equity and diversity during the current Quality Evaluation round.

4. Whilst we support implementation during the current round, we have concerns about the proposed timing of some of the other changes and the potential impact of substantive changes to the Quality Evaluation part-way through a round. We consider care will need to be taken to implement changes and time will be of the essence if changes are to be implemented successfully during the current 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, as well as art and design) 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 support the adoption of a new definition of research excellence for the 2025 Quality Evaluation. We consider the development of a more capacious definition of excellence will require extensive consultation and we are concerned the adoption of new definition could disadvantage researchers and institutions whose research may not respond directly to this definition and who may have limited time to refocus their research plans. Whilst we support the implementation of a more capacious definition during the current round, we are concerned that consultation in respect to the new definition, and finalisation of the definition must be completed with sufficient time to allow successful implementation by TEOs.

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. We support the adoption of the new 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 both users and end-users/stakeholders. The descriptors however appear to be orientated at the A or B rated 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.

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 rated researchers had more of an impact locally than researchers receiving a B or A rating. Te Pūkenga had a high proportion in the C category in the 2018 round and given our geographic locations this puts us in an important role of supporting local and regional knowledge transfer. For many researchers in the various Te Pūkenga subsidiaries (ITPs) 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.

We support the Review Panel Proposal to implement the review subject area weightings 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 subsidiaries 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 (option 3) for the 2025 Quality evaluation.

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.

As an additional and related consideration, we suggest a higher subject area weighting could also be applied to any research that directly addresses Māori and Pacific disadvantage.

Reviewing qualifying criteria

Review Panel Proposal: Reviewing the extraordinary circumstances qualifying criteria¹, 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 criteria² with a view to simplification.

¹ [Guidelines for tertiary education organisations participating in the 2018 Quality Evaluation](#) – page 94

² [Guidelines for tertiary education organisations participating in the 2018 Quality Evaluation](#) – page 19

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 and/or teaching qualifications. The current model disadvantages these staff who, in terms of research are new and emerging, but who take a number of years completing research and/or teaching 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 supporting and financially resourcing 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. However, we also support that if Te Pūkenga can exceed its proportion, that this is recognised. 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 following the completion of the 2025 round.

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 Te Pūkenga, wānanga and 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.