

**Performance-Based Research Fund  
Sector Reference Group consultation paper:  
Māori Research**

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Aims and principles of the PBRF</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Principles of redesign</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Māori Research: Background</b>	<b>4</b>
	4.1 PBRF Working group	4
	4.2 2003 PBRF Guidelines	5
	4.3 2006 PBRF Guidelines	7
	4.4 The 2006 PBRF Quality Evaluation	12
<b>5</b>	<b>Review of the 2006 Quality Evaluation</b>	<b>13</b>
	5.1 TEC Report (White and Grice)	13
	5.2 Independent Strategic Review of the PBRF (Adams Report)	14
	<b>Appendix A: Extracts from the report of the PBRF Working Group</b>	<b>16</b>
	<b>Appendix B: Māori RDC awards split between Masters and Doctorates for the period 2002-2006</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Appendix C: Panel specific guidelines - Māori Knowledge and Development Panel</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>35</b>
	<b>Feedback template</b>	<b>37</b>

### Disclaimer:

This consultation paper has been prepared independently for the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) by the Sector Reference Group, an external group, as part of the review of the Performance-Based Research Fund. Although the TEC is facilitating this process, the consultation paper represents the independent views and suggestions of the Sector Reference Group, and does not necessarily represent the views of the TEC.

## PBRF SRG Consultation paper: Māori Research

### 1. Purpose

This paper has been prepared as part of the consultation process for the 2012 PBRF assessment. Amongst other things it brings together those matters that directly impact upon Māori Research and how it is evaluated and reported in the context of the PBRF Quality Evaluation.

In addition, the PBRF Guidelines 2006 (the Guidelines) included a number of measures intended to promote Māori research. This paper outlines what these measures are, how they were developed, how they have been implemented and some of the commentary on the Guidelines and their operation in the 2003 and 2006 PBRF assessments.

The SRG seeks feedback from the tertiary sector on any issues raised by this paper including the Guidelines and has provided some questions in the document to focus responses. Please use the Māori Research Feedback Template to answer these questions. Once this feedback has been received and considered, a second consultation paper will be written. This second paper will present options and recommendations for addressing any material issues identified in the feedback.

### 2. Aims and principles of the PBRF

In carrying out its role, the SRG for the 2012 PBRF will be guided by the aims and principles of the PBRF. The PBRF is designed 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 information on 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 sector strengths in tertiary education research.

The PBRF is governed by the following principles:

- *Comprehensiveness*: the PBRF should appropriately measure the quality of the full range of original investigative activity that occurs within the sector, regardless of its type, form, or place of output.
- *Respect for academic traditions*: the PBRF should operate in a manner that is consistent with academic freedom and institutional autonomy.
- *Consistency*: evaluations of quality made through the PBRF should be consistent, across the different subject areas and in the calibration of quality ratings against international standards of excellence.

- *Continuity*: changes to the PBRF process should only be made where they can bring demonstrable improvements that outweigh the cost of implementing them.
- *Differentiation*: the PBRF should allow stakeholders and the government to differentiate between providers and their units on the basis of their relative quality.
- *Credibility*: the methodology, format and processes employed in the PBRF must be credible to those being assessed.
- *Efficiency*: administrative and compliance costs should be kept to the minimum consistent with a robust and credible process.
- *Transparency*: decisions and decision-making processes must be explained openly, except where there is a need to preserve confidentiality and privacy.
- *Complementarity*: the PBRF should be integrated with new and existing policies, such as Charters and Profiles, and quality assurance systems for degrees and degree providers.
- *Cultural inclusiveness*: the PBRF should reflect the bicultural nature of New Zealand and the special role and status of the Treaty of Waitangi, and should appropriately reflect and include the full diversity of New Zealand's population.

### 3. Principles of redesign

PBRF redesign work ahead of the 2012 Quality Evaluation will be based on a number of principles and considerations:

- Upholding the aims and principles of the PBRF (outlined above).
- Learning from the first two Quality Evaluations in order to make improvements to the design of the PBRF and the implementation of the 2012 Quality Evaluation.
- Drawing on relevant experience and expertise across the tertiary education sector.
- Exposing proposed changes to rigorous sector and expert scrutiny.
- Achieving as much sector agreement as possible about how the next Quality Evaluation should be conducted.
- Avoiding costly or time-consuming changes unless there are good reasons for believing they will bring significant improvements.

## 4. Māori Research: Background

### 4.1. PBRF Working Group

The PBRF Working Group, established in July 2002 to provide advice on the design and implementation of the PBRF, discussed matters specifically of relevance to Māori. They are reproduced in full from the report of the PBRF Working Group in Appendix A.

The Working Group recommended that the panel structure include a Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) panel to:

“evaluate research into distinctly Māori matters, such as research into tikanga Māori. Where research has a Māori focus, but is conducted within the framework of another discipline, it will be evaluated by the appropriate subject based panel, with advice (where necessary) from the Māori Knowledge and Development panel.”

The Working Group also recommended inclusion of Māori members on other peer review panels where possible and the use of special advisers. Overlapping membership between the MKD and other panels was also suggested for consideration by the TEC.<sup>2</sup>

## 4.2. 2003 PBRF Guidelines

The MKD panel was implemented for the 2003 assessment (but overlapping membership with other panels was not used). The 2003 PBRF Guidelines included a definition of Māori research and detailed MKD panel specific instructions.<sup>3</sup>

Research degree completions by Māori students were double weighted in the 2003 assessment to encourage growth in Māori research capability. This was intended to apply for the first two PBRF quality assessments and to be reviewed after the second quality evaluation.<sup>4</sup> This issue will be discussed further in a separate consultation paper on weightings to be prepared by the SRG.

### Questions for consideration:

- i) Should the Equity Weighting be maintained?
- ii) Whilst it was introduced to provide an incentive to institutions to support Māori and Pacific research quality, are there other measures that may need to be given consideration to achieve this outcome?
- iii) Are there other strategic imperatives, such as research written in te reo Māori, that could be incentivised by adjusting the weighting?

It is the current intention of the SRG to recommend to the TEC that the current Equity weighting be retained.

## Review of the 2003 PBRF Quality Evaluation

In the 2003 assessment, 481 staff members indicated Māori ethnicity (6 percent of all eligible researchers). However, a relatively high proportion of staff members did not indicate an ethnicity (15 percent) so these numbers should be treated with caution. Māori staff members were predominately female (57 percent), less likely to be working at a university (67 percent) than all eligible staff (85 percent), and more likely to be working in a subject area with a weighting of one (71 percent as opposed to 48 percent of all eligible staff). The spread of quality categories was:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Investing in Excellence, p.13

<sup>2</sup> Investing in Excellence, p.13.

<sup>3</sup> PBRF: A Guide for 2003, pp.8, 122-30, 191-92.

<sup>4</sup> PBRF: A Guide for 2003, p.8.

<sup>5</sup> White and Grice, pp.21-22.

**Table 1: Number and proportion of researchers in each Quality Category: 2003 assessment**

	A	B	C	R
No. of Māori researchers	10	52	114	272
Percentage of Māori researchers	2%	12%	25%	61%
<hr/>				
No. of all researchers	443	1802	2494	3273
Percentage of all researchers	6%	22%	31%	41%

The report on the 2003 assessment noted that some staff undertaking research falling within the remit of the MKD panel submitted their Evidence Portfolio (EP) to a different panel and that the results of the MKD panel do not necessarily provide an accurate reflection of the quality of research dealing with Māori themes and issues. The MKD panel reviewed 79 EPs and a further 81 EPs were cross-referred to the panel. The panel noted surprise at how few staff considered their research to fit into the MKD criteria and suggested that advice provided by TEOs to their staff members might remedy this situation.<sup>6</sup> However, it is unclear why researchers may have chosen to submit their EPs to other Panels.

The MKD panel average quality score was ranked tenth and the subject area average quality score was 31 out of 42 subject areas.<sup>7</sup> There were 47 research degree completions by Māori students for 2002 (3 percent of total number of RDCs for that year).<sup>8</sup>

The data on how Māori RDC awards split up between Masters and Doctorates for the period 2002-2006 is provided in Appendix B.

Phase one of the independent strategic review of PBRF, conducted by WEB Research in 2004, noted several issues relevant to Māori researchers:

- a lack of clarity for some Māori researchers about what was required in their EP
- concerns that the PBRF design “does not take account of Māori epistemology, or the stage of development of wānanga”
- difficulties in preparing evidence relating to indigenous research because of a number of factors: lack of appropriate world class journals, significance of oral traditions, ‘peer review’ being conducted in the wider community not academia, the need for research to be of use to the community, differences in research methodologies, ‘rediscovering’ knowledge from community members, cultural barriers to self-promotion, ethical barriers, and
- the perception that Māori research was undervalued because it was not regarded as world class due to its national or regional focus.<sup>9</sup>

In considering these points it must be remembered that the PBRF is an assessment of research quality not research activity. Some of the points, particularly about the stage of development of the wānanga, cannot be addressed in a research quality exercise. It may be that these issues are dealt with in other ways, as suggested by Adams.

<sup>6</sup> PBRF Evaluating Research Excellence: the 2003 assessment, p.63.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p.63.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, p.70.

<sup>9</sup> WEB Research, pp.121, 142, 205.

In some cases, the perception that Māori research was undervalued may have arisen because of the interpretation of the Guidelines. For example, a wider interpretation of Peer Esteem may be appropriate for Māori research so that it includes Māori communities.

The report prepared by the Sector Reference Group for the redesign of the 2006 assessment noted:

“There appears to be no specific issue with the PBRF definition of research in relation to Māori.... Nevertheless, it can be argued that certain types of research (and research outputs) may be more difficult to assess...and may tend...to be valued less highly by peer review panels. To the extent that Māori...researchers produce a higher proportion of these types of research (and research outputs)..., they are likely to fare less well in a research assessment exercise like the Quality Evaluation<sup>10</sup>”

Smith and Ferguson considered the impact of the PBRF on Māori after the 2003 assessment as part of Bakker et al.’s edited collection of essays on the PBRF. Their chapter discussed a number of issues, including the following:<sup>11</sup>

- The subject weighting of the MKD subject area was of concern. For Māori researchers in subject areas with a weighting higher than one, MKD’s weighting of one is a disincentive to submit their EP to the MKD panel and may disadvantage researchers who nominate MKD as their subject.<sup>12</sup>
- A proposal that building capability in Māori research could be further enhanced by extending the RDC measure to completion of individual postgraduate papers/courses in which students undertook research with a Māori focus.<sup>13</sup>
- Māori ethical considerations may inhibit their production of ‘academic’ research outputs.<sup>14</sup>
- Staff, particularly in wānanga, who undertake teaching and research on a volunteer basis are not PBRF-eligible.<sup>15</sup>
- Quality assurance processes that occur during and after production of the research output should be recognised in the PBRF assessment and a wider definition of quality assurance.<sup>16</sup>

### Question for consideration

iv): Does the SRG need to take into account any of the above issues in its recommendations to the TEC? If so, how?

## 4.3. 2006 PBRF Guidelines

The Guidelines for the 2006 assessment contained a number of amendments intended to provide clarification, particularly about the definition of research. The following are extracts from the Guidelines:

<sup>10</sup> Report of the SRG, p.58.

<sup>11</sup> The chapter discussed a wide range of issues, not all of which are included here.

<sup>12</sup> pp.382-84.

<sup>13</sup> pp.385-87.

<sup>14</sup> pp.387-88.

<sup>15</sup> p.388.

<sup>16</sup> p.389.

## Definition of research

For the purposes of the PBRF, research is original investigation undertaken in order to contribute to knowledge and understanding and, in the case of some disciplines, cultural innovation or aesthetic refinement.

It typically involves enquiry of an experimental or critical nature driven by hypotheses or intellectual positions capable of rigorous assessment by experts in a given discipline.

It is an independent\*, creative, cumulative and often long-term activity conducted by people with specialist knowledge about the theories, methods and information concerning their field of enquiry. Its findings must be open to scrutiny and formal evaluation by others in the field, and this may be achieved through publication or public presentation.

In some disciplines, the investigation and its results may be embodied in the form of artistic works, designs or performances.

Research includes contribution to the intellectual infrastructure of subjects and disciplines (eg. dictionaries and scholarly editions). It also includes the experimental development of design or construction solutions, as well as investigation that leads to new or substantially improved materials, devices, products or processes.

Note:\* The term “independent” here should not be construed to exclude collaborative work.

## Māori Research

An important aim of the PBRF is to give due emphasis to research by Māori researchers and to research into Māori matters. Such research may also acknowledge different approaches to the research process.

## Mechanisms for including Māori Research

The PBRF Working Group proposed the following mechanisms to acknowledge the special role and status of the Treaty of Waitangi and the principle of cultural inclusiveness in respect of Māori:

- The formation of the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel, which would evaluate research into distinctly Māori matters, such as: research into aspects of Māori development; te reo Māori; and tikanga Māori.
- The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel would also provide advice on research that had a significant Māori component but was being assessed by other panels.
- The inclusion of Māori researchers on other panels, and, where this was not possible, the use of specialist advisers.
- Encouraging growth in Māori research capability through an equity weighting of 2 for research degree completions by Māori students included in the Postgraduate Research Degree Completions (RDC) measure during the first two Quality evaluation rounds of the PBRF.

## Use of te reo Māori

Te reo Māori may be used for any or all of the material entered in the staff member's EP.

## Māori Knowledge and Development<sup>17</sup>

### Description of panel coverage

The Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) panel assesses EPs in one subject area, Māori Knowledge and Development, and so will cover a wider range of research areas.

The guiding principle for coverage is that the panel will consider all EPs where there is evidence of research based on Māori world-views, both traditional and contemporary, and Māori methods of research. While other methodologies may also be used in the research, the inclusion of Māori methodologies will be an important criterion.

Consequently, there is potential for the panel to consider research across all subject areas.

In practice, however, it is likely that broad theme areas covered by the panel will be: te reo Māori, tikanga Māori, wairuatanga, cultural development, social development, economic development, political development, environmental sustainability, and toi Māori.

It is expected that all or most of the NROs will primarily investigate issues of importance to Māori, with Māori-specific measures and processes being evident. The EP is likely to show significant involvement with Māori, and outcomes that are relevant and of value to Māori.

EPs which include some Māori component (eg. in subject area) but which do not involve Māori methodologies will not be assessed by the MKD panel. Instead, the panel that best covers the subject area of the EP will assess it. That panel will either have its own Māori member or will refer the EP to a Māori adviser as required.

The MKD panel will **cross-refer** EPs to other relevant panels and/or seek input from specialist advisers where it is appropriate to supplement the range of expertise of panel members. This panel acknowledges that EPs, in addition to demonstrating a Māori methodological approach, could include research based on other approaches and across other disciplines, and it will ensure that equitable treatment of multi- and/or cross-disciplinary research.

An EP that is written in Māori will be assessed according to the research method employed, rather than the language used. Māori members of other panels or Māori specialist advisers will be able to assist further.

The MKD panel will assess EPs compiled by Māori and non-Māori, the guiding principle being that the EP consists primarily of research based on Māori world views and methodologies.

<sup>17</sup> PBRF Guidelines 2006, p.106.

## General expectations for standard of evidence to be supplied

Outputs will be considered on their merits. Staff members are asked to ensure that they give as much information as possible in the Comments Relevant to this Output field for each NRO as to: (i) why they have chosen the NRO as one of their (up to) best research outputs, (ii) how it meets the Definition of Research in the general Guidelines and/or panel-specific guidelines (see this panels Elaboration of the Definition of Research below), and (iii) the quality-assurance measures undertaken in its production.

The kinds of quality-assurance measures that could be considered for applied, practice-based and/or print-based research outputs include the provision of, for example:

- a script accompanied by notes and/or comments from judges, assessors and/or other knowledgeable persons (for a performance or artistic output)
- an examiner's report (for a thesis)
- an abstract (for a book or journal article).

In order to assess the quality of research outputs that are non-print based, such as oral presentations at a hui, the panel expects that the staff member will describe the nature of quality assurance according to one or more of the following criteria:

- Publication of the oral presentation in channels with conventionally accepted peer-review processes, such as peer-reviewed journals.
- Attestation by a scholar of acknowledged repute, either in New Zealand or overseas (the scholar may be an eminent kaumātua or an academically credentialed expert).
- Invitation to present at an event, such as a hui, that is acknowledged as having wide significance for Māori.

The MKD panel acknowledges that other criteria may demonstrate the quality and significance of research outputs, and will consider such criteria as described by the staff member on their merits. Examples of these might include:

- wide acclaim by Māori beyond the original presentation (eg. as evidenced by media reports including Māori media)
- conferral of tribal honours for the contribution.

The MKD panel will use the following criteria for assessing all types of research outputs, noting that the scope of these criteria may overlap. This list does not imply a ranking order, although overall research quality will be the critical factor.

In particular, the panel will consider the extent to which the staff member's output:

- reflects Māori world-views
- represents an intellectual or creative advance or a significant contribution to knowledge
- exhibits intellectual rigour, methodological coherence and originality in the approach taken
- has significance for the wider community, eg. through influencing the direction of Māori thought and development

- is considered by peers as being of high quality; while recognising that, in many cases, the Māori community provides a more rigorous assessment of what constitutes excellence in Māori research
- is recognised as an important contribution to Māori knowledge in the context of indigenous knowledge and research by indigenous peoples.

The full panel specific guidelines for the MKD panel are included in Appendix C, but it is worth noting several changes to the Guidelines that responded to some of the issues raised after the 2003 assessment:

- In reviewing an EP the panel will consider the extent to which the output 'is considered by peers as being of high quality; while recognising that, in many cases, the Māori community provides a more rigorous assessment of what constitutes excellence in Māori research'.<sup>18</sup>

The definition of research included clarification of the general Guidelines with respect to interpretation of 'creative', 'cultural innovation' and 'applied research'.<sup>19</sup>

- Translations and 'the 're-discovery' of old knowledge in a Māori context, with its attendant safeguards' were added to the types of research output as was a note that 'copies of attestations...should be sufficient for the panel to form an assessment' of research outputs delivered in a specific Māori context or in a specific Māori format.<sup>20</sup>
- A list of what is not considered to be research and therefore should not be submitted as a nominated research output.<sup>21</sup>
- A definition of each of the quality categories as they pertained to Māori research, specifically noting that research based on Māori methodologies may be considered to be world-class.<sup>22</sup>

#### **Question for consideration:**

- v) Are these 2006 guidelines sufficiently comprehensive and clear? If not, how could they be made more so?

The 2006 Guidelines contain special circumstance provisions including: "a staff member can claim special circumstances only where they have had significant and sustained community responsibilities during the assessment period (eg. to iwi and Pacific communities)".

The panel-specific guidelines for MKD note several other special circumstances that may be taken into account:

- a particular area of Māori knowledge and development where there are insufficient researchers to sustain a research culture
- specific responsibilities beyond the TEO to iwi and Māori
- sustained responsibilities and commitments to the wider whānau, eg. whāngai, kuia, koroua, mokopuna
- the length of time a new and/or emerging researcher has been PBRF-eligible.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> PBRF Guidelines 2006, p.108.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, pp.108-109.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p.109.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, p.110.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, p.111.

<sup>23</sup> PBRF Guidelines 2006, p.110.

A separate paper on Special Circumstances has been prepared by the SRG.<sup>24</sup> The paper recommended retention of the community responsibilities special circumstance. The deadline for feedback on this paper was 31 October 2008. However, comments on the special circumstance provisions are also welcomed in response to this consultation paper.

#### 4.4 The 2006 PBRF Quality Evaluation

In the 2006 assessment, 517 staff members indicated Māori ethnicity (6 percent of all eligible researchers). As with the 2003 assessment, a relatively high proportion of staff did not supply ethnicity information (14 percent). The demographics of Māori researchers were also similar to the 2003 assessment: predominantly female, less likely to be working at a university and more likely to be in a subject area with a weighting of one. The spread of quality categories was:<sup>25</sup>

**Table 2: Number and proportion of researchers in each Quality Category: 2006 assessment**

	A	B	C	CNE	R	RNE
<b>No. of Māori researchers</b>	13	55	102	35	153	124
<b>% of Māori researchers</b>	3%	11%	21%	7%	32%	26%
<b>No. of all researchers</b>	629	2166	2138	825	1964	943
<b>% of all researchers</b>	7%	25%	25%	10%	23%	11%

Of particular note is the high proportion of new and emerging Māori staff (33 percent).

The report on the 2006 PBRF assessment noted that the MKD panel reviewed 89 EPs and 57 EPs cross-referred from other panels. There were also 53 EPs with their quality category carried over from the 2003 assessment. The average quality score for the MKD panel dropped from 1.94 in 2003 to 1.82 (ranked tenth of all the panels). The subject area was number 37 out of 42.<sup>26</sup>

The proportion of research degree completions by Māori students doubled between the two assessments to 6.2 percent of all completions in 2005. Add to this the 49 percent increase in research degree completions in total between the two assessments (1730 in 2002 to 2574 in 2005), the number of research degrees completed by Māori students has increased considerably between the two assessments.<sup>27</sup> The PBRF 2007 Annual Report shows that this number increased again in 2006 to 153 research degree completions by Māori students (more than a 200 percent increase in four years).<sup>28</sup>

The first consultation paper prepared by the 2012 SRG identified two issues: the equity weighting and 'more effective ways of addressing issues associated with Māori research and researchers'. The Panel feedback included in the appendices of the paper also noted the need to encourage Māori researchers and TEOs to provide assistance to Māori staff members in the preparation of their EPs.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup> TEC, 2012 Performance-Based Research Fund Sector Reference Group review: Special Circumstances consultation paper, Wellington, 2008.

<sup>25</sup> White and Grice, pp.18, 21-22.

<sup>26</sup> pp.60-61.

<sup>27</sup> p.67.

<sup>28</sup> PBRF 2007 Annual Report, p.26

<sup>29</sup> Consultation paper 1

## 5. Review of the 2006 Quality Evaluation

There are two primary documents that inform this consultation paper: the *Strategic Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund* prepared by Jonathan Adams and the TEC report prepared by Paula White and Janet Grice, *Participation and Performance by Māori and Pacific Peoples Researchers in the Performance-Based Research Fund, 2003-2006* that Adams refers to extensively in his discussion of Māori research and researchers.

### 5.1 TEC Report (White and Grice)

The White and Grice report included an overview of the concerns that have been expressed with regards to the PBRF and Māori researchers:

- the production of an EP does not fit with Māori values such as humility, whakahihi and whakaiti
- research takes longer using kaupapa Māori processes
- it is difficult to gain international recognition as research is produced for a local audience
- the PBRF does not give adequate weight to the satisfaction of iwi
- the PBRF formalises processes that have “a history of informality”
- verbal agreements are the norm rather than written letters or attestations
- TEOs can choose the panel to submit EPs, and
- the individual as the unit of assessment may not be appropriate in Māori research.

White and Grice undertook an extensive analysis of the 2003 and 2006 PBRF Quality Evaluation results. For this analysis, they noted:

- Māori researchers ‘might disproportionately work in areas of national importance and priority, yet find their research receives lower quality scores because of, perhaps, the cultural characteristics of their research’
- as not all wānanga participated in the 2006 PBRF assessment, the results are not a complete picture of Māori research in New Zealand
- the subject weighting of MKD may disadvantage Māori researchers in some areas and may deter them from submitting their EP to the MKD panel
- on average, Māori researchers include fewer NROs in their EPs but there was little difference in the types of NRO submitted
- a higher proportion of Māori did not submit an EP
- a third of Māori researchers were new and emerging compared to 22% of all researchers.

#### Question for consideration:

vi) Which of the issues raised by White and Grice are particularly important to consider in the redesign of the PBRF Quality Evaluation 2012 and how might the SRG address them in their recommendations to the TEC? How could the PBRF process be changed to appropriately respond to these issues?

## 5.2 Independent Strategic Review of the PBRF (Adams Report)

The Adams report reviewed specific effects of the PBRF relevant to Māori, to Māori knowledge and development and to the wānanga. The White and Grice report informed Adams' consideration of these issues and he noted that:

“the available data do not give rise to concern about equity of treatment or different groups of researchers. Māori researchers do not have lower average outcomes but many were in fields with lower average outcomes and they submitted a smaller number of NROs. The relative growth due to the NE category further supported the TEC view that Māori researchers are disproportionately 'new' to research and this will rapidly change.<sup>30</sup>”

Adams' point about outcomes for Māori researchers is important, as is his acknowledgment that Māori researchers are concentrated in subject areas that do not score highly in the PBRF quality evaluation.<sup>31</sup> There is a risk that discussion of lower than average outcomes for Māori could be interpreted as Māori producing fewer and lower quality research outputs. Such an interpretation would be incorrect. Māori researchers do not have lower than average outcomes because they are Māori - they have lower than average outcomes because of the subject areas in which they engage in research.

### Question for consideration:

vii) Are these matters material and if so how might the SRG address them in its recommendations to the TEC?

It is also important to recognise the excellent research produced by Māori that is acknowledged in the PBRF and that which may not be fully transparent in the results:

- 3.80 staff FTE in the MKD panel were awarded an A quality category in the 2006 assessment
- three universities (Auckland, Waikato, VUW) achieved an average quality score of 3.00 or more in the MKD subject area in the 2006 assessment, and
- one researcher (FTE) in the MKD panel was awarded an A quality category at one university, but 3.5 staff (FTE) were awarded an A quality category in the same university's nominated academic unit for Māori Studies and the department received an average quality score of 4.0 (compared to 3.4 for the MKD subject area). This suggests that the results of the MKD subject area do not adequately reflect the excellent research that is being done by Māori researchers.<sup>32</sup>

Adams did, however, acknowledge that there may be some 'unresolved cultural issues' and an imbalance in the proportion of Māori researchers in different subject areas. He suggested that this may improve over time and noted the role of the wānanga in widening participation of Māori.<sup>33</sup> He also recommended that 'the Māori research community should...[establish] an appropriate

<sup>30</sup> Adams, p.54.

<sup>31</sup> Adams, p.54.

<sup>32</sup> PBRF Evaluating Research Excellence: The 2006 Assessment, p.212.

<sup>33</sup> Adams, p.54.

<sup>34</sup> Adams, p.55.

and defensible quality reference system of its own' to deal with concerns about Māori methods of research and its dissemination.<sup>34</sup>

**Question for consideration:**

viii) Are there any 'unresolved cultural issues' that need to be addressed by the PBRF - if yes, how?

Adams' major recommendation about Māori research was:

"New Zealand should find a different route *pro tem* to supporting the knowledge mission in the wānanga...with the intention of returning assessment to the mainstream at an early opportunity."<sup>35</sup>

This recommendation, however, is not within the scope of the work of the SRG. The TEC will need to consider and consult on this issue separately.

<sup>35</sup> Adams, p.56.

## Appendix A: Extracts from the report of the PBRF Working Group

### Funding for Research degree completions

- 153 An equity weighting would also be added to completions of research degrees by Māori and Pacific students, to encourage providers to enrol and support such students. The Working Group concurred with submissions made by stakeholders that New Zealand's research base should reflect the diversity of the community, and that achieving this goal required additional and enhanced support for Māori and Pacific students. The equity weighting also supports the government's strategic goals of contributing to the achievement of Māori development aspirations and educating for Pacific Peoples' development and success.
- 154 The Working Group considers that the equity weighting should:
- have a weighting of 2, and
  - be reviewed after the second or third quality evaluation round to assess its effectiveness and the ongoing need for such a measure.

### Implications for Māori and Pacific research

- 197 The Working Group recognised the issues raised by the tertiary sector about the implications of the PBRF for Māori and Pacific research and the development of Māori research capability. Although the PBRF is not specifically set up to address these issues, the Working Group acknowledged the need to ensure that the PBRF design fully recognises quality in Māori and Pacific research, and avoids discouraging the development of Māori and Pacific research capability.
- 198 Māori research was seen to encompass research into things Māori, and research conducted according to Māori methods of research and subscribing to Māori ways of knowing. It could also - but not necessarily - include research conducted by Māori; and/or research conducted for Māori (for example, for a Māori audience).
- 199 Stakeholder issues considered by the Working Group included:
- the need for Māori and Pacific development and advancement to be supported adequately by high-quality research
  - the diverse nature of Māori research and the strong basis in action-based research, and collaboration with communities and end users
  - the need for the PBRF to reflect the fact that quality in Māori research is often manifested by stakeholder satisfaction
  - the fact that Māori and Pacific research has some areas of existing excellence, but is also a developing area with a relatively high proportion of new researchers. There are concerns that the PBRF's focus on past performance might disadvantage Māori and Pacific research, especially in new institutions such as the wānanga.
  - the concern that rationalisation or concentration of current degree-level programmes could impact adversely on access for Māori students to higher-level learning (unless

collaboration occurs, allowing continued access to regionally-based degree programmes with an adequate research base.)

- the concern about levels of current provider investment in Māori and Pacific capability-building, and the potential for the PBRF signals to discourage rather than encourage further investment in Māori and Pacific research capability.
- the fact that the demands placed on many Māori and Pacific staff to contribute to capability development in their own institutions, and to contribute to iwi and community initiatives, can reduce the time they have available to engage in research.

200 The Working Group considered that the following aspects of the PBRF's design should address the main issues identified in sector consultation.

201 First, the emphasis of the PBRF on quality was important. Māori and Pacific interests and capability development will be best supported by high quality research and learning environments. Working Group members noted that Māori and Pacific students need access to high quality learning opportunities, and good information about where quality lies.

202 Second, the overall nature and operation of the PBRF would be guided by a set of principles, which include the need to be mindful of New Zealand's bicultural nature and the special role of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the need to appropriately reflect and include New Zealand's diverse population.

203 The broad definition of research should encompass the wide variety of activities which Māori and Pacific researchers have argued form part of their research.

204 The evaluation of quality via assessment of researcher contributions is broadly defined, and should generally be able to account for the variety of ways in which Māori and Pacific researchers make research inputs to iwi-based and community initiatives. Measures of impact and uptake could be included in a researcher's evidence portfolio as esteem indicators.

205 Experts on Māori research would be involved in the peer review process through a Māori Knowledge and Development panel. The panel would directly evaluate Māori researchers, and (where appropriate) provide advice to other panels where the research being evaluated had a Māori focus. The peer review panels will also be supported by guidance from an 'esteemed body' of Pacific researchers.

206 The growth of Māori and Pacific research capability would be encouraged in the PBRF by the recommendation in paragraphs 153-4 that an equity weighting of 2 be added to research degree completions by Māori and Pacific students for the first two or three evaluation rounds. Extra emphasis will also be given in the quality evaluations (through the quality descriptors) to contributions made by academic staff to developing Māori and Pacific researchers.

207 However, the Working Group also agreed that there was a need for additional measures to support the development of Māori and Pacific research capability beyond the PBRF.

Key inputs to this development are adequate investment and support. Effective targeting of the Strategic Development Fund is one option, provided that adequate resources are available. Charters and profiles will have a significant influence on the strategic choices made by institutions. The Working Group recommended that the TEC apply charters and profiles rigorously, to ensure that degree-granting providers are adequately investing in, and supporting, the growth of Māori and Pacific research capability.

- 208 Quality assurance agencies, such as the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit, could assist capability development by evaluating the quality of supervisory practice for Māori and Pacific research degree students. The Working Group also noted that the Health Research Council is developing strategies to develop Pacific research capability, and considered that there could be merit in the other public research funding agencies applying these strategies and frameworks.
- 209 The Working Group also recommended that the TEC, in consultation with the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology, prepare a Best Practice guide, to assist providers in developing strategies to increase and improve support for Māori and Pacific research capability.
- 210 Careful consideration of strengths and investment needs, and a willingness to collaborate, should help to ensure that reasonable access is maintained to degree level programmes in the regions - while also ensuring that access is available to programmes with sound underpinning research.
- 211 Working Group views on the general issue of supporting emergent research capability are outlined elsewhere in the report.
- 212 The Working Group noted the views expressed about the role that taught postgraduate programmes play in building Māori research capability, but did not see this as an overriding factor in determining the definition of postgraduate degree completions.
- 213 Transition arrangements for the PBRF will be important in allowing institutions to react to the first round of evaluations, and to build up quality. The Working Group noted the need to monitor with care the impacts on key institutions, including wānanga.

## Appendix B: Māori RDC awards split between Masters and Doctorates for the period 2002-2006

### Data Information

The Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) has supplied raw data that is indicative only - figures may change if they are updated in the future. The analysis and interpretation of the information are the responsibility of the researcher.

NOTE: Data presented in the table is from two separate spreadsheets with differing figures for the return years.

**Table1: Proportion of Māori RDC with VRF value of 1 and above (Masters Level and above) compared with all ethnicities**

Proportion of research-based postgraduate RDC	VRF	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Masters course of 1.0EFTS thesis or more	1	4%	6%	6%	5%	6%
Doctorate	3	6%	5%	5%	4%	5%

\* Each completion has been nominated one ethnicity variable according to ethnic prioritisation. This option has been phased out of most education analyses according to Statistics New Zealand policy. In the future un-prioritised ethnic data could be captured and analysed, however time constraints restricted this analysis to available data.

Percentage columns may not sum to 100 percent exactly due to rounding.

**Table2: The number of Māori research-based postgraduate degrees completed with a VRF value of 1 and above (Masters Level and above) to overall RDC**

Postgraduate RDC	VRF	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Masters course of 1.0EFTS thesis or more	1	43	96	83	95	103
Doctorate	3	29	27	26	25	25

\* Each completion has been nominated one ethnicity variable according to ethnic prioritisation. This option has been phased out of most education analyses according to Statistics New Zealand policy. In the future un-prioritised ethnic data could be captured and analysed, however time constraints restricted this analysis to available data.

Percentage columns may not sum to 100 percent exactly due to rounding.

**Table 3: Ethnic profile of RDCs**

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
NZ Māori	73	131	118	140	144
Pacific peoples**	27	37	35	43	52
European/Pākehā	1039	1207	1251	1456	1296
Asian***	256	349	368	491	407
Other	299	276	221	279	269
Not known / Not stated	30	259	65	77	293
All	1724	2259	2058	2486	2461

\* Each completion has been nominated one ethnicity variable according to ethnic prioritisation. This option has been phased out of most education analyses according to Statistics New Zealand policy. In the future un-prioritised ethnic data could be captured and analysed, however time constraints restricted this analysis to available data.

\*\* This group is derived from the ethnic groups: Cook Island Māori, Fijian, Niuean, Samoan, Tokelau, Tongan, and Other Pacific.

\*\*\* This group is derived from the ethnic groups: Chinese, Indian, and Other Asian.

Percentage columns may not sum to 100 percent exactly due to rounding.

## Appendix C: Panel specific guidelines - Māori Knowledge and Development Panel

### Māori Knowledge and Development

Description of panel coverage The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel assesses EPs in one subject area, Māori Knowledge and Development, and so will cover a wide range of research areas.

The guiding principle for coverage is that the panel will consider all EPs where there is evidence of research based on Māori world-views, both traditional and contemporary, and Māori methods of research. While other methodologies may also be used in the research, the inclusion of Māori methodologies will be the important criterion.

Consequently, there is potential for the panel to consider research across all subject areas.

In practice, however, it is likely that the broad theme areas covered by the panel will be: te reo Māori, tikanga Māori, wairuatanga, cultural development, social development, economic development, political development, environmental sustainability, and toi Māori.

It is expected that all or most of the NROs will primarily investigate issues of importance to Māori, with Māori-specific measures and processes being evident. The EP is likely to show significant involvement with Māori, and outcomes that are relevant and of value to Māori.

EPs which include some Māori component (eg. in subject area) but which do not involve Māori methodologies will not be assessed by the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel. Instead, the panel that best covers the subject area of the EP will assess it. That panel will either have its own Māori member or will refer the EP to a Māori adviser as required.

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel will cross-refer EPs to other relevant panels and/or seek input from specialist advisers where it is appropriate to supplement the range of expertise of panel members. This panel acknowledges that EPs, in addition to demonstrating a Māori methodological approach, could include research based on other approaches and across other disciplines, and it will ensure equitable treatment of multi- and/or cross-disciplinary research.

An EP that is written in Māori will be assessed according to the research method employed, rather than the language used. Māori members of other panels or Māori specialist advisers will be able to assist further.

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel will assess EPs compiled by Māori and non-Māori, the guiding principle being that the EP consists primarily of research based on Māori world-views and methodologies.

General expectations for standard of evidence to be supplied

Outputs will be considered on their merits. Staff members are asked to ensure that they give as much information as possible in the Comments Relevant to this Output field for each NRO as to (i) why they have chosen that NRO as one of their (up to) four best research outputs, (ii) how it meets the Definition of Research in the general Guidelines and/or panel-specific guidelines, and (iii) the quality-assurance measures undertaken in its production.

The kinds of quality-assurance measures that could be considered for applied, practice-based and/or print-based research outputs include the provision of, for example:

- a script accompanied by notes and/or comments from judges, assessors and/or other knowledgeable persons (for a performance or artistic output)
- an examiner's report (for a thesis)
- an abstract (for a book or journal article).

In order to assess the quality of research outputs that are non-print-based, such as oral presentations at a hui, the panel expects that the staff member will describe the nature of quality assurance according to one or more of the following criteria:

- Publication of the oral presentation in channels with conventionally accepted peer-review processes, such as peer-reviewed journals.
- Attestation by a scholar of acknowledged repute, either in New Zealand or overseas (the scholar may be an eminent kaumâtua or an academically credentialled expert).

Invitation to present at an event, such as a hui, that is acknowledged as having wide significance for Māori.

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel acknowledges that other criteria may demonstrate the quality and significance of research outputs, and will consider such criteria as described by the staff member on their merits. Examples of these might include:

- wide acclaim by Māori beyond the original presentation (eg as evidenced by media reports including Māori media)
- conferment of tribal honours for the contribution.

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel will use the following criteria for assessing all types of research outputs, noting that the scope of these criteria may overlap. This list does not imply a ranking order, although overall research quality will be the critical factor.

In particular, the panel will consider the extent to which the staff member's output:

- reflects Māori world-views
- represents an intellectual or creative advance or a significant contribution to knowledge
- exhibits intellectual rigour, methodological coherence and originality in the approach taken
- has significance for the wider community, eg through influencing the direction of Māori thought and development
- is considered by peers as being of high quality; while recognising that, in many cases, the Māori community provides a more rigorous assessment of what constitutes excellence in Māori research
- Is recognised as an important contribution to Māori knowledge in the context of indigenous knowledge and research by indigenous peoples.

#### Elaboration of the Definition of Research

The panel will have particular regard to Māori research, and generally characterises that research as follows:

- Māori research is a broad descriptor that includes a range of Māori approaches to research, such as kaupapa Māori research, Māori-centred research, mātāuranga Māori research, etc.
- Research is based on Māori world-views (Māori ways of being, knowing, and doing).
- Primary data include material derived from Te Ao Māori.
- Research practices and processes are consistent with Māori ethical standards and guidelines.
- Methods, analyses and measurements recognise Māori philosophies and experience.
- The outcomes of 'Māori research' contribute to Māori knowledge and development.

In respect of applied and/or practice-based research in a Māori context, the term 'creative' in the general Guidelines refers to the generation of images, performances and/or artefacts (including design) that leads to the development of new knowledge, understanding and expertise.

The term 'cultural innovation' in the general Guidelines refers to performance practice in a Māori context that can be a gradual and incremental process over time, that results in an individual style or 'statement', and that produces, contributes to or creates new knowledge.

'Applied' research is work that develops or tests existing knowledge and is primarily directed towards specific practical objectives or the evaluation of policies and/or practices.

#### Elaboration of the Definition of Research

The panel will have particular regard to Māori research, and generally characterises that research as follows:

- Māori research is a broad descriptor that includes a range of Māori approaches to research, such as kaupapa Māori research, Māori-centred research, mātauranga Māori research, etc.
- Research is based on Māori world-views (Māori ways of being, knowing, and doing).
- Primary data include material derived from Te Ao Māori.
- Research practices and processes are consistent with Māori ethical standards and guidelines.
- Methods, analyses and measurements recognise Māori philosophies and experience.
- The outcomes of 'Māori research' contribute to Māori knowledge and development.

In respect of applied and/or practice-based research in a Māori context, the term 'creative' in the general Guidelines refers to the generation of images, performances and/or artefacts (including design) that leads to the development of new knowledge, understanding and expertise.

## Types of research output

Given the diverse nature of the subject areas covered, the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel expects to receive a wide range of research outputs.

Full consideration will be given to the types of research noted in the general Guidelines and, in addition, to other types of research that may especially contribute to Māori knowledge and development.

These could include outputs such as the following:

- Presentations at hui or wānanga.
- Oral presentations such as whaikōrero and waiata.
- Performance such as haka and waiata-ā-ringa.
- Reports for external bodies, including submissions to the Māori Land Court, the Waitangi Tribunal, and/or research for iwi rūnanga.
- Translations (Māori-English, English-Māori).
- The 're-discovery' of old knowledge in a Māori context, with its attendant safeguards.
- Artefacts including material cultural creations such as whakairo, raranga, whare construction, etc.
- Other types of research output, eg. kai products and processes.

Research outputs may be delivered in a specific Māori context or produced in a specific Māori format (eg. an art work, whakairo or whaikōrero). Where such an output is an NRO and is requested by the panel, it may be provided in an alternative form such as a photograph, audio or video recording, transcription, commentary, or kaumātua attestation. It should be noted that copies of attestations, with an appropriate accompanying commentary in the Comments Relevant to this Output field, should be sufficient for the panel to form an assessment of the research output.

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel accepts that there may be some delay in the publication of certain types of research. There may also be circumstances where research outputs are disseminated initially through non-quality-assured media, or else directly to the research community or communities involved. These factors will be given due consideration in evaluating the evidence presented. However, the panel is primarily interested in outputs that contain or are accompanied by evidence of research quality; and it considers, where fieldwork or investigation is undertaken over an extended period, that research outputs such as conference papers and/or journal articles may be expected.

In addition to the exclusions given in the general Guidelines, the following list gives an indication of outputs in a Māori context that are either not considered to be research, or should not be included amongst the NROs in an EP:

- keeping abreast of research developments
- multiple uses or re-workings of a single research output in different formats (note that these can go into the list of up to 30 'other' research outputs which demonstrate the 'platform' or quantity of research achieved during the assessment period)
- papers taken towards a research masters degree or other postgraduate qualification
- reprints of journal articles and new editions of books unless substantially changed
- The routine application of established techniques in an applied and/or practice-based context, except where this meets the PBRF Definition of Research.

Note: Research outputs that do not meet the Definition of Research may be relevant to the PE and/or CRE components of an EP.

Indications of the minimum quantity of research output expected to be produced during the assessment period

In the case of new and emerging researchers, it is expected that the EP will contain evidence of an adequate quantity and quality of research outputs that have been completed during the assessment period, taking into account the length of time the researcher has been PBRF-eligible. A minimum of two quality-assured research outputs would normally be expected, together with a doctoral degree or equivalent (eg in disciplines where doctoral study is not established, a terminal degree).

Special  
circumstances

The general Guidelines apply.

Other special circumstances that the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel may deem relevant, taking into account the evidence presented, could include:

- a particular area of Māori knowledge and development where there are insufficient researchers to sustain a research culture
- specific responsibilities beyond the TEO to iwi and Māori
- sustained responsibilities and commitments to the wider whānau, eg. whāngai, kuia, koroua, mokopuna
- the length of time a new and/or emerging researcher has been PBRF-eligible.

If a staff member has a significant proportion of research that is confidential in nature and this affects their quantity of research output, these circumstances should be explained in the Special Circumstances field. Nevertheless, the onus is on the staff member to provide an assessable EP. It is noted that confidential NROs will be treated with the utmost respect, taking into account such factors as iwi/ hapū/ whānau intellectual property and the nature of the research output itself.

Definitions  
of Quality  
Categories

The general Guidelines apply.

In addition, the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel will have regard to the following:

Quality Category "A": The panel recognises that 'world-class' denotes a standard, not a type or location or focus of research. Research outputs based on Māori research methodologies may rank with the best research of their type conducted anywhere in the world, including New Zealand, and thus be considered to demonstrate performance at this level.

Peer esteem and contributions to the research environment may be demonstrated by research and disciplinary leadership and by extensive networks and/or collaborations, which result in research outputs that contribute in a significant and substantial way to Māori and indigenous knowledge and development in a New Zealand and/or global context.

Quality Category "B": To be assigned a "B" for an EP, the staff member would normally be expected to have produced research outputs of a sustained high quality, and to have acquired peer recognition and made a substantial contribution to the research environment at a national/iwi level or across a range of Māori communities and/or developmental interests.

Quality Category "C": To be assigned a "C" for an EP, the staff member would normally be expected to have produced a reasonable number of quality-assured research outputs, and to have acquired peer recognition and made a contribution to the research environment within her/his own institution and/or at a local community level.

Quality Category "R": The general Guidelines apply.

Quality Categories "C(NE)" and "R(NE)": The general Guidelines will apply.

Measuring the impact of applicable and practice-based research

The impact of applicable and practice-based research may be measured and assessed according to the extent to which it is:

- adopted as a practice standard
- incorporated into institutional and/or agency manuals
- used as a basis for policy at local, regional/iwi and/or national levels
- cited in guidelines, strategies, and/or operational plans.

Characteristics of excellence for applicable and practice-based research

The characteristics of excellence for applicable and practice-based research may be measured and assessed according to the extent to which it is:

- cited favourably in the academic literature and/or recognised by creative and performing networks
- endorsed by Māori agencies and individuals as a useful contribution to Māori knowledge and development
- referenced by students and practitioners in assignments, coursework and/or projects
- incorporated into institutional and/or agency practice bibliographies.

Treatment of non-standard, non-quality-assured and jointly produced research outputs

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel acknowledges that many of the EPs it assesses may contain research outputs that are non-standard, non-quality-assured, and/or jointly produced. In such cases the EP will be judged on its merits. The panel recognises that the lack of evidence of, for instance, quality assurance will not necessarily be taken to mean that the EP is of a lesser quality than if evidence had been provided.

Research outputs that have been jointly produced with specialists in their field should specify the extent of the staff member's contribution, but will be judged according to 'the company kept', ie the fact of being considered worthy to work with a specialist or 'master' speaks for itself in the assessment of such work.

In the case of non-standard or other types of EPs where kaumātua and/or peer attestations are used to support or substitute for the staff member's own commentary in the Comments Relevant to this Output field, the panel will take into account the reluctance of many researchers in a Māori context to self-promote. However, it should be recognised that the output is a taonga in its own right, which deserves to be suitably acknowledged by the researcher in providing the kinds of information that the panel would normally expect to receive - that is, the staff member should state in their own words (i) why it has been chosen as an NRO, (ii) how it meets the Definition of Research, and (iii) the quality-assurance measures undertaken in its production.

Note: 'Peers' in the context of supportive attestations of an applied and/or practice-based nature could include recognised leaders or experts (painters, sculptors, poets, etc) in fields such as whakairo, raranga, kōwhaiwhai, waiata, etc.

Proportions of NROs to be sampled

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel will sample as many NROs as the time constraints and the availability of outputs allow, in order to give full consideration to the EP as a whole. The goal of 15% (or more) of NROs sampled will also apply to transfers and cross-referrals to this panel.

Use of specialist advisers

Specialist advisers will be used by the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel to:

- supplement the range of expertise of panel members
- address conflicts of interest within the panel
- gauge the appropriateness of panel findings
- assist the panel to reach a consensus in borderline cases.

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

### **RO descriptor**

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel will consider all EPs that consist primarily of research based on Māori world-views and methods. Consequently, the panel will potentially consider research across all subject areas. It is expected that all or most of the NROs will investigate issues of importance to Māori, with Māori-specific measures and processes being evident. The EP is likely to show significant involvement with Māori, and outcomes that are relevant and of value to Māori.

Given the diverse nature of the subject areas covered, the panel expects to receive a wide range of research outputs. Full consideration will be given to the examples of research outputs noted in the general Guidelines and, in addition, to other types of research outputs that make a particular contribution to Māori knowledge and development.

The panel acknowledges that there is a wide range of channels of presentation in the Māori community (eg. through marae and rūnanga hui), some of which offer a higher level of scrutiny, peer review or informed critique than others. The panel will take into consideration the channel through which a research output is presented as one measure of quality.

### **Tie-point 6**

The panel recognises that 'world-class' denotes a standard, not a type or location or focus of research. Research outputs based on Māori research methodologies may rank with the best research of their type conducted anywhere in the world, including New Zealand, and thus be considered to demonstrate performance at a global or national level. Other indigenous research will also provide an opportunity for benchmarking at this level.

Nevertheless, it is recognised that 'world-class' in a New Zealand context would include quality-assured research outputs that are at the leading edge of insight and innovation, that have the ability to create new paradigms and concepts, that are influential in the development of new and alternative directions, and that provide models of innovative excellence with a significant impact across the spectrum of Māori practice and/or Māori policy and development at a national level.

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

#### Tie-point 4

Research outputs judged to be of this standard could include those that address issues of relevance to Māori at a national/iwi level and/or across a range of Māori communities and/or developmental interests within New Zealand. It is expected that the majority of such ROs would be quality-assured and demonstrate rigour in creative work practices, research design, and/or methodological approach.

#### Tie-point 2

Research outputs judged to be of this standard could include those that address issues of relevance to Māori at an institutional and/or local community level. It is expected that at least some of such research outputs would be quality-assured and/or would demonstrate an emerging creative work practice with developing rigour in research design and/or methodological approach.

#### **PE descriptor**

The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel acknowledges that a wide range of evidence of peer esteem would indicate that the research is regarded as an important contribution to Māori knowledge and development.

In addition to the examples of peer esteem provided in the general Guidelines, the panel will consider other examples related to Te Ao Māori, including:

- Invitations to address hui where there is wide Māori participation
- Mandated representation on behalf of Māori and/or iwi at a range of fora (eg. marae, Waitangi Tribunal, iwi hui)
- Recognised expertise in a field of endeavour, which results in others looking to that person for inspiration and for examples of excellence in applied and practice-based research.

#### Tie-point 6

World-class recognition of research outputs based on Māori research methodologies could include, for instance, presentations at world indigenous research conferences and fora or a position at an indigenous research institution overseas.

Recognition at this level could also include the presentation of influential and cutting-edge research in a New Zealand context, which attracts overseas (particularly indigenous) as well as national (particularly Māori) attention and uptake. Researchers at this level of achievement could be expected to attract media recognition as spokespersons capable of responding to significant issues that impact on iwi and/or Māori development. They could also be expected to attract recognition and acknowledgement by leading New Zealand and/or overseas commentators, as established performers or exhibitors presenting new and creative insights within the Māori visual and performance culture.

#### Tie-point 4

Evidence of peer esteem at this level could include the staff member's influence being recognised at a national/iwi level and/or across a range of Māori communities and/or developmental interests. Researchers at this level could be expected to attract critical acclaim from nationally recognised commentators, exhibit or perform with others in a recognised national venue, or demonstrate extended end-user satisfaction with the results of the research.

#### Tie-point 2

Evidence of peer esteem at this level could include the staff member's influence being recognised at an institutional and/or local community level. Researchers at this level could be expected to attract favourable critique from an institution or local community authority in the field, exhibit or perform with other recognised artists, or demonstrate effective participation in institutional and/or local community matters of a research nature.

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

#### **CRE descriptor**

A wide range of contributions to the research and creative work environment are relevant to the subject areas covered by the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel.

In addition to the examples of contribution to the research environment provided in the general guidelines, the panel will consider other examples related to Te Ao Māori, including:

- development and maintenance of strong and effective links with end users of research and creative work, including the transfer of knowledge to participants and stakeholders such as whānau/ hapū/ iwi/ Māori communities and/or Māori visual and performing networks. It is also noted that the wider New Zealand community would benefit from being informed about Māori-specific world-views and research (including creative work) achievements
- Contributions to the further development of research and creative work capacity in broad areas of Māori knowledge and development, through supervision, peer review and mentoring
- Promotion of a research and creative work culture within iwi/ hapū/ Māori communities and/or Māori visual and performing networks through guidance, leadership and facilitation
- Engagement at the interface between Māori approaches and other approaches to research and creative work
- The use of Māori research and creative work approaches to inform other disciplines and subject areas.

#### **Tie-point 6**

Extensive networks and collaborations could include links with overseas indigenous researchers and research institutions, while research and disciplinary leadership could include contributions to Māori knowledge and the knowledge of other indigenous peoples in New Zealand and overseas.

The aim should be to demonstrate a level of research and creative work that informs and inspires researchers in a New Zealand context (particularly those working in Māori-related areas), that motivates others to strive for higher levels of achievement, and that provides a model of excellence in disciplinary areas of relevance to Māori researchers and communities (including Māori visual and performing networks) and Māori-relevant organisations.

#### Tie-point 4

Evidence of contribution to the research environment at this level could include the staff member's expertise in aspects of mātauranga Māori and/or Māori visual and performance culture at a national/ iwi level and/or across a range of Māori communities and/or Māori-relevant organisations.

#### Tie-point 2

Evidence of contribution to the research environment at this level could include the staff member's expertise in aspects of mātauranga Māori at an institutional and/or local community level.

Other relevant information required for panel assessors to accurately assign Quality Categories to EPs

No panel-specific guidance.

## Bibliography

Adams, Jonathan, *Strategic Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund: The Assessment Process*, 2008.

Ministry of Education, *Investing in Excellence: The Report of the Performance-Based Research Fund Working Group*, Wellington, 2002.

Smith, Ailsa and Pip Bruce-Ferguson, 'Impact of the Performance-Based Research Fund on Māori research and researchers', in Leon Bakker et al. (eds), *Evaluating the Performance-Based Research Fund: Framing the Debate*, Wellington, 2006, pp.387-399.

TEC, *2012 Performance-Based Research Fund Sector Reference Group review: Special Circumstances consultation paper*, Wellington, 2008.

TEC, *Evaluating Research Excellence: The 2003 Assessment*, Wellington, 2004.

TEC, *Evaluating Research Excellence: The 2006 Assessment*, Wellington, 2007.

TEC, *2006 Quality Evaluation Report of the Sector Reference Group*, Wellington, 2005.

TEC, *PBRF: A Guide for 2003*, Wellington, 2003.

TEC, *PBRF Guidelines 2006*, Wellington, 2005.

TEC, *Performance-Based Research Fund: Annual Report 2007*, Wellington, 2008.

WEB Research, *Phase 1 Evaluation of the implementation of the PBRF and the conduct of the 2003 Quality Evaluation*, Wellington, 2004.

White, Paula and Janet Grice, *Participation and Performance by Māori and Pacific Peoples Researchers in the Performance-Based Research Fund, 2003 – 2006*, Wellington, 2008.



## Performance-Based Research Fund

Feedback template for

Māori Research consultation paper

<b>Feedback from:</b>	
<b>Contact details:</b>	

# 1 Purpose

The purpose of this template is to provide a mechanism for collecting feedback on the matters raised as part of the PBRF Māori Research Consultation paper.

The objective is to obtain feedback in such a way that will speed the collation and review of feedback pertaining to specific areas of interest.

Respondents are encouraged to answer the questions in this template, but should not feel limited from also providing comments in addition to those requested in the template.

Timeframe for feedback

Completed templates and any other comments should be emailed to [PBRF.2012Redesign@tec.govt.nz](mailto:PBRF.2012Redesign@tec.govt.nz) or can be posted to Dr Damien Cole, Tertiary Education Commission, P O Box 27048, Wellington 6141.

Feedback would be appreciated as soon as possible, but no later than 5pm, Friday, 15 May 2009.





If you would like to make any additional comments please do so below.

