

Performance-Based Research Fund  
**User Manual**

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Purpose of the Performance-Based Reserch Fund User Manual</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The objectives of the PBRF</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Purpose of the PBRF	4
2.2	The three elements of the PBRF	4
<b>3</b>	<b>PBRF participation criteria</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Funding available under the PBRF	5
3.2	Funding period	5
3.3	How the PBRF fits with other TEC and Government funds	5
<b>4</b>	<b>An overview of how funding entitlement is calculated</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1	The Quality Evaluation	6
4.1.1	The funding formula for the Quality Evaluation measure	6
4.2	Research degree completions (RDC)	8
4.2.1	RDC returns	8
4.2.2	RDC funding allocations	9
4.2.3	RDC weightings	9
4.2.4	Cost weighting	10
4.2.5	Equity weighting	10
4.2.6	Research-component weighting	10
4.2.7	RDC funding formula	11
4.2.8	Qualification and course approval	11
4.2.9	PBRF notification	11
4.3	External research income (ERI)	12
4.3.1	ERI returns	12
4.3.2	ERI funding allocations and funding formula	13
<b>5</b>	<b>The annual PBRF funding rounds</b>	<b>14</b>
5.1	Preparation for the funding rounds	14
5.2	Corrections affecting historic data	14
5.3	Allocation of additional appropriations	15
5.4	Financial administration	15
5.4.1	Indicative funding	15
5.4.2	Tax	15
<b>6</b>	<b>Reporting of PBRF information</b>	<b>16</b>
6.1	Privacy and Official Information Act obligations	16
6.2	The Annual Report	16
6.3	The TEC website	17
6.4	PBRF enquiries	17
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>18</b>

# 1 Purpose of the Performance-Based Research Fund User Manual

The Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) administers the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) budget received from Vote Education and allocates the funds to tertiary education organisations (TEOs).

The purpose of the PBRF User Manual is to provide a comprehensive guide for all participating TEOs. The User Manual will outline what drives PBRF funding and will assist TEOs in responding to the TEC's PBRF data requirements in relation to their yearly PBRF entitlement.

This User Manual covers:

- the objectives of the PBRF
- an overview of how PBRF funding entitlement is calculated
- the annual PBRF funding rounds
- financial administration
- reporting of PBRF information.

Please note: the details of the Quality Evaluation component of PBRF are not covered in specific detail in these guidelines as this component is currently being redesigned prior to the next Quality Evaluation in 2012.

## 2 The objectives of the PBRF

### 2.1 Purpose of the PBRF

The primary goal of the PBRF is to ensure that excellent research in the tertiary education sector is encouraged and rewarded. This entails assessing the research performance of eligible TEOs and funding them on the basis of this performance. Between 2004 and 2007 the PBRF progressively replaced the current EFTS (equivalent full-time student) “top-up” funding for research.

The Government’s main aims for the PBRF are to:

- increase the average quality of research
- ensure that research continues to support degree and postgraduate teaching
- ensure that funding is available for postgraduate students and new researchers
- improve the quality of public information about research output
- prevent undue concentration of funding that would undermine research support for all degrees or prevent access to the system by new researchers, and
- underpin the existing research strengths in the tertiary education sector.

### 2.2 The three elements of the PBRF

The PBRF is a “mixed” performance-assessment regime because it employs both peer review processes and performance measures. The three assessment elements are:

- a “Quality Evaluation” measure: this is a periodic assessment of the research performance of eligible TEO staff, undertaken by expert peer review panels. The first round was completed in 2003 and the second, a partial round, was held in 2006. The next full round of the Quality Evaluation takes place in 2012. This element makes up 60 percent of the fund.
- a postgraduate “research degree completions” (RDC) measure: this is a measurement of the number of PBRF eligible postgraduate research-based degrees completed in participating TEOs, assessed on an annual basis. This element makes up 25 percent of the fund.
- an “external research income” (ERI) measure: this is a measurement of the amount of income for research purposes received by participating TEOs from external sources, assessed on an annual basis. This element makes up 15 percent of the fund.

## 3 PBRF participation criteria

All New Zealand-based degree-granting tertiary education organisations, and all subsidiaries that are wholly-owned by a New Zealand-based degree-granting tertiary education organisation, are eligible to participate in the PBRF.

The key principles underpinning the participation of a TEO in the PBRF are:

- the TEO had the authority to grant degrees on the PBRF Census date (most recently held 14 June 2006)
- participation in the PBRF is voluntary
- TEOs that participate in the PBRF must do so in all three measures even if their funding entitlement in one or more of the measures is zero, or likely to be zero
- if a PBRF-eligible TEO did not participate in the 2006 Quality Evaluation, then they are unable to make claims for the RDC and ERI measures until the next Quality Evaluation in 2012.

### 3.1 Funding available under the PBRF

The PBRF budget comes from Vote Education and is set annually by Cabinet. The PBRF is capped and can only increase through government budget decisions.

### 3.2 Funding period

The funding period for the PBRF is the calendar year from 1 January - 31 December.

The funding allocation ratios for each measure are calculated for each TEO using the formulae in sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, followed by each TEO's funding entitlement from the PBRF pool.

Each measure will have a percentage that is un-rounded but all final dollar amounts allocated to each TEO are rounded to whole dollars.

### 3.3 How the PBRF fits with other TEC and Government funds

TEOs receive funding from the Student Achievement Component (SAC) and the TEO Component funds. The PBRF is one of the elements in the TEO Component fund, which exists to support the areas critical to ensuring TEO's capability and maintaining a responsive and effective network of provision.

Other Government funding secured for research, such as funding from the Foundation for Science Research and Technology, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise and Marsden funding, is declared by each TEO in their ERI returns to the TEC.

## 4 An overview of how funding entitlement is calculated

### 4.1 The Quality Evaluation

The assessment of research quality is undertaken by interdisciplinary peer review panels consisting of disciplinary experts from both within New Zealand and overseas. These panels provide expert coverage of the subject areas within each panel's respective field of responsibility.

#### 4.1.1 The funding formula for the Quality Evaluation measure

Funding in relation to the Quality Evaluation is based on:

- the Quality Categories assigned to evidence portfolios (EPs)
- the funding weighting for the subject area to which EPs have been assigned
- the full-time-equivalent (FTE) status of the participating TEO's PBRF-eligible staff as at the date of the PBRF Census: Staffing Return (with the qualifications as outlined below in the section "FTE status of staff").

#### The Quality Categories

The PBRF funding generated by way of staff who participate in the Quality Evaluation is determined by the Quality Category assigned to their EP by the relevant peer review panel. These Quality Categories are then given a numerical weighting known as a "quality weighting". The quality weightings used in the 2006 Quality Evaluation are outlined in Table 4.1.2 below.

Table 4.1.2 Quality-category weightings

Quality Category	Quality weighting
A	5
B	3
C	1
C(NE)	1
R	0
R(NE)	0

#### Funding weighting for subject areas

Subject-area weightings are based on an EP's primary subject area of research. The current funding weightings for subject areas are shown in Table 4.1.3 below.

**Table 4.1.3 Subject-area weightings**

Subject areas	Funding Category	Weighting
Māori knowledge and development; law; history, history of art, classics and curatorial studies; English language and literature; foreign languages and linguistics; philosophy; religious studies and theology; political science, international relations and public policy; human geography; sociology, social policy, social work, criminology and gender studies; anthropology and archaeology; communications, journalism and media studies; education; pure and applied mathematics; statistics; management, human resources, industrial relations, international business and other business; accounting and finance; marketing and tourism; and economics.	A, I, J	1
Psychology; chemistry; physics; earth sciences; molecular, cellular and whole organism biology; computer science, information technology, information sciences; nursing; sport and exercise science; other health studies (including rehabilitation therapies); music, literary arts and other arts; visual arts and crafts; theatre and dance, film and television and multimedia; and design.	B, L	2
Engineering and technology; agriculture and other applied biological sciences; ecology, evolution and behaviour; architecture, planning, surveying; biomedical; clinical medicine; pharmacy; public health; veterinary studies and large animal science; and dentistry.	C, G, H, M, Q	2.5

**Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) status of staff**

The FTE status of each staff member is also a factor in the formula. Funding is generated in proportion to FTE status (as stated in the PBRF Census: Staffing Return). Four particular considerations apply to FTE calculations.

- When staff were concurrently employed at two TEOs, they generated an FTE entitlement for each organisation based on their FTE status in their employment agreement with each TEO.
- For most staff, their FTE status was that of the week 12 June 2006 to 16 June 2006. However, if staff changed their employment status within the TEO during the previous 12 months, their FTE status was their average FTE status over the period (eg. six months at 0.5 FTE and six months at 1 FTE = 0.75 FTE).

- When a staff member started employment in the 12-month period before the PBRF Census and was previously not employed by a participating TEO, then (providing they had an employment agreement of one year or more) their FTE status was what their employment agreement stated it to be at the time of the Census.
- When a staff member left one participating TEO to take up a position in another participating TEO in the 12 months before the PBRF Census, both TEOs had a proportional FTE entitlement.

### Quality Evaluation funding formula

The funding formula for the Quality Evaluation measure is:

$\frac{\sum \text{TEO} [(numerical\ quality\ score) \times (FTE\ status\ of\ researcher) \times (funding\ weighting\ for\ relevant\ subject\ area)]}{\sum \text{all TEOs} [(numerical\ quality\ score) \times (FTE\ status\ of\ researcher) \times (funding\ weighting\ for\ relevant\ subject\ area)]}$	X	<i>Total amount of funding available for the Quality Evaluation component of the PBRF</i>
--	---	---

## 4.2 Research degree completions (RDC)

RDC is a measure of the number of research-based postgraduate degrees (eg. masters and doctorates) that are completed within a TEO and that meet the following criteria:

- The degree has a research component of 0.75 EFTS value or more.
- The student who has completed the degree has met all compulsory academic requirements by the end of the relevant year (the year preceding the return).
- The student has successfully completed the course.

The use of RDC as a performance measure in the PBRF serves two key purposes:

- It captures, at least to some degree, the connection between staff research and research training - thus providing some assurance of the future capability of tertiary education research.
- It provides a proxy for research quality. The underlying assumption is that students who choose to undertake lengthy, expensive and advanced degrees (especially doctorates) tend to search out departments and supervisors who have reputations in the relevant fields for high-quality research and research training.

### 4.2.1 RDC returns

It is critical for TEOs to submit their numbers of postgraduate RDCs within the deadlines advised by the TEC. The TEC will send a list of postgraduate RDCs for TEOs to verify. There are two funding rounds associated with RDCs: an “Indicative Funding” round and a “Wash-up Funding” round.

For the Indicative Funding round, the PBRF fund co-ordinator will request the Single Data Return (SDR) data for RDCs from the TEC IT Group in September and send it to each TEO for verification.

Each TEO must then verify the data and return its list to the PBRF co-ordinator by the date set.

For the “Wash-up Funding” round, the PBRF co-ordinator will ask TEOs to verify RDC lists again to account for any changes since the last checking. These must be returned by the date set.

See Section 5.1 for more information on these two funding rounds.

The RDC lists for verification will contain the following fields:

**Provider Code**

**Reference year (successfully completed PBRF eligible course)**

**Course code**

**Index**

**Ethnicity**

**Ethnicity Factor**

**Volume Research Factor**

**Category Code (subject code)**

**Category Weighting (subject weighting)**

**EFTS factor (optional).**

It is important that all this information is complete and has been validated and verified by the Ministry of Education’s STEO website. Detailed guidance on how this information is converted into RDC entitlement is to be found below.

For further information on data checking and verification, see Chapter 8 of the *PBRF Guidelines 2006*.

#### **4.2.2 RDC funding allocations**

Within the RDC component of the PBRF, a funding allocation ratio calculated on a rolling average basis determines the amount allocated to each TEO annually.

For example, the 2008 funding allocation ratio for each TEO was based on 15 percent of its RDC figure for 2004, 35 percent of its RDC figure for 2005, and 50 percent of its RDC figure for 2006.

In 2009 the funding allocation ratio for each TEO is 15 percent of its RDC figure for 2005, 35 percent of RDC figure for 2006, and 50 percent of its RDC figure for 2007.

#### **4.2.3 RDC weightings**

The funding formula for the RDC component includes weightings for the following factors:

- the funding category of the subject area (a cost weighting)
- Māori and Pacific student completions (an equity weighting)
- the volume of research in the degree programme (a research-component weighting).

The cost weighting (for the subject area) in Table 4.2.4 below is the same as that applied in the Quality Evaluation part of the PBRF (refer to Table 4.1.3).

**Table 4.2.4 Cost weighting**

Student Component - Funding Category	Weighting
A, I, J	1
B, L	2
C, G, H, M, Q	2.5

Table 4.2.5 below shows the equity weighting applied to each completion. This weighting aims to encourage TEOs to enrol and support Māori and Pacific students, as they have little representation at higher levels of the qualifications framework. Ethnicity is taken from the student enrolment files, using the latest enrolments in the course.

**Table 4.2.5 Equity weighting**

Ethnicity	Weighting
Māori	2
Pacific	2
All other ethnicities	1

A break down of all ethnicity codes is given in Appendix C.

The research-component weighting uses a “volume of research factor” (VRF). The VRF is based on the volume of research included in the degree programme that has been completed, as shown in Table 4.2.6 below.

**Table 4.2.6 Research-component weighting**

Research-component weighting	Weighting
Less than 0.75 EFTS	0
0.75-1.0 EFTS of masters	EFTS value
Masters course of 1.0 EFTS thesis or more	1
Professional doctorate with research component	EFTS value of research component
Doctorate	3

The VRF attached to the final course completion represents the amount of research associated with the qualification completed. The general rule for this is that anything under .75 is a zero VRF; anything from .75-1 is the same as the EFTS value; and anything worth 1 EFTS and higher has a VRF of 1 for Master’s and 3 for a PhD. However, because the final successful PBRF eligible completion course is used to determine VRF, cases must be accommodated where students who do more than one paper as part of their Master’s or PhD will have the correct VRF assigned to their course completion.

For example, if a student did 10 courses over 10 years to make up a PhD, the total EFTS for the qualification would be taken into account to get the VRF, rather than just the VRF for the final course. So if the qualification is worth one EFTS, then the volume research factor will be three. Some Master's and PhD courses, however, are made up of only one course and in these cases, the Table 4.2.6 is your guide for assigning the correct VRF.

TEOs provide the TEC with information on all new courses that meet the research requirement (ie. courses that have an EFTS value between 0.75 and 1.0). The TEOs identify those courses that have been divided into two parts, to allow for part-time enrolments or to reflect the normal pattern of enrolment, but that qualify because their total EFTS value, when combined, is 0.75 EFTS or more. Participating TEOs are responsible for identifying these courses.

RDC information is collected three times per year using the Ministry of Education's SDR. It includes information contained in the course register, the student enrolment files and the course completions file.

#### 4.2.7 RDC funding formula

The formula used to calculate funding for the RDC measure for each TEO is:

$$\Sigma RDC = [(research\ component\ weighting) \times (cost\ weighting\ for\ relevant\ subject\ area) \times (equity\ weighting)]$$

The funding formula for the 2008 RDC measure was:

$$\frac{\Sigma [(RDC\ for\ TEO2004 \times 0.15) + (RDC\ for\ TEO2005 \times 0.35) + (RDC\ for\ TEO2006 \times 0.5)]}{\Sigma [(Total\ RDC\ for\ TEOs2004 \times 0.15) + (Total\ RDC\ for\ TEOs2005 \times 0.35) + (RDC\ for\ TEO2006 \times 0.5)]} \times Total\ amount\ of\ funding\ available\ for\ the\ RDC\ component\ of\ the\ PBRF$$

#### 4.2.8 Qualification and course approval

A TEO must submit qualifications and courses to the TEC for approval. TEOs are responsible for entering all qualification and course information through the Ministry of Education's STEO site (<http://www.steo.govt.nz>) so that the TEC can process and approve them. The TEC is not obliged to fund any courses for PBRF purposes that are not PBRF eligible and approved by the TEC.

#### 4.2.9 PBRF notification

It is important that TEOs notify the TEC via their SDR of any changes to PBRF status or any new courses that are PBRF eligible. The PBRF codes are:

Part-time PhD	C
Full-time PhD	D
Part-time Masters	L
Full-time Masters	M
Not eligible	X

All PBRF courses will have a VRF as given in table 4.2.6. Please note that, even if PBRF eligible, a course with an EFTS less than 0.75 will attract no PBRF funding. This is because anything less than 0.75 will be given a zero VRF and based on the formula used for RDC, will result in zero value. It is therefore important for TEOs to check the accuracy of all RDC fields in the lists given for verification.

## 4.3 External research income (ERI)

ERI is a measure of the total research income received by a TEO and/or any wholly-owned subsidiary. This excludes income from TEO employees who receive external research income in their personal capacity (ie. the external research income is received by them and not their employer). Also excluded is income from controlled trusts, partnerships, and joint ventures.

Income cannot be included in the ERI calculation until the work has been “undertaken”. A complete description of inclusions and exclusions is given in Chapter 5 of the *PBRF Guidelines 2006*, along with guidance on the status of joint or collaborative research. ERI is included as a performance measure in the PBRF on the basis that it provides a good proxy for research quality. The underlying assumption is that external research funders are discriminating in their choice of who to fund and that they allocate their limited resources to those they see as undertaking research of a high quality.

### 4.3.1 ERI returns

Each participating TEO submits a return to the TEC. This return shows the TEO's total PBRF-eligible ERI for the 12 months ending 31 December of the preceding year (GST exclusive). In addition, in support of each ERI calculation, the TEO must provide an independent audit opinion and a declaration signed by the TEO's Chief Executive.

Independent audit opinions of ERIs must be submitted to the TEC by 31 May each year for the “Indicative Funding” round the following year. The TEC seeks reconfirmation of ERIs by March of the next year for the “Wash-up Funding” round which occurs in April/May.

TEOs with ERI less than \$200,000 do not need to submit an independent audit opinion, but must supply independent verification of their ERI in the form of an annual report or copies of working papers to calculate the income.

ERI Declarations for the 12 months ending 31 December 2008 are due with the TEC on 31 May 2009. The TEC will validate the ERI Declarations by checking to ensure that independent audit certificates (where applicable) have been received and that each CEO has signed the declaration confirming that the ERI data is accurate. An ERI Declaration form is attached as Appendix B.

Information explaining the requirements of ERI can be found in the *PBRF 2006 Guidelines* on pages 191-199 and 220-221. The PBRF Guidelines can be downloaded from the publications page of the TEC website ([www.tec.govt.nz](http://www.tec.govt.nz)).

Please send ERI Declarations (including audit certificates) to:

Donna Boot  
The Tertiary Education Commission  
P O Box 27048  
WELLINGTON 6141.

Electronic copies will be accepted and these can be sent to: [pbrfinfo@tec.govt.nz](mailto:pbrfinfo@tec.govt.nz)

#### 4.3.2 ERI funding allocations and funding formula

Within the ERI component of PBRF funding, a funding allocation ratio calculated on a rolling average basis determines the amount paid to each TEO annually. For example, the 2008 funding allocations were based on the ERI data supplied by TEOs for each of the calendar years 2004, 2005 and 2006. The 2008 funding allocation ratio for each TEO was 15 percent of its ERI figure for 2004, 35 percent of its ERI figure for 2005, and 50 percent of its ERI figure for 2006.

In 2009 the funding allocation ratio for each TEO is 15 percent of its ERI figure for 2005, 35 percent of its ERI figure for 2006, and 50 percent of its ERI figure for 2007.

The funding formula for the 2008 ERI measure was:

$$\frac{\sum [ERI \text{ for TEO2004} \times 0.15] + (ERI \text{ for TEO2005} \times 0.35) + (ERI \text{ for TEO2006} \times 0.5)}{\sum [Total ERI \text{ for TEOs2004} \times 0.15] + (Total ERI \text{ for TEOs2005} \times 0.35) + (ERI \text{ for TEO2006} \times 0.5)} \times \text{Total amount of funding available for the ERI component of the PBRF}$$

## 5 The annual PBRF funding rounds

### 5.1 Preparation for the funding rounds

There are two official PBRF funding rounds each year: An “Indicative Funding” round and a “Wash-up Funding” round.

At each Indicative Funding round and Wash-up Funding round, TEOs are asked to verify their ERI and the RDC for the relevant years. For example 2009 indicative and wash-up funding is based on the years 2005/06/07. For 2010 funding, the relevant years are 2006/07/08.

The Quality Evaluation ratios were set after the 2006 Quality Evaluation and will next change after the next Quality Evaluation is completed in 2012.

The amount of a TEO’s final PBRF entitlement may vary from its indicative funding for a number of reasons, including:

- a TEO may leave the PBRF during the course of a year by ceasing operation or changing course offerings, which may increase the value of the share received by each remaining TEO
- errors may be found in PBRF data as a result of checks. Once corrected, this may result in an increase or decrease in the share of a TEO (with a corresponding adjustment for other TEOs)
- a change in the total PBRF pool size as a result of budget increases or decreases.

For example, by May of 2009, TEOs will be informed of their final funding allocation for the 2008 year. Some TEOs may have no change to their funding. However, if there is a difference between the Indicative Funding and the final funding allocation, some TEOs may receive an additional payment, and some may pay part of their funding back to the TEC.

If this wash-up process results in an additional payment for a TEO, the TEO will be advised in writing of the amount and when to expect this payment.

If this wash-up process results in a TEO paying part of their funding back to the TEC, the TEC will contact the TEO to explain the rationale for any recoveries and allow the TEOs the opportunity to respond. Once TEOs have responded, the TEC will arrange the fund recovery if it is still necessary.

### 5.2 Corrections affecting historic data

Action is taken by the TEC to correct errors in historic data at the time of the wash-up for the relevant year. No action will be taken if errors are identified after the completion of the wash-up.

### **5.3 Allocation of additional appropriations**

If the Government allocates additional PBRF funding in a budget decision, the TEC calculates the amount each TEO participating in PBRF is entitled to, based on the Quality Evaluation, RDC and ERI ratios used for the current year's allocation. The TEC will advise each TEO in writing of this amount and when to expect this payment. No additional information is requested from TEOs for this exercise.

## **5.4 Financial administration**

### **5.4.1 Indicative funding**

After TEOs have confirmed their RDCs and ERI information, the TEC will inform TEOs of their indicative entitlement for the following year. This will happen around November of each year as part of the Plan Update.

A follow-up letter will be sent giving a break down of ratios for Quality Evaluation, RDC and ERI.

Monthly payments will commence in January of the following year.

### **5.4.2 Tax**

The PBRF payments include GST but are shown GST exclusive in all correspondence (such as the Investment Plan letter). The TEC does not provide tax advice. TEOs should take advice from an accountant or tax specialist about income from grants, including the effect on the costs and depreciation that may be claimed in tax returns.

## 6 Reporting of PBRF information

### 6.1 Privacy and Official Information Act obligations

Information received by the TEC relating to the PBRF is held in the strictest confidence. However, as the TEC is subject to the Official Information Act (OIA), the information held can be requested by third parties and the TEC must provide information as required by law. The information may include:

- name of funding recipient
- amount of funding
- contact details of recipient
- general statement of the nature of the project/activity
- the outcome of the activity assisted.

The OIA provides that information can be withheld for several reasons, including if it is subject to an obligation of confidence or is commercially sensitive. The TEC will not release any details beyond those listed above without first advising the applicant involved. The TEC must comply with the Privacy Act 1993 and Official Information Act 1982 in all its undertakings with applicants.

### 6.2 The Annual Report

PBRF Annual Reports are published on the TEC website at approximately the end of July annually.

The purpose of the PBRF Annual Report is to provide TEOs with information to gauge their current performance in comparison to other TEOs, based on the PBRF Quality Evaluation, RDC and ERI measures. It also provides translation of this data into PBRF Funding information for each TEO.

There are four key sets of data identified in the report:

- Indicative Funding for the year after the date of the report
- Quality Evaluation ratios
- postgraduate RDC
- ERI.

The majority of the data in the report are derived from these four key sets of data. Prior to 2007, the TEC reported funds that were GST inclusive. Reporting changed in 2007 and funds were reported as GST exclusive.

## 6.3 The TEC website

Key communications regarding the PBRF can be found on the Performance-Based-Research fund page of the TEC website ([www.tec.govt.nz](http://www.tec.govt.nz)).

In particular, the TEC website provides:

- information and downloads on the PBRF in general
- the 2006 Quality Evaluation report
- the 2007 PBRF Annual Report
- documents to assist TEOs prepare for the Quality Evaluation
- recent PBRF sector updates
- worksheets and a declaration form for external research income.

PBRF sector updates and publications are also regularly posted on the website.

## 6.4 PBRF enquiries

TEOs are able to email specific PBRF queries to the TEC. This includes requests from individual researchers for their 2006 Component Scores.

Information requests can be made to the TEC via the email address [pbrfinfo@tec.govt.nz](mailto:pbrfinfo@tec.govt.nz). The mailbox is cleared as frequently and quickly as possible.

## Appendix A: 2006 Quality Evaluation Panels and Subject Areas

Panel	Subject Area
Biological Sciences	Agriculture and other applied biological sciences
	Ecology, evolution and behaviour
	Molecular, cellular and whole organism biology
Business and Economics	Accounting and finance
	Economics
	Management, human resources, industrial relations, international business and other business
	Marketing and tourism
Creative and Performing Arts	Design
	Music, literary arts and other arts
	Theatre and dance, film and television and multimedia
	Visual arts and crafts
Education	Education
Engineering, Technology and Architecture	Architecture, design, planning, surveying
	Engineering and technology
Health	Dentistry
	Nursing
	Other health studies (including rehabilitation therapies)
	Pharmacy
	Sport and exercise science
	Veterinary studies and large animal science
Humanities and Law	English language and literature
	Foreign languages and linguistics
	History, history of art, classics and curatorial studies
	Law
	Philosophy
	Religious studies and theology
Māori Knowledge and Development	Māori knowledge and development
Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology	Computer science, information technology, information sciences
	Pure and applied mathematics
	Statistics
Medicine and Public Health	Biomedical
	Clinical medicine
	Public health

Physical Sciences	Chemistry
	Earth sciences
	Physics
Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Studies	Anthropology and archaeology
	Communications, journalism and media studies
	Human geography
	Political science, international relations and public policy
	Psychology
	Sociology, social policy, social work, criminology and gender studies

### Performance-Based Research Fund External Research Income Declaration

*Chief Executive Officer Declaration for a Tertiary Education Organisation participating in the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF):*

Submission of annual data on External Research Income to the Tertiary Education Commission

As the Chief Executive Officer of \_\_\_\_\_ (organisation name)

I hereby certify that:

- a) For the year ended 31 December \_\_\_\_\_ (year), the PBRF External Research Income for \_\_\_\_\_ (organisation name) and its wholly owned subsidiaries is \$ \_\_\_\_\_ (amount GST excl).
- b) I have been responsible for the preparation of the PBRF External Research Income information and the judgements used therein.
- c) the PBRF External Research Income figure has been compiled in accordance with the relevant PBRF guidelines and fairly reflects the PBRF External Research Income for the year ended 31 December \_\_\_\_\_ (year).

This declaration for \_\_\_\_\_ (organisation name) is made by:

Signature of Chief Executive Officer: \_\_\_\_\_

Full name of Chief Executive Officer: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C: Ethnicity codes

Ethnicity	Code	Ethnicity	Code
Pre-2007		Full List from 2007	
European/Pākehā	1	NZ European/Pākehā	111
New Zealand Māori	20	British/Irish	121
Samoaan	31	Dutch	122
Cook Islands Māori	32	Greek	123
Tongan	33	Polish	124
Niuean	34	South Slav	125
Tokelauan	35	Italian	126
Fijian	36	German	127
Other Pacific Island	37	Australian	128
Chinese	51	Other European	129
Indian	52	Māori	211
SE Asian		Samoaan	311
Other Asian	68	Cook Islands Māori	321
Other	89	Tongan	331
International student	98	Niuean	341
Not known	99	Tokelauan	351
		Fijian	361
		Other Pacific peoples	371
		Filipino	411
		Cambodian	412
		Vietnamese	413
		Chinese	421
		Indian	431
		Sri Lankan	441
		Japanese	442
		Korean	443
		Other Asian	444
		Middle Eastern	511
		Latin American	521
		African	531
		Other ethnicity	611
		Not stated	999

