![Tertiary Education Commission — Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua]

PBRF Sector Reference Group – Consultation paper 3

Redesigning Evidence Portfolios

Name	Status	Distribution
PBRF Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper 3 Evidence Portfolio Design	CONSULTATION PAPER	Public Direct feedback to: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/KYWGXYR Feedback due 5pm, 18 April 2022

Purpose

1   This paper sets out options developed by the PBRF Sector Reference Group (SRG) for changes to design of the Evidence Portfolios (EP) submitted by eligible staff in the Quality Evaluation and invites feedback from the tertiary education sector and other stakeholders. Specifically, it:

›   Sets out background information including the PBRF Review Panel's recommendations and Cabinet's decisions in relation to the design of EPs;

›   Provides the rationale for the proposed changes based on feedback from previous Quality Evaluation participants, PBRF Review Panel findings, and TEC officials' analysis;

›   Sets out options for achieving Cabinet's directions to the TEC to make changes to EPs that place greater weight on research quality and reflect a more capacious understanding of research excellence that includes collaboration, engagement and impact;

›   Identifies where further work will be required to develop detailed design and technical changes once options are selected and explains the process for that work including opportunities for sector feedback;

›   Sets out the process and timeframe for aligning in principle decisions on changes to EPs with decisions on research definitions; and

›   Invites feedback on the options set out in this paper.

2   Following Cabinet instructions, the SRG has considered and developed options in relation to two core components of the EP: the Research Output component, and the Research Contribution component. These options are presented in this paper as follows: for each component, the current settings are presented, followed by information and analysis on which the SRG drew in reaching decisions on the options. This is then followed by options for new settings along with any matters to consider.

3   Options for changes to the 2018 Extraordinary Circumstances rules will be proposed in the Individual Circumstances consultation paper, which is due for publication in early May 2022. There are a number of dependencies that flow directly from particular options in this paper, which will be highlighted.

Background

PBRF review recommendations and Cabinet decisions

4   Following the PBRF Quality Evaluation 2018, the Ministry of Education (MoE) set up an independent PBRF review panel. The review panel drew on sector feedback, PBRF data, expert analysis, and insight from TEC, Ministry of Business Innovation and Enterprise and MoE officials in developing its recommendations. The review recommendations informed Cabinet's decisions on changes to the PBRF, released in May 2021.

5   The review recommended that, in addition to a new PBRF definition of research, changes should be made to the design of EPs including replacing the existing Research Output component with a new 'Examples of Research Excellence' section, and focussing the Research Contributions section on activities that sustain and develop the research environment. These changes were intended to place more weight on excellence over volume, and to shift from a narrow focus on research outputs to a more capacious definition of research excellence that also includes collaboration, impact, and engagement.

6   In July 2021, Cabinet released its decisions on changes to the PBRF, including instructing the TEC, in consultation with the sector led by the SRG, to make the following changes to the design of EPs:

   a.   Replace the current Nominated Research Output section with a new Examples of Excellence (ERE) section. Each ERE will comprise outputs or activities and an accompanying narrative to contextualise and explain. Cabinet did not set upper or lower limits on the number of outputs or activities each ERE should contain. Cabinet decided that a maximum of four EREs will be permitted per EP, and that a minimum number of EREs will also apply.

   b.   Replace the current Other Research Output section with a new Other Examples of Research Excellence (OERE) section, to address the same issues as the new ERE section, and to complement that section.

   c.   Review the Research Contribution section with a view to complementing the new ERE and OERE sections.[1]

These changes are intended to complement the new PBRF definition of research.[2]

7   Changes to the design of EPs should also give effect to the new PBRF Guiding Principles agreed by Cabinet:

   a.   Partnership: the PBRF should reflect the bicultural nature of Aotearoa New Zealand and the special role and status of the Treaty of Waitangi / Te Tiriti o Waitangi;

   b.   Equity: different approaches and resources are needed to ensure that the measurement of research excellence leads to equitable outcomes; and

   c.   Inclusiveness: the PBRF should encourage and recognise the full diversity of epistemologies, knowledges, and methodologies to reflect Aotearoa New Zealand's people.[3]

---

[1] Ministry of Education, 2021. *Education Report: Final recommendations on the PBRF Review*. Wellington, New Zealand Government, para 57.

[2] Cabinet Minute of Decision: Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund: Final Report (CAB-21-MIN-0175), p. 2.

[3] CAB-21-MIN-075, p. 2.

Sector Reference Group and consultation process

EP Redesign

8   The options developed by the SRG and set out in this consultation paper are high-level approaches to changing the design of EPs. Once the group has considered feedback and in principle agreement has been reached, TEC officials will ensure the decisions made are fed into the detailed changes made to guidance on the submission of EPs, including the technical schema and template.

9   The sector will have the opportunity to give feedback on changes to the EP schema as part of the Technical Matters paper, and to review the submission guidance for EPs as part of the Draft Guidelines review process in the first quarter of 2023.

10   The SRG will also consult as required on other substantive issues which flow from high-level in principle decisions on the design of EPs, including reviewing the relative weighting of the two EP components in the assessment. The Technical Matters section (paragraphs 76-86) in this paper sets out relevant issues identified through the development of these options, including component weightings. These are for noting only at this stage.

Research definitions

11   In order to give the sector additional time to provide feedback on the research definitions, and to allow the TEC/SRG to carry out targeted stakeholder consultation on detailed wording and approaches, the SRG agreed to an extended timeframe for consultation. In principle decisions on changes to the design of EPs will therefore be published in mid-2022 alongside research definitions approaches and wording. This will also ensure that the decisions on both sets of issues are aligned.

12   In developing options for changes to the design of EPs, the SRG considered whether they:

  a.   Deliver Cabinet's instructions;

  b.   Address the concerns and aspirations identified in the *Report of the PBRF Review Panel* and the *Report of the Moderation and Peer Review Panels*;

  c.   Deliver fair and equitable outcomes for all participating TEOs and their staff;

  d.   Uphold the unique nature of research produced in Aotearoa New Zealand and reflect what is distinctive about our national research environment;

  e.   Are consistent with the PBRF Guiding Principles, including the three new Principles of partnership, equity, and inclusiveness; and

  f.   Are able to be implemented and audited (legally and practically).

13   In developing the options the SRG also took into consideration the impact of any changes on submitting staff, TEOs, and assessors, with the aim of not increasing administrative or assessment burden unless this creates clear benefits.

Redesigning Evidence Portfolios

14   The purpose of the EP is to enable peer review panels to fairly assess the quality of submitting TEO staff members' research and research-related activity during the assessment period. To support this, the EP comprises a combination of research outputs which are submitted for assessment, metadata and information about research outputs and activities, narrative statements, and information about submitting staff including extraordinary circumstances declarations.

15   The EP design settings for the PBRF Quality Evaluation 2018 are set out in the Guidelines, which can be found on the [TEC website](). The EP template is attached as Appendix 1. The EP had two main components:

   a. The Research Output (RO) component, which had to include at least one and up to four Nominated Research Outputs (NROs) and up to 12 Other Research Outputs (OROs). For 2025, Cabinet has directed the TEC to replace these with Examples of Research Excellence (EREs) and Other Examples of Research Excellence (OEREs), and has decided that this component will be renamed the Examples of Research Excellence component.

   b. The Research Contribution (RC) component, which could include up to 15 items of peer esteem, contribution to the research environment within or outside academia, and community or end-user impact. For 2025, Cabinet has directed the TEC to review this section to ensure it complements the new ERE and OERE sections.

16   In the 2018 Quality Evaluation, the RO component had a 70 percent weighting against the total EP score, and the RC component had a 30 percent weighting. These weightings will be revisited once decisions on EP design are reached (see Technical Matters section).

17   The third main component of the EP was the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary. Although it was not scored, it was an important element that aided peer reviewers and the panel in understanding the evidence presented in the NRO and RC components, and also supported the panel to make judgements where EPs required holistic assessment. The Platform of Research was a narrative statement of up to 2,500 characters which enabled submitting staff members to present the peer review panel with context for outputs submitted to the NRO and ORO components. It was intended to answer the questions: who is the researcher, what are they doing, and what is their research. It could also include as relevant statements about the nature of the specific research environment they operate in, employment status, and any changes to their research focus in the assessment period.

18   Cabinet's instructions do not require redesign of the Platform of Research - Contextual Summary. Because the Platform of Research is an open narrative, the TEC and SRG do not consider that significant design changes are required to this component. However, In Principle decisions on changes to the Research Output and Research Contributions

components – and on any other related matters, such as the definitions of research and research excellence – will be reflected in guidance on the information to be included in the Platform of Research in the final Guidelines.

19   The TEC and SRG do not consider it necessary to consult on technical changes to the EP Details, Research Details, Panel Details, or Extraordinary Circumstances EP sections as part of this paper. The EP template will be updated for the final Guidelines to reflect any agreed changes to the Extraordinary Circumstances settings, which will be consulted on as part of the Individual Circumstances paper. The sector will have the opportunity to review all changes when the Draft Guidelines are published in April 2023.

Designing the Examples of Research Excellence component

20   This section provides context, and sets out options, for designing the Examples of Research Excellence component of the EP (previously the Research Outputs component). The following section provides context and sets out options for changes to the Research Contributions component.

Research Output component settings in the Quality Evaluation 2018

21   In the Guidelines for Quality Evaluation 2018, the RO component was intended to enable assessment of research quality by directly reviewing a submitting staff member's research outputs. Each EP had to contain at least one NRO, and could contain up to four. EPs could also contain up to 12 OROs, if four NROs were submitted.

22   The NRO comprised the output itself, the output metadata providing publication or dissemination details, and short statements describing the submitting staff member's contribution to the output and the output itself (see Appendix 1 p.6).

23   NROs were nominated by submitting staff members as their best outputs. Research outputs submitted as NROs had to meet the eligibility criteria including: meeting the PBRF Definition of Research, being first made publically available within the assessment period, being capable of submission for assessment by a peer review panel, and being auditable.

24   OROs could be submitted if four NROs had been nominated. They were not assessed, and only the ORO metadata was submitted. Research outputs submitted as OROs had to meet similar eligibility criteria to NROs including: meeting the PBRF Definition of Research, being first made publically available within the assessment period, and being auditable.

25   Full details of NRO and ORO eligibility criteria can be found in the 2018 Guidelines, pp. 41-80.

26   The definition of 'research output' in the Quality Evaluation 2018 was broad and included but was not limited to:

a. Published academic and non-academic work, for example books, novels, reports, journal articles, conference proceedings, and Master's or doctoral theses;

b. Work presented in non-print media, for example paintings, carvings, weaving, websites, video, and audio recordings;

c. Other types of outputs, for example intellectual property, products, performances, materials, designs, and exhibitions.

Each research output had to be classified under one of 15 research output types (see 2018 Guidelines, p. 46).

27 All research outputs were considered on merit, with no one specific type of output weighted higher than another.

Issues to be addressed through changes to the Examples of Research Excellence component

Supporting a broader PBRF Definition of Research

28 Cabinet's decision to replace NROs and OROs with EREs and OEREs is intended to support the broadened PBRF definition of research. PBRF Sector Reference Group Consultation Paper 2, *Towards a more holistic understanding of research excellence: PBRF research and research excellence definitions*, sets out the rationale for changes to the PBRF Definition of Research.

29 Part of the intent of Cabinet's changes to the definition of research and the design of EPs, following the recommendations of the PBRF Review Panel, is to 'provide more space for consideration of collaboration, engagement, and impact, without the need for new assessment methods or metrics'. Cabinet's specific directions are that while the changes are 'not intended to remove the focus on research outputs', the new ERE component should be 'more inclusive of early and mid-career researchers, and a wide range of research activities and cultures' and should 'ensure that in the assessment of outputs, there is capacity to consider research production and engagement, and resulting impacts'. Cabinet has indicated that a narrative element should be included in each ERE to support this aim.[4] This is separate to the Platform of Research - Contextual Summary, which addresses the EP as a whole.

30 The options for the design of an ERE component to replace the Research Outputs component are intended to deliver on these aims, and in particular to ensure greater recognition of impact as an important element of quality research. The options are intended to strike a balance between recognising a broader range of research activity and ensuring the guidance is clear, administrative burden is minimised, and EPs are capable of fair assessment.

31 Based on Cabinet's instructions to broaden the PBRF definition of research and on the options subsequently put forward to the sector, there is certainty that the new definition will either implicitly or explicitly include a broader range of research

---

[4] *Final recommendations on the PBRF Review*, para 57.

activities. This will include Māori knowledges, Pacific knowledges, and practice-based, applied, and community research. The options proposed in this paper support this broadened research definition approach.

Clarifying the minimum and maximum number of Examples of Research Excellence and Other Examples of Research Excellence

32 The current settings require a minimum of one and up to four NROs to be nominated within an EP and, if four NROs are nominated, a maximum of 12 OROs can then be included. Cabinet has decided to retain the maximum of four EREs, and did not consider changes to the number of OEREs per EP.[5]

33 The 2018 Quality Evaluation guidance states:

> *Staff members will not be penalised for including fewer than four NROs, provided there is at least one NRO in the EP. The reason for having fewer than four NROs can be explained in the extraordinary circumstances section (if it meets the criteria for extraordinary circumstances) or the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary section of the EP.*[6]

This created some potential ambiguity. The guidelines stated that no penalties would apply to EPs with fewer than four NROs. However, because explanations for having fewer than four are invited, it could be inferred that EPs with fewer than four NROs would be expected to score lower in the absence of mitigating reasons being provided. In this respect, the guidance was therefore unclear about whether the number of NROs in an EP would be a factor in EP assessment outcomes.

34 The Government's intention has always been that the PBRF Quality Evaluation assesses individuals' research quality, not quantity. However, analysis of 2018 results provides some evidence that, regardless of the existence of a minimum requirement in the PBRF Guidelines of one NRO, the sector generally regards four NROs as a target.

35 Table 1 below shows that, in 2018, 98.7% of EPs contained four NROs (8,165 EPs). Of the 104 EPs with fewer than four NROs, none were awarded A or B Quality Categories, 45 were awarded a C(NE), and 14 were awarded a C. The remainder received R or R (NE) Quality Categories.

36 In total, only 56.7% (59 out of 104) of EPs with fewer than four NROs were awarded funded Quality Categories, as compared 94.9% of EPs with four NROs (7,850 out of 8,165). An EP with fewer than four NROs, in other words, was around 40% less likely to be awarded a funded Quality Category than an EP with four NROs.

---

[5] *Final recommendations on the PBRF Review*, para 57.

[6] *Performance-Based Research Fund Guidelines for tertiary education organisations participating in the 2018 Quality Evaluation*, p. 42

Table 1: 2018 Quality Evaluation NROs – number of EPs

	A Quality Category	B Quality Category	Total funded Quality Categories	Total unfunded Quality Categories	Total EPs submitted
4 NROs, no Exceptional Circumstances	1,179	2,995	7,514	306	7,820
4 NROs and EC declared	51	153	336	9	345
Total 4 NROs	**1,229**	**3,148**	**7,850**	**315**	**8,165**
Fewer than 4 NROs, no ECs	0	0	57	42	99
Fewer than 4 NROs and EC declared	0	0	2	3	5
Total fewer than 4 NROs	**0**	**0**	**59**	**45**	**104**
Total QCs awarded	**1,229**	**3,148**	**7,909**	**360**	**8,269**

37   While there will be a range of reasons why EPs with fewer than four NROs scored lower on the whole, there is a clear correlation between the number of NROs and the scores awarded. The SRG considers that it would be beneficial to take this opportunity to resolve any ambiguity around both the number of NROs that should be submitted and how EPs with fewer than 4 NROs will be assessed. Setting a required number of EREs, rather than specifying a minimum and maximum, would reflect what the sector appears to be doing already.

38   There is also evidence to suggest that ambiguity about the minimum and maximum number of NROs needed in an EP contributes to apparent confusion about the purpose and function of Extraordinary Circumstances declarations. The intent of the EC provision was to enable staff to explain personal circumstances (e.g. parental leave) which had impacted on the **quantity** of research produced in the assessment period, but not the **quality**. The guidance states that:

> *Extraordinary circumstances will be considered by the peer review panel only in relation to the quantity of research outputs and other aspects of research activity produced during the assessment period. Extraordinary circumstances are not relevant to the assessment of the quality of research outputs and activities.* [7]

However, providing the option to make an Extraordinary Circumstances declaration does not clearly align with the statement that penalties would not apply to EPs with

---

fewer than four NROs in ordinary circumstances. The submission data reflects this ambiguity. In 2018, 345 of the 350 EPs with Extraordinary Circumstances declarations contained four NROs (98.6%). This suggests that submitting staff members or TEOs may not have understood that the main purpose of the EC declarations was to explain reductions in the quantity of research outputs and activities.

In conjunction with consulting on the required number of EREs in this paper, the SRG will consider how to clarify the purpose of the Extraordinary Circumstances declarations as part of the Individual Circumstances paper to ensure any ambiguity is removed. Note that for simplicity this paper refers to Extraordinary Circumstances when discussing options for addressing the issues traversed above, but this does not signify that the SRG has reached any decisions in advance on matters to be considered in the Individual Circumstances paper, including potentially renaming Extraordinary Circumstances.

39 Cabinet's decisions to replace the NRO and ORO sections with new ERE and OERE sections, and to retain the maximum of four EREs per EP, must be implemented. The direction to include a narrative element in the ERE settings and to determine a minimum number of EREs per EP must also be given effect to.

40 Beyond these specific instructions, Cabinet's decisions provide a broad scope to determine how the current Research Output component should be revised to achieve the aims of supporting the new PBRF Definition of Research and better recognising and rewarding research impact and engagement and a more diverse range of research activity.

41 Presented below are the individual issues for the design of EPs arising from Cabinet's decisions, and options the SRG has developed for implementing the required changes.

Issue 1: What comprises an Example of Research Excellence?

Note: These options are summarised in Table 2 below, for ease of comparison.

42 **Option 1:** An ERE comprises a single research output which aligns with one of the eligible output types and which is submitted for assessment. In addition, an ERE includes a narrative, with a fixed word limit, which sets out the nature of the research and the issues it addresses, how the findings have been disseminated, implemented, shared or commercialised, how stakeholders or beneficiaries have been engaged and/or have contributed to the research, and the impact of the research (whether within or outside academia).

Under this option, the list of eligible output types is reviewed and broadened as necessary to reflect the new PBRF Definition of Research.

43 **Option 2:** The ERE comprises a single core research output which aligns with one of the eligible output types and which is submitted for assessment. The list of eligible output types is broadened to reflect the new PBRF Definition of Research. In addition, an ERE may include a list of up to four supplementary research outputs and/or activities.

Two sub-options flow from Option 2 as follows:

Sub-option 2.a: The ERE may include a list of up to four supplementary research activities. The activities are not submitted for assessment, but metadata must be provided to enable audit.

A list of eligible research activities specific to the ERE is developed which reflects the new PBRF Definition of Research. Eligible research activities for the ERE component will focus on research recognition, funding, dissemination, collaboration, engagement and impact.

The ERE also includes a narrative with a fixed word limit which, in addition to the purpose described under Option 1, explains the relationship between the core research output and the additional research activities.

Sub-option 2.b: The ERE may include a list of up to four supplementary research activities OR outputs. The activities and/or outputs are not submitted for assessment, but metadata must be provided to enable audit. Otherwise, as for sub-option 2.a.

44 **Option 3:** The ERE and the OERE sections are combined into a single ERE component (see also Issue 4, Option 3, paragraph 56 below). The ERE comprises a single core research output which must align with one of the eligible output types and which is submitted for assessment. In addition, the ERE may include a list of up to five supplementary research outputs and/or activities. The ERE also includes a narrative with a fixed word limit which, in addition to the purpose described under Option 1, explains the relationship between the core research output and the additional research activities.

The same sub-options as for Option 2 flow from this option in terms of whether eligible supplementary items should be activities only, or activities and outputs, as set out in the table below.

Table 2: Comparison of options for ERE definition

Element	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Core research output submitted for assessment and audit	Yes	Yes	Yes
Supplementary ERE items submitted for audit only	No	**Option 2.a** Up to 4 research activities	**Option 3.a** Up to 5 research activities
		Option 2.b Up to 4 research activities OR outputs	**Option 3.b** Up to 5 research activities OR outputs
Narrative element	Yes	Yes and must link core and supplementary activities/outputs	Yes and must link core and supplementary activities/outputs
Eligible items	List of eligible research outputs revised to reflect new PBRF Definition of Research.	List of eligible research outputs revised to reflect new PBRF Definition of Research. List of eligible research activities developed which	List of eligible research outputs revised to reflect new PBRF Definition of Research. List of eligible research activities developed which

		includes activities related to impact, engagement, collaboration, dissemination, and peer esteem.	includes activities related to impact, engagement, collaboration, dissemination, and peer esteem.
Relationship to OERE section	OERE section allows submission of additional activities/outputs	OERE section allows submission of additional activities/outputs	No standalone OERE section

45 Of the options presented above, Option 1 addresses Cabinet's instructions via the smallest conceptual and operational change. It would provide scope to describe excellent dissemination, collaboration, engagement and impact activity and outcomes through the inclusion of the narrative element. It also would not significantly increase the burden on staff, TEOs, or assessors. However, this option retains a narrower focus on assessing a research output and would not enable staff to submit additional research activities or outputs as evidence to support claims in the narrative section. The SRG considers that other options would more fully realise Cabinet's intent.

46 Options 2 and 3 represent more significant change, and the SRG's preference is to pursue either of these options. While retaining the focus on the research output as the central element, these options would enable a more holistic presentation of the ERE, and allow submitting staff to demonstrate excellent dissemination, collaboration, engagement and impact activity and outcomes that flow from the core research output, as well as significant recognition and funding related to the output.

47 In relation to Options 2 and 3, the SRG seeks the sector's views as to whether the supplementary items should be research activities only, or activities and outputs, noting that additional items would be submitted as metadata only, and would not be assessed.

48   Option 2 provides staff and TEOs with greater flexibility to present a portfolio of activity, but would also increase the workload required to develop an EP. Option 3 is intended to mitigate against additional workload by simplifying the overall ERE component design and by reducing the overall upper number of research outputs and activities submitted.

49 Options 2 and 3 would necessitate new panel training material and a review of the assessment criteria. These issues will be addressed by the SRG when it considers the two Panels issues papers.

Issue 2: Minimum number of EREs in an EP

50 **Option 1:** The minimum number of EREs is set at one, and the maximum is set at four. An EP with at least one but fewer than four EREs is assessed against the same criteria as an EP with four EREs. Submitting staff may use the Extraordinary Circumstances declaration or the Platform of Research – Contextual Summary to explain why fewer than four EREs are included. If Extraordinary Circumstances are declared, the EP must contain fewer than four EREs, recognising that the declarations are intended to recognise reductions in research output quantity.

This option clarifies that Extraordinary Circumstances should only account for research quantity, rather than quality, but does not resolve the ambiguities in relation to whether having fewer than four EREs impacts on assessment or not. However, the SRG felt that there were some advantages to retaining the minimum of one/maximum of four setting, and would like to understand the sector's views on this issue.

51 **Option 2:** An EP must contain four EREs, unless one or more of the following exceptions applies:

a. Extraordinary circumstances apply. The number of EREs will be reduced by between one and three depending on the nature and duration of the circumstances. The criteria and calculation for determining ERE reduction will be addressed in the forthcoming Individual Circumstances consultation paper

b. The submitting staff member is a New and Emerging Researcher (NER). The number of EREs required is reduced in recognition that NERs have had less time to develop a research programme. The ERE reduction will be considered in the forthcoming Individual Circumstances paper.

c. The submitting staff member is employed at less than 1 FTE. The number of EREs required is reduced to reflect the staff member's FTE fraction. The calculation for determining ERE reduction will be addressed in the forthcoming Individual Circumstances paper.

d. An ERE which is based on a large output (e.g. a single-authored monograph, scholarly edition, or creative fiction, a major composition or artwork) is double-weighted, recognising the greater time commitment required to produce such outputs. An EP with one double-weighted ERE and two single-weighted EREs is regarded as having met the four ERE threshold; likewise an EP with two double-weighted EREs is regarded as having met the four ERE threshold. A definition of eligible large outputs will be developed.

Note that under this option EPs to which one or more of the exceptions listed above apply can still include OEREs; the exception simply lowers the number of EREs required. The SRG would consider as part of the Individual Circumstances paper how multiple exceptions would operate together.

52   While Option 2 represents a significant change, and will require the development of robust and equitable criteria for determining reductions, analysis suggests that the sector already treats four NROs as the minimum for a funded QC. This option addresses the potential ambiguity around the number of NROs that should be in an EP, and also means that staff with extraordinary circumstances, staff who pursue long-form outputs, NERs, and part-time employees are treated equitably.

Issue 3: What comprises an Other Example of Research Excellence?

53   The options for OERE design are dependent to some extent on which option for ERE design is pursued. However, the SRG proposes that all options for OERE design should entail a broadening from the research output to include research activities as eligible items.

54   **Option 1:** OEREs can be research outputs or research activities. Lists of eligible research outputs and research activities are developed which reflect the new PBRF definitions of research and which cover research recognition, funding, dissemination, collaboration, engagement and impact, as for Issue 1: Option 2 and 3 (see paragraphs 42-43). This reflects the overall broadening of focus from research outputs to examples of research excellence, and will also complement the options for changes to the Research Contribution component, discussed in the next section.

Issue 4: How many OEREs should be included in an EP?

55   **Option 1**: Up to 12 OEREs may be submitted. An OERE comprises a single research output or activity, which aligns with one of the eligible ERE output or activity types. Unlike an ERE, only metadata is submitted to enable audit. The OERE section includes a narrative with a fixed word limit which staff may use to contextualise and link together the OEREs listed. OEREs may, but do not need to, connect to the EREs submitted.

56   **Option 2**: Recognising that the new ERE design allows the inclusion of more information and evidence (both through the narrative section and, for Option 2 through submitting more research activities), up to eight additional OEREs may be submitted. Otherwise, the same as for Option 1.

     Note that if Option 1 under Issue 2: Minimum number of EREs in an EP is pursued, OEREs can only be submitted where the EP contains the maximum of four EREs. If Issue 2: Option 2 is pursued, all EPs would be eligible to include OEREs, including EPs with accepted Extraordinary Circumstances and EPs submitted by part-time and NER staff, because there is a fixed number of EREs required.

57   **Option 3:** As for Option 3 under Issue 1: What comprises an ERE: the ERE and OERE sections are combined, and no standalone OEREs are submitted.

Redesigning the Research Contribution component

58 This section provides context, and sets out options, for changes to the Research Contribution (RC) component of the EP. It is presented separately from the Research Outputs component in this paper to reflect Cabinet's differing directions and decisions in relation to each, but the options are intended to work together. The SRG has considered all potential changes to design of EPs holistically.

Research Contributions component settings in the Quality Evaluation 2018

59. In the Guidelines for Quality Evaluation 2018, the RC component of an EP described the contribution and recognition of a staff member's research and research-related activities. It provided staff with an opportunity to demonstrate:

    a. the esteem in which their peers, within and outside of TEOs, hold their research;

    b. their role and the contributions they make in creating a vital, high-quality research environment;

    c. any impacts that their research has had outside academia.

60. An EP could contain up to 15 items in the RC component. Items submitted had to align with one of the 12 eligible research contribution types, and had to meet the timing eligibility criteria. Although it was not expected that each EP would contain activities in every contribution type, it was expected that all EPs would include evidence of peer esteem and contributions to the research environment, except where the researcher was New and Emerging.

61. The twelve eligible types were:

    1. Contribution to Research Discipline and Environment
    2. Facilitation, Networking and Collaboration
    3. Invitations to Present Research or Similar
    4. Other Evidence of Research Contribution
    5. Outreach and Engagement
    6. Recognition of Research Outputs
    7. Research Funding and Support
    8. Research Prizes, Fellowships, Awards and Appointments
    9. Research Development
    10. Reviewing, Refereeing, Judging, Evaluating and Examining
    11. Student Factors
    12. Uptake and Impact.

    See Appendix 2 or pp. 84- 92 in the 2018 Guidelines for detailed descriptions of each type.

62. All RC types were considered on merit, with no one specific type of contribution weighted higher than another.

63. New and emerging researchers were not required to have RC items to be considered for the C(NE) Quality Category. However, if they had research contribution items they were

encouraged to submit them because it could allow them to be considered for a higher Quality Category.

64   Full details of RC eligibility criteria, including eligible types, can be found in the 2018 Guidelines, pp. 82-92.

Issues addressed through changes to the Research Contributions component

65   As with the changes to the RO component, changes to the RC component must support the new PBRF Definition of Research. In addition, any changes must complement the new ERE section, including any provisions for recognising Extraordinary Circumstances, and submissions by NER and part-time staff. Cabinet has given otherwise broad directions to make design changes to the RC component.

66   The 2018 *Guideline*s list 12 types of research contribution (see above, paragraph 52).The PBRF Review Panel took the view that this list is too broad, and recommended that the RC component should be 'refocused on the best examples of those activities that contribute to the sustainability and vitality of the research system'.[8] The Panel proposed that this would entail a shift away from peer esteem indicators towards activities aimed at developing and fostering a vibrant research environment, for example leadership, mentoring, and disciplinary development activities.

67   Cabinet's directions on changes to the RO component also mean that some of the activities that currently fall within the RC component can now be included as eligible research activities under the ERE and OERE sections, particularly those relating to research recognition, peer esteem, dissemination, collaboration, engagement, and impact. As noted in previous sections, the list of eligible research outputs and activities will be revised as necessary to reflect in principle decisions on PBRF research definitions and on changes to the ERE component.

68   The SRG considers that the terminology used to describe the existing 12 types of research contribution is no longer up to date with current research practices and norms, and that in particular the type names could better reflect activity related to Māori, Pacific, and practice- and community-based research environments and cultures. As part of reviewing which activities should be eligible in the RC component, the SRG has therefore reviewed the type names and seeks the sector's views on the proposed changes and suggestions for further changes.

---

[8] *Report of the PBRF Review Panel*, p. 64.

69   Below we present options for changes designed to deliver Cabinet's instructions on changes to the RC component.

Issue 1: Renaming the Research Contributions component

70   **Option 1:** Rename the 'Research Contribution' component the 'Contributions to Research Environment' component. This reflects the fact that the new ERE component mean that there is no longer a clear distinctions between research outputs and research contributions. This change would also reflect this component's focus on activity which builds and sustains a healthy research environment. Note that this name was used in Quality Evaluations prior to 2018, but this does not signal a return to that design.

Issue 2: What types of activity should be eligible as a Research Contribution?

71   **Option 1:** The existing 12 types of RC are revised down to the following six types:

›   Contribution to Research Discipline, Culture, and Environment (previously Contribution to Research Discipline and Environment);

›   Facilitating, Networking and Collaboration;

›   Researcher Development, Capability-Building, and Mentoring (previously Researcher Development);

›   Reviewing, Refereeing, Judging, Evaluating and Examining;

›   Student Development and Support (previously Student Factors);

›   Peer esteem and research recognition not included in ERE section.

The detailed descriptions of each type are reviewed and revised where necessary to ensure relevant activity is covered.

The remaining types (Invitations to Present Research; Collaboration, Outreach and Engagement; Recognition of Research Outputs; Research Funding and Support; Research Prizes, Fellowships, Awards and Appointments, Uptake and Impact) will be included in the list of eligible research activities for the new OERE and/or ERE sections, and will also be revised and renamed as necessary. If the decision is that the ERE comprises a single research output (Issue 1: Option1), then these types will only be eligible as OERE activities. If Options 2 or 3 are preferred, then these types will be also be eligible as supplementary research activities within an ERE.

The detailed descriptions of the existing RC types are appended as Appendix 2, and can also be found in the 2018 Guidelines.

The SRG welcomes the sector's suggestions for changes and/or additions to the detailed descriptions and names.

Issue 3: What should the Research Contribution component comprise?

72 Table 3 below presents these options for ease of comparison.

73 **Option 1:** The RC component comprises a minimum of one and up to 15 items. . Sufficient metadata must be submitted to enable audit, but the items are not assessed, as in the current guidelines.

74 **Option 2:** The RC component comprises a minimum of one and up to 15 items, and additionally includes a brief narrative section enabling staff to link the items together and to contextualise and describe their RC activity as a whole. . Sufficient metadata must be submitted to enable audit, but the items are not assessed.

75 **Option 3:** The RC component comprises a minimum of one and up to ten items, and additionally includes a brief narrative section enabling staff to link the items together and to contextualise and describe their RC activity as a whole. Sufficient metadata must be submitted to enable audit, but the items are not assessed.

This option recognises that because many items that would previously have been submitted to the RC component will now better fit in the ERE component, the upper limit should be revised down.

Note that for each of the three options the SRGs working assumption at this stage is there will be some adjustments or reductions to the 'minimum of one' requirement where Extraordinary Circumstances apply, or where the submitting staff member is a NER or employed part time. What counts as Extraordinary Circumstances, the nature of any adjustments/reductions, and the mechanism for determining them, will be addressed in the Individual Circumstances paper.

Table 3: Comparison of options for Research Contribution content

Change	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Number of items	Minimum of one up to 15	Minimum of one up to 15	Minimum of one up to 10
Narrative component	No	Yes	Yes

Technical matters to consider

76 The potential changes outlined above raise a number of follow-on technical matters. TEC officials consider that these should be resolved once In Principle decisions on the high level EP design issues discussed above have been reached, but we note them here to support the SRGs consideration of the options.

EP component weightings

77   The SRG has heard feedback from the sector that the weightings of the two scored EP components should be revisited. Currently, the RO component has a 70 percent weighting attached, and the RC component has a 30 percent weighting.

78   The proposed options for changes to the ERE and RC components discussed above will broaden the eligible activities under the ERE component and refine the eligible activities under the RC to a greater or lesser extent, depending on which options are supported. The proportion of total activity included in each component will therefore change to some extent. Because of this, TEC officials recommend that EP component weightings be revisited once In Principle decisions have been made on ERE and RC.

Eligible research and research-related activities

79   New lists of eligible research outputs and research activity types will need to be developed, reflecting agreed changes to the ERE component. The acceptable forms of evidence for assessment and metadata and evidence for auditing will need to be developed for each new type of research activity and new research outputs, and the existing types reviewed. Subject specialist and audit advice may be needed on what would constitute acceptable evidence for some new types of activity or output.

80   Eligible RC types will need to be reviewed and revised as necessary to reflect agreed changes to the RC component. As above, acceptable forms of metadata and evidence for audit purposes will need to be developed for any new types.

81   Guidance on the submission of EREs for assessment, including electronic submission, will require revisiting once the list of eligible activities has been developed to encompass any new types.

82   Quality Assurance processes for EREs will require revisiting once the lists of eligible activities and outputs have been developed, to encompass any new types.

Examples of Research Excellence

83   In relation to the minimum number of EREs in an EP, if the decision is to pursue Option 2 (all EPs to contain four EREs unless exceptions apply), the IT system design will need to enable validation checks to ensure the correct number of EREs have been submitted.

EP template and schema

84   The EP template (Appendix 1) will require revision to reflect agreed In Principle decisions on EP design. In particular, character limits will be required for any new narrative sections, and descriptions required for new fields.

85   The EP schema (available on the TEC website) will similarly require revision. Technical IT input and feedback including from TEOs may be required in developing any changes.

86   TEC officials recommend that the issues identified in this section may be addressed in the Technical Matters paper.

Next steps and consultation feedback

87   Feedback is sought on the following:

1. **What comprises an Example of Research Excellence?**
   Do you prefer Option 1 (single research output), Option 2 (core research output plus up to four research activities and/or outputs), or Option 3 (combined ERE and OERE comprising core research output plus up to five research activities and/or outputs)?

   If you prefer Option 2 or Option 3, do you think that only research activities should be eligible as supplementary items (sub-options 2.a and 3.a), or that research activities and research outputs should be eligible supplementary items (sub-options 2.b and 3.b)?

   Is there a different option you would like to propose?

2. **Minimum number of EREs in an EP**
   Do you prefer Option 1 (retain minimum of one and maximum of four EREs) or Option 2 (all EPs must contain four EREs unless one of the exceptions apply)?

   Is there a different option you would like to propose?

3. **What comprises an Other Example of Research Excellence?**
   Do you agree with the proposal that OEREs should include research outputs and activities as eligible items?

4. **How many OEREs should an EP include?**
   Do you prefer Option 1 (up to 12 OEREs), Option 2 (up to 10 OEREs), or Option 3 (ERE and OERE section combined)?

   Is there a different option you would like to propose?

5. **Renaming of the Research Contribution component**
   Do you agree with the proposal to rename the component Contributions to Research Environment?

   Is there a different option you would like to propose?

6. **What types of activity should be eligible as a Research Contribution?**
   Do you agree with the proposal to reduce the eligible types to those which relate to research environment, noting that the remaining types will be eligible as supplementary research items and/or OEREs?

   Do you have suggestions to revisions to the detailed type descriptions?

   Is there a different option you would like to propose?

7. **What should the Research Contribution component comprise?**
   Do you prefer Option 1 (Up to 15 items, no overarching narrative), Option 2 (Up to 15 items plus overarching narrative), or Option 3 (Up to 10 items plus overarching narrative)?

   Is there a different option you would like to propose?

88   Feedback can be provided to the TEC via the online survey here: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/KYWGXYR. Responses must be submitted by 5pm, 4 April 2022.

Next steps

89   Following the end of the consultation period, the SRG will consider the feedback, and make recommendations to the TEC on design of the EP. We anticipate that the TEC's In Principle decisions on EP design will be confirmed in mid-2022 alongside decisions on research definitions.

References

Cabinet Minute of Decision: Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund: Final Report (CAB-21-MIN-0175)

Ministry of Education, 2021. *Education Report: Final recommendations on the PBRF Review*. Wellington, New Zealand Government.

PBRF Review Panel, 2020. *Toward the Tertiary Research Excellence Evaluation (TREE): The Report of the PBRF Review Panel*. Wellington, PBRF Review Panel

Tertiary Education Commission, 2016. *Guidelines for the 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment process.* Wellington, New Zealand Government.

Appendix 1: PBRF Quality Evaluation 2018 EP template

Evidence Portfolio Details

All fields marked with * are mandatory

*Evidence Portfolio Identifier (max 10 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Contains Confidential Research	Choose an item.
*Release Permission Obtained	Choose an item.
*Send Quality Category to Researcher	Choose an item.

Researcher Details

*National Student Number (NSN)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Local Identifier	Click or tap here to enter text.
Title	Click or tap here to enter text.
*First Name	Click or tap here to enter text.
Middle Names	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Last Name	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Date of Birth (DD-MM-CCYY)	Click or tap here to enter text.

Panel Details

*Primary Panel	Choose an item.
*Primary Subject Area of Research (this should be a subject area that is assessed by the Primary Panel)	Choose an item.
*Field of Research Description (max 200 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Does this EP contain Māori research for cross-referral to the MKD panel?	Choose an item.
Rationale/Comment (mandatory if YES, max 500)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Referenced Component	Click or tap here to enter text.

(up to 5 NRO, or ORO or RC Id)	
Does this EP contain Pacific research for cross-referral to the PACIFIC panel?	Choose an item.
Rationale/Comment (mandatory if YES, max 500)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Referenced Component (up to 5 NRO, or ORO or RC Id)	Click or tap here to enter text.

Platform of Research Contextual Summary

*Contextual Narrative (max 2500 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

Canterbury Extraordinary Circumstances

*Type(s) Refer Appendix A5	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Period(s) for which this extraordinary circumstance is claimed (must equate to a minimum of three years)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Comments (max 2000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

Extraordinary Circumstances

*Type(s) Refer Appendix A6	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Period(s) for which this extraordinary circumstance is claimed (must equate to a minimum of three years)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Comments (max 2000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

Nominated Research Output (NRO)

Complete for up to 4 Nominated Research Outputs (NRO)

1. Nominated Research Output (NRO)

*Component Id	NRO1
Confidential Research Output	No
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
Preferred Order	1
*Title (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Authors (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Main Research Object (this should be the actual research for assessment i.e. the book, or the composition, or the journal article)	Choose an item. Note that this field is for collection of data by a TEO, it is not part of the PBRF IT System user interface.
Main Research Object URI (mandatory if selected Direct Link or Upload to TEC)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Main Research Object Location (mandatory only if 'Panellist to request hard copy' selected for Main Research Object, max 500)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Supporting Objects' URIs (max of 4 additional URIs for SUPPORTING information for assessment and audit)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Is this a large sound or video file?	Choose an item.
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Year Available (2012 to 2017)	Choose an item.
*Output Source (This is bibliographic information, max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Individual Contribution (max 1050)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Description (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Nominated Research Output (NRO)

*Component Id	NRO2
Confidential Research Output	No
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
Preferred Order	2
*Title (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Authors (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Main Research Object (this should be the actual research for assessment i.e. the book, or the composition, or the journal article)	Choose an item. Note that this field is for collection of data by a TEO, it is not part of the PBRF IT System user interface.
Main Research Object URI (mandatory if selected Direct Link or Upload to TEC)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Main Research Object Location (mandatory only if 'Panellist to request hard copy' selected for Main Research Object, max 500)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Supporting Objects' URIs (max of 4 additional URIs for SUPPORTING information for assessment and audit)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Is this a large sound or video file?	Choose an item.
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Year Available (2012 to 2017)	Choose an item.
*Output Source (This is bibliographic information, max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Individual Contribution (max 1050)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Description (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.

3. Nominated Research Output (NRO)

*Component Id	NRO3
Confidential Research Output	No
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
Preferred Order	3
*Title (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Authors (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Main Research Object (this should be the actual research for assessment i.e. the book, or the composition, or the journal article)	Choose an item. Note that this field is for collection of data by a TEO, it is not part of the PBRF IT System user interface.
Main Research Object URI (mandatory if selected Direct Link or Upload to TEC)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Main Research Object Location (mandatory only if 'Panellist to request hard copy' selected for Main Research Object, max 500)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Supporting Objects' URIs (max of 4 additional URIs for SUPPORTING information for assessment and audit)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Is this a large sound or video file?	Choose an item.
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Year Available (2012 to 2017)	Choose an item.
*Output Source (This is bibliographic information, max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Individual Contribution (max 1050)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Description (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.

4. Nominated Research Output (NRO)

*Component Id	NRO4
Confidential Research Output	No
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
Preferred Order	4
*Title (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Authors (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Main Research Object (this should be the actual research for assessment i.e. the book, or the composition, or the journal article)	Choose an item. Note that this field is for collection of data by a TEO, it is not part of the PBRF IT System user interface.
Main Research Object URI (mandatory if selected Direct Link or Upload to TEC)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Main Research Object Location (mandatory only if 'Panellist to request hard copy' selected for Main Research Object, max 500)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Supporting Objects' URIs (max of 4 additional URIs for SUPPORTING information for assessment and audit)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Is this a large sound or video file?	Choose an item.
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Year Available (2012 to 2017)	Choose an item.
*Output Source (This is bibliographic information, max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.
Individual Contribution (max 1050)	Click or tap here to enter text.
*Description (max 1000)	Click or tap here to enter text.

Other Research Outputs (ORO)

Complete for up to 12 Other Research Outputs (ORO).
OROs should be clustered by type

1.   Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO1
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	1
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

2.   Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO2
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	2
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

3.   Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO3
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	3
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

4.   Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO4
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	4
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

5. Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO5
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	5
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

6. Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO6
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	6
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

7. Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO7
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	7
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

8. Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO8
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	8
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

9. Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO9

*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	9
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

10. Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO10
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	10
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

11. Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO11
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	11
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

12. Other Research Outputs (ORO)

*Component Id	ORO12
*Research Output Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	12
*Quality Assured	Choose an item.
*Bibliographic details/description (max 1000 characters)	Click or tap here to enter text.

Research Contribution (RC)

Complete for up to 15 Research Contributions (RC)
RCs should be clustered by type

1.   Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC1
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	1
*Description	
(max 1500 characters)	

2.   Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC2
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	2
*Description	
(max 1500 characters)	

3.   Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC3
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	3
*Description	
(max 1500 characters)	

4.   Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC4
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	4
*Description	
(max 1500 characters)	

5.   Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC5
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	5

*Description

(max 1500 characters)

6.   Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC6
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	6

*Description

(max 1500 characters)

7.   Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC7
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	7

*Description

(max 1500 characters)

8.   Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC8
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	8

*Description

(max 1500 characters)

9.   Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC9
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	9

*Description

(max 1500 characters)

10. Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC10
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	10

*Description

(max 1500 characters)

11. Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC11
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	11
*Description	
(max 1500 characters)	

12. Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC12
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	12
*Description	
(max 1500 characters)	

13. Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC13
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	13
*Description	
(max 1500 characters)	

14. Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC14
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	14
*Description	
(max 1500 characters)	

15. Research Contribution (RC)

*Component Id	RC15
*Research Contribution Type	Choose an item.
*Preferred Order	15
*Description	
(max 1500 characters)	

Appendix 2: PBRF Quality Evaluation 2018 Guidelines – Researcher Contribution types

Types of research contribution

The Quality Evaluation assesses a wide range of research-related activities and research outcomes.

The key factors are:
› TEOs need to classify each research contribution item submitted in an EP under one of the 12 research contribution types below.
› The types are listed in alphabetical order and do not reflect an order of importance.
› All research contribution items will be considered on their merit. This means no one specific type will be weighted higher than another.
› Panel-specific guidelines may provide further examples of discipline-specific, research-related activities and research outcomes.

Research Contribution Type	Description

Contribution to Research Discipline and Environment	Contribution to research discipline and environment items reflect the staff member's contribution to the development of their discipline or improvements to research capability and/or the research environment inside and/or outside of academia.
	
	Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to:
	› developing new discipline methodologies or knowledge
	› developing new laboratories and/or organising new equipment
	› leadership positions that increase capability, for example:
	  − director of a laboratory or research facility
	  − head, or deputy head, of school, department, centre or research group with a focus on research development or initiatives in that role
	› initiatives to grow mātauranga Māori and kaupapa Māori knowledge bases and capacity
	› initiatives to grow Pacific knowledge bases and capacity, including those that build non-Pacific researchers' knowledge and understanding of Pacific research and paradigms
	› membership of a research or postgraduate committee
	› fostering internal or external linkages, cooperation, collaborative research and development with other departments, institutions or organisations
	› support of research and development within professional bodies and industry
	› organising or participating in departmental or institutional research seminars.

Research Contribution Type	Description
Facilitation, Networking and Collaboration	Facilitating, networking and collaboration items provide an indicator of the contribution the staff member makes to the research environment specifically through developing and supporting research networks and collaborations that develop their discipline or improve research capability inside and outside of academia. Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to: › facilitating or organising conferences or other formal networks, such as symposia, meetings, workshops, seminar series, hui, fono, wānanga, online forums › participating as a conference chair, track chair or session chair › partnering with iwi and Māori entities on shared research priorities › partnering with Pacific entities and Pacific organisations to increase research capability in Pacific research and researchers › membership of a conference programme committee, technical programme committee or conference panel › director of a consortium or research group › member of collaborations and consortia › internal or external research collaboration › fostering internal or external linkages, cooperation, collaborative research and development with other departments or organisations › activities that improve research opportunities, such as working in collaborations or consortia › hosting esteemed visitors.
Invitations to Present Research or Similar	Invitations to present research or similar items provide an indicator of the staff member's reputation within and outside of academia, and, as such, these items are about invitations that are specifically based on the staff member's research reputation. The invitation can count as an indicator regardless of whether it was accepted. Staff members may want to indicate if the invitation was taken up. Indicators of this esteem can include but are not limited to: › invitations to give a keynote address or plenary, or invitations to be a principal speaker or invited speaker › invited membership of a research advisory, strategy, reference or working group, task force, or steering committee for an internal or external organisation › invitations to present research to professional groups or organisations, or industry bodies

Research Contribution Type	Description
	› invitations to develop iwi, Māori or Pacific community-based projects › invitations to produce a journal article, review paper, chapter or reprints specifically based on the staff member's research reputation › invitations to overseas organisations or events › invitations to work in an overseas institution › invited or commissioned to create, perform or produce creative work › invitations to contribute to Māori conferences, Māori development panels, Māori research hui and Māori advisory boards › invitations to contribute to Pacific conferences, Pacific development panels, Pacific research fono and Pacific advisory boards › invitations to present research to other non-professional groups, community interest groups, ethnic or cultural representatives.
Other Evidence of Research Contribution	Other evidence of research contribution may include other items that are not included in the research contribution categories but that demonstrate the contributions made, and esteem held, by a staff member and their research within or outside of academia. Indicators of this esteem and/or contribution can include but are not limited to: › requests to provide or providing tenure references › the offer of a staff position for a new and emerging researcher › producing reference materials, such as encyclopaedia and dictionary entries.
Outreach and Engagement	Outreach and engagement items reflect the contribution the staff member makes to the wider community in New Zealand and/or internationally through their research-based expertise. Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to: › outreach activities › community engagement › contributions to public understanding of a particular issue or discipline › 'critic and conscience' of society and debate in the discipline › media coverage of research

Research Contribution Type	Description
	› presentation of research to professional groups or organisations, or industry bodies.
Recognition of Research Outputs	Recognition of research outputs items reflect the esteem in which a staff member's specific research outputs are held by their peers and other stakeholders. Recognition of NROs in the EP should be described in the NRO Description field.
	Indicators of this esteem can include but are not limited to:
	› positive commendations and/or reviews for the staff member's research outputs
	› metrics that relate to the assessment period, such as citation counts (excluding self-citation)
	› other metrics, for example, those that relate to different forms of media, such as social media, number of downloads, Google Analytics
	› acknowledgment by iwi and Māori leaders, kaumātua and kuia of contributions to Māori economic, social and cultural advancement
	› acknowledgment and support by Pacific stakeholders of contributions to Pacific economic, social and cultural advancement
	› selected for important or esteemed public–private collection or performance venue
	› extended exhibition or performance dates due to demand
	› reprints of the staff member's research or repeated exhibitions or performances.
Research Funding and Support	Research funding and support items provide an indicator of the contribution the staff member makes to the research environment, or reflect the staff member's esteem where the funding/support is competitive.
	Indicators of this esteem and/or contribution can include but are not limited to:
	› securing external contestable grants, for example, Marsden Fund grants
	› competitive funding from the staff member's own organisation
	› funding from external organisations
	› funding for research facilities or gaining competitive access to facilities
	› competitive travel grants
	› securing in-kind or pro-bono support to facilitate research including key people (including kaumātua and community engagement capability), resources, equipment and materials.

Research Contribution Type	Description
Research Prizes, Fellowships, Awards and Appointments	Research prizes, fellowships, awards and appointments items indicate the staff member's research reputation within and outside of academia, and, as such, these items are about selective memberships. Only elected/awarded memberships, fellowships, awards, appointments and so on should be included. Fee-paying only memberships are excluded. Indicators of this esteem can include but are not limited to: › best paper, poster or presentation › awards and prizes for creative arts outputs › adjunct appointment › research fellowship › industry secondment › mandated iwi and Māori authority leadership roles › mandated cultural leadership roles (for example, chairperson, church minister or honorific chiefly title) › fellow of a professional body, for example, Fellow of the Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand or Fellow of the Royal Society of New Zealand › member of a society or academy with restricted or elected admission, for example, the British Society of Audiology. Activity as part of a standard membership of societies must be listed under 'Contribution to research discipline and environment'. Membership of funding committees must be listed under 'Reviewing, refereeing, judging, evaluating and examining'.
Researcher Development	Researcher development items reflect the staff member's contribution to the range of activities related to mentoring colleagues in relation to research development. Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to: › mentoring and supervising other staff members including new and emerging researchers › growing institutional support for, and the pool of, iwi and Māori researchers › increasing institutional capacity for growing the pool of Pacific researchers › supervising postdoctoral fellows › head of department where there is a focus on researcher development activities while in the role › research mentoring.

Research Contribution Type	Description
Reviewing, Refereeing, Judging, Evaluating and Examining	Reviewing, refereeing, judging, evaluating and examining items provide an indicator of the esteem a staff member may have amongst their peers. Indictors of this esteem can include but are not limited to: › member of funding committee that reviews or evaluates funding proposals or grant applications › member providing specialist or expert advice to a research advisory, strategy, reference, working group, task force or steering group › member of a committee providing specialist or expert advice to, or for, a relevant external organisation › member of an editorial board › external thesis examiner › editor or guest editor › invited to contribute to indigenous/first nation peoples development panels, boards and major programmes › invited to be a member of a selection panel for awards and prizes › reviewing a journal article, conference paper, book manuscript › reviewing abstracts (as part of the selection of presenters) and conference proceedings (following selection) › peer reviewer for industrial, commercial or government organisations.

Student Factors	Student factors items reflect the staff member's contribution to student-related activity, as well as esteem factors associated with the staff member's research students. Indicators of this esteem and/or contribution can include but are not limited to:
	› attracting, supervising and supporting students including but not limited to:
	  – doctoral, Master's, honours research
	  – Māori and Pacific students
	  – summer research students and visiting research students
	  – other high-quality postgraduate students
	› assisting student publishing, exhibiting or performance
	› research student placements
	› supporting Māori students to connect with their iwi through mutually beneficial research
	› supporting students to gain scholarships, prizes or awards

Research Contribution Type	Description
	› supporting students to gain positive employment outcomes.
Uptake and Impact	Uptake and impact items provide an indication of the contribution the staff member's research has had outside of academia.
	Note: Research impacts must have occurred in the assessment period to be included in the EP, but these do not need to relate to research undertaken in the assessment period or submitted within the EP.
	Indicators of this contribution can include but are not limited to:
	› uptake/adoption of research by industry, iwi, Pacific, community or professional bodies nationally and/or internationally as standard practice or policy
	› providing expert advice to the public sector, communities and/or the private sector, nationally and/or internationally, which informed or influenced policy and/or practice
	› improvements to existing practices, policy, law, businesses, process or products
	› commercialisation of research
	› contributing to economic prosperity, social or environmental well-being, innovation and entrepreneurial activity through the design and delivery of new tools, products, processes or services
	› contributing to Māori social, economic and cultural advancement
	› contributions to Pacific social, economic and cultural advancement
	› evidence that the knowledge generated by the research is in use outside academia
	› other technology and knowledge transfer
	› expert witness or testimony
	› consultancy based on research expertise.