



Tertiary Education Commission
Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua

Performance-Based Research Fund

Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper #7

**Review of the general and Canterbury Earthquakes
Special Circumstances provisions**

Contents

Purpose	1
Design principles for the 2018 Quality Evaluation	1
Background	1
<i>General special circumstances</i>	1
<i>Canterbury earthquake special circumstances</i>	4
<i>Ministry of Education review of the PBRF</i>	6
Proposed operational framework for the special circumstances provision	7
<i>General special circumstances</i>	7
<i>Canterbury Earthquakes special circumstances provisions</i>	8
Providing feedback	10
Appendix 1: Objectives and principles of the PBRF	11
Appendix 2: Breakdown of general special circumstances types by gender and age	13
Appendix 3: General special circumstances claims by TEO in the 2012 Quality Evaluation	15
Appendix 4: Links to relevant papers	17

Name	Status	Distribution
Review of the general and Canterbury Earthquakes Special Circumstances provisions	CONSULTATION PAPER	Tertiary education sector and other stakeholders Online feedback to: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/JMWHGGZ Other feedback and questions to: PBRFSRG@tec.govt.nz Closing date: 5pm Monday 13 July 2015

Purpose

1. This paper has been prepared as part of the consultation for the design of the 2018 Quality Evaluation. Specifically it:
 - provides background and purpose of the special circumstances provision as it relates to both the general and Canterbury Earthquakes special circumstances;
 - provides information about the review of the PBRF by the Ministry of Education and the decisions made by Cabinet in relation to changes to the special circumstances provision, specifically the objective that fewer than 10% of Evidence Portfolios submitted would use the provision;
 - discusses the issues relating to the special circumstances provisions;
 - sets out the proposed operational framework for the special circumstances provisions in the 2018 Quality Evaluation;
 - invites feedback on the proposals set out in this paper; and
 - invites feedback on any other matters relating to the special circumstances provisions not covered in this paper.

Design principles for the 2018 Quality Evaluation

2. The work of the Sector Reference Group (SRG) in the design of the 2018 Quality Evaluation is based on the following principles and considerations:
 - upholding the objectives and aims of the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) set out in Appendix 1;
 - drawing on the lessons learned as part of the previous Quality Evaluations;
 - accessing relevant experience and expertise across the SRG and the wider tertiary education sector;
 - ensuring that any proposed changes are exposed to rigorous sector and expert scrutiny;
 - achieving a level of consensus regarding how the 2018 Quality Evaluation should be conducted; and
 - avoiding changes that result in unreasonable compliance or high costs unless there is a robust rationale that indicates changes will result in significant improvements.

Background

General special circumstances

3. The Quality Evaluation process includes provision ('special circumstances provision') for staff members whose particular circumstances have had a negative impact on the quantity of research outputs and other research activities produced within the assessment period. Any impact on the quality of research is not a factor in considering special circumstances.

4. In the assessment process, peer review panels are required to consider special circumstances on their merit and during both the individual and panel assessment stages. Each of the two panellists assigned to the EP (panel pair), as well as any cross-referral panellists, are required to assign two Preparatory scores, one when the circumstances are considered and one where they are not. Panels are also required to consider special circumstances during Preliminary scoring and in the Holistic assessment stage of the process, with particular attention being given to those EPs that were on the cusp of a Quality Category.
5. In the assessment, neither panels nor individual panellists are required to increase the Quality Category or the component scores of an EP after they have taken the circumstances into account, although they may, particularly if there is evidence that the circumstances were sustained over a significant period of the assessment period resulting in a decrease in the quantity of outputs and/or activities.
6. In the 2003 Quality Evaluation, 75% of EPs claimed special circumstances. As a result, a requirement to include more detailed information on these circumstances was introduced for the 2006 Quality Evaluation. This action reduced this number to 60% of all EPs submitted. The SRG that designed the 2012 Quality Evaluation introduced further change which reduced this number to just over 37% of all EPs submitted.
7. More information on the background and changes to the special circumstances provision in the 2003 and 2006 Quality Evaluation can be found in the [2006 SRG consultation paper](#). Feedback from that paper can be found [here](#).

Special circumstances in the 2012 Quality Evaluation

8. The 2006 SRG that consulted on the design of the 2012 Quality Evaluation clarified the guidance on the provision in the 2012 Guidelines including a statement that that “*it would be unusual for special circumstances to influence the final quality category unless there is evidence that the circumstances have been sustained over at least one half of the assessment period (i.e. three years)*”. They also revised the types of circumstances that would be considered and reduced the number of types to six:
 - *Extended Leave* such as sick leave, parental leave etc. that prevents research activity from occurring. Note, sabbatical leave that allows for a continuation of research activity should not result in lowered expectations of the quantity of research output and will therefore not be considered for this purpose.
 - *Significant community responsibilities* such as to iwi and Pacific communities.
 - *Leadership positions* involving extended or above the usual time commitment such as Dean or Pro-Vice-Chancellor positions. Less extensive roles such as Head of Department will not usually result in lowered expectations of the quantity of research output to the extent that they would be considered under this criterion.
 - *Long term disability* of a nature that would reduce the quantity of research outputs or activities.
 - *Part-time employment* for some or all of the assessment period, or becoming research active for the first time during the assessment period.
 - *Other circumstances* that are seen to be relevant, at the discretion of the panel Chair, such as staff teaching at both degree and sub-degree level, or confidentiality

requirements that restrict the publication of further outputs based on the confidential research output.

9. Where special circumstances were claimed, staff members were required to describe the circumstances in sufficient detail that a panel assessor could make a judgement about them, including dates of all relevant time periods and a description of how the circumstance in question negatively impacted on the quantity of the staff member's research.
10. These changes appear to have had a demonstrable impact on the number of general special circumstance claims in the 2012 Quality Evaluation with 37.1% of all staff members who submitted an EP claiming special circumstances (29.6% claimed one, 6.4% claimed two, 1.0% claimed three and 0.1% claimed four).
11. In total, there were 3,364 claims regarding general special circumstances across 2,723 EPs.

Special circumstance type	Frequency claimed
Other circumstances	33.3%
Part-time employment	30.5%
Leadership positions involving extended or above the usual time commitment	17.5%
Extended leave	13.9%
Long term disability	2.5%
Significant community responsibilities	2.3%

12. Panels noted that, despite the additional guidance, it was difficult to clearly ascertain how circumstances had impacted on the quantity of research. An example of this was that 131 (4.8%) of the EPs claiming special circumstances contained the maximum number of research outputs (34) and Peer Esteem and Contribution to the Research Environment activities (60) that could be submitted. Other issues identified by panels and the TEC included short time periods, misuse of special circumstances i.e. claiming leadership positions as a negative impact then using the same position as a Peer Esteem or Contribution to the Research Environment example, duplication of categories, particularly the 'Other circumstances' type.
13. Analysis of the 'Other circumstances' submitted indicates significant duplication of the part-time employment and leadership positions circumstances, a large number of claims for New and Emerging research status, along with claims relating to high workloads. There are three areas that have been identified as more significant in terms of having a more personal impact on an individual which are family responsibilities due to death or illness, family responsibilities for children, and serious illness experienced by the individual. These findings are consistent with that found following the 2006 Quality Evaluation.¹
14. The direct impact of special circumstances can only be accurately observed during the individual assessment stage where the scoring is numerical. This is done by comparing

¹ TEC, PBRF Sector Reference Group review: Special circumstances consultation paper, September 2008, p.7.

the average component scores (0-7) assigned before and after special circumstances are taken into account. This has been shown to have a modest effect on component scores. For example, in the 2012 Quality Evaluation, the average research output component score before general special circumstances were taken into account was 3.52 (out of a maximum of 7), and 3.68 after taking special circumstances into account. The comparable averages for the 2006 Quality Evaluation were 3.13 (before) and 3.20 (after). The impact special circumstances may have on the final Quality Category cannot be readily determined due to the different factors that influence the final panel decision, particularly the effect of both individual and panel calibration and moderation on scores.

Canterbury earthquake special circumstances

15. Following the earthquakes in Canterbury in 2010 and 2011, the TEC worked directly with the affected TEOs to determine what actions could and should be taken regarding their participation in the 2012 Quality Evaluation. It was noted at the time that the impact of the earthquakes had the potential to affect some staff members more significantly in the subsequent assessment period (2012 - 2017). In July 2011 the sector was consulted on a range of options to potentially mitigate the impact of the Canterbury earthquakes on participating staff members.

16. The options consulted on were all implemented and included:

- an additional special circumstances category (Canterbury earthquakes) that included impact areas and was assessed separately but using the same key principles as the existing framework for special circumstances i.e. special circumstances may be cited in relation to a reduction in the quantity of research outputs produced but not the quality;
- an alternative assessment period, which allowed staff to submit research outputs from 1 January 2005 to 31 December 2010 rather than the 2006 – 2011 assessment period;
- Allowing Accepted Manuscripts to be submitted as eligible research outputs where the publication date had been delayed as a result of the earthquakes;
- The appointment of Professor Steve Weaver (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) at University of Canterbury) as a Special Adviser to the Moderators and panels, and whose experience in understanding the effects of the earthquakes was utilised to ensure that special circumstances related to the Canterbury earthquakes were appropriately considered; and
- enhanced panel training which provided additional support and advice to panels on the assessment of special circumstances.

17. Staff members claiming Canterbury earthquakes special circumstances were able to claim none, any or all six identified areas of impact in order to communicate the specific impact caused by the series earthquakes. These impact areas were:

- *personal trauma* includes death or injury to family member, friend or close colleague; injury to self; personal psychological impact;
- loss or damage to home and/or contents;
- *inability to access facilities and resources* (includes office, laboratory, library space, venue space; field work; equipment, IT resources);

- *increased responsibilities* (family/community responsibilities; teaching or organisational/management responsibilities at work);
- *impediments to undertaking research activity that equates to PE and/or CRE activities* (PhD students discontinued; conferences cancelled; invitations to meetings declined); and
- other impacts.

18. The option for additional commentary was also provided but was not mandatory.

19. In total, 775 EPs claimed Canterbury earthquakes special circumstances from 13 TEOs. 84 EPs claimed alternative assessment period of 1 January 2005 to 31 December 2010.

TEO	EPs claiming CESC	Alternative assessment period	% of EPs claiming CESC	Also claimed Other SC
AIS St Helens	1	-	9.1%	1
Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology	43	-	28.5%	2
Laidlaw College	2	-	18.2%	0
Lincoln University	84	8	39.8%	28
Massey University	3	-	0.3%	1
Otago Polytechnic	2	-	2.0%	1
Unitec New Zealand	1	-	0.6%	1
University of Auckland	6	1	0.3%	5
University of Canterbury	508	63	75.0%	108
University of Otago	121	12	9.2%	83
Victoria University of Wellington	2	-	0.3%	1
Waikato Institute of Technology	1	-	2.4%	1
Wellington Institute of Technology	1	-	5.9%	1

20. At the completion of the 2012 Quality Evaluation the TEC concluded that the provisions made to mitigate some of the impacts of the Canterbury earthquakes had the desired effect and did influence the results of the 2012 Quality Evaluation appropriately. More specifically, they had been successful in ensuring affected researchers were able to participate in the assessment on an equitable basis with those unaffected by the earthquakes. This was observed at two levels, the individual assessment stage and the distribution of Quality Categories:

- As noted in the previous section, the direct impact of special circumstances can be observed at the individual assessment stage where the scoring is numerical. For the

Canterbury earthquakes special circumstances, the average research output component score before general special circumstances were taken into account was 3.77 (out of a maximum of 7), and 3.96 after taking special circumstances into account.

- b. For the TEOs directly affected, there is almost no difference between the distribution of Quality Categories when comparing those with and without a claim of the Canterbury earthquakes special circumstances overall.

Ministry of Education review of the PBRF

21. During 2012/2013 the Ministry of Education undertook a review of the PBRF in collaboration with the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC).
22. This review sought to build on the existing performance of the PBRF to identify how it could be improved. It included a specific focus on what changes could be considered to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the PBRF through the simplification of the Quality Evaluation process.
23. Between August and October 2013, public feedback was sought on a range of proposed changes. One of these changes was the proposal to remove the special circumstance provisions; however the proposal did not preclude the introduction of special circumstances provisions where an exceptional event (such as the Canterbury earthquakes) occurs that impacts a large group of people.
24. The rationale was that the proposal to reduce the number of research outputs and examples that could be included in EPs would significantly reduce the need for special circumstance provisions as these provisions are designed to reflect reductions in the quantity of items contained with an EP. The consultation document also identified the issue with many EPs submitted to the 2012 Quality Evaluation claiming special circumstances without showing a reduction in the quantity of research outputs or examples. It also identified that claims for special circumstances create transaction costs for the TEC and assessment panels which only resulted in a quality category change in less than 1% of cases and as such removing special circumstances would significantly simplify the assessment process, reducing time spent by panels assessing EPs.²
25. The feedback received by the Ministry of Education did not support the removal of the provision due to the impact that this could have on marginalised groups, for example those staff on parental leave, part-time employees and those with serious health and/or disability issues. Feedback acknowledged that the provisions were overused, and there was a strong recommendation that the provisions be reviewed and tightened to ensure that the use of the provision was limited to only those circumstances that were exceptional.
26. In February 2014, Cabinet decided that the criteria for staff to have special circumstances considered in the assessment process would be tightened, with the objective that fewer than 10% of EPs submitted would use the provision. This change must be implemented for the 2018 Quality Evaluation. This decision was silent on the continuation of the Canterbury earthquakes special circumstances.

² Ministry of Education, Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund Consultation Document, August, 2013, p.20.

Proposed operational framework for the special circumstances provision

General special circumstances

27. The SRG is committed to ensuring that those staff members who have experienced circumstances that have seriously impacted the quantity of research and research-related activities are treated equitably in the 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment process. At the same time, the SRG seeks to implement the Cabinet objective of reducing the use of the provision to fewer than 10% of EPs.
28. With the overall goal of reducing the number of EPs claiming special circumstances to fewer than 10%, it is recognised that this has differing implications for TEOs participating in the Quality Evaluation process. The table in Appendix 3 shows the percentage of EPs claiming special circumstances in the 2012 Quality Evaluation by TEO.
29. The continuing high number of staff claiming special circumstances, and the limited effect on the numerical scoring of EPs, clearly suggests that the minority of these circumstances are 'special'. The types of circumstances most often claimed appear to be part of the normal expectation of an academic staff member's activity (or an academic staff member in that discipline). This is particularly the case with staff who have leadership positions within a TEO, are research active for the first time, or a limited number of research outputs or research related activities.
30. The decision by Cabinet to reduce the quantity of items submitted in an EP (from 94 items down to 31) also has a direct impact on the special circumstances provision. It is likely that fewer staff will experience circumstances, which will substantially impact on the quantity of research outputs and research-related activities submitted in an EP.
31. These two factors (differentiating between circumstances that are 'special' and those that are part of normal academic activity, and the reduced quantity of items that can be submitted in an EP) underpin the changes proposed by the SRG. The SRG proposes implementing all four changes set out below and seeks feedback from the sector and other stakeholders on this proposal and the changes:
 - a. Renaming the provision 'extra-ordinary circumstances'. This name change provides a clearer signal to submitters that only those circumstances that are uncommon and unexpected would be considered as part of the EP submission.
 - b. Establishing a minimum time period of three years during the assessment period over which the circumstances need to have occurred in order for these circumstances to be submitted. The three year period does not need to be contiguous and can be made up smaller periods of time that equate to three years. A staff member would need to identify all relevant dates within their submission as a means of validating this information. The 2012 Guidelines provided advice that it would be unlikely that circumstances would influence the final quality category unless there was evidence that the circumstances have been sustained over at least one half of the assessment period. This change formalises that advice and means that TEOs would not be able to submit claims for circumstances that have affected the quantity of staff members' research or research-related activity for less than three years.
 - c. Not allow the submission of extra-ordinary circumstances where the EP has no reduction in quantity in either the Research Output component or the Research Contributions component. As the assessment can only be based on reductions in quantity, this change formalises the basis of assessment.

d. Allow only the following circumstances types to be claimed:

- *Long-term illness or disability* of a nature that would reduce the quantity of research outputs or activities.
- *Extended personal leave* of a nature that prevents research activity from occurring. This includes sick leave and parental leave. Sabbatical leave is *not* considered in this circumstance.
- *Significant family/community responsibilities* of a nature that prevents research activity from occurring. This includes responsibility for dependants and/or to specific communities, such as iwi and/or Pacific communities.

32. These three types reflect the exceptional nature of circumstances that can directly impact the ability of an individual to undertake research and/or research-related activity. These circumstances are generally outside the individual's control and are not part of normal academic activity. Consideration has been given to the prohibited grounds of discrimination set out in the [Human Rights Act 1993](#) when determining appropriate circumstances to be included in the provision. These types align to the prohibited grounds of discrimination when viewed in the context of the PBRF Quality Evaluation process and the production of research. Staff members can continue to claim more than one circumstance and would still need to describe and clearly link the circumstance(s) to a reduction in the quantity of research and/or research-related activity.

33. The SRG has given significant consideration to part-time circumstances. As has been noted by previous SRGs, the part-time employment of an individual does not necessarily reduce the opportunities that person has to undertake research or research-related activities. The SRG acknowledges that there can be part-time employment of a nature that does reduce the quantity of research outputs or activities, however is often as a result of circumstances that can be claimed under this provision, for example staff members who are employed part-time due to recovering from long-term illness.

Canterbury Earthquakes special circumstances provisions

34. The Canterbury Earthquakes of 2010 and 2011 triggered New Zealand's only civil disaster. They have had a major impact on the Canterbury region, affecting the daily lives of residents in Christchurch in a variety of ways, as individuals, families and communities. The effects of the earthquakes have been, and continue to be, systemic, with an impact on peoples' personal and professional lives that extends throughout the wider community. This impact at the community level makes these circumstances unique.

35. For those individuals involved in the PBRF, the personal impacts are compounded by the effects the earthquakes have had on the operations of TEOs in Canterbury. This includes a reduction in student and staff numbers, on-going disruption to buildings and facilities, a prioritisation of teaching and pastoral care over research, and organisational restructuring.

36. Although variable across disciplines, the effects of the earthquakes are systemic and long-term, and have continued to impact individuals' research performance during the 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment period. The SRG believes these issues need to be recognised and considered.

37. The SRG proposes to maintain a separate Canterbury circumstances provision for the 2018 Quality Evaluation. The provision will continue to be assessed separately but using the same key principles as the existing framework for the provision i.e. exceptional circumstances may be cited in relation to a reduction in the **quantity** of research outputs produced but not the **quality**. The provision would:
- a. be referred to as the 'Canterbury extra-ordinary circumstances' provision;
 - b. have a required minimum time period of three years during the assessment period over which the circumstances need to have occurred in order for these circumstances to be submitted; and
 - c. disallow a submission claiming 'Canterbury extra-ordinary circumstances' where the EP has no reduction in quantity in either the Research Output component or the Research Contributions component.
38. The SRG seeks feedback from the sector and other stakeholders on the proposal to maintain a separate Canterbury circumstances provision for the 2018 Quality Evaluation that aligns to the framework of the general aspect of the provision.
39. The SRG have reviewed the more detailed aspects of the Canterbury Earthquakes special circumstances provision used in the 2012 Quality Evaluation and seeks feedback from the sector and other stakeholders on the proposed changes.
- a. Removing the alternative assessment period provision as this particular provision is no longer relevant.
 - b. Allow outputs included in the 2012 Quality Evaluation as Accepted Manuscripts under the Canterbury Earthquakes provisions to be included in the 2018 Quality Evaluation in their final publicly accessible form. The inclusion of Accepted Manuscripts as eligible Research Outputs under the provision in the 2012 Quality Evaluation was anomalous. These outputs would be eligible for the 2018 Quality Evaluation in usual circumstances.
 - c. Maintain the enhanced panel training to provide additional support and advice to panels on the assessment of the provision.
 - d. Appoint a Special Advisor to support the Moderators and panels, who will monitor the effectiveness of the provision through the Moderation process.
 - e. Allow one or more of the following five impact types to be claimed:
 - *On-going trauma, stress and fatigue*, which could include the on-going impacts of death or injury to a family member, friend or close colleague; an injury to self; a personal psychological impact; and on-going fatigue or stress.
 - *Loss or damage to house and/or contents*, which could include loss of home/displacement from home; substandard housing or alternative housing; on-going/protracted issues dealing with EQC/insurers/builders; and care and advocacy for extended family who have been displaced or need support.
 - *Disruption related to facilities/resources*, which could include the on-going inability to access facilities or equipment or resources; disruption caused by temporary office or laboratory spaces, decanting, and/or deconstruction/construction nearby; lost samples or data, or resources/consumables; and damaged equipment.

- *Significant additional responsibilities*, which could include increased teaching loads; additional administration related to building activity e.g. construction and decanting; increased financial administration; additional or increased personal or community responsibilities, such as caring for family members or Board of Trustee duties; and increased Head of Department responsibilities associated with the earthquakes.
- *Reduced research opportunities*, which could include disruption to research pipeline affecting research outputs years later; disruption to postgraduates – reduced recruitment, lost students, PhDs downgraded to Masters, loss of preferred candidates, increased pastoral care; reduced research support - lost opportunities due to reduction in travel funding and research funding; lost networking opportunities due to travel restrictions; lost funding opportunities (unable to submit applications, unable to commit to new research contracts), with subsequent impact on research pipeline/publications; and reduced research time due to increased student recruitment activity and teaching loads

40. The five impact types set out above reflect the nature of on-going earthquake-related issues experienced by staff at the Canterbury-based TEOs. These types may be selected by staff members to communicate the specific impact caused by the series of the Canterbury earthquakes. Staff members can claim any or all of the five areas of impact and provide a commentary in relation to the specific nature of the circumstance and the direct impact it has had on the ability of the individual to undertake research and/or research-related activity.

41. The SRG has considered allowing affected researchers at Canterbury-based TEOs and who participated in the 2012 Quality Evaluation to reuse their 2012 Quality Category result rather than participate in the 2018 Quality Evaluation. This would effectively follow the same process as the 2006 Quality Evaluation which was a partial round. However, the SRG does not believe that this option is warranted.

Providing feedback

42. Feedback is sought from the sector and other key stakeholders on the proposals outlined in this paper.

43. The SRG also welcomes feedback on any other matters not included in this paper that relate to either the general or Canterbury special circumstances provisions.

44. Feedback can be completed:

- online: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/JMWHGGZ>
- or via email using the template provided on the TEC website, with completed templates being emailed to PBRFSRG@tec.govt.nz.

45. All feedback would be appreciated as soon as possible, but no later than 5pm Monday 13 July 2015.

Appendix 1: Objectives and principles of the PBRF

Objectives of the PBRF

The primary objectives of the PBRF are to:

- increase the quality of basic and applied research at New Zealand's degree granting TEOs;
- support world-leading research-led teaching and learning at degree and postgraduate levels;
- assist New Zealand's TEOs to maintain and lift their competitive rankings relative to their international peers; and
- provide robust public information to stakeholders about research performance within and across TEOs.
- In doing so the PBRF will also:
 - support the development of postgraduate student researchers and new and emerging researchers;
 - support research activities that provide economic, social, cultural and environmental benefits to New Zealand, including the advancement of Mātauranga Māori; and
 - support technology and knowledge transfer to New Zealand businesses, iwi and communities.³

Principles of the PBRF

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;

³ The objectives were revised as a part of the Ministry of Education's review of the PBRF and agreed by Cabinet in February 2014.

Efficiency: administrative and compliance costs should be kept to the minimum consistent with a robust and credible process;

Transparency: decisions and decision-making processes must be explained openly, except where there is a need to preserve confidentiality and privacy;

Complementarity: the PBRF should be integrated with new and existing policies, such as charters and profiles, and quality assurance systems for degrees and degree providers; and

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.⁴

⁴ These principles were first enunciated by the Working Group on the PBRF. See [Investing in Excellence](#), pp.8-9.

Appendix 2: Breakdown of general special circumstances types by gender and age

Staff members claiming special circumstances could claim multiple special circumstances types (as noted in paragraph 10 of this paper). This is reflected in the tables below. For example, a single individual could be counted as female or male, or within one age bracket, against up to four special circumstances types. The age data for those 65+ is not robust due to the use of a default date of birth (11/11/1918).

Special circumstance type	Total number of claims	Gender			Age				
		Female	Male	Unknown	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-65	65+
Other circumstances	1,120	589	531	-	144	325	331	252	68
Part-time employment	1,028	599	428	1	84	296	330	228	90
Leadership positions involving extended or above the usual time commitment	588	206	382	-	4	64	187	278	55
Extended leave	469	343	126	-	41	242	98	59	29
Long term disability	82	33	49	-	1	13	27	27	14
Significant community responsibilities	77	37	40	-	1	9	22	41	4
Totals	3,364	1,807	556	1	275	949	995	885	260

Special circumstance type	Total percentage of claims	Gender			Age				
		Female	Male	Unknown	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-65	65+
Other circumstances	33.3%	52.6%	47.4%	-	12.9%	29.0%	29.6%	22.5%	6.1%
Part-time employment	30.6%	58.3%	41.6%	0.1%	8.2%	28.8%	32.1%	22.2%	8.8%

Special circumstance type	Total percentage of claims	Gender			Age				
		Female	Male	Unknown	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-65	65+
Leadership positions involving extended or above the usual time commitment	17.5%	35.0%	65.0%	-	0.7%	10.9%	31.8%	47.3%	9.4%
Extended leave	13.9%	73.1%	26.9%	-	8.7%	51.6%	20.9%	12.6%	6.2%
Long term disability	2.4%	40.2%	59.8%	-	1.2%	15.9%	32.9%	32.9%	17.1%
Significant community responsibilities	2.3%	48.1%	51.9%	-	1.3%	11.7%	28.6%	53.2%	5.2%

Appendix 3: General special circumstances claims by TEO in the 2012 Quality Evaluation

TEO	Percentage of EPs claiming general SC	Number of funded EPs
AIS St Helens	77.8%	5.00
Auckland University of Technology	56.4%	429.47
Bethlehem Institute of Education	71.4%	3.00
Carey Baptist College	16.7%	5.50
Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology	4.5%	32.65
Eastern Institute of Technology	24.5%	29.71
Good Shepherd College – Te Heparā Pai	50.0%	2.00
Laidlaw College	27.3%	6.40
Lincoln University	26.5%	174.10
Manukau Institute of Technology	45.2%	24.35
Massey University	30.1%	918.62
New Zealand College of Chiropractic	33.3%	2.00
New Zealand Tertiary College	0.0%	3.00
Northland Polytechnic	8.7%	6.35
Open Polytechnic of New Zealand	37.9%	14.70
Otago Polytechnic	50.5%	51.39
Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi	52.0%	11.00
Unitec New Zealand	42.5%	114.77
University of Auckland	35.0%	1555.48
University of Canterbury	30.1%	617.06
University of Otago	42.4%	1168.24
University of Waikato	44.0%	440.63
Victoria University of Wellington	34.5%	641.54
Waikato Institute of Technology	41.5%	22.15
Wellington Institute of Technology	47.1%	7.91

TEO	Percentage of EPs claiming general SC	Number of funded EPs
Whitecliffe College of Arts and Design	0.0%	11.49
Whitireia Community Polytechnic	51.6%	12.90

Appendix 4: Links to relevant papers

[Investing in Excellence](#), 2002

[PBRF Sector Reference Group review: Special circumstances consultation paper](#), 2008

[Summary of sector responses to Special circumstances consultation paper](#), 2008

[PBRF: Quality Evaluation Guidelines 2012](#), May 2013

[Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund Consultation Document](#), August, 2013

[Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund, Summary of Submissions received on the Review of the Performance-Based Research Fund Consultation Document](#), March, 2014