

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

## Contents

<b>1. Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Aims and principles of the PBRF</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Principles of redesign</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Definition</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 The Adams report	
4.2 Recommendations of the previous sector Reference Group concerning weightings	6
<b>5. Weightings</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1 The three elements of the PBRF	7
5.2 Evidence Portfolio components	9
5.3 Weightings of the Quality Categories	10
5.4 New and emerging researchers	11
5.5 Weightings of subject cost categories	12
5.6 Equity Weightings	15
<b>6. Summary of SRG recommendations and request for feedback</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>16</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.

# Performance-Based Research Fund Sector Reference Group Review: Weightings Consultation Paper

## 1. Purpose

This paper has been prepared by the Sector Reference Group (SRG) as part of the consultation process for the 2012 Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) assessment. The SRG invites feedback from the tertiary education sector on the appropriateness of the different weightings given to the various components of the PBRF scheme. Previous consultation with the sector by the SRG was completed as part of the preparation for the 2006 PBRF Quality Evaluation and responses from the sector indicated that the various weightings were appropriate. The present paper offers a further opportunity to review the weightings.

Of the various components of the PBRF scheme, weightings are applied to:

- (a) Research Outputs, Peer Esteem, and Contributions to the Research Environment in the Evidence Portfolio submitted by staff for Quality Assessment
- (b) the Quality Category (“A”, “B”, “C”, “R”) assigned to Evidence Portfolios submitted by individual staff
- (c) the contribution to funding from Quality Assessment, Research Degree Completions, and External Research Income
- (d) the cost of postgraduate and staff research in the different subject areas (subject cost categories) for the purposes of funding, and
- (e) additionally, the consultation paper on New and Emerging researchers suggested that a weighting could be applied to the Quality Categories of these staff.

Each of these areas is considered in the present paper, and the views of the sector are invited on possible alternative options. Please use the feedback template to submit responses.

## 2. Aims and principles of the PBRF

In carrying out its role, the SRG will be guided by the aims and principles of the PBRF system which 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.

To meet these aims, the prime focus of the PBRF is on rewarding and encouraging excellence. Excellence in this respect is not just about the production of high-quality research articles, books and other forms of research output. It also includes all of the following:

- The production and creation of leading-edge knowledge.
- The application of that knowledge.
- The dissemination of that knowledge to students and the wider community.
- Supporting current and potential researchers (eg. postgraduate students) in the creation, application and dissemination of knowledge.

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 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 the following 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. Definitions

Definitions of some of the terms used in this paper are given below. In some cases these expand on the definitions given in the Glossary of the *PBRF Guidelines 2006*.<sup>1</sup> Note that these definitions are provided for the purpose of better understanding this consultation paper, and that they may alter for 2012.

*Component Scores*: the scores from 0-7 that are assigned to each of the three components of an Evidence Portfolio (EP): Research Output (RO), Peer Esteem (PE) and Contribution to the Research Environment (CRE). These three components are weighted 70 percent, 15 percent, and 15 percent respectively in determining the Quality Score.

*Quality Score* (total weighted score): the sum of the points allocated to each component of the Evidence Portfolio during the first stage of the assessment, multiplied by the weighting for each component.

*Quality Category*: A rating of research excellence assigned to the Evidence Portfolio of a PBRF-eligible staff member following the Quality Evaluation process. There are six Quality Categories: "A", "B", "C", "C(NE)", "R" and "R(NE)". Quality Category "A" signifies researcher excellence at the highest level and Quality Category "R" represents research activity or quality at a level which is insufficient for recognition by the PBRF.

<sup>1</sup> TEC, *PBRF Guidelines 2006*, pp 237-242.

**Average Quality Score (AQS):** This score is calculated for each subject, nominated academic unit (NAU) and each participating TEO. Scores of 5, 3, 1 and 0 are given to Quality Categories of "A", "B", "C" (or "C(NE)"), and "R" (or "R(NE)") respectively. It is calculated using the following four steps:

**Step 1.** Multiply each individual staff member's Quality Category score by that person's FTE.

**Step 2.** Sum the results of Step 1 for the reporting level in question and multiply the sum by 2.

**Step 3.** Calculate the total number of PBRF-eligible FTE staff members in the TEO/peer review panel/subject area/academic unit in question.

**Step 4.** Divide the result of Step 2 by the result of Step 3 to give a score out of 10.

**External Research Income (ERI):** A measure of income for research purposes gained by a TEO from external sources (for more information see *PBRF Guidelines 2006*, p. 193).

**Subject Cost Category:** the weighting given to the cost of research in different subject areas.

## 4.1 The Adams report

The independent strategic review of the PBRF commissioned by the TEC and completed in 2008 by Dr Jonathan Adams included a section on weighting factors.<sup>2</sup>

The general view taken by Adams was that because PBRF aims to increase research quality by rewarding excellence, greater weightings should be given to elements of research performance that reflect quality and excellence. Examples are research outputs in the EP, and the weighting of the "A" quality category. Adams also noted the weightings used for subject cost categories but did not provide suggestions other than pointing to the different weightings used in the UK.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Adams, pp. 23, 72-4.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74.

## 4.2 Recommendations of the previous Sector Reference Group concerning weightings

Prior to the implementation of the 2006 PBRF Quality Evaluation, the previous Sector Reference Group consulted with the sector.<sup>4</sup> This consultation resulted in the *Report of the Sector Reference Group*, published in June 2005. This report contained a set of recommendations to the TEC on the design of the 2006 Quality Evaluation. It included a number of recommendations concerning weightings.

These recommendations were:

*Recommendation Fifty-six:* That the current weightings of the three components (RO = 70 percent; PE = 15 percent; and CRE = 15 percent) be retained.

*Recommendation Eighty-eight:* That quality scores should be calculated using a single denominator based on all PBRF-eligible staff (FTE-weighted).

*Recommendation Eighty-nine:* That the current funding weightings for the Quality Categories not be changed and that they continue to be used in calculating quality scores.

*Recommendation One hundred three:* That the subject weightings applied as part of the RDC measure should not be changed, unless significant changes arise in the Funding Category Review.

*Recommendation One hundred nine:* That the TEC conduct a review of the PBRF cost weightings to ensure that the funding rates fairly reflect the costs of undertaking research in different subject areas.

These will be borne in mind by the current Sector Reference Group in developing recommendations for the 2012 Quality Evaluation.

## 5 Weightings

There are a number of sets of weightings as a part of the PBRF. This paper examines each of them in the following sections:

- 5.1 The three elements of the PBRF.
- 5.2 Evidence Portfolio components.
- 5.3 Weightings of the Quality Categories.
- 5.4 New and Emerging Researchers.
- 5.5 Weightings of Subject Cost Categories.
- 5.6 Equity Weightings.

<sup>4</sup> Note that the previous Sector Reference Group was a different entity from the current Sector Reference Group. The former provided advice on the design of the 2006 PBRF Quality Evaluation, while the latter is providing advice on the design of the 2012 PBRF Quality Evaluation.

## 5.1 The three elements of the PBRF

The *PBRF Guidelines 2006* sets out the three elements in the PBRF:<sup>5</sup>

- 1) Quality Evaluation (QE) - the Assessment of the Research Quality of TEO staff members, based on peer review.
- 2) Postgraduate Research Degree Completion (RDC) measure - the number of postgraduate research-based degrees completed in the TEO.
- 3) External Research Income (ERI) measure - the amount of income for research purposes received by the TEO from external sources.

These elements are differentially weighted in their contribution of funding to TEOs (QE = 60 percent, RDC = 25 percent, ERI = 15 percent).

The Quality Evaluation relies on peer review, while the RDC and ERI measures are quantitative. Given the emphasis of PBRF on research quality, the higher weighting given to Quality Evaluation is appropriate; indeed, this weighting should not be reduced, and could possibly be increased.

In addition, Adams expressed the view that “if the overall PBRF aim is quality then a 25 percent weighting on the RDC quantity measure seems high”.<sup>6</sup> Adams suggests that an equal weighting of 15 percent each for RDC and ERI would be appropriate.

To help the evaluation of these two possibilities, two scenarios were modelled using indicative funding from table 8.3 of the *PBRF Evaluating Research Excellence: The 2006 Assessment* report. In the table below, the first column gives the proportions of indicative funding allocations for all TEOs for 2007, using the current 60/25/15 ratio. The second column shows the proportions when a ratio of 65/20/15 is used and the third column shows the proportions when a ratio of 70/15/15 is used.

**Table 1: Percent of total funding for weights given to Quality Evaluation, RDC, and ERI respectively, of 60/25/15 (2007 indicative), 65/20/15, and 70/15/15**

TEO	For 60/25/15 (2007 Indicative)	For 65/20/15	For 70/15/15
A	30.28 percent	29.96 percent	29.65 percent
B	21.02 percent	21.31 percent	21.61 percent
C	14.99 percent	14.85 percent	14.72 percent
D	10.15 percent	10.06 percent	9.98 percent
E	8.96 percent	9.01 percent	9.06 percent
F	6.43 percent	6.39 percent	6.36 percent
G	3.30 percent	3.35 percent	3.41 percent
H	2.31 percent	2.36 percent	2.40 percent
All others	2.56 percent	2.69 percent	2.82 percent

<sup>5</sup> TEC, *PBRF Guidelines 2006*, page 15.

<sup>6</sup> Adams, page 72.

The small size of the changes does not provide a strong justification for changing the weighting from the current ratio of 60/25/15. If the ratio were to be changed, the rationale for the change would be that suggested by Adams, namely that the funding formula should place greater emphasis on quality. Given the aims of PBRF, the SRG supports measures that will give appropriate focus to research quality, but the small size of changes to funding seem insufficient to justify a change to the ratio for the funding formula. In addition, an important purpose of the PBRF is to provide funding for the teaching, supervision and training of postgraduate research students, and reducing the weighting for RDC could work against this. Because of the objectives of the PBRF, the SRG does not see any compelling reason to alter the status quo.

The rationale for retaining the status quo is that this will maintain consistency and the continuity of the PBRF process. Retaining a relatively high weighting for the Quality Evaluation component will incentivise behaviour that is considered important.

### **SRG Recommendation**

*The SRG invites comment from the sector on the following recommendation:* That no change be made to the funding ratio for Quality Evaluation, Research Degree Completion and External Research Income from the current ratio of 60/25/15.

## **5.2 Evidence Portfolio Components**

The Evidence Portfolio (EP) has three elements. Currently these elements, and the weightings attached to each, are as follows:

- Nominated Research Outputs/Research Outputs (NRO/ROs), weighted at 70 percent.
- Peer Esteem (PE), weighted at 15 percent.
- Contribution to the Research Environment (CRE), weighted at 15 percent.

The high weighting for the NRO/ROs appropriately reflects the emphasis on research quality assessed by PBRF. The Adams report suggests that this strong emphasis on quality should not be reduced. Placing too great a weight on NRO/ROs, however, may result in too much inward focus by researchers at the expense of engagement with the wider academic community.

PE provides an overall estimate of the impact of an individual's research.

CRE recognises the importance of the broader contribution made by effective researchers.

The previous SRG consultation concluded that the weighting of EP components seemed satisfactory and recommended that no change be made. Adams stated: "I received no strong views that the current weightings in the EP are seen as problematic."<sup>7</sup> There seems to be no strong case for change, and retention of the current component weighting allows for comparison of individual quality scores across time.

### **SRG Recommendation**

*The SRG invites comment from the sector on the following recommendation:* That no change be made to the weightings of the three components of the Evidence Portfolio.

<sup>7</sup> Adams, p. 72.

### 5.3 Weightings of the Quality Categories

Currently these are:

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

These weightings are used to determine funding and also to generate an overall Average Quality Score (AQS) for each TEO. The reputational impact of the AQS should not be underestimated. As noted in the Adams report, however, there is considerable confusion between AQS for subjects versus AQS for Nominated Academic Units.<sup>8</sup> The Sector Reference Group Consultation Paper on Reporting of Results contains further discussion of this.

Adams suggests that because PBRF emphasises excellence, the gain between “B” and “A” could be increased. He suggests that by using a 6/3/1 ratio instead of the current 5/3/1 ratio, the gain from “A” to “B” would be doubled.<sup>9</sup>

Modelling of results for eight universities, however, suggests that the ranking of AQS across TEOs would not change with a 6/3/1 ratio. The funding attributable to Quality Evaluation, as a percent of total funding for the eight universities, showed no appreciable change as a result of changing the weighting of “A” from 5 to 6. (This modelling took into account the current subject cost-category weightings.) The table below shows that funding would slightly increase for three universities and slightly decrease for five.

**Table 2: Funding attributable to Quality evaluation as a percent of the total for eight universities**

University	Ratio: 5/3/1 weights	Ratio: 6/3/1 weights
A	27.96 percent	28.30 percent
B	23.32 percent	23.38 percent
C	14.96 percent	14.79 percent
D	10.83 percent	10.88 percent
E	10.27 percent	10.20 percent
F	6.64 percent	6.57 percent
G	3.19 percent	3.15 percent
H	2.84 percent	2.73 percent

<sup>8</sup> Adams, p. 74.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 73.

It seems that the only advantage of changing to a 6/3/1 ratio is that it could encourage TEOs to place greater investment in the development of staff who might achieve an "A" quality score. This advantage, however, may be offset if TEOs do not also invest in the development of staff likely to be in the other categories as well. This would be especially problematic if it were to adversely affect new and emerging researchers. An additional disadvantage of increasing the weighting for an "A" is that comparison of research quality across time would not be possible.

#### SRG Recommendation

*The SRG invites comment from the sector on the following recommendation:* That no change be made to the weightings for the Quality Categories (other than possibly C(NE), see section 5.4 below).

## 5.4 New and Emerging Researchers

New and Emerging ("NE") researchers are staff who were appointed to their first PBRF-eligible position at any institution during the 6-year assessment period. They are declared as such in the Census, but only those who achieve an "R" or "C" Quality Category are reported as "NE". Table 3 shows that in 2006 many "NE" staff actually achieved a Quality Category of "B" and occasionally "A" under the same assessment criteria as other non-"NE" staff.

**Table 3: Final Quality Categories achieved by "NE" researchers in the 2006 Quality Evaluation**

Final Quality Category	Number of "NE" staff	Percentage
A	6	0.31 percent
B	115	5.97 percent
C <sup>10</sup>	37	1.92 percent
C(NE)	826	42.86 percent
R(NE)	943	48.94 percent
Total	1927	100 percent

The "C(NE)" and "R(NE)" Quality Categories were introduced to minimise the disadvantage faced by early career staff in having insufficient opportunity to build up a record of PE and CRE. Evidence of PE or CRE were not required in an Evidence Portfolio in order for an "NE" researcher be assigned a "C(NE)" Quality Category. The "C(NE)" Quality Category was weighted 1 (the same weighting as the "C" Quality Category), for the purposes of funding and the calculation of the Average Quality Score.

In his report, Adams echoed the continuing concern of the sector that the PBRF system tends to discourage the development of early career staff.<sup>11</sup> This issue has been covered fully in the present Sector Reference Group's consultation paper on New and Emerging Researchers.<sup>12</sup> In that paper, it was suggested that additional encouragement to TEOs to support their early-career staff would be provided by an increased weighting for the "C(NE)" Quality Category.<sup>13</sup> Separate weightings for "A"

<sup>10</sup> Some staff received a "C" Quality category in the 2003 Quality Evaluation (before there was a "C(NE)" Quality Category) and then did not participate in the partial 2006 Quality Evaluation, although their date of appointment meant they were classified as "NE" researchers in 2006.  
<sup>11</sup> Adams, page 52.

<sup>12</sup> This consultation paper was available to the sector for comment between 14 November 2008 and 30 January 2009.

<sup>13</sup> "One of the aims of the PBRF is to provide support for new researchers and help develop capacity in the research sector. Providing a higher weighting for those new and emerging researchers awarded funded quality category would enhance their value to their TEO and encourage TEOs to support new researchers. It would allow new researchers to feel appreciated and provide an incentive for them to focus on their research and complete an EP fully." SRG consultation paper: New and Emerging researchers, page 12.

or "B" achieved by staff identified as "NE" in the Census were unnecessary because their PE and CRE were sufficient to achieve those categories.

As the important issue here is the level of support provided by TEOs for their "NE" staff, an increased weighting for "C(NE)" is likely to encourage support for all "NE" staff, independently of the Quality Category each of them achieves. At present, "NE" staff are advantaged in the assessment process by not having their PE and CRE taken into account in the assessment process. The question raised here is whether the weighting for the Quality Category of "C(NE)" should be raised to 1.5 or higher.

### SRG Request

The SRG invites comment from the sector on whether the Quality Category of "C(NE)" should be weighted higher (such as 1.5, 2.0 or even 3.0), alongside the weightings of 5.0, 3.0, and 1.0 respectively for Quality Categories "A", "B", and "C".

## 5.5 Weightings of subject cost categories

Currently these are:

Subject Areas	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.	1
Psychology; chemistry; physics; earth sciences; molecular, cellular and whole organism biology; ecology, evolution and behaviour; 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.	2
Engineering and technology; agriculture and other applied biological sciences; architecture, design, planning, surveying; biomedical; clinical medicine; pharmacy; public health; veterinary studies and large animal science; and dentistry.	2.5

These cost categories are historical. Given the purpose of PBRF, the intention is that they should reflect the relative cost of research in these subject areas at both postgraduate and staff level. For funding purposes, both the weighted Quality Scores for staff and the Research Degree Completions are multiplied by the weighting given to the subject cost category. The effect on funding of having no differential weighting is described in the Ministry of Education factsheet titled "How the PBRF has shifted research funding" (February 2008).<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Obtainable at the following link: [http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/tertiary\\_education/18792](http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/tertiary_education/18792)

In 2002 the PBRF Working Group advised that the different cost categories should “reflect the differences in the cost of undertaking research that occur between subject areas,” and that “little robust information is currently available on these costs”. The PBRF Working Group decided that “the best available proxies in New Zealand would appear to be the differentials between the top-ups added to EFTS for research-based postgraduate degrees.”<sup>15</sup> The PBRF Working Group recommended that: “Where appropriate, the findings of the Funding Category Review inform the further development of the PBRF funding formula, and that further work be done to determine the relative costs of undertaking research in New Zealand”.<sup>16</sup>

The Funding Category Review, released in May 2005, was jointly undertaken by the TEC and the Ministry of Education. It did not address the issue of the relative costs of undertaking research as this was considered to be outside of the terms of reference of a limited review of funding categories.

In June 2005 the previous Sector Reference Group recommended, “That the TEC conduct a review of the PBRF cost weightings to ensure that the funding rates fairly reflect the costs of undertaking research in different subject areas.”<sup>17</sup> In its response to this recommendation the TEC noted that it was appropriate that this issue be considered by the Adams Report.

Adams observes that the subject cost weightings are derived from information concerning the costs of teaching these subjects rather than the costs of conducting research in these subjects.<sup>18</sup> He advises that these weightings should be revisited to determine whether they remain appropriate.

The following considerations may be relevant to this issue. From the 2006 PBRF Quality Assessment, across eight universities, the percentage of all staff in cost categories 1, 2, and 2.5 respectively were 44 percent, 33 percent, and 23 percent. These were distributed across “A”, “B”, and “C” Quality Categories as follows (as a percent of staff in each cost category):

**Table 4: Distribution of Quality Categories across subject cost categories across 8 universities**

Cost category	Quality category A	Quality category B	Quality category C
1	10.4 percent	40.0 percent	49.6 percent
2	12.5 percent	39.2 percent	48.4 percent
2.5	13.5 percent	40.2 percent	46.3 percent

Because the distributions of Quality Categories are generally similar across cost categories, alterations to the cost category weightings are unlikely to have a large effect.

<sup>15</sup> Investing in Excellence: The report of the PBRF Working Group, p. 27 (sections 141-2).

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 44 (recommendation yy).

<sup>17</sup> Report of the Sector Reference Group, p. 29 (recommendation one hundred nine).

<sup>18</sup> Adams, pp. 23, 74.

Several scenarios were modelled using eight universities and their distribution of “A”, “B”, and “C” staff in the different sets of cost categories. Table 5 below shows the funding for each university attributable to Quality Evaluation as a percentage of the total funding for all eight universities. The scenarios are as follows:

- (a) The status quo sets the cost category weightings at 1, 2, and 2.5.
- (b) Using the UK weightings of 1, 1.3, and 1.7, three universities lose a small proportion of the total funding for Quality Evaluation, and five make a small gain.<sup>19</sup>
- (c) Recognising that postgraduate research in the 2.5 cost category is much more expensive to support, and using weightings of 1, 2, and 5, four of the eight universities lose funding and four gain funding.
- (d) Recognising that postgraduate research in both 2 and 2.5 cost categories is more expensive to support, and using weightings of 1, 2.5, and 5, four of the eight universities lose funding and four gain funding.

**Table 5: Funding as a percentage of the total funding attributable to Quality Evaluation for eight universities for different sets of subject cost-category weightings.**

University	Scenario (a)	Scenario (b)	Scenario (c)	Scenario (d)
A	27.96 percent	27.77 percent	29.54 percent	29.17 percent
B	23.32 percent	22.34 percent	24.68 percent	24.66 percent
C	14.96 percent	14.93 percent	15.21 percent	15.15 percent
D	10.83 percent	10.90 percent	10.35 percent	10.46 percent
E	10.27 percent	10.85 percent	8.72 percent	8.94 percent
F	6.64 percent	7.23 percent	5.19 percent	5.37 percent
G	3.19 percent	3.07 percent	3.79 percent	3.67 percent
H	2.84 percent	2.92 percent	2.52 percent	2.58 percent

In the absence of evidence about the actual costs of postgraduate and staff research in different subjects, including infrastructural costs, and the relatively small changes made by the different alternative sets of weightings, there appears to be no strong case to move away from the historical cost category weightings.

### SRG Recommendation

*The SRG invites comment from the sector on the following recommendation:* That no change be made to the weightings of Subject Cost Categories.

Note: Recommendations on the weighting of the Māori knowledge and development subject cost category have been made in the Māori Research consultation paper.

<sup>19</sup> These weightings are noted by Adams as being specifically based on costs of research rather than costs of teaching (p. 74).

## 5.6 Equity weightings

Research Degree Completions by Māori and Pacific graduates result in a double weighting for funding purposes. In the interests of encouraging TEOs to foster the development of Māori and Pacific postgraduate research students, the double weighting has merit.

Recommendations on Māori and Pacific RDC equity weightings have been made in the Māori Research consultation paper and the Pacific Research consultation paper.

## 6. Summary of SRG recommendations and requests for feedback

The SRG invites feedback on the following requests and recommendations:

### Requests:

- I. The SRG invites comment from the sector on whether the Quality Category of "C(NE)" should be weighted higher (such as 1.5, 2.0 or even 3.0), alongside the weightings of 5.0, 3.0, and 1.0 respectively for Quality categories "A", "B", and "C".

### Recommendations:

- I. That no change be made to the funding ratio for Quality Evaluation, Research Degree Completion and External Research Income from the current ratio of 60/25/15.
- II. That no change be made to the weightings of the three components of the Evidence Portfolio.
- III. That no change be made to the weightings for the Quality Categories (other than possibly "C(NE)", see Request I above).
- IV. That no change be made to the weightings of Subject Cost Categories.

## Bibliography

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

Ministry of Education, *How the PBRF has shifted research funding*, factsheet, February 2008.

Ministry of Education and Tertiary Education Commission, *Funding Category Review*, Wellington, May 2005.

Ministry of Education and Transition Tertiary Education Commission, *Investing in Excellence: The Report of the PBRF Working Group*, Wellington, December 2002.

Tertiary Education Commission, *Report of the Sector Reference Group*, Wellington, June 2005.

Tertiary Education Commission, *PBRF Guidelines 2006*, Wellington, July 2005.

Tertiary Education Commission, *Response of the Steering Group to the Report of the Sector Reference Group*, Wellington, June 2005.

Tertiary Education Commission, *PBRF Evaluating Research Excellence: The 2006 Assessment*, Wellington, 2007.

## Performance-Based Research Fund

### Feedback template for Weightings 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 Sector Reference Group Weightings 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.

## **Time frame for feedback**

Completed templates and any other comments should be emailed to **PBRF.2012Rdesign@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, 16 October 2009.

## 2. Questions - Weightings

Request for feedback:

The SRG invites comment from the sector on whether the Quality Category of C(NE) should be weighted higher (such as 1.5, 2.0 or even 3.0), alongside the weightings of 5.0, 3.0, and 1.0 respectively for Quality categories "A", "B", and "C".

Please comment on the following SRG recommendation:

- I. That no change be made to the funding ratio for Quality Evaluation, Research Degree Completion and External Research Income from the current ratio of 60/25/15.

Please comment on the following SRG recommendation:

- II. That no change be made to the weightings of the three components of the Evidence Portfolio.

Please comment on the following SRG recommendation:

- III. That no change be made to the weightings for the Quality Categories (other than possibly C(NE), see Request for feedback above).

Please comment on the following SRG recommendation:

IV. That no change be made to the weightings of Subject Cost Categories.

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

