



Education Report: PBRF Review - Update and summary of sector feedback

To:	Hon Chris Hipkins, Minister of Education		
Date:	09 December 2020	Priority:	Medium
Security Level:	In Confidence	METIS No:	1244560
Drafter:	s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]	DDI:	s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Key Contact:	s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]	DDI:	s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Messaging seen by Communications team:	No	Round Robin:	No

Purpose of paper

This report provides an update on the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) Review, including a summary of sector feedback following consultation.

Summary

1. The Ministry of Education (the Ministry) has recently concluded targeted sector consultation on proposed changes to the PBRF.
2. The proposed changes were informed by recommendations made by the independent Review panel, chaired by Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith.
3. While sector feedback was varied, some proposed changes received strong support. In addition, feedback demonstrated a strong preference across the sector for a collaborative approach to the design and implementation of any changes made to the PBRF.
4. We are developing advice on a final package of changes to the PBRF. This advice will be informed by sector feedback and aligned with the recently published Tertiary Education Strategy (TES) as well as Ka Hikitia and the Action Plan for Pacific Education.
5. This report summarises the sector feedback and outlines how this feedback will be analysed and used to inform the Government's response to the PBRF Review.

Recommended actions

The Ministry of Education recommends you:

- a. **note** that the Ministry has concluded targeted sector consultation on the PBRF Review, and that consultation feedback is summarised in this report

Noted

- b. **note** that the Ministry will develop advice on a final package of changes to the PBRF informed by sector feedback and aligned with the TES, Ka Hikitia and the Action Plan for Pacific Education

Noted

- c. **discuss** with officials in your agency meeting on Monday 14 December any changes you would like the Ministry to focus on when developing this advice

Noted

- d. **note** that you will receive this advice providing further analysis and recommendations in early 2021

Noted

- e. **advise** if there any further considerations, in addition to those above, that you would like to be taken into account in developing advice on a final package of changes to the PBRF

Yes / **No**

- f. **agree** that this briefing be proactively released once final decisions on the PBRF Review have been made

Agree / **Disagree**


Katrina Sutich
**Group Manager Tertiary Education
Graduate Achievement,
Vocations and Careers**

09/12/2020


Hon Chris Hipkins
Minister of Education

____/____/____

Background

1. The PBRF is the main mechanism of Government funding for tertiary education research capability and is a fund of \$315 million per year. The PBRF employs three funding components, with 55% of the fund allocated through the Quality Evaluation – a peer review process.

The Review of the PBRF

2. While the PBRF did not need to be fundamentally redesigned, the Review provided the opportunity to examine government support of research excellence by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the fund. The Terms of Reference for the Review were approved by Cabinet in September 2018 [CAB-18-MIN-0449 refers] and covered a wide range of issues (see Annex One for a summary of the Terms of Reference).
3. Completing the Review of the PBRF is also noted as an ongoing part of your Education Work Programme (EWP) in the EWP Cabinet Paper, due to go to Cabinet Business Committee in early 2021.
4. The Review commenced in July 2019 (after the publication of the 2018 Quality Evaluation results) with the appointment of an independent panel (the panel). The panel was chaired by Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith (see Annex Two for the panel membership).
5. In developing its recommendations, the panel engaged extensively with the tertiary education and research sectors. The Ministry of Education (the Ministry) as well as the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) supported the panel.
6. On 31 January 2020, the panel submitted its final report that summarises its response to the Terms of Reference and outlines recommendations for changes to the PBRF. COVID-19 meant a delay in seeking Cabinet approval to carry out targeted consultation.
7. Following Cabinet approval in July 2020 [CAB-20-MIN-0352 refers], we carried out targeted consultation on proposed changes for strengthening the PBRF with the tertiary education sector. These proposed changes were informed by recommendations made by the independent Review panel.

Development of the proposed changes to the PBRF for consultation

8. The panel made 34 recommendations for the PBRF, ranging from operational details to changes designed to drive strategic shifts in funding allocation. These recommendations were used to develop proposed changes for consultation with the sector. Amendments were made to the panel's recommendations to ensure they were feasible, and where relevant, able to be implemented in time for the next Quality Evaluation in 2025.
9. Many of the panel's recommendations were included for consultation. However, we did not consult on recommendations that affirmed the status quo of some aspects of the fund, such as retaining the individual as the unit of assessment in the Quality Evaluation. In addition, two recommendations were excluded in full, namely:
 - a. development of Evidence Portfolio exemplars as this was not a feasible option,
 - b. a funding increase of \$100m per annum, as any increase to the fund will need to go through the Budget process.

10. In total, we consulted on 26 proposed changes. These are largely grouped under three key objectives to provide structure for the large number of proposals and demonstrate the high-level rationale for the proposed changes. There are also 5 operational changes for the TEC to consider. The Table below sets out the proposed changes.

<p>Key objective one: Broadening the PBRF concept of research excellence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adding a new objective to the PBRF b. Rewording the PBRF definition of research c. Replacing the Nominated Research Output (NRO) component of the Evidence Portfolios with <i>Examples of Research Excellence</i> (EREs)¹ d. Replacing the Other Research Output (ORO) component of the Evidence Portfolios with <i>Other Examples of Research Excellence</i> (OEREs)², and reducing the maximum number allowed e. Refocusing the Research Contributions of the Evidence Portfolios f. Reviewing subject area weightings for accuracy
<p>Key objective two: Enabling a sustainable and diverse research workforce</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. Increasing the subject area weighting for Evidence Portfolios assessed by the <i>Māori Knowledge and Development</i> (MKD), and <i>Pacific Research</i> (PR) peer-review panels h. Additional weighting of 2 for Evidence Portfolios submitted by staff who identify as Māori or Pacific i. Adopting both the above options j. Refreshing the extraordinary circumstances qualifying criteria k. Reviewing the new and emerging qualifying criteria
<p>Key objective three: Improving how Government Supports Research</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> l. Supporting Te Pūkenga and its subsidiaries m. Co-designing with wānanga n. Working across Government to support a sustainable Māori and Pacific research workforce and a diverse system o. Fixing a minimum allocation for Te Pūkenga based on the proportion allocated through the 2018 Quality Evaluation to the Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs) p. Renaming the PBRF in English and/or te reo Māori q. Modifying the guiding principles r. Discontinuing the External Research Income component s. Redistributing External Research Income funding into the Quality Evaluation component, or a new component t. Replacing Average Quality Score (AQS) metrics u. Establishing a programme of research into PBRF processes and impacts
<p>Operational changes to the PBRF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. Ensuring peer-review panels are diverse w. Ensuring peer-review panels are well supported by a training programme x. Improving understanding of the PBRF y. Adopting Open Research And Contributor ID (ORCID) as the unique PBRF-eligible staff identifier z. Consulting the Sector Reference Group on change implementation following this Review

¹ To allow for examples of research excellence across research production, engagement, impact and support for research cultures to be included – these would still be anchored by research outputs.

² To complement the shift to *Examples of Research Excellence*.

Targeted sector consultation

11. Targeted sector consultation ran from Monday 31 August until Friday 6 November. This was extended from the original 6 week timeframe after the Tertiary Education Union (TEU) requested an extension, citing the increased workload their members were experiencing due to COVID-19 [METIS 1241765 refers].
12. We received feedback from **73 online survey responses** (largely from university staff in research and teaching positions) and **47 written submissions**. Feedback came from:
 - individual universities, Universities New Zealand (UNZ) and Te Kāhui Amokura,
 - Te Pūkenga and two of its subsidiaries,
 - groups and departments within tertiary organisations,
 - academic staff from both universities and subsidiaries of Te Pūkenga,
 - Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, and
 - the TEU.
13. Throughout consultation we met with a range of stakeholders to discuss their submissions, including the TEU, the Research Committee of UNZ and three early-career researcher forums.
14. We also sought feedback from wānanga, in particular from Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiāraangi and Te Wānanga o Aotearoa as they participated in the 2018 Quality Evaluation, but we have not received any feedback at this stage.

Summary of Sector Feedback from Consultation³

Key objective one: Broadening the PBRF concept of research excellence

15. There is general support for the proposed new objective for the PBRF and rewording of the PBRF definition of research – particularly amongst institutions. Many respondents supported the panel’s recommendation that the current PBRF settings should be refreshed to encompass and include a broader view of research excellence.
16. There is some opposition to the related proposed changes to Evidence Portfolios (recommendations c-e) which were recommended by the panel to give practical effect to the high-level strategic proposed changes. Respondents expressed concerns that these could add to the current workload of producing Evidence Portfolios so, while researchers may see some benefits in their work being better recognised and rewarded, it may come at a cost. The strongest opposition came from individual research staff.
17. Feedback indicated that any exact changes to Evidence Portfolios would be best determined by the Sector Reference Group⁴ (SRG) for the next Quality Evaluation.

Comment

18. To address concerns around the proposed changes to Evidence Portfolios, further work is needed to determine the most beneficial and appropriate level of change for individual researchers as well as to examine the potential role that the SRG will likely play in determining any final changes.

³ See Annex Three and Four for summaries of sector feedback on significant proposed changes.

⁴ A Sector Reference Group (SRG) is appointed before each Quality Evaluation, to work with the TEC on implementation.

Key objective two: Enabling a more sustainable and diverse research workforce

19. There is sector-wide support for improving PBRF processes for Māori, Pacific and early career researchers. There is also broad recognition of the need to better support research based on kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, as well as Pacific research areas throughout the tertiary education and research systems.
20. While there is support for the funding options proposed (recommendations g-i) under this key objective, some respondents expressed concerns over the multiplier effect of implementing both options together. There was some preference for introducing only one of either option. One university submission argues for the exact weightings to be determined by the SRG.
21. There is wide support for reviewing the qualifying criteria for extraordinary circumstances (recommendation j) and new and emerging researchers (recommendation k). Feedback suggested strongly that the exact changes should be determined by the SRG, in consultation with the sector.

Comment

22. While there was broad support for the proposed changes under key objective two, some respondents expressed general support in principle rather than commenting on specific changes, noting that they would have greater impact if coupled with other system changes to support diverse research areas and address the undersupply of Māori and Pacific researchers. Respondents also expressed concerns about the impact of these changes on individual staff and the potential for these changes to have little impact on what are largely held to be systemic institutional issues.
23. Further work is needed to determine the impact and cost of these proposed changes, and how they will operate alongside other tertiary education and research system changes.

Key objective three: Improving how Government supports research across the sector

24. There is a range of views on the changes proposed under this objective. While there is strong support for discontinuing the use of AQS metrics (recommendation t), there is almost no sector-wide support for fixing the minimum funding for Te Pūkenga in the next Quality Evaluation (recommendation o). There is also almost no support for renaming the PBRF or for the new name proposed by the Review panel (recommendation p).
25. We received lots of responses on the potential discontinuation of the External Research Income (ERI) component (recommendation r). Responses vary among universities, groups and staff and we note that the universities are split evenly between supporting and opposing this proposal. Te Pūkenga and its subsidiaries that provided feedback during consultation support the proposed discontinuation of the ERI.

Comment

26. Further work is needed to evaluate a number of these proposed changes. Many interdependencies were raised during consultation. For example, we need to more fully understand the financial impacts of discontinuing the ERI component for both institutions and researchers. In our next advice, we will likely provide more than one option for the ERI component.

27. The proposal to fix the minimum allocation for Te Pūkenga in the next Quality Evaluation also requires further consideration. While this proposal received little support outside of Te Pūkenga and its subsidiaries, it is important to note the recommendation was made to safeguard research capacity and capability in the subsidiaries during this time of transition.

Operational changes to the PBRF

28. There is broad support for these proposed changes. In addition, many respondents provided useful feedback on how best to implement different changes.

Further Comment

29. All tertiary education organisations (TEOs) that have participated in the PBRF were invited to participate in consultation, including relevant research groups, centres and individual researchers within the tertiary and research systems.
30. We received responses from many of the participating TEOs; the majority from the university sector. We received responses from Te Pūkenga, two of its subsidiaries (Otago Polytechnic and Toi Ohomai Institute of Technology) and only one response received from a participating Private Training Establishment.

Wānanga

31. We have not received a response from either of the participating wānanga. We have heard the views of wānanga on the PBRF in the past (including when Professor Smith met with both participating wānanga during the Review), and can anticipate that, while the proposed changes and options could benefit them financially, they would still view the PBRF as being fundamentally incompatible with much of their kaupapa.
32. We will continue to address the broader collective and individual concerns of wānanga through ongoing Te Hono Wānanga work. Should we receive feedback from the wānanga over the next few months we will consider it in our advice to you early next year.

The Tertiary Education Union

33. The TEU provided a written submission, including commentary from members, which called for any future Quality Evaluation rounds to be cancelled, and for the PBRF to be discontinued and replaced with a system that allocates funding on the basis of the un-weighted full-time equivalent numbers of research active staff in an institution. While the submission did not indicate support or opposition to any of the proposed changes, it highlighted many concerns with the PBRF, including high transaction costs for participating staff, which we will consider in further advice.

Response to High-Level Nature of the Proposed Changes

34. The panel's recommendations and the proposed changes consulted on were deliberately high-level; intended to seek thematic feedback and invite comment from the sector on how best to make and implement changes. While this was largely successful, much support expressed by TEOs is in principle, with their expectation for further collaborative design and implementation work with the TEC and the SRG.

35. In general, responses from TEOs were hesitant to support some of the more specific recommendations. We understand from engagement with TEO leadership that this is motivated by the difficulty in changing internal processes between Quality Evaluation rounds. Any changes to the allocation of PBRF funding will have an impact on TEOs and while many TEOs support the objectives of the proposals, there are concerns for the impact of these changes on their core funding.

Emphasis on the Sector Reference Group

36. Overall, feedback highlighted the importance of collaborating with the sector in the design and implementation of any final changes. Many respondents indicate that the SRG for the next Quality Evaluation would be well placed to design the operational details of any changes, in consultation with the sector. Feedback demonstrated strong support for the new SRG to comprise a diverse membership, including senior Māori and Pacific academics as well as staff from different disciplines, TEOs and career stages.

Aligning the outcomes of the PBRF Review with education priorities

37. We are developing advice on a final package of changes to the PBRF. This advice will be informed by the sector feedback summarised in this report and by modelling of any financial implications of the proposed changes for TEOs, including the funding weightings for Māori and Pacific research and researchers as well as the discontinuation of the ERI component. In addition, we will ensure the final package of changes is aligned with other key strategies and action plans. We will also meet with Te Taumata Aronui to discuss the Review and how it might align with their work.

Tertiary Education Strategy

38. You recently published the TES alongside the Statement of National Education and Learning Priorities (NELP), which includes, under priority eight: *enhance the contribution of research and mātauranga Māori in addressing local and global challenges*, a Government action to develop and implement a Government response to the Independent Review of the PBRF. We will ensure that proposed changes to the PBRF align with this priority and the overall direction for tertiary education.

Ka Hikitia and the Action Plan for Pacific Education

39. As detailed in the summary of consultation feedback, the most widespread support was for changes to support Māori and Pacific research and researchers. In addition to this recent consultation feedback, there have been ongoing concerns that the PBRF does not adequately recognise and reward:
- a. Māori and Pacific academics across the tertiary system;
 - b. participating wānanga and their academic staff; and
 - c. research based on kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori, as well as Pacific research.
40. Recent research has shown that the proportion of Māori staff in tertiary education has not increased in recent years and argues this raises questions about TEOs commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi⁵, as well as to broader Pacific communities⁶. Māori and Pacific academics have significantly lower odds of being in the professoriate, being promoted,

⁵ 'Why isn't my professor Māori? A snapshot of the academic workforce in New Zealand universities', McAllister et al, 2019.

⁶ 'Why isn't my professor Pasifika? A snapshot of the academic workforce in New Zealand universities', Naepi, 2019.

or having higher earnings, and these inequities cannot be explained by PBRF performance.⁷

41. Concerns have also been raised around how students may be impacted by the combination of these funding inequities and a lack of representation in the academic workforce and tertiary education research.
42. Many of the proposed changes will specifically impact Māori and Pacific staff and students so consideration of these impacts in alignment with both Ka Hikitia and the Action Plan for Pacific Education is critical.
43. At this stage, the proposed changes for the PBRF will likely support three of the five outcome domains of Ka Hikitia (*Te Tangata, Te Kanorautanga and Te Tuakiritanga*), and at least one of the system shifts outlined in the Action Plan for Pacific Education (*grow, retain and value highly competent teachers, leaders and educational professionals of diverse Pacific heritages*).

Next Steps

44. You are meeting with officials at your agency meeting on Monday 14 December to discuss the feedback received during targeted consultation.
45. In developing further advice, we will work closely with both the TEC (particularly on implementation issues and preparations for the SRG) and MBIE (who are currently briefing the Associate Minister of Research, Science and Innovation on the PBRF).
46. A timeline for next steps is set out below. A report-back to Cabinet by May 2021 allows for the implementation of a new SRG as soon as possible, which is critical to operationalising any final changes to the PBRF in time for the next Quality Evaluation.

Date	Action
February 2021	The Ministry (in consultation with relevant agencies) will provide you with advice on any final changes, seeking decisions for a Cabinet paper.
Early March 2021	Agency consultation on Cabinet paper with any recommendations for any final changes to the PBRF.
Late March – April 2021	Ministerial consultation on Cabinet paper with recommendations for any final changes to the PBRF.
Late April 2021	Report back to SWC with recommendations for any final changes to the PBRF.
Early May 2021	Report back to Cabinet with recommendations for any final changes to the PBRF.

⁷ 'Glass ceilings in New Zealand Universities', McCallister et al, 2020.

Date	Action
Mid May 2021	Any confirmed final changes to the PBRF are communicated publicly and the TEC can start the appointment process for the Quality Evaluation SRG.

Annexes

Annex 1: Summary of the Terms of Reference for the Review of the PBRF

Annex 2: Membership of the independent PBRF Review panel

Annex 3: Quantitative breakdown of all sector feedback on significant changes

Annex 4: Quantitative breakdown of institutional, group and individual staff feedback on significant changes

Proactively Released

Annex 1: Summary of the Terms of Reference for the Review of the PBRF

- **Revisiting the PBRF objectives:** The Review considered whether the PBRF objectives meet current and future challenges and priorities.
- **Improving research collaboration and engagement with end users:** The Review considered the merits of moving from individual-based assessment to a group-based assessment, in terms of collaboration, supporting workforce development, reducing compliance costs and measuring impact of research.
- **Boosting the impact of tertiary education research:** The Review examined the PBRF assessment of impact on communities, the environment, businesses and Government.
- **Assessing excellent research with lower transaction costs:** The Review examined options for modifying current PBRF settings to reduce transaction costs for research staff, TEOs and Government.
- **Recognising and rewarding all types of research activity:** The Review considered how the PBRF can better support the activities of all types of research.
- **Sustainable and diverse workforce with investigator-led research capability:** The Review examined the effectiveness of the PBRF on the development of a highly skilled and diverse research workforce.

Annex 2: Membership of the independent PBRF Review panel

Panel member	Current organisation/institution
Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Chair)	University of Waikato
Professor Wendy Lerner	Victoria University of Wellington
Dr David Phipps	York University, Canada
Professor Ian Town	Ministry of Health
Associate Professor Yvonne Underhill-Sem	University of Auckland
Associate Professor Marcus Williams	Unitec Institute of Technology, subsidiary of Te Pūkenga

The panel members were selected for their collective skills and expertise across these areas:

- a.** overseas funding systems;
- b.** detailed knowledge of our current system – from a research perspective and a management perspective;
- c.** mātauranga Māori;
- d.** Pacific research; and
- e.** knowledge transfer and impact/applied researchers or those from industry.

Annex 3: Quantitative breakdown of all sector feedback on significant changes

Key proposed changes to the PBRF		Sector feedback - all responses (total: 120)		
		Support	Oppose	Blank/Unsure
Key objective one: Broadening the PBRF concept of research excellence	Adding a new objective to the PBRF	65	31	24
	Rewording the PBRF definition of research	63	38	19
	Replacing the NRO component of the Evidence Portfolios with EREs	48	50	22
	Replacing the ORO component of the Evidence Portfolios with OEREs, and reducing the maximum number allowed	43	52	25
	Refocusing the Research Contributions of the Evidence Portfolios	37	57	26
	Reviewing subject area weightings for accuracy	61	39	20
Key objective two: Enabling a sustainable and diverse research workforce	Increasing the subject area weighting for Evidence Portfolios assessed by the MKD & PR peer-review panels	64	39	17
	Additional weighting of 2 for Evidence Portfolios submitted by staff who identify as Māori or Pacific	68	38	14
	Adopting both the above options	51	48	21
	Refreshing the extraordinary circumstances qualifying criteria	73	24	23
	Reviewing the new and emerging qualifying criteria	70	27	23
Key objective three: Improving how Government Supports Research	Fixing a minimum allocation for Te Pūkenga based on the proportion allocated through the 2018 QE to the ITPs	40	47	33
	Renaming the PBRF in English or te reo Māori	44	52	24
	Modifying the guiding principles	54	36	30
	Discontinuing the ERI component	58	45	17
	Replacing AQS metrics	56	37	27
	Establishing a programme of research into PBRF processes and impacts	67	31	22
Operational Changes to the PBRF	Ensuring peer-review panels are diverse	78	19	23
	Ensuring peer-review panels are well supported by a training programme	73	22	25
	Improving understanding of the PBRF	48	34	38
	Adopting ORCID as the unique PBRF-eligible staff identifier	63	32	25

Summative colour key:

Strong support	Support	Neutral	Opposition	Strong opposition

Annex 4: Quantitative breakdown of institutional, group and individual staff feedback on significant changes – page 1 of 2

Key proposed changes (abbreviated)		Universities and UNZ (total: 10)			University groups ⁸ (total: 16)			Te Pūkenga + subsidiaries (total: 3)			Individual staff (total: 86)		
		Support	Oppose	Blank/Unsure	Support	Oppose	Blank/Unsure	Support	Oppose	Blank/Unsure	Support	Oppose	Blank/Unsure
Key objective one: Broadening the PBRF concept of research excellence	Adding a new objective to the PBRF	5	0	5	10	0	6	2	0	1	47	31	8
	Rewording the PBRF definition of research	7	1	2	6	0	10	3	0	0	44	37	5
	Replacing the NRO component of the Evidence Portfolios with EREs	2	4	4	8	0	8	2	0	1	34	46	6
	Replacing the ORO component of the Evidence Portfolios with OEREs, and reducing the maximum number allowed	2	4	4	4	2	10	2	0	1	34	46	6
	Refocusing the Research Contributions of the Evidence Portfolios	2	2	6	4	2	10	2	0	1	28	51	7
	Reviewing subject area weightings for accuracy	3	6	1	6	3	7	3	0	0	49	29	8
Key objective two: Enabling a Sustainable and Diverse Research Workforce	Increasing the subject area weighting for Evidence Portfolios assessed by the MKD & PR peer-review panels	6	1	3	12	0	4	3	0	0	41	37	8
	Additional weighting of 2 for Evidence Portfolios submitted by staff who identify as Māori or Pacific	7	1	2	14	0	2	3	0	0	42	36	8
	Adopting both the above options	4	1	5	12	0	4	3	0	0	31	46	9
	Refreshing the extraordinary circumstances qualifying criteria	7	0	3	11	0	5	3	0	0	50	24	12
	Reviewing the new and emerging qualifying criteria	6	0	4	12	0	4	3	0	0	47	27	12

⁸ Including university faculty, department, or other groups, as well as one Centre of Research Excellence

Annex 4: Quantitative breakdown of institutional, group and individual staff feedback on significant changes – page 2 of 2

Key proposed changes (abbreviated)		Universities and UNZ (total: 10)			University groups (total: 16)			Te Pūkenga + subsidiaries (total: 3)			Individual staff (total: 86)		
		Support	Oppose	Blank/ Unsure	Support	Oppose	Blank/ Unsure	Support	Oppose	Blank/ Unsure	Support	Oppose	Blank/ Unsure
Key objective three: Improving how Government Supports Research	Fixing a minimum allocation for Te Pūkenga based on the proportion allocated through the 2018 QE to the ITPs	2	2	6	3	3	10	3	0	0	32	40	14
	Renaming the PBRF in English or te reo Māori	3	2	5	8	1	7	2	0	1	31	48	7
	Modifying the guiding principles	6	0	4	7	0	9	2	0	1	38	36	12
	Discontinuing the ERI component	4	4	2	6	3	7	3	0	0	44	34	8
	Replacing AQS metrics	7	1	2	7	0	9	3	0	0	37	36	13
	Establishing a programme of research into PBRF processes and impacts	4	1	5	7	2	7	2	1	0	53	26	7
Operational Changes to the PBRF	Ensuring peer-review panels are diverse	7	0	3	6	0	10	3	0	0	60	19	7
	Ensuring peer-review panels are well supported by a training programme	7	0	3	4	0	12	3	0	0	57	22	7
	Improving understanding of the PBRF	4	0	6	3	0	13	2	0	1	38	34	14
	Adopting ORCID as the unique PBRF-eligible staff identifier	5	1	4	3	1	12	3	0	0	50	29	7

Summative colour key:

Strong support	Support	Neutral	Opposition	Strong opposition