

**Performance-Based Research Fund
Sector Reference Group review:
Māori Research (Part two - options)**

Contents

1. Purpose	3
2. Aims and principles of the PBRF	3
3. Principles of redesign	4
4. Equity weighting	5
5. Strategic weightings	5
6. Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) panel	5
7. Improvements to guidelines	7

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 (Part Two - Options)

1. Purpose

This paper has been prepared as part of the consultation process for the 2012 PBRF assessment. It follows on from the first consultation paper on Māori Research and should be read in conjunction with that first paper (refer to <http://www.tec.govt.nz/upload/downloads/PBRF-Maori-research-v4.pdf>).

The first consultation paper presented a broad spectrum of issues related to Māori research in the context of PBRF. Sector response on these issues was invited through the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) web site from 27 March 2009 to 15 May 2009. In addition, the paper was discussed on 30 April 2009 at the Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga Participating Research Entities Forum.

This second consultation paper presents options and recommendations for addressing key issues identified in the submissions on the first paper. The PBRF Sector Reference Group (SRG) is now seeking feedback on the options presented below, and invites response from the sector through the Māori Research 2 Feedback Template.

Please note that the options presented in this paper are not mutually exclusive. Selecting one option does not necessarily rule out any of the others. If you wish, you may endorse all, some or none of the below options.

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, and
- avoiding costly or time-consuming changes unless there are good reasons for believing they will bring significant improvements.

4. Equity weighting

Recommendation: Retain the equity weighting of 2.0 for Research Degree Completions (RDC) by Māori students.

The SRG has decided that the overwhelming response in favour of this equity weighting means they will formally recommend to the TEC that it be retained.

5. Strategic weighting

Option A: Introduce a strategic weighting of 4.0 to all RDCs written entirely in te reo Māori .

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
A) Introduce a Strategic Weighting of 4.0 to all RDCs written entirely in te reo Māori	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- will help to maintain the language- te reo Māori is the only language appropriate for presenting research on some parts of Kaupapa Māori- New Zealand is the only country in the world in which research at tertiary level might be expected to be produced in te reo Māori- a weighting of this size will not be distorting because the numbers involved are very small	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- there is limited capability to examine theses in te reo Māori- may provide perverse incentives- the ability to internationalise research may be reduced if not written in English

6. Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) panel

Option B: Raise the weighting of the MKD panel to 2.0.

(When considering this option it should be borne in mind that PBRF is a bulk fund and it is up to TEOs to decide how they distribute it within their own organisation.)

Option C: Consider appointing an appropriate number of Māori panel members to panels that may be likely to be evaluating significant numbers of Evidence Portfolios from Māori researchers.

Option D: Ensure that the selection of MKD panellists is not contingent on self-nomination or on prospective panellists having a PhD. Identify individuals recognised nationally for their Māori knowledge and approach these people to be on the MKD panel.

Option E: Appoint one or two international indigenous researchers to the MKD panel for the 2012 Quality Evaluation.

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
B) Raise the weighting of the MKD panel to 2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would incentivise the development of Māori knowledge and scholarship - Would encourage submissions to the MKD panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As PBRF is a bulk fund, any increase in funding that may result from this will not necessarily flow back to Māori researchers
C) Consider appointing an appropriate number of Māori panel members to panels that may be likely to be evaluating significant numbers of Evidence Portfolios from Māori researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would ensure that panels are adequately supported to evaluate Māori scholarship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May be a shortage of appropriate scholars willing to participate as panellists
D) Identify individuals recognised nationally for their Māori knowledge and approach these people to be on the MKD panel.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The MKD panel would be better balanced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Such individuals may not wish to serve as panellists
E) Appoint one or two international indigenous researchers to the MKD panel for the 2012 Quality Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International benchmarking is important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It may be challenging to assess the international relevance of publications in te reo Māori

7. Improvements to guidelines

Option F: Rewrite the MKD panel-specific guidelines as follows:

- remove the phrase “and Māori methodology” as a criterion for submission to the MKD panel on the basis that this concept is subject to various possible interpretations and so cannot serve as a clear criterion.
- ensure that any unique aspects of Māori research are acknowledged.

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
F1) Rewrite the MKD panel-specific guidelines, removing the phrase “and Māori methodology” as a criterion for submission to the MKD panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The concept of “Māori methodology” does not serve as a clear criterion - Would allow new creative works in te reo Māori to be submitted to the MKD panel even when these works are not necessarily created using Māori methodologies 	
F2) Rewrite the MKD panel-specific guidelines ensuring that any unique aspects of Māori research are acknowledged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater clarity and directions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased material would not guarantee increased understanding

Performance-Based Research Fund

Feedback template for

Māori research (Part two - options) consultation paper

Feedback from:	
Contact details:	

1 Purpose

The purpose of this template is to provide a mechanism for collecting feedback on the matters raised as part of the PBRF Sector Reference Group Māori Research (Part two - options) Consultation paper.

The objective is to gain comment from the sector in a way that will speed the collation and review of such feedback.

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 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, 14 August 2009.

2. Questions - Māori Research (Part two - options)

The Māori Research (Part two - options) consultation paper presents six options for consideration by the sector. Please note that these options are not mutually exclusive. Selecting one option does not necessarily rule out any of the others. If you wish, you may endorse all, some or none of the below options. If you see any problems with any of these options please indicate what they are and how you think they could be overcome:

Option A: Introduce a Strategic Weighting of 4.0 to all RDCs written entirely in te reo Māori.

If you would like to comment on this option please do so below:

Option B: Raise the weighting of the MKD panel to 2.0.

If you would like to comment on this option please do so below:

Option C: Consider appointing an appropriate number of Māori panel members to panels that may be likely to be evaluating significant numbers of Evidence Portfolios from Māori researchers.

If you would like to comment on this option please do so below:

Option D: Ensure that the selection of MKD panellists is not contingent on self-nomination or on prospective panellists having a PhD. Identify individuals recognised nationally for their Māori knowledge and approach these people to be on the MKD panel.

If you would like to comment on this option please do so below:

Option E: Appoint one or two international indigenous researchers to the MKD panel for the 2012 Quality Evaluation.

If you would like to comment on this option please do so below:

Option F: Rewrite the MKD panel-specific guidelines as follows:

- Remove the phrase “and Māori methodology” as a criterion for submission to the MKD panel on the basis that this concept is subject to various possible interpretations and so cannot serve as a clear criterion.
- Ensure that any unique aspects of Māori research are acknowledged.

If you would like to comment on this option please do so below:

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