#121

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 9:10:18 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 3:11:23 PM
Time Spent: 06:01:04

Page 2: Section 1: submitter contact information

Q1

Name

Brigid Ryan

Q2

Email address

Privacy - 9(2)(a)

Q3 **Yes**

Can MBIE publish your name and contact information with your submission?Confidentiality notice: Responding “no” to this question does not guarantee that we will not release the name and contact information your provided, if any, as we may be required to do so by law. It does mean that we will contact you if we are considering releasing submitter contact information that you have asked that we keep in confidence, and we will take your request for confidentiality into account when making a decision on whether to release it.

Q4 **Yes**

Can MBIE contact you in relation to your submission?

Page 3: Section 2: Submitter information

Q5 **Organisation**

Are you submitting as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Page 4: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q6 **Respondent skipped this question**

Are you a researcher or scientist?

Q7

Age

Respondent skipped this question

Q8

Gender

Respondent skipped this question

Q9

In which region do you primarily work?

Respondent skipped this question

Q10

Ethnicity

Respondent skipped this question

Page 5: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q11

What is your iwi affiliation?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q12

If you wish, please specify to which Pacific ethnicity you identify

Respondent skipped this question

Page 7: Section 2: Submitter information - individual

Q13

What type of organisation do you work for?

Respondent skipped this question

Q14

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

Respondent skipped this question

Q15

Which disciplines are most relevant to your work?

Respondent skipped this question

Q16

What best describes the use of Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) in your work?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 8: Section 2: Submitter information - organisation

Q17

Organisation name

Te Titoki Mataroa MedTech Research Translator Future Leaders Module

Q18

Organisation type

Other (please specify):
National network of early and mid-career researchers (medical technology and brain research)

Q19

Is it a Māori-led organisation?

No

Q20

Where is the headquarters of the organisation?

Auckland

Q21

What best describes the use of Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) in your organisation?

There is some Mātauranga Māori, but it is not the main science knowledge

Page 9: Section 3: Research Priorities

Q22

Priorities design: What principles could be used to determine the scope and focus of research Priorities? (See page 27 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q23

Priority-setting process: What principles should guide a national research Priority-setting process, and how can the process best give effect to Te Tiriti?(See pages 28-29 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q24

Operationalising Priorities: How should the strategy for each national research Priority be set and how do we operationalise them?(See pages 30-33 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Page 10: Section 4: Te Tiriti, mātauranga Māori, and Māori aspirations

Q25

Engagement: How should we engage with Māori and Treaty Partners?(See page 38 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q26

Mātauranga Māori: What are your thoughts on how to enable and protect mātauranga Māori in the research system?(See pages 38-39 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q27

Regionally based Māori knowledge hubs: What are your thoughts on regionally based Māori knowledge hubs? (See page 39 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Page 11: Section 5: Funding

Q28

Core Functions: How should we decide what constitutes a core function, and how do we fund them?(See pages 44-46 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q29

Establishing a base grant and base grant design: Do you think a base grant funding model will improve stability and resilience for research organisations?(See pages 46-49 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q30

Establishing a base grant and base grant design: How should we go about designing and implementing such a funding model?(See pages 46-49 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Page 12: Section 6: Institutions

Q31

Institution design: How do we design collaborative, adaptive and agile research institutions that will serve current and future needs?(See pages 57-58 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q32

Role of institutions in workforce development: How can institutions be designed to better support capability, skill and workforce development?(See page 58 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q33

Better coordinated property and capital investment: How should we make decisions on large property and capital investments under a more coordinated approach?(See pages 58-59 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q34

Institution design and Te Tiriti: How do we design Tiriti-enabled institutions? (See page 59 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Q35

Knowledge exchange: How do we better support knowledge exchange and impact generation? What should be the role of research institutions in transferring knowledge into operational environments and technologies?(See pages 60-63 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Respondent skipped this question

Page 13: Section 7: Research workforce

Q36

Workforce and research Priorities: How should we include workforce considerations in the design of national research Priorities?(See pages 69-70 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

There will need to be consideration that early and mid-career researchers (EMCRs) are at a really variable time of their career – some have young families, some don't, some have come in from other careers etc, so ensuring that the new system allows for flexibility and diversity of job roles will be important. This includes a robust support system to remediate the impact of parental leave and child rearing, as EMCRs are the key group likely affected by starting a family. The new system should take into account not just flexibility in career pathways but also ensure that promotions pathways are clearly mapped. Supporting diversity among the EMCR cohort is also critical. It is important to ensure that the new model recognises and supports the diverse needs of Māori and Pacifica EMCRs, for example.

The universities and CRIs need to foster more diverse options of career progression beyond the standard academic pathway. The current system does not practically allow for pathways other than being a Professor as the endpoint. Careers in transdisciplinary research, commercial translation, community engagement and/or involvement should be encouraged and supported. The base grant initiative is laudable, and the implementation should include ongoing pragmatic mentorship and guidance on the different aspects of career options supported by the grant. Additional tiered funding pools should be created to specifically support progression in certain career opportunities at the end of the base grant.

Having roles that incentivise leadership roles is important, but not everyone wants to be a Principal Investigator and we still want to retain these skilled staff rather than lose them to other industries. The US National Institutes of Health (NIH), for example, do this through roles called 'staff scientist' – which is essentially a renewable/permanent postdoctoral position: they are expected to run projects and drive technology innovations, but their position isn't dependent on number of papers/committees/teaching/students etc (https://oir.nih.gov/sourcebook/personnel/ipds-appointment-mechanisms/staff-scientist). They have their own KPIs dependent on the role. Staff scientists have PhDs, are more experienced than a technician or research assistant, and have really valuable expertise, especially if they are retained in a lab over a long period of time. In our current NZ system these people would usually run out of funding or tire of short-term contracts and just leave science.

The current model requires EMCRs to develop a 'research niche' that is distinct from their Principal Investigator's in order to be considered for a permanent academic position. This encourages EMCRs to diversify their research focus. This may be at odds with the research priority approach. The research priorities will need to allow EMCRs to develop independent programmes of research within a research priority and/or provide for permanent positions as a non-Principal Investigator (e.g. 'staff scientist' roles) within an existing lab.

We need a system that encourages and facilitates young scientists to remain in NZ and contribute to our knowledge base instead of being part of the "brain drain" issues for NZ. The fact we don't have anything like 'tenure-track' in NZ is an issue for attracting and retaining researchers. Most EMCRs are disillusioned that there will never be a stable job for us unless someone retires in our institution. This may not happen during the window of time that EMCRs have available to them before they are ineligible for fellowships. Even if an elusive permanent position becomes available, there will be 5-10 people competing for that one job. Retention might be improved if there were funding schemes that supported future leaders into stable positions. Rutherford and Hercus are the closest we have and even then, at the end of 4-5 years there is still no guarantee of a permanent role. We need a scheme where these prestigious fellowships come with the requirement that your institution put you on a tenure-track so that you are supported and mentored with the expectation that there will be permanent role (obviously performance based) at the end of the fellowship.

Q37

Respondent skipped this question

Base grant and workforce: What impact would a base grant have on the research workforce?(See pages 70-71 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Q38

Respondent skipped this question

Better designed funding mechanisms: How do we design new funding mechanisms that strongly focus on workforce outcomes? (See page 72 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)

Page 14: Section 8: Research infrastructure

Q39

Respondent skipped this question

Funding research infrastructure: How do we support sustainable, efficient and enabling investment in research infrastructure?(See pages 77-78 of the Green Paper for additional information related to this question)