



Tertiary Education Commission
Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua

Performance-Based Research Fund

Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper #1

**Approach to the design of the 2018 Quality
Evaluation**

Contents

Purpose	1
Background of the PBRF	1
Objectives of the PBRF	2
Principles of the PBRF	2
The Quality Evaluation process and review of the PBRF	3
Role of the SRG.....	3
Design of the PBRF and the 2018 Quality Evaluation	4
Design changes.....	5
Design principles	5
Process for design.....	6
Developing the new guidelines	6
Proposed consultation papers	7
Areas out of scope for the SRG	9
Consultation feedback.....	9
APPENDIX 1: General information	10
APPENDIX 2: Summary of actual and proposed changes	15

Name	Status	Distribution
Sector Reference Group – Consultation Paper #1 Approach to the design of the 2018 Quality Evaluation	CONSULTATION PAPER	Public Direct feedback to: PBRFSRG@tec.govt.nz by 29 September 2014

Purpose

- 1 This paper sets out the approach of the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) Sector Reference Group (SRG) for the design of the 2018 Quality Evaluation. Specifically it:
 - provides background information on the purpose of the PBRF, the establishment of the SRG, and the Ministry of Education's review of the PBRF;
 - identifies potential changes to the operation of the Quality Evaluation process that require sector consultation;
 - proposes a redesign of the structure of the Quality Evaluation guidelines;
 - proposes a suite of papers and indicative timetable for consultation on these papers; and
 - invites feedback from the sector and other key stakeholders on any other matters that should be considered as part of the design process.

Background of the PBRF

- 2 Cabinet agreed to establish a performance-based research fund for tertiary education organisations (TEOs) in 2002. The design details were developed by a PBRF Working Group, supported by the Ministry of Education and the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), working in consultation with the sector. The recommendations and rationale were published as a report, *Investing in Excellence*. Cabinet accepted this report, and its recommendations still form the basis for most of the PBRF design and implementation.
- 3 Cabinet agreed that the fund would be allocated through three separate components:
 - the Quality Evaluation;
 - Research Degree Completions (RDC); and
 - External Research Income (ERI).
- 4 The Quality Evaluation is an assessment of research quality for the purpose of allocating bulk funding to participating TEOs. The unit of assessment used is individual academic staff at participating TEOs. These results are used in the funding and reporting calculations.
- 5 TEOs are required to apply a set of eligibility criteria to their staff in order to determine which individuals are eligible to participate. Evidence Portfolios (EPs) consisting of published research outputs and other examples of research-related activity for each eligible academic are compiled by staff in conjunction with their employing TEO. These EPs are then submitted to the TEC along with a census of staff employed by the TEO on a specific date. This information is audited by the TEC to ensure that it is correct and robust. EPs are assessed by subject-specific peer review panels and awarded a quality category. The Quality Evaluation results, along with the results of the RDC and ERI components, form the basis of PBRF funding for each TEO for a six-year period.

- 6 Appendix 1 contains information on the content of the 2012 Quality Evaluation Guidelines, information on the 12 peer review panels, and a list of PBRF-related abbreviations to assist in the reading of this and future consultation papers.

Objectives of the PBRF

- 7 The primary objectives¹ of the PBRF are to:

- increase the quality of basic and applied research at New Zealand's degree granting TEOs;
- support world-leading research-led teaching and learning at degree and postgraduate levels;
- assist New Zealand's TEOs to maintain and lift their competitive rankings relative to their international peers; and
- provide robust public information to stakeholders about research performance within and across TEOs.

In doing so the PBRF will also:

- support the development of postgraduate student researchers and new and emerging researchers;
- support research activities that provide economic, social, cultural and environmental benefits to New Zealand, including the advancement of mātauranga Māori; and
- support technology and knowledge transfer to New Zealand businesses, iwi and communities.

Principles of the PBRF

- 8 The PBRF is governed by the following principles²:

- *Comprehensiveness*: the PBRF should appropriately measure the quality of the full range of original investigative activity that occurs within the sector, regardless of its type, form, or place of output;
- *Respect for academic traditions*: the PBRF should operate in a manner that is consistent with academic freedom and institutional autonomy;
- *Consistency*: evaluations of quality made through the PBRF should be consistent across the different subject areas and in the calibration of quality ratings against international standards of excellence;
- *Continuity*: changes to the PBRF process should only be made where they can bring demonstrable improvements that outweigh the cost of implementing them;
- *Differentiation*: the PBRF should allow stakeholders and the government to differentiate between providers and their units on the basis of their relative quality;
- *Credibility*: the methodology, format and processes employed in the PBRF must be credible to those being assessed;
- *Efficiency*: administrative and compliance costs should be kept to the minimum consistent with a robust and credible process;

¹ The objectives were revised as a part of the Ministry of Education's review of the PBRF and agreed by Cabinet in February 2014.

² These principles were first enunciated by the Working Group on the PBRF. See [Investing in Excellence](#), pp.8-9.

- *Transparency*: decisions and decision-making processes must be explained openly, except where there is a need to preserve confidentiality and privacy;
- *Complementarity*: the PBRF should be integrated with new and existing policies, such as charters and profiles, and quality assurance systems for degrees and degree providers; and
- *Cultural inclusiveness*: the PBRF should reflect the bicultural nature of New Zealand and the special role and status of the Treaty of Waitangi, and should appropriately reflect and include the full diversity of New Zealand's population.

The Quality Evaluation process and review of the PBRF

- 9 The first PBRF Quality Evaluation was conducted during 2003. The next was conducted in 2006; however, this was a partial round and those academics that participated in 2003 were not required to participate. The 2012 Quality Evaluation was a full round with all eligible staff participating.
- 10 Comprehensive review and evaluation of the PBRF has occurred following each of the Quality Evaluation rounds and has identified issues to be addressed for subsequent Quality Evaluations.
- 11 The Ministry of Education completed a review of the PBRF at the conclusion of the 2012 Quality Evaluation. Cabinet agreed a number of recommendations for changes to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the PBRF. At a high-level, the changes aim to:
 - clarify the objectives of the PBRF;
 - better value user-perspectives of research quality and engagement in user-orientated research;
 - simplify the PBRF Quality Evaluation to reduce transaction costs;
 - better support the sustainability of the tertiary education research workforce; and
 - strengthen reporting on research performance.
- 12 Some of the changes to the PBRF require further consultation on operational aspects in order to fully implement them. All changes will be introduced between 2015 and the next Quality Evaluation in 2018.
- 13 More information on the review can be found on the Ministry of Education's [website](#).
- 14 In addition to the changes proposed by the review, a number of recommendations for change have also been made by the peer review panels and the TEC following the 2012 Quality Evaluation.
- 15 All recommendations for change have been summarised in Appendix 2.

Role of the SRG

- 16 The TEC has established a Sector Reference Group (SRG) to prepare for each of the Quality Evaluations. The current SRG will be expected to co-ordinate and oversee the production of consultation papers to inform the 2018 Guidelines. It will then consider the responses to the consultation, oversee the production of draft Guidelines and recommend these to the TEC for approval and dissemination to the sector. The Guidelines will then be published on the TEC website.

17 The SRG members are:

Name	Affiliated organisation
Emeritus Professor Ian Town (Chair)	Independent
Professor Richard Blaikie	University of Otago
Dr Maxine Bryant	University of Canterbury
Professor Donald Cleland	Massey University
Professor Philippa Howden-Chapman	University of Otago
Mr Jonathan Hughes	Universities New Zealand
Professor Kate Kearins	Auckland University of Technology
Professor Robyn Longhurst	University of Waikato
Dr Shireen Maged	Te Wānanga o Aotearoa
Professor Janet McLean	University of Auckland
Professor Kay Morris-Matthews	Eastern Institute of Technology
Professor Richard Newcomb	Plant and Food Research and the University of Auckland
Professor Tony Parker	Massey University
Dr Steven Ratuva	University of Auckland
Associate Professor Jacinta Ruru	University of Otago
Professor David Simmons	Lincoln University

18 The TEC expects members to:

- contribute to discussion on the basis of their expertise and experience;
- contribute to the development of advice through peer review and, by agreement, produce working papers within their field of expertise;
- maintain confidentiality where required;
- canvass proposals widely within their network of contacts in the sector; and
- work with other SRG members to make recommendations regarding design changes to the TEC.

19 One of the main principles guiding the work of the SRG is that members do not act as representatives for their respective organisations. All members are selected on the basis of a good mix of views and perspectives of all stakeholders.

Design of the PBRF and the 2018 Quality Evaluation

20 The Ministry of Education review of the PBRF has resulted in both policy and operational changes being agreed by Cabinet. The recommendations of the panels, including the Moderation Panel, and the TEC staff, are focussed on operational changes.

Design changes

- 21 The changes outlined in Appendix 2 fall into three categories:
- a. Agreed by Cabinet, no further consultation is required but information will be included in the new guidelines.
 - b. Agreed by Cabinet, further consultation on how the change should be implemented required.
 - c. New change proposed that requires consultation.
- 22 In addition to these categories, there are a small number of changes proposed by peer review panels that relate to other operational aspects of the 2018 Quality Evaluation, for example the training of peer review panel members. These recommendations have been considered to be out of scope for the SRG as they are implementation issues to be addressed by the TEC at the appropriate stage of the Quality Evaluation process. All recommendations from the peer review panels can be found on the TEC [website](#).

Design principles

- 23 PBRF design work ahead of the 2018 Quality Evaluation will be based on a number of principles and considerations:
- upholding the objectives and principles of the PBRF (detailed in paragraphs 7 and 8);
 - learning from the previous three Quality Evaluations in order to make improvements to the design of the PBRF and the implementation of the 2018 Quality Evaluation;
 - drawing on relevant experience and expertise across the tertiary education sector;
 - exposing proposed changes to rigorous sector and expert scrutiny;
 - achieving as much sector agreement as possible about how the next Quality Evaluation should be conducted; and
 - avoiding costly or time-consuming changes unless there are good reasons for believing they will bring significant improvements.
- 24 Based on the above, the SRG is working on the following assumptions:
- a. the 2018 Quality Evaluation process will be undertaken following a similar timeline as the 2012 Quality Evaluation (EP submission in July 2018 with results released in April 2019, further details of the 2012 Quality Evaluation timeline can be found in Appendix 1);
 - b. the assessment period for research outputs will be six years from 1 January 2012 until 31 December 2017; and
 - c. the submission of EPs and research outputs will be electronic.

Process for design

- 25 The process the SRG follows in considering the design of the PBRF before the implementation of the 2018 Quality Evaluation will be as follows:
- decisions made on topics for issues/consultation papers (including seeking feedback on any additional issues for consideration);
 - preparation of issues papers for the SRG that give background information, specify the issues, and outline potential options for resolution;
 - consideration of issues papers by the SRG (in terms of the quality of the analysis, accuracy, clarity, coverage of the relevant issues and options, and recommended approach);
 - preparation of consultation papers for the sector providing background information, clarification of issues, analysis, and recommended approach;
 - consultation with the sector, and the receipt and incorporation of feedback as required;
 - recommendations made to the TEC;
 - receipt of feedback from TEC on the recommendations; and
 - if agreed by TEC, SRG proposals integrated into the PBRF guidelines.
- 26 At the conclusion of the PBRF design phase in June 2016, a new set of guidelines for the operation of the 2018 Quality Evaluation will be issued, containing the integrated designed process.

Developing the new guidelines

- 27 It is proposed that the format of the guidelines for the 2018 Quality Evaluation is significantly revised. Feedback from a wide range of users has indicated that the current single document format could be improved significantly.
- 28 As such it is proposed that the guidelines be released as separate documents that target specific user groups. For example, the following documents could be compiled:
- a. Introduction to the Quality Evaluation process, background and overview of the evaluation, reporting and complaints processes (this information will be of interest to a more general audience);
 - b. Description of the staff eligibility process and evidence portfolio (EP) development and submission processes, along with the associated audit information (this information will be more targeted at TEOs participating in the Quality Evaluation process);
 - c. EP completion process (this information will be more targeted at researchers participating in the Quality Evaluation process); and
 - d. The assessment, moderation and panel processes, along with the associated audit information (this information will be important for panellists and of interest to a more general audience).

- 29 All documents would be publicly available on the TEC website but the proposed approach would ensure that different users have access to more targeted information.
- 30 In addition, it is proposed that a complete set of draft guidelines is released for consultation in approximately October 2015. This will allow users and other key stakeholders to review the information and ensure that any areas considered ambiguous are resolved prior to the final guidelines being released for sector use no later than June 2016.
- 31 Should this proposal be supported by the sector and other key stakeholders, the SRG will seek provisional approval of its recommendations to enable the draft guidelines to be developed. Following the consultation on the draft guidelines, final recommendations will be made to the TEC and approved changes will be integrated into the final set of PBRF guidelines.

Proposed consultation papers

- 32 Following consideration of the changes that have been agreed by Cabinet and other proposed changes, the SRG proposes to produce sector consultation papers on the following topics (which should be read in conjunction with Appendix 2):

Title	Proposed content	Indicative timeframe for consultation
Review of staff eligibility criteria	a. Outlines the purpose of the staff eligibility criteria. b. Outlines the changes agreed by Cabinet. c. Details the options for changes to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of overseas-based staff. • Definition of non-TEO staff. • New and Emerging researcher criteria. 	October/November 2014
Feasibility of a Pacific Research peer review panel	a. Outlines the previous approaches to assessing Pacific Research. b. Outlines the Cabinet decision. c. Details issues regarding the establishment of a new peer review panel.	December 2014/January 2015
Documenting and assessing professional, applied and commercial research	a. Outlines the previous approaches to assessing professional, applied and commercial research. b. Outlines the Cabinet decision. c. Details options regarding how to document and assess professional, applied and commercial research.	January/March 2015
Developing Evidence Portfolios – operational guidance for the Research	a. Outlines the background for the changes and what was agreed by Cabinet. b. Details the options for changes to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Contribution component. • Research Contribution component types. 	February/April 2015

Title	Proposed content	Indicative timeframe for consultation
Contribution component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptions to the assessment period. • Evidence of impact. 	
Developing Evidence Portfolios – operational guidance for the Research Output component	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outlines the background for the changes and what was agreed by Cabinet. b. Details the options for changes to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output definitions. • Definition of research (regarding research and professional practice). • Other Comments section • Definition of publicly available. • Patents and commissioned reports. • Ensuring consistent entries • Evidence of impact. • Accepted Manuscript provision. 	March/May 2015
Review of the general Special Circumstances provisions and the Canterbury Earthquake Special Circumstances provisions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outlines the purpose of the general Special Circumstances provisions b. Outlines the changes the general Special Circumstances provisions agreed by Cabinet. c. Details the options for changes to the general Special Circumstances provisions. d. Outlines the purpose of the Canterbury Earthquake Special Circumstances provisions. e. Outlines the on-going effects of the earthquakes on the research environment. f. Details the options for changes to the existing Canterbury Earthquake Special Circumstances provisions. 	May/June 2015
Review of the assessment framework – weighting and scoring, peer review panel subject areas, multi-disciplinary research, definitions, and advice	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outlines the purpose of the current assessment framework b. Outlines the issues related to the assessment framework c. Details the options for changes to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighting and scoring the two components. • The assessment stages. • Panel subject areas • Subject area weightings. • Multi-disciplinary research • Minimal evidence definition • Assessing special circumstances 	June/July 2015

Title	Proposed content	Indicative timeframe for consultation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessing multi-author NROs • Cross-panel calibration 	

Areas out of scope for the SRG

- 33 There have been changes to the External Research Income component of the PBRF which are out of scope for the SRG. The TEC is currently consulting on the implementation approach agreed by the Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills and Employment. More information on this can be found on the [TEC website](#).
- 34 Changes to the data collection that supports the calculation of the Average Quality Score (AQS) which uses academic staff as the denominator is also out of scope for the SRG. This work is also being led by the Ministry of Education.

Consultation feedback

- 35 Feedback is sought from the sector and other key stakeholders on:
- a. the potential changes in regard to the operation of the Quality Evaluation process that require sector consultation as outlined in Appendix 2;
 - b. the proposal to design the structure of the PBRF Quality Evaluation guidelines;
 - c. the proposed suite of consultation papers and the sub-topics/content within them;
 - d. the indicative timetable for the consultation on these papers; and
 - e. any other matters that should be considered as part of the design process.
- 36 This feedback can be emailed to the TEC at PBRFSRG@tec.govt.nz before **29 September 2014**.

APPENDIX 1: General information

Timeline for the 2012 Quality Evaluation

Phase	Deadline/Activity	Date
Eligibility Periods	End of alternate assessment period for EPs impacted by the Canterbury Earthquakes	31 December 2010
	End of assessment period for ROs and PE/CRE examples.	31 December 2011
EP and Census data submission	PBRF Census Date	14 June 2012
	Submission date for Census and EP data	6 July 2012
	Period for final review and correction of Census and EP data	7 July 2012 to 20 July 2012
	Close-off date for re-submission of Census and EP data	4 pm 20 July 2012
	Deadline for CEO's Declaration to confirm accuracy of data and process of assessment within the TEO	21 July 2012
Notices of notices of Conflicts of Interest	Deadline for TEOs submitting notices of conflicts of interest in relation to panellists	31 July 2012
Audits	Staff eligibility audit	23 July 2012 to 17 August 2012
	NRO and ORO audit	23 July 2012 to 12 October 2012
Assignment	Assignment of EPs for assessment	21 July 2012 to 26 August 2012
Pre-meeting assessment	Pre-meeting panellist assessment of EPs	27 August 2012 to 2 November 2012
	Initial Moderation Panel meeting	November 2012
	Deadlines for panellist requests for additional specialist advice and cross-referrals	21 September 2012
	Deadline for completion of preparatory scores by all panellists including specialist advisers	18 October 2012
	Deadline for completion of preliminary scores	2 November 2012
Panel meetings	Panel Meetings	26 November 2012 to 7 December 2012
	Second Moderation Panel Meeting	December 2012
Final Quality Categories and complaints	Final Quality Categories reported to TEOs	mid-April 2013
	35-day period for TEOs to lodge complaints	Mid-April 2013 to late May 2013
	60-day period for TEC to investigate complaints	May 2013 to July 2013

Outline of 2012 Quality Evaluation Guidelines contents

Chapter 1	<p>Background and introduction to the PBRF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the guidelines • Background, aims, principles • Elements and participants • Definition of 'Research' • TEO eligibility • Key difference between 2006 and 2012 QE
Chapter 2	<p>Completion and submission of Evidence Portfolios</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence portfolios • Staff eligibility • Research outputs • Peer esteem • Contribution to the research environment • Special circumstances • Completing an EP • Selecting a Panel • Expert advisory groups
Chapter 3	<p>Assessing, scoring and assigning a Quality Category to Evidence Portfolios</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality evaluation process & categories • Role of panel chairs, members, secretariat, & process • Scoring, weighting • Allocating EPs to Panels • Assessing and scoring EPs • Panel processes – additional input, special advisors, cross-referrals • NRO assessment • New and emerging researchers • Peer review panels • Moderation • Conflicts of interest and confidentiality
Chapter 4	Reporting PBRF results
Chapter 5	Complaints
Chapter 6	Audits
Chapter 7	Forms of evidence, media and formats

Peer review panel abbreviations and subject areas

Abbreviation	Full panel name	Subject areas covered
<i>BIOS</i>	<i>Biological Sciences</i>	Agriculture and other applied biological sciences Ecology, evolution and behaviour Molecular, cellular and whole organism biology
<i>BEC</i>	<i>Business and Economics</i>	Accounting and finance Economics Management, human resources, industrial relations, international business and other business Marketing and tourism
<i>CPA</i>	<i>Creative and Performing Arts</i>	Design Music, literary arts and other arts Theatre and dance, film and television and multimedia Visual arts and crafts
<i>EDU</i>	<i>Education</i>	Education
<i>ETA</i>	<i>Engineering, Technology and Architecture</i>	Architecture, design, planning, surveying Engineering and technology
<i>HEALTH</i>	<i>Health</i>	Dentistry Nursing Other health studies (including rehabilitation therapies) Pharmacy Sport and exercise science Veterinary studies and large animal science

Abbreviation	Full panel name	Subject areas covered
<i>HAL</i>	<i>Humanities and Law</i>	English language and literature Foreign languages and linguistics History, history of art, classics and curatorial studies Law Philosophy Religious studies and theology
<i>MKD</i>	<i>Māori Knowledge and Development</i>	Māori knowledge and development
<i>MIST</i>	<i>Mathematical and Information Sciences and Technology</i>	Computer science, information technology, information sciences Pure and applied mathematics Statistics
<i>MEDPH</i>	<i>Medicine and Public Health</i>	Biomedical Clinical medicine Public health
<i>PHYSC</i>	<i>Physical Sciences</i>	Chemistry Earth sciences Physics
<i>SSOCSS</i>	<i>Social Sciences and Other Cultural/Social Sciences</i>	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

List of PBRF abbreviations

AQS – average quality score

CRE – contribution to the research environment

EAG – expert advisory group

EFTS – equivalent full-time student

EP – evidence portfolio

ERI – external research income

FTE – full-time equivalent

ITP – institutes of technology and polytechnics

NRO – nominated research output

ORO – other research output

PAR EAG – Professional and Applied Research Expert Advisory Group

Pacific EAG – Pacific Research Expert Advisory Group

PBRF – Performance-Based Research Fund

PE – peer esteem

PTE – private training establishments

RDC – research degree completions

RO – research output

SDR – single-data return

SRG – Sector Reference Group

TEC – Tertiary Education Commission

TEO – tertiary education organisation

APPENDIX 2: Summary of actual and proposed changes

Area	#	Agree/proposed change and source	Does the change require consultation?
Changes to the format of the PBRF Guidelines	1	<p>TEC proposal: The current structure of the Guidelines could be significantly improved in order to make them more user-focused.</p> <p>The proposed approach would be to split them into different documents, for example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Quality Evaluation (including background, a summary of the submission and assessment process, and reporting). b. A Guide for TEOs (including information on why the exercise is undertaken, staff eligibility, completing Evidence Portfolios and audit requirements). c. A Guide for Researchers on completing Evidence Portfolios. d. The Assessment Process (including assessment, moderation, roles of panellists and audit). <p>A full review of all content can also be conducted as part of this process.</p> <p>Consideration also needs to be given on how to incorporate the panel-specific guidelines and the timing of the release of these.</p>	Yes
PBRF objectives	2	<p>Cabinet decision:</p> <p>The primary objectives of the PBRF which are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the quality of basic and applied research at New Zealand’s degree granting tertiary education organisations • Support world-leading research-led teaching and learning at degree and postgraduate levels • Assist New Zealand’s tertiary education organisation to maintain and lift their competitive rankings relative to their international peers • Provide robust public information to stakeholders about research performance within and across tertiary education organisations; <p>In doing so the PBRF will also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the development of postgraduate student researchers and new and emerging researchers • Support research activities that provide economic, social, cultural and environmental benefits to New Zealand, including the advancement of matauranga Maori • Support technology and knowledge transfer to New Zealand businesses, iwi and communities. 	No – this is agreed by Cabinet

Area	#	Agree/proposed change and source	Does the change require consultation?
Funding	3	Cabinet decision: Increasing the proportion of funding allocated to the ERI to 20% and decrease the proportion of QE funding to 55%	No – this is agreed by Cabinet
	4	Cabinet decision: Introduce a financial weighting of 2 for new and emerging researchers who receive a C quality category in the QE	No – this is agreed by Cabinet
Developing Evidence Portfolios	5	Cabinet decision: Clarifying operational guidance on the Research Contribution measure - may include examples of esteem and contribution inside and outside academia	Yes
	6	Cabinet decision: Reducing the number of ‘other’ research outputs in EPs from 30 to 12	No – this is agreed by Cabinet
	7	Cabinet decision: Reducing the CRE and PE components and reducing the number of items in the new Research Contribution component from 60 to 15	No – this is agreed by Cabinet
	8	SRG proposal: Provide advice to provide greater consistency in the Research Contribution component including aggregating entries, for example providing one entry that includes all student supervisions.	Yes
	9	SRG proposal: Consider the inclusion of documentary evidence of impact in the Research Contribution component.	Yes
	10	SRG proposal: Review the output definitions for the Research Contribution and Research Output components.	Yes
	11	SRG contributions: Review the ‘exceptions’ previously allowed under the CRE and PE components of the EP.	Yes
	12	SRG proposal: Revise the “Other Comments” section of the EP to clarify the importance of this section, including review of the title, description, advice on completing the section and the position of the information in the EP.	Yes
	13	Panel recommendation: Require TEOs to submit consistent data in EPs. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EP naming formats • NRO naming formats • use of PDF for NROs • correct use of the NRO categories, and • submission of non-electronic NROs. 	Yes
	14	Panel recommendation: Provide greater clarity in guidance and better auditing of TEOs to determine when a research output is first ‘publicly available’.	Yes

Area	#	Agree/proposed change and source	Does the change require consultation?
	15	Panel recommendation: Clarify the requirements for submission and assessment of patents and commissioned reports.	Yes
	16	Panel recommendation: Require TEOs to submit appropriate sound files (where appropriate) and ensure quality visual data where submitted.	Yes
	17	Panel recommendation: Guidance on ordering of other research outputs (OROs).	Yes
	18	Panel recommendation: More specific guidance in the difference between research and professional practice, particularly in relation to creative outputs.	Yes
	19	Panel recommendation: Provide greater clarification on the evidence of research impact expected, such as the use of citation numbers and journal impact factors (to ensure greater consistency of this information across evidence portfolios).	Yes
	20	TEC proposal: Remove the Accepted Manuscript provision due to the ambiguity and relevance of the provision.	Yes
Special circumstances provisions	21	Cabinet decision: Tightening the criteria for staff to have special circumstances considered in the assessment process, with the objective that fewer than 10% of EPs submitted seek to have special circumstances considered.	Yes
	22	Panel recommendation: Consider the continuing impact of the Canterbury earthquakes in the next Quality Evaluation.	Yes
	23	Panel recommendation: The scope of special circumstances are more clearly defined, identifying the area(s) of research (research output, peer esteem, or contribution to the research environment) affected by the special circumstances. Take steps to minimise the claiming of special circumstances, particularly in relation to senior management positions (and associated managerial duties), which currently do not constitute in the Guidelines a leadership position, substantial enough to justify special consideration. Require researchers claiming special circumstances to provide specific information on the impact of their circumstances on the quantity of evidence of research outputs, peer esteem, or contribution to the research environment.	Yes
	24	Panel recommendation: Provide specific guidance on the assessment of EPs claiming special circumstances.	Yes
Staff eligibility criteria	25	Cabinet decision: Excluding overseas-based staff from the QE	No – this is agreed by Cabinet

Area	#	Agree/proposed change and source	Does the change require consultation?
	26	Panel recommendation: The eligibility criteria for staff and the related audit and reporting arrangements should be reviewed carefully to minimise the potential for the inconsistent application of those criteria by TEOs.	Yes
	27	TEC proposal: Criteria need to be revised to determine who should be considered as 'overseas-based' staff.	Yes
	28	TEC proposal: Criteria need to be revised to determine who should be considered as 'non-TEO' staff.	Yes
	29	TEC proposal: Additional advice on determining what 1 FTE is comprised of, particularly the number of hours per week.	Yes
New and Emerging staff	30	Panel recommendation: Review the eligibility criteria for new and emerging researchers, provide greater guidance on eligibility for this category, and greater clarification on equivalency for PhDs for those in professional practice areas (particularly in the creative arts and health).	Yes
Assessment and panel processes	31	Cabinet decision: Allowing only the Chairs of the panels to request that an EP be considered by more than one peer review panel.	No – this is agreed by Cabinet
	32	Cabinet decision: Discontinuing the use of specialist advisors	No – this is agreed by Cabinet
	33	Cabinet decision: Disestablish the two expert advisory groups (the Professional and Applied Expert Advisory Group and the Pacific Research Expert Advisory Group)	No – this is agreed by Cabinet
	34	Panel recommendation: In initiating a cross-referral, a panel Chair must specify the feedback sought, including the specific part of the research component. Panellists receiving a cross-referral must provide contextual information/comments/rationale for the scoring.	Yes
	35	Panel recommendation: Consider ways to improve cross-panel calibration in order to improve the usefulness of cross-referral advice.	Yes
	36	Panel recommendation: Provide more detailed and explicit advice for changing a quality category as a result of the holistic assessment process, and the timing of this assessment in the process.	Yes
	37	SRG proposal: Provide specific holistic tie-point descriptors.	Yes
	38	Panel recommendation: Additional guidance on assessing non-standard EPs i.e. interdisciplinary research, disparate disciplines.	Yes

Area	#	Agree/proposed change and source	Does the change require consultation?
	39	SRG proposal: Review the advice provided on multi-disciplinary research, including the advice provided on subjects that cross subject area boundaries.	Yes
	40	SRG proposal: Review the peer review panel subject/disciplinary areas.	Yes
	41	SRG proposal: Review the weighting and scoring system in regard to the change from three to two components.	Yes
	42	SRG proposal: Review the current subject area weightings (currently based on the weightings associated with the Student Achievement Component cost categories).	Yes
	43	Panel recommendation: Clearly define the meaning of “minimal evidence” and review the level 1 and 2 descriptors for research outputs.	Yes
	44	SRG proposal: Clarify the definition of “minimal evidence” in regard to new and emerging researchers and specify what would be considered equivalent evidence for different disciplinary areas.	Yes
	45	Panel recommendation: Review the use of the terminology “preparatory” and “preliminary” in the EP scoring system to indicate more clearly the stages in the assessment process.	Yes
	46	Panel recommendation: Provide greater clarification on the approach for assessing individual contribution to multi-authored NROs.	Yes
	47	Panel recommendation: Specify how Chairs should manage conflicts of interest when allocating EPs to panel pairs, and managing conflicts of interest raised at panel meetings.	Yes
	48	TEC proposal: Explicitly address the way in which panel meetings should be structured, managing and organised, and the steps that Chairs are required to take to provide both for all the EPs to be reviewed and for all panel members to be involved in the process.	Yes
	49	TEC proposal: Restrict panel members from finding out their own Quality Category results at the panel meeting.	Yes
	50	TEC proposal: Clearly specify what “concerns” can be recorded by panel members.	Yes
	51	Panel recommendation: Consider what changes could be made so that longer timeframes between the completion of research and its uptake and impact can be recognised appropriately.	Yes
	52	Panel recommendation: Review the composition of panels, with particular reference to the need for educational-based assessors in the MIST panel and other panels (i.e. ESOL expertise in the Education panel).	Yes

Area	#	Agree/proposed change and source	Does the change require consultation?
Pacific Research peer review panel	53	Cabinet decision: TEC will report to the Minister on the operational feasibility of establishing a peer review panel for Pacific research before the 2018 QE	Yes
	54	Panel recommendation: Review the requirements for identifying NROs with a Pacific Research designation.	Yes
Reporting	55	Cabinet decision: The primary measure for reporting future QE results will be average quality research based on the number of full-time equivalent teaching and research staff (AQS(S)) in TEOs, subject areas and nominated academic units.	No – this is agreed by Cabinet The MoE is leading work on data collection to support this calculation
	56	Cabinet decision: Additional context will be provided by reporting the extent to which teaching at degree level and above is underpinned by high-quality research (AQS(E)) in TEOS	No – this is agreed by Cabinet
	57	Panel recommendation: Provide clear guidance to appear along with the published results, to ensure results are clearly understood and not misinterpreted in regard to calculation changes between Quality Evaluation rounds.	Yes
	58	TEC proposal: Provide specific advice on the presentation of the reporting, including how TEOs are ranked, use of decimal places, etc.	Yes
External research income	59	Cabinet decision: TEOs will be required to report PBRF-eligible ERI, broken down by the following sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NZ government contestable funds; • NZ public sector contract research; • NZ non-government sources; and • overseas research income. 	Out of scope for the SRG The TEC is currently consulting on the implementation of this change
	60	Cabinet decision: A weighting of 2 on ERI from non-government sources and 1.5 on ERI from overseas sources	See comment above