

**Tertiary Education  
Commission**  
Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua



# PBRF Sector Reference Group – Consultation paper 6

**Panels membership criteria and  
working methods**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Distribution</b>
PBRF Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper Panels membership criteria and working methods	CONSULTATION PAPER	Public Direct feedback to: <a href="https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/HQHRNGY">https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/HQHRNGY</a> Feedback due 5pm, 29 July 2022

## Purpose

- 1 This paper sets out proposals and approaches developed by the PBRF Sector Reference Group (SRG) for membership criteria and working methods of the peer review panels which will be convened for Quality Evaluation 2025.
- 2 The paper sets out background information, analysis, and proposals for:
  - › Panel chairing arrangements;
  - › Panel composition;
  - › Panel size and subject area coverage; and
  - › Panel and subject names.
- 3 It also provides the sector with information in relation to a number of matters for which consultation is not required. These are:
  - › Changes to panel membership criteria;
  - › Panellist training; and
  - › Panel-specific guidelines.

A second consultation paper will set out proposals in relation to the panels assessment criteria. It is anticipated that this paper will be open for consultation in September 2022.

## Background

- 4 The proposals set out in the consultation paper are informed by recommendations the SRG has made to date, feedback received on areas for potential operational changes following Quality Evaluation 2018, and the new PBRF principles set out in Cabinet's decisions on changes to PBRF.

### *In principle decisions on changes to research definitions and EP design*

- 5 Following sector consultation, the SRG recently made recommendations to the TEC on changes to research definitions and EP design for Quality Evaluation 2025. The TEC has approved these changes in principle. Changes to research definitions include:
  - › A new PBRF Definition of Research;
  - › Statements acknowledging the value of Māori research and Pacific research;
  - › A new definition of research excellence and of impact; and
  - › New Quality Category descriptors.
- 6 Changes to EP design include:

- › A definition of an Example of Research Excellence, which replaces the Nominated Research Output;
  - › A definition of an Other Example of Research Excellence, which replaces the Other Research Output;
  - › A requirement that all EPs must ordinarily contain three Examples of Research Excellence unless one or more individual circumstances apply;
  - › Changes to the Research Contributions component, including renaming it Contributions to the Research Environment and revising the types of eligible item.
- 7 Full details of the in principle changes can be found in the In Principle decisions and summary of feedback documents on the TEC website: [SRG Consultation Papers 2025 | Tertiary Education Commission \(tec.govt.nz\)](https://www.tec.govt.nz/consultation/papers/2025/tertiary-education-commission)

### **Changes to the Moderation Team for Quality Evaluation 2025**

- 8 Following sector consultation, the SRG also made recommendations to the TEC on changes to the Moderation Team for Quality Evaluation 2025, which the TEC has approved and implemented. The TEC will appoint two Co-Moderators, with one Co-Moderator required to have expertise in Mātauranga Māori. A Deputy Moderator with Pacific research expertise will support the Co-Moderators. Full details can be found on the TEC website: <https://www.tec.govt.nz/funding/funding-and-performance/funding/fund-finder/performance-based-research-fund/moderation-team-for-quality-evaluation-2025/>.
- 9 These changes will be reflected in all further recommendations on changes to the Guidelines for Quality Evaluation 2025. They will also inform the composition of and appointment process for peer review panels, including chairing arrangements, the approach to Panel-specific guidance, and the approach to panellist training.

### **Feedback and lessons learned from Quality Evaluation 2018**

- 10 Following the conclusion of Quality Evaluation 2018, the TEC heard feedback from panel Chairs, members, the Moderation Team, and internal feedback. Feedback from the Moderators and Panel Chairs has been published as *The Report of the Moderation Panel and Peer Review Panels*. On the advice of the TEC, the SRG agreed to consult on a number of the issues raised in this feedback.
- 11 The report recommended that members with Māori knowledge expertise be appointed across all panels, to ensure EPs drawing on Māori knowledge could be appropriately assessed where cross-referral to the Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) Panel was not appropriate.
- 12 The TEC received feedback that panel diversity could be improved, and that in some panels it was challenging to meet the targets which had been set, particularly in terms of Māori and Pacific members.

- 13 The TEC also received feedback that some panels, notably the Health, Medicine and Public Health, and Social Sciences and other Social/Cultural Studies panels, had disproportionately larger numbers of EPs submitted with high workloads for panellists. The recommendation was to consider splitting and recombining these panels.
- 14 The TEC received feedback that the MKD Panel be renamed the Māori Knowledge panel, and that the subject area Statistics be renamed Statistics and Data Science.

### **Cabinet decisions on new PBRF principles**

- 15 Any changes to issues grouped in this paper should also give effect to the new PBRF Guiding Principles agreed by Cabinet:
  - › 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;
  - › Equity: different approaches and resources are needed to ensure that the measurement of research excellence leads to equitable outcomes; and
  - › Inclusiveness: the PBRF should encourage and recognise the full diversity of epistemologies, knowledges, and methodologies to reflect Aotearoa New Zealand's people.

### **Sector Reference Group process**

- 16 The proposals set out in this paper for the most part concern high-level approaches to panels membership, working methods, and training. The SRG's recommendations, following sector consultation, will take the form of advice to the TEC, rather than wording for the Guidelines, although the Guidelines will of course reflect the decisions made as necessary.
- 17 Operationalising and delivering the approaches recommended by the SRG will remain the responsibility of the TEC.
- 18 In developing the proposals in this paper, the SRG has considered whether they:
  - › Deliver Cabinet's instructions;
  - › Address the concerns and aspirations identified in the Report of the PBRF Review Panel and the *Report of the Moderation Panel and Peer Review Panels*;
  - › Deliver fair and equitable outcomes for all participating TEOs and their staff;
  - › Uphold the unique nature of research produced in Aotearoa New Zealand and reflect what is distinctive about our national research environment;
  - › Are consistent with the PBRF Guiding Principles, including the three new Principles of partnership, equity, and inclusiveness; and

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

## PART A: PROPOSALS FOR SECTOR CONSULTATION

### Panel Chairing provisions

- 19 Peer review panels in previous Quality Evaluations have been led by a Panel Chair, supported by a Deputy Chair.
- 20 Prior to the assessment phase, Panel Chairs were responsible for developing the Panel-specific guidance for the panel they led, and for working with the Moderation Team to appoint the Deputy Chair and an initial group of panel members who assisted in developing the Panel-specific guidelines. They were also responsible for appointing further panel members as necessary once indicative EP numbers were known.
- 21 During the assessment phase, Panel Chairs were responsible for ensuring that the Panel process was conducted in a fair, transparent and timely way according to the Guidelines and other policies set out by the TEC. Key duties included:
  - › Assigning EPs for pre-meeting assessment;
  - › Chairing Panel meetings to review and calibrate scores and assign Quality Categories;
  - › Ensuring Panel decisions are documented and critical issues necessary for a fair review are appropriately addressed;
  - › Managing any conflicts of interest.
- 22 During the assessment phase, the Deputy Chair supported the Panel Chair in their duties, including by deputising for the Panel Chair as necessary.
- 23 A full description of Panel and Deputy Chair roles can be found on page 20 of the *Guidelines for the 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment process* (<https://www.tec.govt.nz/assets/Forms-templates-and-guides/PBRF/d7cddcb100/PBRF-Assessment-guidelines-October-2017.pdf>). Note that changes to these substantive duties are not being considered for Quality Evaluation 2025.

### *Rationale for changing Panel Chairing provisions*

- 24 The new PBRF principles of Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity, and the TEC's commitment under the Education and Training Act 2020 to honour its obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and to uphold Māori-Crown partnership, should be embedded across the design of Quality Evaluation 2025.
- 25 The *Report of the Moderation Panel and Peer Review Panels* recommended greater Māori representation on peer review panels, to better support understanding and assessment of EPs based on Māori knowledge across all panels.

- 26 A co-chairing arrangement, with one Co-Chair required to have expertise in Māori knowledge alongside panel-specific expertise, would best meet the TEC's Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations and would reflect the Partnership principle. It would also deliver against the *Report of the Moderation Panel and Peer Review Panels'* recommendation to increase Māori representation on all panels – although note the proposed additional measures to address this issue (see *Panels composition* section below).
- 27 Such an arrangement would also mirror the decision to adopt a Co-Moderator model for the Moderation Team.
- 28 The SRG recognises that it may not be possible to implement such a change in every panel for Quality Evaluation 2025. However, the SRG considers that it is important to signal expectations through making these changes to the criteria.
- 29 For this reason, the SRG also considers that requiring as a minimum Co-Chair expertise in Māori knowledge in the broader sense, rather than Mātauranga Māori specifically, will ensure that as many panels as possible are able implement this change in Quality Evaluation 2025.

### **Proposal for Panel Chairing provisions**

- 30 Panels will be chaired by two Co-Chairs. The person specifications will specify that in addition to generally meeting the criteria for panel members (see paragraph 61 below), the Co-Chairs ideally will:
- › be recognised experts in one of the subject areas within the relevant Panel;
  - › have an appreciation of the diverse range of ontologies, epistemologies, knowledges, and research in Aotearoa New Zealand;
  - › have expertise in Māori knowledge (at least one Co-Chair);
  - › have previous experience as a PBRF panel member or equivalent (at least one Co-Chair);
  - › be familiar with quality evaluation processes; and
  - › be able to commit the necessary time.
- 31 The Co-Chairs will have equal standing, and both will carry out the duties described in the *Guidelines for the 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment process*. The Co-Chair Māori will additionally be required to review the initial assessments of all EPs submitted to their panel that draw on Māori knowledge, and to make recommendations for cross-referral to the Māori Knowledge and Development (MKD) panel where appropriate (note that the SRG is consulting on a proposed change to this panel name, but for clarity this paper refers throughout to the current name). This work will be taken into consideration by the TEC and the Co-chairs to ensure the workload is shared equitably.
- 32 These criteria will apply to all Panels.

### **Panels composition**

- 33 For Quality Evaluation 2018, Panel Chairs were asked to work to guidance including a number of targets when making their panel membership selections. These targets were aimed at ensuring panels had an appropriate balance in terms of new and previous panel members, gender representation and international representation. In addition, Panel Chairs were asked to ensure, where possible, that panels represented Māori researchers and Pacific researchers, early career researcher interests, applied and practice-based researchers, interdisciplinary research, and non-University TEOs and other research organisations.
- 34 The table below summarises the overall panel composition targets for Quality Evaluation 2018. A more detailed version of this table, along with the panel-specific

targets and guidance, can be found in Appendix 2: *Peer Review Panel nomination and selection process for the 2018 Quality Evaluation*, within Appendix 6: Guidance to Panel Chairs.

Panel composition criteria	Target
An appropriate mix of new and previous panel members	60% new panel members
Gender representation	40% female panel members. The overall target of 40% should be viewed as a minimum level of representation for those Panels that had more than 40% of EPs submitted on behalf of female researchers. For Panels where fewer than 40% of EPs are submitted by female researchers, 40% should be considered an aspirational target, and the individual panel target seen as a minimum level of representation.
International representation	25% international panel members
Representation from across different tertiary education sectors and other research organisations.	No overall target, but Panel Chairs asked to aim to include representation. Panel-specific targets in some cases.
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of applied/practice-based researchers	No target, but Panel Chairs asked to aim to include representation. Panel-specific guidance that representation was necessary in some cases.
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of early career researchers	No target, but Panel Chairs asked to aim to include representation (note that this did not necessarily mean appointing early career researchers).
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of inter-disciplinary researchers	No target, but Panel Chairs asked to consider patterns of cross-referral in QE 2012 and ensure the panel will have access to the expertise needed.
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of Māori researchers	No overall target, but Panel Chairs asked to aim to include representation. Panel-specific guidance that representation was necessary in some cases.
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of Pacific researchers	No overall target, but Panel Chairs asked to aim to include representation. Panel-specific guidance that representation was necessary in some cases.

35 These targets and guidance were based upon analysis of submissions to Quality Evaluation 2012, with the general aim of assembling panels that reflected the makeup of researchers who submitted EPs.

**Rationale for adjusting panel composition targets and guidance**

36 The new PBRF principles of Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity, and the TEC commitment under the Education and Training Act 2020 to honour its obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and to uphold Māori-Crown partnership should be embedded across the design of Quality Evaluation 2025.

37 In the context of panels composition, this means aiming to appoint panels that reflect the diversity of Aotearoa New Zealand, and ensuring they include the expertise necessary to value and fairly assess the diverse range of ontologies, epistemologies, knowledges and research that make up the national research environment.

38 It also means that panels composition should reflect and support our aspirations for the diversity of the future research workforce, particularly in terms of Māori researchers and research, and Pacific researchers and research. Cabinet’s decisions on changes to the PBRF clearly signal that growing the diversity of our research workforce is a priority.

39 The *Report of the Moderation Panel and Peer Review Panels* recommended that more Māori knowledge expertise was required across all panels. The report noted that this was specifically required to ensure that EPs were cross-referred to the MKD panel only when appropriate, as well as to ensure EPs drawing on Māori knowledge were able to be fairly assessed.

40 The table below shows a high-level analysis of EPs submitted to Quality Evaluation 2018, against the 2018 panel composition criteria.

Panel composition criteria	QE 2018 target or guidance	Proportion of EPs submitted in QE 2018
Gender representation	40% women	44.3% of EPs submitted in QE 2018 were submitted by women
Representation from across different tertiary education sectors and other research organisations.	No overall target; panel-specific guidance in some cases	In QE 2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; 90.9% of EPs were submitted by staff at universities</li> <li>&gt; 7.3% were submitted by staff at what is now Te Pūkenga</li> <li>&gt; 1.2% were submitted by staff at PTEs</li> <li>&gt; 0.5% were submitted by staff at wānanga</li> </ul>

Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of applied/practice-based researchers	No target; panel-specific guidance in some cases	There is no readily available metric which can stand in for this criterion.
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of early career researchers	No target; representation desirable	17.6% of EPs submitted in 2018 were submitted by New and Emerging Researchers.
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of inter-disciplinary researchers	No target; Panel Chairs to decide based on cross-referral patterns	Excluding cross-referrals to the MKD and Pacific Research panels, 0.78% of EPs submitted in QE 2018 were cross-referred.
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of Māori researchers	No target; representation desirable	0.9% of EPs were cross-referred to the MKD panel in QE 2018. 4.8% of EPs submitted in QE 2018 were submitted by researchers identifying as Māori.  Note that it is not possible to accurately ascertain the total proportion of EPs submitted that drew on Māori knowledge where those EPs were not cross-referred.
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of Pacific researchers	No target; representation desirable	1.4% of EPs were cross-referred to the Pacific Research panel in QE 2018. 1.3% of EPs submitted in QE 2018 were submitted by researchers identifying as Pacific.  Note that it is not possible to accurately ascertain the proportion of EPs submitted that drew on Pacific research where those EPs were not cross-referred.

### ***Proposal for panels composition guidance and expectations***

- 41 The proposal for adjustments to panels composition targets and guidance is based upon the Quality Evaluation 2018 submission data in the table above, the recommendations of the *Report of the Moderation Panel and Peer Review Panels*, the new PBRF Principles, and the intent of Cabinet's changes to PBRF.
- 42 The SRG considers that rather than setting any cross-Panel targets as in 2018, it is more appropriate to set high-level expectations that are grounded in the new PBRF Principles and are tied to the demographic make-up of Aotearoa New Zealand.
- 43 Note that this proposal concerns high-level guidance across all panels only. Panel-specific targets and guidance will be developed where necessary.

#### **Panels composition guidance and expectations**

Panel chairs are expected to convene panels that reflect the diversity of Aotearoa New Zealand's population and the PBRF Principles of Partnership, Equity, and Inclusiveness, including:

##### **Gender diversity**

Panel Chairs are expected to convene panels that reflect the gender diversity of Aotearoa New Zealand.

##### **Māori researchers and research**

Panel Chairs are expected to convene panels that include representation of Māori researchers and Māori knowledge expertise (not including the Co-Chairs), upholding Māori-Crown partnership and Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

##### **Pacific researchers and research**

Panel Chairs are expected to convene panels that include representation of Pacific researchers and research expertise.

##### **Representation from across the TEO and research sector**

Panel Chairs are expected to convene panels reflective of sector participation in the panel and TEO submission intentions, including as appropriate representation from the wānanga, Te Pūkenga, and PTEs. Panel-specific targets may be set.

##### **Researcher career stage**

Panel Chairs are expected to aim to convene panels which represent the full range of career stages, from early to late career researchers. This may include appointing early career researchers, where they meet the criteria.

### **Applied and practice-based research**

Panel Chairs are expected to aim to include representation of applied and practice-based researchers. Panel-specific targets will be set in relevant panels.

### **Proportion of new and previous members**

Panel Chairs are expected to aim to convene panels that include members who have not previously sat on PBRF panels.

### **International members**

Panel Chairs are expected to aim to convene panels that include members from international TEOs and research organisations.

### **Interdisciplinary research**

Panel Chairs will determine their panel needs based on cross-referral patterns.

## **Panel sizes and subject area coverage**

44 In Quality Evaluation 2018, there were 13 peer review panels, each covering a number of subject areas as set out below:

<b>Panel</b>	<b>Subject Areas</b>
<b>Biological Sciences</b>	Agriculture and other applied biological sciences Ecology, evolution and behaviour Molecular, cellular and whole organism biology
<b>Business and Economics</b>	Accounting and finance Economics Management, human resources, industrial relations, international business and other business Marketing and tourism
<b>Creative and Performing Arts</b>	Design Music, literary arts and other arts Theatre and dance, film and television and multimedia Visual arts and crafts
<b>Education</b>	Education
<b>Engineering, Technology and Architecture</b>	Architecture, design, planning, surveying Engineering and technology
<b>Health</b>	Dentistry Nursing Other health studies (including rehabilitation therapies)

	Pharmacy Sport and exercise science Veterinary studies and large animal science
<b>Humanities and Law</b>	English language and literature Foreign languages and linguistics History, history of art, classics and curatorial studies Law Philosophy Religious studies and theology
<b>Māori Knowledge and Development</b>	Māori knowledge and development
<b>Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology</b>	Computer science, information technology, information sciences Pure and applied mathematics Statistics
<b>Medicine and Public Health</b>	Biomedical Clinical medicine Public health
<b>Pacific Research</b>	Pacific research
<b>Physical Sciences</b>	Chemistry Earth sciences Physics
<b>Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Studies</b>	Anthropology and archaeology Communications, journalism and media studies Human geography Political science, international relations and public policy Psychology Sociology, social policy, social work, criminology and gender studies

- 45 In convening peer review panels, Panel Chairs were given advice about the number of panel members to appoint per subject area. This was based on modelling of likely EP numbers and distribution across subject areas, and on the assumption that 35 submitted EPs per panel member represented a reasonable workload (see Appendix 2; in particular pages 27 and 30).

- 46 The SRG notes that the 35 EPs per panel member ratio in practice represents a workload of up to 70 EPs per panel member, because each EP was assigned to a pair of panel members to help ensure consistency of assessment.

***Rationale for changes to panel sizes and panel subject area coverage***

- 47 Feedback from panel members and TEC officials involved in Quality Evaluation 2018 was that some panels felt that workloads were too high, or unevenly distributed. It was noted in particular that the Health, Medicine and Public Health, and Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Studies panels were very large and encompassed a large number of subject areas compared with other panels.
- 48 The table below provides a high-level comparison of average EPs submitted per panel member, across the 13 panels.

<b>Panel</b>	<b>Number of EPs submitted in QE 2018 (exc. cross-referrals)</b>	<b>Number of panel members</b>	<b>Average number of EPs submitted per panel member (rounded to nearest whole number)</b>
Biological Sciences	787	24	33
Business and Economics	857	25	34
Creative and Performing Arts	538	19	28
Education	588	17	35
Engineering, Technology and Architecture	771	24	32
Health	615	24	26
Humanities and Law	666	22	30
Māori Knowledge and Development	188	10	19
Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology	562	17	33
Medicine and Public Health	1,210	32	38
Pacific Research	60	9	7
Physical Sciences	549	14	39
Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Studies	878	26	34

- 49 The table above indicates that the majority of panels kept below the recommended 35 EPs per panel member, with the exception of Physical Sciences and Medicine and Public Health.

- 50 Comparison of the number of EPs submitted within each subject area in 2012 and 2018 reveals that within the majority of panels, including Health and Social Sciences, changes ranged from a decrease of 133 EPs (Education) to an increase of 155 (Engineering and Technology).
- 51 On the basis of the data discussed above, the SRG can see a clear rationale for reviewing panel member numbers both to ensure they keep pace with increases in panel sizes, and to ensure the current ratio of 35 EPs submitted per panel member is a reasonable workload, taking into consideration the assessment pairing process. However, the SRG considers that this is an issue for consultation with former panel members rather than with the sector as a whole.
- 52 Within Medicine and Public Health, there have been more significant shifts. In Quality Evaluation 2012, 908 EPs were submitted to this panel. In Quality Evaluation 2018, this rose by a third to 1,210 EPs. All three subject areas saw significant increases in the number of EPs submitted, but this was most marked in Biomedical, which rose by 187 EPs. Were this rate of change to be sustained in Quality Evaluation 2025, this would result in a panel with approximately 1,600 EPs.
- 53 Based on the data, there may be merit in splitting the Medicine and Public Health Panel into two panels: Medicine, and Public Health. Based on Quality Evaluation 2018 submission data, this would result in a Medicine panel of approximately 850 EPs and a Public Health panel of approximately 360 EPs. However, such a change would require the clear support of researchers who submit to the current Medicine and Public Health Panel as well as of the relevant professional bodies.

### **Proposals for adjusting panel sizes and subject area coverage**

54 **Panel sizes:** The TEC will carry out targeted consultation with former panel members in relation to panel workloads in Quality Evaluation 2018. Depending on the outcome of this consultation, the SRG may recommend a different ratio of submitted EPs to panel members.

55 Panel sizes will be adjusted once TEO submission intentions are known, taking into consideration any new ratios recommended by the SRG.

#### **56 Panel subject area coverage**

**Option 1:** The current Medicine and Public Health panel remains unchanged. Panel membership will be adjusted to reflect any new ratios recommended by the SRG, and any growth in submissions.

**Option 2:** The current Medicine and Public Health panel is split into two panels: Medicine, and Public Health. Panel membership of each will reflect any new ratios recommended by the SRG, and indicated submissions.

In addition to seeking the sector's feedback on these options, the TEC will also consult with relevant professional bodies, given the significant number of researchers in this area who are also clinical practitioners.

### **Panel and subject area names**

57 In Quality Evaluation 2018, panel members in the relevant panels gave feedback that the following name changes would be more accurate and should be considered:

- › The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel should be renamed the Māori Knowledge Panel; and
- › The Statistics subject area should be renamed Statistics and Data Science.

58 The TEC has determined that the Statistics subject area name should not be changed. This is because of the importance of PBRF subject areas mirroring Student Achievement Component (SAC) course classifications. This is important to retain because of the PBRF's function in supporting research-led teaching. However, clarification will be provided through the Panel Coverage description in the panel-specific guidelines for the Mathematics and Information Sciences and Technology panel.

***Proposal for panel and subject name changes***

59 The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel will be renamed the Mātauranga Māori Panel.

## PART B: PROCESS CHANGES FOR SECTOR INFORMATION

### Panel membership criteria

60 In Quality Evaluation 2018, peer review panel members were responsible for assessing EPs submitted to their panel, and for participating in panel meetings to calibrate scores and agree final Quality Categories awarded. Specifically, their duties were to:

- › understand the principles, guidelines and procedures of the PBRF Quality Evaluation;
- › assess EPs assigned to them by the panel Chair, primarily by assigning preparatory and preliminary scores as required;
- › understand the broad criteria under which the evaluations are to be made and apply these objectively to the work of the panel;
- › be diligent in their preparation for meetings and in completing tasks allocated to them by the panel Chair (for example, undertaking initial assessment of EPs allocated to them in a timely manner);
- › contribute fully, constructively and dispassionately to all panel processes and take collective ownership for the panel decisions;
- › maintain confidentiality of both the deliberations and decisions of the panel;
- › exercise due skill and care in the performance of their responsibilities; and
- › identify instances where they may have a conflict of interest and raise this with the panel Chair prior to the conflict affecting the assessment process.

Note that changes to the substantive duties of panel members are not being considered for Quality Evaluation 2025.

61 In order to carry out these duties, panel members were ideally expected to:

- › have substantial experience in a peer review or research evaluation role;
- › have significant and broad research expertise;
- › have sufficient levels of knowledge and expertise to be able to apply expert judgements about quality against widely recognised standards of excellence;
- › be able to give appropriate consideration to the significance, quality and impact of professional and applied research (where relevant);

- › have limited conflicts of interest;
- › be committed to operating within the guidelines in an objective, fair and dispassionate manner;
- › be able to operate effectively and productively as a member of a small, multi-disciplinary team over a pressured time period; and
- › have the confidence of their peers.

62 These criteria were applied by Panel Chairs and the Moderation Team to appoint panel members. As such, the criteria must remain sufficiently broad that they can be applied within all panel-specific contexts. Panel Chairs bring their own disciplinary expertise to bear in determining how the criteria are interpreted for their panel.

63 The 2018 panel selection criteria and role descriptions are set out in Appendix 2: *Peer Review Panel nomination and selection process for the 2018 Quality Evaluation*.

#### ***New requirements for panel selection criteria***

64 The new PBRF principles of Partnership, Equity, and Inclusivity, and the TEC commitment under the Education and Training Act 2020 to honour its obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and to uphold Māori-Crown partnership, should be embedded across the design of Quality Evaluation 2025.

65 In the context of the roles and responsibilities of panel members, this means ensuring that panel members have not just the requisite disciplinary expertise and academic standing, but are able to demonstrate awareness of the significance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and have an appreciation of the diverse range of epistemologies, knowledges, and research in Aotearoa New Zealand.

66 The TEC has agreed in principle a new PBRF Definition of Research. The new definition specifically encompasses Māori and Pacific research ontologies and methodologies, as well as recognising applied, practice- and community-based research, and research impact.

67 Applying the PBRF Definition of Research is a fundamental aspect of panel members' work; as such it is important that the selection criteria align with the new definition.

#### ***Additional and revised panel selection criteria***

68 Given the new requirements outlined above, panel selection criteria will be adjusted to ensure that panel members:

- › demonstrate awareness and understanding of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the significance of Māori-Crown partnership; and
  - › demonstrate an appreciation of the diverse range of ontologies, epistemologies, knowledges, and research in Aotearoa New Zealand.
- 69 The criterion ‘able to give appropriate consideration to the significance, quality and impact of professional and applied research (where relevant)’ will be updated to include practice-based and community-based research.
- 70 The specific criteria will be confirmed when the TEC runs the process to appoint Panel Chairs and initial panellists.

### **Panel member training**

- 71 For previous Quality Evaluations, panel members received comprehensive training materials. In addition, panel members based in New Zealand, Australia, and the Pacific Islands participated in two-day face-to face training workshops in Wellington.
- 72 The training materials were developed by TEC officials with input from Panel Chairs. Training workshops were delivered by TEC officials and led by Panel Chairs. The Moderation Team and the Chair of the SRG also contributed.
- 73 Training was designed to address:
- › The mechanics of the assessment process;
  - › Calibration of scoring;
  - › Holistic scoring;
  - › Cross-referral;
  - › Understanding the tie-points and tie-point descriptors;
  - › Scoring the Research Output and Research Contribution components;
  - › Applying the Panel-specific guidance;
  - › Panel culture; and
  - › Unconscious bias.
- 74 Panel training for Quality Evaluation 2025 will need to address these issues in the context of the changes that have been agreed, and the new PBRF principles.

### **Panel member training for Quality Evaluation 2025: TEC approach**

- 75 The following information sets out the TEC's intended approach to panel member training. It is provided for sector information.
- 76 In addition to the general topics noted at paragraph 73 above, panel training for Quality Evaluation 2025 will cover:
- › Understanding and applying the revised PBRF Definition of Research.
  - › An introduction to Mātauranga Māori and the Te Ao Māori approach to research;
  - › Understanding how the MKD Panel and Pacific Research Panel elaborations of the PBRF Definition of Research apply to other panels.
  - › Understanding the new EP design. In particular, panels will receive training in how to score EPs given the in-principle decision that EPs must contain three EREs unless one or more exceptions apply. A fundamental principle of assessment for Quality Evaluation 2025 will be that panel members must assess each EP on the basis of the merits of the material included only, with no consideration for whether more items could have been included.
  - › Scoring Examples of Research Excellence. In particular, panels will receive training in how to score EREs on the basis of the merits of the material included only, with no consideration for whether more items could have been included.
  - › Scoring the Examples of Research Excellence and Contributions to the Research Environment components.
  - › Understanding the new Extraordinary Circumstances provisions. In particular, panels will receive training that Extraordinary Circumstances impacts are reflected in the number of EREs the EP must contain and/or whether CRE items must be included, and thus panel members are not expected to take the impact of the circumstances into consideration in assessing the EPs.
  - › Any other matters arising from discussions between TEC officials and the SRG Co-Chairs, Co-Moderators, and Panel Chairs/Co-Chairs.

### **Panel-specific guidelines**

- 77 In previous Quality Evaluations, the Guidelines governing the exercise as a whole have been accompanied by panel-specific guidelines. These have been published simultaneously with the Guidelines, and provide elaborations on the Guidelines specific to each panel that are aimed at assisting researchers preparing EPs to understand the panel's expectations.

- 78 Panel-specific guidelines have been developed by Panel Chairs along with Deputy Chairs and the initial panel members, with support from TEC officials to ensure alignment with the Guidelines.
- 79 General principles informing the development of the guidelines have been that they should:
- › expand on rather than duplicate or deviate from the main Guidelines;
  - › indicate what should be included as content in the different sections of the EP; and
  - › advise on aspects of research that are non-typical for the subject area or discipline but will be considered by the panel.
- 80 Guidance has varied considerably from panel to panel, reflecting differences in research processes and practices across the disciplines they cover. Topics covered have included:
- › Panel coverage, or the subject areas and disciplines that the panel considers as falling within its scope;
  - › Elaborations of the PBRF Definition of Research;
  - › Elaborations of the types of research output or contribution that are acceptable;
  - › Criteria for cross-referral;
  - › Panel expectations with respect to use of metrics, journal impact factors, or citations; and
  - › Panel expectations with respect to EPs by new and emerging researchers.
- 81 The panel-specific guidelines for Quality Evaluation 2018 can be found here: <https://www.tec.govt.nz/assets/Forms-templates-and-guides/PBRF/76cca23ea0/PBRF-2018-Panel-Specific-Guidelines-April-2018.pdf/>.

***Requirements for new directions to Panel Chairs on panel-specific guidelines: TEC approach***

- 82 The following information sets out the TEC's intended approach to panel-specific guidelines and is provided for sector information.
- 83 Feedback from Quality Evaluation 2018 panel members indicated that the panel-specific guidelines could include clearer descriptions of how to apply the Definition of Research to research outputs and to EPs generally.
- 84 The panel-specific guidelines will reflect all in-principle decisions on changes to the design of Quality Evaluation 2025 but in particular:

- › Following in-principle decisions on the approach to acknowledging Māori research and Pacific research, the panel-specific guidelines for Quality Evaluation 2025 will articulate how the elaborations of the Definition of Research developed by the Māori Knowledge and Development and the Pacific Research panels will apply in each panel.
- › Following in-principle decisions on EP design, the panel-specific guidelines will elaborate how the new ERE design and the new Contributions to the Research Environment component should apply within each panel.

## Next steps and consultation feedback

85 Feedback is sought on the following proposals:

### Panel chairing provisions

1. Do you support the proposal to adopt a co-chairing model, with one Co-Chair required to have expertise in Māori knowledge?

### Panels composition

2. Do you support the proposed new approach and expectations for ensuring appropriate panel representation of the diversity of Aotearoa New Zealand and of the sector?

### Panel sizes and subject area coverage

3. Note that the TEC will consult with former panel members on the current ratio of 35 submitted EPs per panel member, and the SRG's recommendation will be based on this feedback.
4. Do you support **Option 1**: retain the Medicine and Public Health panel, or **Option 2**: split the panel into two new panels, one for Medicine and one for Public Health?

### Panel and subject area names

5. Do you support renaming the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel as the Mātauranga Māori Panel?

86 We welcome any comments you wish to make on the TEC's intended approach to the following issues:

### Panel membership criteria

1. We welcome any comments you have on the TEC's intended approach to the panel membership criteria, or any additional criteria that should be considered.

**Panel member training**

2. We welcome any comments on the TEC's intended approach to the panel training, or any additional training topics that should be considered.

**Panel-specific guidelines**

3. We welcome any comments on the TEC's intended approach to the panel-specific guidelines, or any additional topics that should be considered.

88 The consultation period will run from Friday 1 – Friday 29 July 2022. Feedback can be provided via the online survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/HQHRNGY>.

89 Consultation feedback will be considered by the SRG and recommendations made to the TEC.

## Appendix 1

### Research definitions and EP design: record of PBRF Sector Reference Group recommendations

The PBRF Sector Reference Group met on 13 May 2022 and made recommendations on proposed research definitions including:

- › a revised PBRF Definition of Research,
- › the approach to acknowledging Māori research and Pacific research,
- › the definition of research excellence, the Quality Category descriptors, and
- › changes to the design of Evidence Portfolios (EPs).

The Sector Reference Group recommends to the TEC:

#### PBRF Definition of Research

1. That the revised PBRF Definition of Research is as follows:

For the purposes of the PBRF, research is defined as a process of investigation or inquiry leading to new, recovered, or reinterpreted knowledge or understanding which is effectively shared and capable of rigorous assessment by the appropriate experts.

In Aotearoa New Zealand our distinctive research cultures and environments draw on diverse ontological, epistemological, and methodological traditions of critical inquiry, experimentation, and knowledge-creation. This definition of research includes Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori; diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research; and work that embodies new insights of direct relevance to the specific needs of iwi, hapū, marae, communities, government, scholarship and teaching, industry, and commerce, which may be developed through collaborative and practice-led processes involving stakeholders from those constituencies.

Research can be an individual or collective process and may be embodied in the form of artistic works, performances, designs, policies, or processes that lead to novel or substantially improved insights.

For further clarification, research includes:

- › Activity that leads to scholarly books, journal articles, and other nationally and internationally published outputs and presentations that offer new, recovered, or reinterpreted knowledge;
- › Activity that leads to contributions to the intellectual underpinning of different ontologies and epistemologies, subjects, and disciplines (for example, dictionaries, scholarly editions, teaching materials that embody original research, or teaching practices or activities that produce original research);

- › Applications of existing knowledge to produce new or substantially improved materials, devices, products, designs, policies, granted patents, or creative outputs;
- › Re-centering and revitalisation of knowledge (for example, the study of raranga, whakapapa narratives, waiata composition, navigational knowledge, translation studies, historical or literary archival studies, or ecological research); and
- › The synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that the insights generated are new.

It does not include:

- › routine testing and data collection lacking analysis, interpretation and/or evaluation;
- › preparation for teaching that does not embody original research (for example, collation of existing research and research outputs into handbooks or textbooks where this does not embody new insights); or
- › the legal and administrative aspects of intellectual property protection and commercialisation activities.

## **Approach to acknowledging Māori research and Pacific research**

2. That the following statements are included in the PBRF Quality Evaluation 2025 Guidelines alongside the PBRF Definition of Research:

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to Māori ways of knowing, being, and conducting rangahau. Rangahau and knowledge of relevance to Māori communities, such as kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, is an essential component of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research culture. The Māori Knowledge and Development Panel-Specific Guidance has elaborated the ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which comprise Te Āo Māori. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

The new definition of research includes explicit reference to diverse Pacific ways of knowing, being, and conducting research. Research and knowledge of relevance to Pacific communities is an essential component of Aotearoa New Zealand's distinctive research culture. The Pacific Research Panel-Specific Guidance has elaborated the topics, ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies, knowledges and understandings which make up Pacific research cultures. This elaboration applies across all Panels and will be used to determine whether EPs should be cross-referred.

## **Definition of Research Excellence and definition of impact for the purposes of PBRF Quality Evaluation 2025**

3. That the following revised definition of research excellence is adopted and included in the PBRF Quality Evaluation 2025 Guidelines:

For the purposes of the Quality Evaluation, research excellence will be assessed in terms of originality, rigour, reach, and significance, with reference to the quality standards appropriate to the subject area and to the unique nature of Aotearoa New Zealand's research cultures and needs.

Excellence will be assessed across the following areas of activity:

- › The production and creation of knowledge, including ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies unique to Māori and to Pacific communities
- › The dissemination and application of that knowledge within academic and/or other communities and its impact outside the research environment; and
- › Activity which sustains and develops the research environment, within and across both academic and non-academic domains

4. That the following definition of impact is included in the PBRF Quality Evaluation 2025 Guidelines alongside the definition of research excellence:

For the purposes of the Quality Evaluation, the impact of research is defined as a positive effect on, change, or benefit to society, culture, the environment, or the economy at any level, outside the research environment.

Impacts on scholarship, research, or the advancement of knowledge within the research environment are not included.

## Quality Category descriptors

5. That the new Quality Categories are as follows:

### Quality Category A

The panel considers that as a whole the EP contains evidence of activity that is recognised by peers as outstanding, representing the leading-edge in its field (including if appropriate through international publication or dissemination), demonstrates very significant contributions to the research environment, and/or has led to very significant impact.

- › Research outputs are recognised by peers as leading-edge for the field in terms of their originality, rigour, and significance and/or in terms of the reach and significance of their impact.
- › Research-related activities demonstrate very significant outcomes from collaboration, dissemination and/or engagement within or outside academic domains; they may have delivered very significant impacts, with considerable reach, and where relevant have gained the highest level of recognition from peers, which may also include peers within industry, communities, iwi, hapū, marae, the public and third sectors, and/ or professional practice.

- › Research environment contributions demonstrate very significant contributions to the vitality and sustainability of the research culture and environment, which is likely to occur beyond the field of research.

### **Quality Category B**

The panel considers that as a whole the EP contains evidence of activity which is recognised by peers as high-quality within its field (including if appropriate through international recognition), demonstrates significant contributions to the research environment, and/or has led to significant impact.

- › Research outputs are recognised by peers as high quality for the field in terms of their originality, rigour, and significance and/or in terms of the reach and significance of their impact.
- › Research-related activities demonstrate significant outcomes from collaboration, dissemination and/or engagement either within or outside academic domains; they may have delivered significant impacts with reach, and where relevant have gained recognition from peers which may also include peers within industry, communities, iwi, hapū, marae, the public and third sectors, and/or professional practice.
- › Research environment contributions demonstrate significant contributions to the vitality and sustainability of the research culture and environment.

### **Quality Category C**

The panel considers that as a whole the EP contains evidence of activity which is recognised by peers as having met quality-assurance standards within its field (including if appropriate through international recognition), demonstrates some contributions to the research environment and/or has led to some impact.

- › Research outputs are recognised by peers as meeting the quality standards of the field in terms of their originality, rigour, and significance, and/or demonstrate impact which is limited in terms of reach or significance.
- › Research-related activities demonstrate some outcomes from collaboration, dissemination and/or engagement either within or outside academic domains; they may have delivered moderate impacts and where relevant may have gained some recognition by peers, which may also include peers within industry, communities, iwi, hapū, marae, the public and third sectors, and/or professional practice.
- › Research environment contributions demonstrate some contributions to the vitality and sustainability of the research culture and environment.

### **Quality Category C(NE)**

The panel considers that as a whole the EP contains evidence of activity which is recognised by peers as having met quality-assurance standards within its field (including if appropriate through international recognition), and/or has led to

some impact. The EP may contain evidence of contributions to the research environment.

- › Research outputs are recognised by peers as meeting the quality standards of the field in terms of their originality, rigour, and significance, and/or demonstrate impact which is limited in terms of reach or significance.
- › Research-related activities demonstrate some outcomes from collaboration, dissemination and/or engagement either within or outside academic domains; they may have delivered moderate impacts and where relevant may have gained some recognition by peers, which may also include peers within industry, communities, iwi, hapū, marae, the public and third sectors, and/or professional practice.
- › Research environment contributions, if present, demonstrate some contributions to the vitality and sustainability of the research culture and environment.

This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of new and emerging researchers only.

### **Quality Category R**

An EP will be assigned an R when the evidence included does not demonstrate the quality standard required for a C Quality Category or higher.

### **Quality Category R(NE)**

An EP will be assigned an R(NE) when the evidence included does not demonstrate the quality standard required for a Quality Category C(NE) or higher.

This Quality Category can be awarded to the EPs of new and emerging researchers only.

## Evidence Portfolio design

### Examples of Research Excellence

6. That an Example of Research Excellence (ERE) will comprise a single core research output, along with up to three linked supplementary items and a brief contextualizing narrative. In addition, the SRG recommends the Guidelines clarify that:
  - › EREs are assessed according to the same assessment criteria regardless of whether they contain fewer than the maximum allowable number of supplementary items, or no supplementary items at all; and
  - › Research activities demonstrating impact must have occurred within the assessment period to be eligible, but the underpinning research output does not have to be published within the assessment period (as in Quality Evaluation 2018). Impacts which were first claimed in a previous Quality Evaluation are not eligible for submission in Quality Evaluation 2025.
7. That an EP must contain three EREs, unless one of the following exceptions apply:
  - › New and Emerging Researcher
  - › Extraordinary Circumstances (noting that the name may change)
  - › Part-time employment

Note that further recommendations, regarding the mechanism for determining what reductions will apply to EPs claiming one or more of the eligible exceptions, will be decided based upon the Individual Circumstances 2 options and consultation feedback in September 2022.

### Other Examples of Research Excellence

8. That both research outputs and research activities will be eligible as Other Examples of Research Excellence.
9. That up to eight OEREs may be included in the EP, along with a narrative which staff may use to contextualise/link together the OEREs submitted.

### Research Contributions

10. That the 'Research Contributions' component be renamed the 'Contributions to the Research Environment' component.
11. That the existing 12 types of eligible Research Contributions are reduced to the following six, and that the type descriptors be reviewed and revised to better reflect Māori and Pacific research modes, to clarify the distinctions between types, and to ensure that peer esteem factors have a clear place within the EP:
  - › 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.

12. That the Contribution to the Research Environment component contain a minimum of one and a maximum of ten items, and that no overarching narrative be required.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Performance-Based Research Fund Peer Review Panel nomination and selection process for the 2018 Quality Evaluation**

**Tertiary Education  
Commission**  
Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua



# Performance-Based Research Fund

**Peer Review Panel nomination and  
selection process for the 2018  
Quality Evaluation**

Published by the Tertiary Education Commission  
Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua  
National Office  
44 The Terrace  
PO Box 27048  
Wellington, New Zealand

Updated December, 2017

ISBN [insert number] (electronic) – if required, check with [publishing@tec.govt.nz](mailto:publishing@tec.govt.nz)

#### **Authors**

The Tertiary Education Commission

Every effort is made to provide accurate and factual content. The TEC, however, cannot accept responsibility for any inadvertent errors or omissions that may occur.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence. You are free to copy, distribute, and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to the Tertiary Education Commission and abide by the other licence terms. Please note you may not use any departmental or governmental emblem, logo, or coat of arms in any way that infringes any provision of the Flags, Emblems, and Names Protection Act 1981.

# Contents

Peer Review Panels	4
What is the overall outcome sought?	4
What is the overall process?	4
What are the selection criteria?	5
What is required of panellists?	6
How do I nominate someone or be nominated?	6
Where do I submit this nomination and by when?	7
How are Panel Members appointed?	7
When will I know the result?	8
Can I withdraw my nomination?	8
What if I have questions?	8
Key dates for panel nominations and appointments	9
Appendix 1: Peer Review Panels	10
Appendix 2: Nomination information	12
Appendix 3: Information relating to panel appointments	15
Appendix 4: Conflict of interest policy	19
Appendix 5: Confidentiality of Information policy	22
Appendix 6: Guidance to Panel Chairs	24
Panel guidance	28
Potential number of Panel members by subject area	30
Appendix 7: Appointment of Panel Chairs and Deputy Chairs	34

# Peer Review Panels

**The Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) invites nominations for people to serve as Panel Members for the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) 2018 Quality Evaluation.**

This document provides an overview of the nomination and appointment processes, as well as key information and dates for those interested in being on a panel in the 2018 Quality Evaluation.

## What is the overall outcome sought?

The two-stage panel selection process will result in the appointment of the Chairs, Deputy Chairs and members (collectively referred to as “panellists”) of the thirteen peer review panels for the 2018 Quality Evaluation (see [Appendix 1](#)).

PBRF peer review panellists are appointed for their specific expertise and knowledge, and do not act as representatives of their employer or discipline.

In the appointment of a peer review panel, the goal will be to achieve the highest calibre of panellists, who jointly represent a comprehensive range of subjects and interests.

Each panel will have, where possible:

- › an appropriate mix of new and previous panel members
- › gender representation
- › international representation of at least 25%
- › representation from across different tertiary education sectors and other research organisations
- › panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of:
  - applied/practice-based researchers
  - early career researchers
  - inter-disciplinary researchers
  - Māori researchers
  - Pasifika researchers.

## What is the overall process?

There is a two-stage open nomination process for membership of the 2018 Quality Evaluation peer review panels, with the first stage closed in September 2015, and the second stage open until 26 February 2018.

Nominations are welcome from individuals with recognised research expertise and knowledge, including those with experience of applied research or significant evidence of links to research users, and who undertake research in non-TEO settings.

There are key activities within the overall nomination and selection process. These activities and the indicative dates are set out in the table on the following page.

**Table 1: Activities and time frames**

Activity	Indicative date	Status
First nomination deadline closes	14 September 2015	Completed
Panel Chairs announced	6 November 2015	Completed
Initial cohort of members including Deputy Chairs announced	4 February 2016	Completed
Panel-specific guidelines developed and released	February – July 2016	Completed
Evidence Portfolio (EP) estimates supplied by TEOs to inform judgements about size of each panel	12 February 2018	
Second nomination process closes	26 February 2018	
Second cohort of members announced	10 May 2018	
Deadline for submission of EPs	13 July 2018	
Additional appointments of Panel Members announced	31 July 2018	

## What are the selection criteria?

The preferred attributes and qualities of a panel member are that they will:

- › have substantial experience in a peer review or research evaluation role
- › have significant and broad research expertise
- › have sufficient levels of knowledge and expertise to be able to apply expert judgements about quality against widely recognised standards of excellence
- › be able to give appropriate consideration to the significance, quality and impact of professional and applied research (where relevant)
- › have limited conflicts of interest
- › be committed to operating within the guidelines in an objective, fair and dispassionate manner
- › be able to operate effectively and productively as a member of a small, multi-disciplinary team over a pressured time period
- › have the confidence of their peers.

## What is required of panellists?

In the PBRF Quality Evaluation process, individuals are appointed as peer review panellists in their own right, for their specific skills and expertise in both research and the assessment of research. They do not act as representatives of their employer or discipline.

### *Responsibilities of Panel Members*

Panel members are to participate fully in the evaluation process within their panel.

Specifically, their responsibilities are to:

- › understand the principles, guidelines and procedures of the PBRF Quality Evaluation
- › assess EPs assigned to them by the Panel Chair, primarily by assigning preparatory and preliminary scores as required
- › understand the broad criteria under which the evaluations are to be made, and apply these objectively to the work of the panel
- › be diligent in their preparation for meetings and in completing tasks allocated to them by the Panel Chair (such as undertaking initial assessment of EPs allocated to them in a timely manner)
- › contribute fully, constructively and dispassionately to all panel processes and take collective ownership for the panel decisions
- › maintain confidentiality of both the deliberations and decisions of the panel
- › exercise due skill and care in the performance of their responsibilities
- › identify instances where they may have a conflict of interest and raise this with the Panel Chair prior to the conflict affecting the assessment process.

Panel members appointed in the first selection process in 2015 are also required to assist with revising and updating panel-specific guidelines.

## How do I nominate someone or be nominated?

Any person seeking to be appointed to a panel must be nominated by another person who must submit a nomination form.

PBRF panel members from previous Quality Evaluations will not be automatically reappointed.

All nominations must be submitted online by the person making the nomination. All nominations must be completed using this [online form](#).

If you wish to nominate someone as a panel member, you must:

- › Ask the nominee to agree to the nominee declaration and provide all nominee information required and a current curriculum vitae (CV) that outlines the nominees' appropriate skills, attributes and backgrounds. The CV must be no more than five single-side A4 pages.
- › Complete the remaining information and declaration, and submit the completed form with the attached nominee's CV to the TEC.

The TEC reserves the right to approach individuals directly.

## Where do I submit this nomination and by when?

The first nomination process (to select Panel Chairs, Deputy Chairs, and an initial cohort of panellists to develop panel-specific guidelines) has now closed.

Nominations for the second nomination process remain open and will be accepted any time up until **26 February 2018**. Self-nominations will not be accepted.

All nominations must be completed using this [online form](#).

Nominees who were not successful in the first nomination process have been carried over to the second nomination process.

## How are Panel Members appointed?

Panel Members will be selected through a two-stage open nomination process.

*First nomination process (completed February 2016)*

An initial cohort of panel members, consisting of at least five members who provide fair representation of all relevant disciplines covered by the panel, have been appointed to each peer review panel. This number excludes the Panel Chair and the Deputy Panel Chair.

This initial cohort of each panel was responsible for developing the panel-specific guidelines that are used by the sector to support the submission of Evidence Portfolios (EPs).

*Second nomination process (ongoing until 26 February 2018)*

A second nomination process will finalise the size of each panel prior to the Quality Evaluation in 2018 by appointing panellists that meet the specific gaps identified by the Panel Chairs and Moderators. Nominations from the first selection process will be included for consideration by Panel Chairs.

*Selection process*

Panel Chairs will assess nominees against the selection criteria reviewing the information supplied about those people nominated for the relevant peer review panel.

Panel Chairs are also able to directly nominate potential members where they consider this necessary or appropriate.

The Panel Chair will then work with the Moderators to recommend suitable candidates for appointment as Panel Members by the TEC. The Moderators will review the recommendations and provide specific advice on this. Panel members are to participate fully in the evaluation process within their panel.

The recommendations to the TEC will include:

- › the grouping of nominees as follows:
  - preferred candidates for appointment to the role of Panel Member
  - candidates identified as suitable for appointment but not recommended
  - individuals who are not considered suitable for appointment;
- › information on what gaps may have arisen in the membership of the initial cohort of Panel Members, and what steps were taken to identify alternative Panel Members
- › what gaps have arisen in the overall membership of the panel based on the nominations received to date, taking into account the overall goal that is sought.

### *Finalising the panel following the submission of Evidence Portfolios*

Participating tertiary education organisations (TEOs) will submit their Evidence Portfolios no later than 13 July 2018.

Following this, Panel Chairs may need to appoint a small number of additional members to address certain subject areas or manage conflicts of interest.

Panel Chairs will select these members from the nominations received and through direct nomination of appropriate individuals where they consider this necessary or appropriate.

## **When will I know the result?**

The TEC will advise each nominee on the outcome of the process. Following the second nomination round, nominees will be advised by **18 April 2018** that their application has either been successful or unsuccessful.

### *Finalising appointments*

Once the recommendations for panel appointments and panel profiles are approved by the TEC, the successful nominees will be advised in writing.

This information will include a letter of appointment to be signed and returned as acceptance of the appointment. It will include a confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration.

Panel appointments will be announced on the TEC's website with information on each member to include name, current employer/organisation affiliation, and subject area expertise.

### *Replacing Panel Chairs or Members*

Should a recommended nominee decline an appointment or resign, the TEC will work with the Moderators and relevant Panel Chair where applicable, to recommend a replacement from the list of those who are "suitable for appointment but not recommended". The final decision on appointment will rest with the TEC.

## **Can I withdraw my nomination?**

Nominees can withdraw their nomination at any time by emailing [pbrfhelp@tec.govt.nz](mailto:pbrfhelp@tec.govt.nz) with their name, contact details and nominated panel name so that the TEC can identify the correct nomination.

## **What if I have questions?**

Any questions can be sent via email to [pbrfhelp@tec.govt.nz](mailto:pbrfhelp@tec.govt.nz) and we will get back to you directly. Updates on the process will be published on the TEC website.

## Key dates for panel nominations and appointments

Activity	Indicative date
Nomination process opens	3 August 2015
First nomination process closes (second nomination process continues)	14 September 2015
Panel Chairs advised of appointment	16 October 2015
Panel Chairs announced	6 November 2015
Panel Chair induction session (1 day)	19 November 2015
Deputy Panel Chairs and Panel Members (initial cohort) advised of appointment	15 December 2015
Deputy Panel Chairs and Panel Members (initial cohort) announced	4 February 2016
Panel specific guidelines released for consultation	18 April 2016
Consultation closes on panel-specific guidelines	17 June 2016
Final panel-specific guidelines released	22 July 2016
TEOs provide estimates of EPs to be submitted by panel and subject area	12 February 2018
Second nomination process closes	26 February 2018
Panel Members (second cohort) advised of appointment	By 18 April 2018
Second cohort of members announced	10 May 2018
Chair training meetings (2 days)	30-31 May 2018
Deadline for submission of EPs	13 July 2018
Additional appointments of Panel Members announced	31 July 2018
Panel training meetings (2 days) (Schedule in Appendix 3)	August 2018
Pre-panel meeting assessment of EPs	August – November 2018
Initial moderation meeting (Chairs and Moderators only)	15 November 2018
Panel meetings (3-5 days) (Schedule in Appendix 3)	19 Nov –7 December 2018
Second Moderation meeting (Chairs and Moderators only)	11 December 2018
Any panels reconvened if necessary	January 2019
Panel reports due	February 2019

## Appendix 1: Peer Review Panels

Panel	Panel Identifier	Subject Area
Biological Sciences	BIOS	Agriculture and other applied biological sciences Ecology, evolution and behaviour Molecular, cellular and whole organism biology
Business and Economics	BEC	Accounting and finance Economics Management, human resources, industrial relations, international business and other business Marketing and tourism
Creative and Performing Arts	CPA	Design Music, literary arts and other arts Theatre and dance, film and television and multimedia Visual arts and crafts
Education	EDU	Education
Engineering, Technology and Architecture	ETA	Architecture, design, planning, surveying Engineering and technology
Health	HEALTH	Dentistry Nursing Other health studies (including rehabilitation therapies) Pharmacy Sport and exercise science Veterinary studies and large animal science
Humanities and Law	HAL	English language and literature Foreign languages and linguistics History, history of art, classics and curatorial studies Law Philosophy Religious studies and theology
Māori Knowledge and Development	MKD	Māori knowledge and development
Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology	MIST	Computer science, information technology, information sciences Pure and applied mathematics Statistics

Medicine and Public Health	MEDPH	Biomedical Clinical medicine Public health
Pacific Research	PACIFIC	Pacific research
Physical Sciences	PHYSC	Chemistry Earth sciences Physics
Social Sciences and Other Cultural/ Social Studies	SSOCSS	Anthropology and archaeology Communications, journalism and media studies Human geography Political science, international relations and public policy Psychology Sociology, social policy, social work, criminology and gender studies

## Appendix 2: Nomination information

The table below can be used to collect the required information, however; all nominations must be completed using this [online form](#).

The information in a nomination form will be available to other Panel Members if the nominee is appointed. Nominees may wish to use contact details for their place of employment.

A current copy of the nominee's CV that outlines the nominee's appropriate skills, attributes and background must be uploaded with the nomination form. The CV must be no more than five single-side A4 pages and can be submitted in Microsoft Word or PDF format only. The CV should include information on the nominee's research outputs (where applicable).

*Information required for a nominee*

Nominee's details	
Surname	
First name	
Preferred name (if different from first name above)	
Preferred title	
Gender	
Ethnicity (and iwi affiliations where applicable)	
Contact details	
Contact phone number	
Mobile phone number	
E-mail address	
Postal Address	
Physical Address for courier (if different from above)	
Employment/academic details	
Employer (if applicable)	
Current position	
Academic qualifications and year attained	
Ethnicity (and iwi affiliations where applicable)	
Peer review panel details	
Panel(s) nominating for (please refer to Appendix 1)	
Primary area of subject expertise	
Specific subject area expertise (A brief statement relating to the subject areas of the panel)	

Up to five examples of appointments to external bodies/committees (including dates)	
Up to five examples of external experience in peer review/assessment situations	
Up to five examples of significant awards/grants/fellowships	
A list of all actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest (refer to the Conflict of Interest policy for guidance)	
<b>Declaration</b>	
<p>The nominee must agree to the submission of the nomination form on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› they have read the information set out in this document <i>Peer Review Panel nomination and selection process for the 2018 Quality Evaluation</i> and agree to the Conditions of Nomination set out as part of that information; and</li> <li>› they have read and agree to the <u><i>Conflict of Interest Policy</i></u> and the <u><i>Confidentiality of Information Policy</i></u>; and</li> <li>› the information contained in the nomination form is accurate.</li> </ul>	

*Information required for the person making the nomination*

<b>Contact details</b>	
Name (including title)	
Position	
Phone number	
Email address	
<b>Declaration</b>	
<p>The person making the nomination must confirm that they are submitting the nomination form on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› they have discussed this nomination with the person they are nominating and they have agreed to be considered; and</li> <li>› the nomination is valid for the 2018 Quality Evaluation only; and</li> <li>› the information contained in the nomination form is accurate.</li> </ul>	

*Accepting nominations*

Nominations will be accepted by the TEC on the understanding that:

- › nominees have read this document and understand the role, responsibilities and commitments of the role they are being nominated for, this includes:
  - being available to contribute to the preparation of panel-specific guidelines between March and May 2016 (initial cohort only)

- using the PBRF IT system and all processes developed by the TEC for the purposes of assessing and scoring of Evidence Portfolios
  - attending the one-day induction session in November 2015 (Chairs only)
  - attending the two-day training session in August 2018 (all Chairs and New Zealand and Australian-based Members)<sup>1</sup>
  - being available to evaluate Evidence Portfolios between July and December 2018 (including being available for a meeting of up to 5 days during the last two weeks of November and first week of December 2018)
  - being available for any further panel meeting or assessment that is required as directed by the Moderation Panel for the Quality Evaluation (normally in January or February of 2019)
- › nominees employed by any agency of the Crown have the agreement of their employer to their potential involvement
  - › Panel Chairs and Members who are employed by a Crown Research Institute or any other agency of the Crown will not receive an honorarium for their PBRF duties if they are also being paid by their employer for the same time
  - › the information will be made available to panels seeking additional members, particularly in multi-disciplinary research areas, if necessary.

The TEC undertakes to:

- › safeguard the information provided by the person being nominated and the person making the nomination
- › only use this information for the purposes of appointing peer review Panel Members and to those panels
- › acknowledge all nominations received and to notify all nominees of the outcome of the appointment process
- › maintain the confidentiality of Panel Members' deliberations and decision-making.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appropriate training options for other overseas-based panel members will be developed and advised to appointees in advance of August 2018.

## Appendix 3: Information relating to panel appointments

### *Honorarium*

The honorarium for each role is set out below.

- › Panel Chairs: \$18,170
- › Deputy Chairs: \$5,500
- › Panel Members (appointed in the initial cohort): \$4,500
- › Panel Members (appointed in the second cohort): \$3,500

All honoraria are exclusive of GST.

Panel Chairs and Members who are employed by a Crown Research Institute or any other agency of the Crown will not receive an honorarium for their PBRF duties if they are also being paid by their employer for the same time.

Panel Chairs and Members who are self-employed or employed within the private sector will be appointed through a contract for service. The payment for services will be negotiated with those individuals.

### *Tax*

If you live permanently in New Zealand and are registered for GST, you must provide the TEC with an invoice for your honorarium (if applicable).

If you are not registered for GST, and you are not claiming through a company or partnership, you must also submit an [IR330 Tax Code Declaration Form](#). The TEC will deduct resident withholding tax from your honorarium prior to payment.

### *Payments*

All payments will be by direct credit to your bank account. Please complete and supply a direct credit authority as specified on the Direct Credit Form included in this letter.

When claiming fees please note that:

- › Overseas-based persons in New Zealand for less than 64 days are exempt from withholding tax.
- › If you are not registered for GST, the fee will be paid through our payroll system and withholding tax will be deducted from the total claimed.
- › If you are claiming as an individual or as a company or partnership registered for GST, or through your organisation, you will need to provide a valid GST invoice within one month of completion of the relevant activity. GST should be added to the total claimed.

If you do not want to have withholding tax deducted, you will need to provide a copy of your certificate of exemption from withholding tax.

### *Disbursements*

All disbursements will be paid in accordance with the TEC's travel, accommodation and expense claim policy, unless otherwise agreed. This policy will be provided to appointees following acceptance of their role.

### *Term of appointment*

The term of appointment will be for the 2018 Quality Evaluation, however for those appointed as part of the initial cohort including Panel Chairs and Deputy Chairs the term will be for a longer period (2015/2016 until 2019).

The TEC may terminate appointments with immediate effect by giving the Panel Member written notice if they:

- › breach any of the terms and conditions of this appointment; or
- › commit any act amounting to serious misconduct.

The TEC may also terminate an appointment if it determines that the Panel Member's conflicts of interest are at a level that they may impact on the operation of a fair, impartial and effective evaluation process.

The Panel Member, or the TEC, may also terminate the appointment (at the Panel Member's, or our, sole discretion) for any reason by giving 14 days' notice in writing to the other party.

If the appointment terminates, the Panel Member must promptly deliver all property, documents, records and papers in their possession or under their control associated with the appointment to the TEC.

### *Time commitment*

The role of a Panel Member is reasonably demanding and includes the comprehensive assessment of Evidence Portfolios (EPs), the detailed review of selected Nominated Research Outputs, extensive liaison with other Panel Members, preparation for the peer review panel meetings, and a range of administrative tasks.

In addition, Panel Members will normally be expected to attend seven days of panel meetings in Wellington comprising:

- › up to two days of panel training in August 2018; and
- › up to five days of peer review panel meetings in November or December 2018.

### *Panel meeting schedule and location*

Panel meetings will be held in Wellington, New Zealand from 19 November to 7 December 2018.

Panel members must attend on all days that their panel meets.

The number of days that each panel will meet is based on estimates of the number of EPs expected. Once the number of EPs is confirmed, slight adjustments may need to be made to the number of days that some panels meet.

<b>Panel Meeting Schedule</b>	
<b>Panel</b>	<b>2018 Meeting Dates</b>
Mathematical & Information Sciences & Technology	19-22 November
Education	19-23 November
Pacific Research	20-22 November
Business and Economics	19-23 November
Biological Sciences	26-30 November
Humanities and Law	26-30 November
Creative & Performing Arts	26-29 November

Māori Knowledge & Development	26-28 November
Physical Sciences	26-29 November
Medicine & Public Health	3-7 December
Engineering, Technology & Architecture	3-6 December
Social Sciences & Other Cultural/Social Sciences	3-7 December
Health	3-6 December

### *Training*

Chairs must be available for a two-day training session in Wellington on 30-31 May 2018.

Panel Member training will be a combination of online self-directed training, and in-person in Wellington for Panel Members based in New Zealand, Australia, or the Pacific islands. Panel members who are based in other overseas countries will be provided with additional online training materials and support.

<b>Panel Training Schedule</b>	
<b>Panel</b>	<b>Training Dates</b>
Pacific Research Māori Knowledge & Development Education Creative & Performing Arts	2-3 August 2018
Biological Sciences Medicine & Public Health Health	6-7 August 2018
Mathematical & Information Sciences & Technology Engineering, Technology & Architecture Business & Economics	9-10 August 2018
Social Sciences & Other Cultural/Social Sciences Humanities & Law Physical Sciences	15-16 August 2018

### *Peer assessment process*

Panel Members will be involved in the assignment of EPs from July 2018, and normally begin assessing EPs from the last week of August 2018. These assessments will involve intensive work until early November 2018, and preparation for the peer review panel meetings during November and December 2018.

Meetings of the panels will be held for up to five days between 19 November and 7 December 2018

Panel Chairs will need to be available for Moderation Panel meetings on 15 November and 11 December 2018.

### *Copyright*

The TEC will obtain a copyright agreement from Copyright Licensing Limited for the period of the 2018 Quality Evaluation. Participating TEOs also have similar copyright agreements in place.

### *Conflicts of interest*

All Panel Members will be required to declare any conflicts of interest and to comply with the directions of the relevant Panel Chair in managing these conflicts in accordance with the TEC's policy. While the nomination form calls for nominees to set out any significant conflicts of interest, once appointed Panel Members will be asked to make a declaration of all actual or potential conflicts of interest. Any changes to conflicts of interest must be updated should they occur.

### *Confidentiality of information*

By accepting the appointment, Panel Members agree to comply with the TEC's Confidentiality of Information Policy. The policy sets out the obligations in respect of information that they may receive in their capacity as a Panel Member.

### *Public comment*

You may not make statements to the media or any other third party about the work of the panel or the PBRF 2018 Quality Evaluation process, without the prior consent of the TEC.

### *Release of names*

The names of all appointed Panel Members, their position/current employer, and subject area expertise will be made public by the TEC.

## Appendix 4: Conflict of interest policy

### *Definition*

In the PBRF Quality Evaluation process, individuals are appointed as peer review panellists in their own right, for their specific skills and expertise in both research and the assessment of research.

In this context, a conflict of interest is any situation where a panellist has an interest which conflicts, might conflict or might be perceived to conflict with the interests of the TEC in running a fair, impartial and effective peer review process.

While the conflict of interest itself is unlikely to be improper, it could lead to improper conduct or allegations of such conduct if not declared.

Note: In this context, the term 'panellists' should be read to include Panel Chairs, Panel Members, the TEC Panel Advisor, and other staff involved in the TEC processes.

### *Principles*

The TEC's policy on conflict of interest is guided by the following principles:

- › all conflicts of interest must be declared and recorded;
- › a conflict of interest can be declared at any time during the process but must be done as soon as practicable;
- › the Panel Chair has discretion to take decisions on the action required in any situation;
- › the action required depends on the nature of the conflict;
- › all actions on declared conflicts will be recorded; and
- › individual panellists can exclude themselves from panel discussions even if this is not required by the policy.

The policy is also guided by the fact that the Quality Evaluation process, through the use of panel pairs and wider panel assessment, ensures that no single panellist is responsible for the decision on the final Quality Category given to an EP.

### *Identifying a conflict of interest*

In determining whether a conflict is present or not, there are two questions to ask:

- › Would a fair-minded reasonably informed observer have a reasonable apprehension that the panellist's professional judgement would be compromised in evaluating another researcher's evidence portfolio?
- › Does the interest create an incentive for the panellist to act in a way that would be contrary to the objectives of a fair, impartial and effective peer review process?

If the answer to these questions is 'yes', then a conflict exists.

### *Examples of possible conflicts of interest*

Examples of possible conflicts of interest can include, but are not limited to:

- › assessment of one's own Evidence Portfolio (EP);
- › assessment of the EP of:
  - a family member/partner or close personal friend;
  - a current colleague within the same small academic unit or research team;

- a close colleague or someone reporting directly to the panellist or to whom the panellist currently reports;
  - a colleague with whom the panellist has, or has had at any time in the assessment period, a research collaboration and/or direct teaching collaboration; or
  - an academic who is undertaking Doctoral work under the supervision of the panellist;
- › assessment of an EP where the panellist may receive a personal financial benefit from a high Quality Category; or
  - › any situation where the panellist considers they might not provide an objective review of another researcher’s EP because of a direct, indirect, potential or perceived conflict of interest, or where a reasonable observer would consider the panellist to be conflicted.

#### *Conflict at institutional level*

The following activities can be perceived as representing a conflict of interest for panellists:

- › involvement in the internal assessment process the TEOs use to determine which EPs to submit to the TEC; and
- › the provision by panellists of either general or specific advice or guidance on the preparation of EPs within their TEO.

The provision by panellists of general information and guidance about the assessment process within or outside their employing TEOs is not considered a conflict of interest by the TEC; however, to ensure that the peer review process is perceived as fair, impartial and effective the TEC has determined the following principles generally apply to panellists:

- › If the panellist is involved in the internal assessment of their TEO’s EPs, or they have provided specific advice or guidance on individual EPs at their TEO while serving on a panel, they cannot assess EPs from their TEO at the individual assessment stage and can only contribute to panel discussions at the request of the Chair.
- › If the panellist has no involvement in the internal assessment of their TEO’s EPs, they have not provided specific advice or guidance on individual EPs at their TEO while serving on a panel and they have no other conflict of interest, they cannot be a Lead assessor for EPs from their TEO but they may be assigned as a second assessor.

#### *When to declare a conflict of interest*

A panellist may declare a conflict of interest at any time during the Quality Evaluation process. Conflicts must be declared as soon as practicable after the person concerned realises that a conflict exists. However, the TEC would expect any newly discovered or potential conflicts to be declared at the following points in the Quality Evaluation process:

- › when first appointed;
- › on assignment of EPs;
- › at the beginning of peer review panel meetings; and
- › when discussing an individual EP at the panel meeting.

#### *Responsibilities*

All interests must be recorded within the PBRF IT system, which will create an Interests Register.

All panellists are responsible for registering interests and undertaking any action required by the Panel Chair.

The TEC's Panel Advisor is responsible for registering any interests submitted by TEOs, recording any action(s) that may be required, and monitoring the Interests Register.

The Chair of each panel, on the advice of the TEC Panel Advisor, is responsible for deciding whether a conflict of interest exists in any instance.

The Chair of each panel is also responsible for ensuring that:

- › all conflicts and any action(s) that may be required have been recorded in the Interests Register;
- › appropriate action(s) is taken in respect of the conflict of interest during assignment, assessment and/or panel meetings; and
- › the action(s) taken with respect to declared conflicts as part of the panel meeting process is recorded in the panel meeting minutes.

The Principal Moderator is responsible for considering conflicts of interest for Chairs and determining the appropriate action to be taken.

The TEC is responsible for undertaking an independent review of the Interests Register and the actions taken.

#### *Actions to take*

The nature of any action(s) to be undertaken by a panellist will depend on the extent of the conflict of interest. Most potential conflicts will be managed at the assignment stage of the assessment process, with conflicted panellists not being assigned individual EPs.

Actions may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- › not receiving or being able to access an individual or group of EPs;
- › having no involvement in the EP assessment at any stage and leaving the room when the EP is being discussed and decisions made at the panel meeting;
- › having no involvement in the EP assessment at the individual assessment stage but remaining in the room when the EP is being discussed by the panel at the panel meeting, and participating in the discussion and/or decision-making if asked by the panel Chair;
- › possible involvement in the EP assessment at the individual assessment stage (although not as the Lead assessor) and full participation in the discussion and decision-making on the EP.

The TEC may determine that a panellist's conflicts of interest are at a level that they may impact on the operation of a fair, impartial and effective evaluation process. In such a situation, the TEC reserves the right to stand-down a panellist.

#### *Chair conflicts*

Where the Chair has a conflict of interest, this must be declared to the Principal Moderator and the TEC's Panel Advisor assigned to that panel. The decision on what action, if any, should be taken will rest with the Principal Moderator.

In these circumstances, the Principal Moderator may ask the Deputy Chair to act as Chair for the period if it is decided that the Chair is unable to participate. If this is not appropriate, the Principal Moderator will ask another panellist to act as Chair for the period the Chair is unable to participate.

The TEC's Panel Advisor will be responsible for recording any action(s) undertaken in the panel meeting minutes.

## Appendix 5: Confidentiality of Information policy

As a participant in the PBRF 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment process, you will receive information and be a party to discussions and decisions that may be confidential. You are responsible for taking all reasonable steps to maintain the security of the information provided to you and maintaining this confidentiality during your involvement and after it has ended.

### **Information**

#### *Electronic Information*

You must retain any electronic information in a secure manner.

You must not treat electronic information in such a way that it could be accessed by others with or without your knowledge.

#### *Storage and destruction of physical information*

You are permitted to obtain and retain physical copies of Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) information (or supporting information) provided for meetings. You must keep these papers secure at all times to avoid the accidental disclosure to a third person. You are not permitted to make additional copies of this information unless expressly authorised by the TEC.

You may elect to return any or all physical copies of information you hold to the TEC for disposal at any time during your tenure as a participant in the PBRF 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment process.

At the end of your tenure you must return to the TEC all physical copies of information you hold that has not been publicly released.

#### *No other uses*

You are not permitted to use electronic or physical information for any purpose other than that for which it was provided.

#### *Official Information Act 1982 and Privacy Act 1993*

Information received by the TEC will be official information in terms of the Official Information Act (OIA), and may be personal information under the Privacy Act, so may be requested by various parties. The TEC will be responsible for dealing with any requests made under the OIA or the Privacy Act.

For the purposes of section 27(1)(c) of the OIA and section 29(1)(b) of the Privacy Act, this paragraph constitutes a promise that the TEC will keep confidential at all times your notes relating to your assessment of the EPs. However, you acknowledge that if the TEC receives a request for such notes under the OIA or the Privacy Act, the TEC may be under a legal obligation to release such information and such release will not amount to a breach of the terms of this letter by the TEC.

#### *Confidential information*

Confidential information includes, but is not limited to, EPs, associated evidence of nominated research outputs, and the assessment information related to EPs.

#### *Treatment of confidential information*

You must not circulate or communicate confidential information provided to you by the TEC, whether in hard copy or by electronic means, to another person for any reason.

Physical copies of any electronic confidential information can be made for the purpose of assessment only. You must keep these papers secure at all times to avoid the accidental disclosure to a third person.

You must not treat confidential information in such a way that it could be accessed by others with or without your knowledge.

At the end of your tenure as a participant in the PBRF 2018 Quality Evaluation assessment process you must:

- › return to the TEC for disposal, or securely dispose of, any or all physical copies of confidential information you hold; and
- › delete any or all electronic copies of confidential information you hold.

*No other uses*

You are not permitted to use confidential information for any purpose other than that for which it was received.

***PBRF meeting discussions***

*Discussions and communications*

You must treat as confidential all discussions and communications between fellow participants (Moderators, Panel Chairs, and Panel Members), the TEC Panel Advisor and other TEC employees.

*Outcomes*

You must treat as confidential any decisions made by PBRF peer review panels into perpetuity.

.

## Appendix 6: Guidance to Panel Chairs

Summary of criteria, methodology and targets

Panel Selection Criteria	Methodology	Target
An appropriate mix of new and previous panel members	The proportion of Panel Members for the 2012 Quality Evaluation who were appointed for the first time was 63%. The target for the 2018 Quality Evaluation is an approximation of that proportion.	<i>New Panel Members target: 60%</i>
Gender representation	<p>The proportion of female Panel Members for the 2012 Quality Evaluation was 30%, which is lower than the share of EPs submitted on behalf of female researchers (41%). The target proportion aims to ensure that the membership of the Peer Review Panels is more reflective of the overall academic workforce.</p> <p>Individual targets have been developed for each Peer Review Panel based on the proportion of EPs submitted by female researchers to the relevant panel.</p>	<p><i>Female Panel Members target: 40%</i></p> <p><b>General Guidance for Panel Chairs:</b> The overall target of 40% should be viewed as a minimum level of representation for those Panels that had more than 40% of EPs submitted on behalf of female researchers. For Panels where fewer than 40% of EPs are submitted by female researchers, 40% should be considered an aspirational target, and the individual panel target seen as a minimum level of representation.</p> <p>See below for specific guidance and targets for each Panel.</p>
International representation of at least 25%	The proportion of international Panel Members for the 2012 Quality Evaluation was 19%. International Panel Members are expected to make up 25% of all Panel Members for the 2018 Quality Evaluation.	<i>International Panel Members target: 25%</i>
Representation from across different tertiary education sectors and other research organisations.	The proportion of EPs that were submitted by TEOs other than universities has been used as a proxy for this guidance.	<p><b>General Guidance for Panel Chairs:</b> Panel Chairs should have regard to the expertise within New Zealand among people who are employed by non-university TEOs. Panel Chairs should also have regard to the distribution of measured research quality in the tertiary system and refer to the report of the 2012 Quality Evaluation for guidance.</p> <p>See below for specific guidance and targets for each Panel.</p>

Panel Selection Criteria	Methodology	Target
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of applied/practice-based researchers	The share of EPs referred to the Professional and Applied Research Expert Advisory Groups has been used as a proxy for this guidance.	<p><b>General Guidance for Panel Chairs:</b> Panel Chairs should seek as far as practicable to include Panel Members who have a familiarity with and understanding of professional and applied research to a level that they are able to give appropriate consideration to the significance, quality and impact of the research. Panel Chairs should note that the appointment of such researchers is strongly recommended.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the appointment of individuals working in industry, and non-university research organisations including Crown Research Institutes.</p> <p>See below for specific guidance and targets for each Panel.</p>
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of early career researchers	The proportion of early career researchers uses the proportion of new and emerging researchers as a proxy. The proportion of EPs submitted by new and emerging researchers for the 2012 Quality Evaluation was 18%.	<p><b>General Guidance for Panel Chairs:</b> Panel Chairs should note that EPs submitted on behalf of new and emerging researchers made up around one-fifth of all EPs submitted. Panel Chairs should take care to appoint Panel Members who can give a fair assessment of the research performance by early career researchers and have experience supporting the development of early career researchers.</p>
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of interdisciplinary researchers (1)	<p>Most interdisciplinary research is likely to be able to be assessed within the subject areas covered by a particular Peer Review Panel.</p> <p>The extent to which EPs were cross-referred to other Peer Review Panels provides an indication of the need for wider expertise whether within a particular panel or across all panels.</p>	<p><b>General Guidance for Panel Chairs:</b> Panel Chairs should carefully review the Peer Review Panel reports for the 2012 Quality Evaluation to identify patterns of referral. These patterns will assist Panel Chairs in identifying areas of particular demand for advice and input from other areas.</p> <p>Panel Chairs should discuss with each other the range of expertise required across the panels and agree how best to meet these needs through the appointment of Panel Members.</p>
Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of interdisciplinary researchers (2)	The proportion of EPs referred to specialist advisors and the reports of the Peer Review Panels have been used to develop this guidance.	<p><b>General Guidance for Panel Chairs:</b> Panel Chairs should seek as far as practicable to ensure Panel Members are able to assess the widest range of topics and research areas covered by the subject areas for each Peer Review Panel.</p>

Panel Selection Criteria	Methodology	Target
<p>Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of Māori researchers</p>	<p>The proportion of EPs that were cross-referred to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel has been used as a proxy for the need on each Peer Review Panel for researchers with a familiarity with and understanding of Māori research methodologies and research relevant to Te Ao Māori.</p> <p>The proportion of EPs cross-referred to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel for the 2012 Quality Evaluation was 2%, with a range between 0% and 5% across the Peer Review Panels.</p>	<p><b>General Guidance to Panel Chairs:</b> All Panel Chairs should seek as far as practicable to include Panel Members who have a familiarity with and understanding of Māori research methodologies and research relevant to Te Ao Māori. The potential to refer EPs to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel should not be a substitute for representation of such researchers on Peer Review Panels.</p> <p>See below for guidance for specific panels.</p>
<p>Panel members who have the ability to represent the interests of Pasifika researchers</p>	<p>The proportion of EPs that were referred to the Pacific Research Expert Advisory Group has been used as a proxy for the need on each Peer Review Panel for researchers with a familiarity with and understanding of Pacific research methodologies and research relevant to Pacific peoples.</p> <p>The proportion of EPs referred to the Pacific Research Expert Advisory Group for the 2012 Quality Evaluation was 2%, with a range between 0% and 5% across the Peer Review Panels.</p>	<p><b>General Guidance for Panel Chairs:</b> Panel Chairs should seek as far as practicable to include Panel Members who have a familiarity with and understanding of Pasifika research methodologies and Pacific Peoples. The potential to refer EPs to the Pacific Research Panel should not be a substitute for representation of such researchers on Peer Review Panels.</p> <p>See below for guidance for specific panels.</p>

*Additional factors considered in the methodology*

Other Factors	Methodology	Target
<p>Number of EPs expected to be submitted</p>	<p>The model assumes that there will be:              8,000 EPs submitted by participating TEOs as part of the 2018 Quality Evaluation.              a similar distribution of EPs by subject area as applied in the 2012 Quality Evaluation;              120 EPs submitted to the Pacific Research Panel;              at least two Panel Members in any given subject area; and              approximately 35 EPs submitted per Panel Member is a reasonable 'load'.              The number of Panel Members for each panel was then calculated by dividing the number of EPs per panel by the maximum reasonable 'load'. Exceptions were applied to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel, and the Pacific Research Panel. For these panels, a minimum number of 11 Panel Members was applied.</p>	<p><i>Targets have been developed for the overall number of Panel Members per Panel, and guidance developed in relation to the number of Panel Members per subject area.</i></p> <p><b>General Guidance for Panel Chairs:</b> Panel Chairs should consider the overall profile of Panel Members by subject area taking into account the other targets and guidance provided by the TEC.</p> <p><i>TEOs will provide estimates of EPs to be submitted by panel and subject area in February 2018. The total number of EPs expected to be submitted and the distribution of these EPs to panels will be updated based on this information. Panel sizes will also be confirmed at this stage.</i></p>

## Panel guidance

The General Guidance for Panel Chairs provided in the preceding table should inform the selection of Panel Members. Additional advice specific to particular Panels is presented below.

### *Biological Sciences*

Representing the interests of applied/practice-based researchers: A significant number of EPs were referred to the Professional and Applied Research Expert Advisory Groups, particularly in Agriculture and other Applied Biological Sciences. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members with expertise relevant to environmental and commercial applications and impact of research in the subject areas covered by the Panel.

### *Creative and Performing Arts*

Representing the interests of Māori researchers: A small number of EPs in the subject area of visual arts and crafts were cross-referred to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members with Kaupapa Māori expertise.

Representing the interests of inter-disciplinary researchers: A small number of EPs in the subject areas of music, literary arts and other arts, and theatre and dance, film, television and multimedia were referred to specialist advisors in 2012. Consideration should be given when appointing Panel Members to ensure that the widest range of expertise is available to the Panel.

### *Education*

Representing the interests of Māori researchers: A modest number of EPs were cross-referred to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members with Kaupapa Māori expertise.

Representing the interests of Pacific researchers: A modest number of EPs were referred to the Pacific Research Expert Advisory Group. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members to the Education Panel with Pasifika research expertise.

Representing the interests of inter-disciplinary researchers: The Panel Report for the 2012 Quality Evaluation noted the value of specialist advisor input in the area of foreign languages and linguistics, particularly in relation to the teaching of English as a Second Language. See related advice for the Humanities and Law Panel.

### *Engineering Technology and Architecture*

Representing the interests of applied/practice-based researchers: A significant number of EPs were referred to the Professional and Applied Research Expert Advisory Groups, in both subject areas covered by the panel. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members with expertise relevant to environmental, commercial and professional practice applications and impact of research in the subject areas covered by the Panel.

### *Humanities and Law*

Representing the interests of Māori researchers: A small number of EPs in the subject area of law were cross-referred to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members with Kaupapa Māori expertise.

Representing the interests of Pacific researchers: A small number of EPs in the subject areas of foreign language and linguistics and history, history of art, classics and curatorial studies were referred to the Pacific Research Expert Advisory Group. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members to the Humanities and Law panel with Pasifika research expertise.

Representing the interests of inter-disciplinary researchers: The Panel Report for the 2012 Quality Evaluation noted an overlap with the Education Panel in relation to the need for expertise in foreign language and linguistics, particularly in relation to the teaching of English as a Second Language. The Panel Chairs for Education and Humanities and Law should discuss how best to optimise the composition of panels to meet this need.

The subject area of foreign language and linguistics required the assessment of EPs with research outputs in a wide range of languages including Korean, Italian, Japanese, Russian and Spanish. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the panel has access to a suitably wide range of expertise in foreign languages and linguistics.

#### *Medicine and Public Health*

Representing the interests of Māori researchers: A small number of EPs in the subject area of public health were cross-referred to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members with Kaupapa Māori expertise.

Representing the interests of Pacific researchers: A modest number of EPs in the subject area of public health were referred to the Pacific Research Expert Advisory Group. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members to the Medicine and Public Health panel with Pasifika research expertise.

#### *Pacific Research Panel*

Panel composition: The largest number of referrals to the Pacific Research Expert Advisory Group as part of the 2012 Quality Evaluation were from the subject areas of: Education; Public Health; and Anthropology and Archaeology. There is likely to be a need for expertise in the subject areas covered by the Peer Review Panels of: Medicine and Public Health; Humanities and Law; and Business and Economics.

#### *Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences*

Representing the interests of Māori researchers: A small number of EPs in the subject area of psychology were cross-referred to the Māori Knowledge and Development Panel. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members with Kaupapa Māori expertise.

Representing the interests of Pacific researchers: A modest number of EPs in the subject area of anthropology and archaeology, and a small number in each of human geography and sociology, social policy, social work, criminology and gender studies were referred to the Pacific Research Expert Advisory Group. Consideration should be given to the appointment of one or more Panel Members to the Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences panel with Pasifika research expertise.

## Potential number of Panel members by subject area

Panel	Subject Area	Recommended Number of Panel Members
Biological Sciences	Agriculture and other applied biological sciences	5
	Ecology, evolution and behaviour	8
	Molecular, cellular and whole organism biology	11
Business and Economics	Accounting and finance	6
	Economics	5
	Management, human resources, industrial relations, international business and other business	8
	Marketing and tourism	5
Creative and Performing Arts	Design	3
	Music, literary arts and other arts	4
	Theatre and dance, film and television and multimedia	2
	Visual arts and crafts	6
Education	Education	21
Engineering, Technology and Architecture	Architecture, design, planning, surveying	5
	Engineering and technology	14
Health	Dentistry	2
	Nursing	3
	Other health studies (including rehabilitation therapies)	4
	Pharmacy	2
	Sport and exercise science	2
	Veterinary studies and large animal science	2
Humanities and Law	English language and literature	2
	Foreign languages and linguistics	5
	History, history of art, classics and curatorial studies	5

Panel	Subject Area	Recommended Number of Panel Members
	Law	6
	Philosophy	2
	Religious studies and theology	2
Māori Knowledge and Development	Māori knowledge and development	11
Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology	Computer science, information technology, information sciences	10
	Pure and applied mathematics	4
	Statistics	2
Medicine and Public Health	Biomedical	10
	Clinical medicine	8
	Public health	9
Pacific Research	Pacific research	11
Physical Sciences	Chemistry	6
	Earth sciences	5
	Physics	3
Social Sciences and Other Cultural/ Social Studies	Anthropology and archaeology	3
	Communications, journalism and media studies	3
	Human geography	2
	Political science, international relations and public policy	3
	Psychology	7
	Sociology, social policy, social work, criminology and gender studies	6

## Targets for panel composition

Dimension	Target	BIOS	BEC	CPA	EDU	ETA	HEALTH	HAL	MEDPH	MIST	MKD	PAC	PHYS	SSOCSS
Estimated number of EPs (2018) <sup>2</sup>	<b>8000</b>	838	850	520	730	655	534	761	939	558	156	120	490	849
Number of Panel Members		24	24	15	21	19	15	22	27	16	11	11	14	24
New Panel Members														
Target:	<b>60%</b>	14	15	9	13	11	9	13	16	10	7	7	8	15
Female Panel Members														
Target (each panel):	<b>40%</b>	33%	35%	42%	68%	19%	59%	41%	44%	20%	55%	54%	22%	51%
Target (Panel Members)		8	9	6	14	4	9	9	12	3	6	6	3	12
International Panel Members														
Target:	<b>25%</b>	6	6	4	5	5	4	5	7	4	3	3	3	6
New and emerging researchers														
<b>Information for Chairs</b>	<b>18%</b>	23%	16%	19%	10%	21%	24%	13%	23%	15%	18%	15%	20%	19%

<sup>2</sup> TEOs will provide estimates of EPs to be submitted by panel and subject area in February 2018. The total number of EPs expected to be submitted and the distribution of these EPs to panels will be updated based on this information. Panel sizes will also be confirmed at this stage.

Dimension	Target	BIOS	BEC	CPA	EDU	ETA	HEALTH	HAL	MEDPH	MIST	MKD	PAC	PHYS	SSOCSS
Māori research methodologies and topics														
<b>Advice to Chairs</b>			Y	Y			Y	Y					Y	
Pacific research methodologies and topics														
<b>Advice to Chairs</b>				Y			Y	Y					Y	
Non-University TEOs														
Target (each panel):	<b>9%</b>	3%	7%	38%	16%	9%	14%	6%	1%	9%	17%	11%	1%	6%
Target (Panel Members)		1	2	6	3	2	2	1	0	1	2	1	0	1
Requirement for expertise in professional and applied research														
<b>Advice to Chairs</b>		Y				Y								
Implications of the use of specialist advisors														
<b>Advice to Chairs</b>			Y	Y			Y							
Implications of the use of cross-referrals														
<b>Advice to Chairs</b>		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

## Appendix 7: Appointment of Panel Chairs and Deputy Chairs

### *How are Panel Chairs appointed?*

All nominations for Panel Chairs will be considered against the relevant selection criteria (see Appendix 2) by the three Moderators for the 2018 Quality Evaluation.<sup>3</sup> Additional advice may also be sought from appropriate external experts, including but not limited to previous Principal Moderators, Deputy Moderators, and the Sector Reference Group Chair and/or members.

The Moderators will make appointment recommendations to the TEC based on the nominations; however, the TEC retains the right to supplement nominations through identifying individuals directly, particularly where gaps are identified or specific skills are needed.

Panel Chairs will be appointed by the TEC, with nominees advised by 16 October 2015 and appointments announced by 6 November 2015.

### *Selection criteria for Panel Chairs*

The following criteria will be applied when considering suitable candidates for the role of a panel Chair.

The preferred attributes and qualities of a panel Chair are that they will:

- › have proven chairing skills, especially previous experience in chairing assessment panels<sup>4</sup>
- › be considered a highly esteemed researcher
- › have limited conflicts of interest
- › be from a different subject area and/or TEO to the previous Chair (where feasible).

It will also be desirable for them to have been a previous New Zealand-based panel member.

Attention will be paid to ensuring an appropriate balance in terms of institutional affiliation, gender and ethnicity.

Suitable candidates for the role of Deputy Chair will also be considered against the criteria above.

### *Responsibilities of a Panel Chair*

The responsibilities of a peer review Panel Chair, when acting as Chair, are to:

- › identify an appropriate panel using the guidelines and procedures established by the TEC giving due regard to the advice of the TEC and the moderators

---

<sup>3</sup> Professor Paula Jameson (Principal Moderator), Distinguished Professor Marston Conder and Professor Helen May (Deputy Moderators).

<sup>4</sup> This refers to any form of relevant assessment panel, not only the PBRF Quality Evaluation panels.

- › assist with revising and updating panel-specific guidelines
- › ensure the panel operates within the policies, guidelines and procedures established by the TEC
- › assign each EP to two panel members for pre-meeting assessment and determine which of these panel members will be the lead for that EP
- › if necessary, decide whether an EP requires additional input from another peer review panel
- › advise and mentor panel members, as required, on the assessment criteria and processes
- › chair meetings of the panel to review and calibrate the scores and to assign EPs to Quality Categories;
- › ensure panel decisions are documented and that critical issues necessary for a fair review are appropriately addressed
- › ensure that the panel completes its preparation and evaluation work to agreed timeframes
- › ensure that all panel members have an opportunity to contribute to the process and participate fully in the panel's activities
- › take due regard of the decisions of the moderators and the Moderation Panel
- › report to the TEC Board at the end of the Quality Evaluation.

#### *Responsibilities of a Deputy Chair*

The responsibilities of a peer review panel Deputy Chair are to:

- › support the Chair in their duties as required; including but not limited to chairing the meeting of the panel in instances where the chair may have a conflict of interest
- › revise and update panel-specific guidelines
- › understand the principles, guidelines and procedures of the PBRF Quality Evaluation
- › assess EPs assigned to them by the Panel Chair, primarily by assigning preparatory and preliminary scores as required
- › understand the broad criteria under which the evaluations are to be made, and apply these objectively to the work of the panel
- › be diligent in their preparation for meetings and in completing tasks allocated to them by the Panel Chair (e.g. undertaking initial assessment of EPs allocated to them in a timely manner)
- › contribute fully, constructively and dispassionately to all panel processes and take collective ownership for the panel decisions
- › maintain confidentiality of both the deliberations and decisions of the panel
- › exercise due skill and care in the performance of their responsibilities
- › identify instances where they may have a conflict of interest and raise this with the Panel Chair prior to the conflict affecting the assessment process.