

Toihuarewa's response to Te Ara Paerangi Green Paper

16 March 2022

1. Name

Assoc/Prof Meegan Hall (on behalf of Toihuarewa, Te Herenga Waka—Victoria University of Wellington)

2. Email address

Privacy - 9(2)(a)

3. Can MBIE publish your name and contact information with your submission?

Yes

4. Can MBIE contact you in relation to your submission?

Yes

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

Organisation

6. Organisation name

Toihuarewa (the Māori academic community at Te Herenga Waka—Victoria University of Wellington)

7. Organisation type
University

8. Is it a Māori-led organisation?

Yes

9. Where is the headquarters of the organisation?

Wellington

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

Mātauranga Māori is the central knowledge system

Section 3: Research Priorities

In this section, we ask for information to help us understand the principles and process through which we should determine the scope and focus of Research Priorities, as well as how we can deliver research most effectively in relation to the Priorities.

(See pages 24-27 of the Green Paper for context on these questions)

11. 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)

Te Tiriti o Waitangi needs to underpin everything about the way the science research and innovation (SRI) sector is designed and operated. It should not be marginalised or relegated to a ‘Tiriti’ section. Take for example, this green paper – it does not have Te Tiriti all the way through, and it is not prominent in all six areas.

In relation to the scoping and focus of research priorities, the principles should be drawn directly from the articles of Te Tiriti itself, namely, *kāwanatanga*, *rangatiratanga*, and *ōritetanga*. The *kāwanatanga* principle should ensure that any decision-making is qualified by an overarching responsibility to ensure Māori interests are protected. The *rangatiratanga* principle should preserve Māori rights to self-determination within the SRI sector and provide for entities and opportunities to exercise that right. The *ōritetanga* principle should set an expectation of equitable outcomes for Māori in all aspects of the SRI sector and should drive all efforts to attain that goal.

In addition to these three core principles, there are several additional principles that have been extrapolated from Te Tiriti o Waitangi that are also relevant for this context. See, for example, Te Herenga Waka—Victoria University of Wellington’s Te Tiriti o Waitangi Statute. It also includes the principle of *kaitiakitanga*, which establishes a responsibility to protect not only Māori people and places but also *mātauranga Māori*, and the principle of *kōwhiringa*, which allows for Māori people to choose whether to follow Māori and non-Māori pathways or, in the case of the SRI sector, to engage in Māori research activity governed by and for Māori or not.

Holding these principles at the core of any decision making and action around structure or funding or other priorities of the sector will ensure more attention is given to Māori needs and aspirations than is currently the case. These principles are also not just for listing on a website or in a document, they must be enacted and given effect.

*12. 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)*

The principles listed in our response to Q11 are also relevant here. We would add that real change is needed in the sector, not just ‘rearranging the deck chairs.’ For too long, research priorities for this country have depended on who is in government, with little long-term vision or impact. For Māori, our ultimate research priority is survival — not the economy.

*13. 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)*

Equal time and energy should be spent talking and strategising with Māori scientists and other Māori knowledge holders to determine a complementary set of Māori national research priorities. Māori people and knowledge are not just a small component of the SRI context, we are meant to be equal partners and should be treated as such within the approach taken to set the priorities.

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

In this section, we ask for information to help us understand how Māori want to engage throughout the reform process including beyond this consultation, how we can facilitate the application of mātauranga Māori throughout the research system, and views on regionally-based Māori knowledge hubs.

(See pages 36-37 of the Green Paper for context on these questions)

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

Firstly, the phrasing of this question is inappropriate. Who is the ‘we’ in the sentence (because it creates an ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy)? And why is this question differentiating between Māori who are Treaty signatories and those who are not? Also, the section heading refers to Te Tiriti, so why does this question relate to ‘Treaty’ partners?

In answer to the question, it will take time, and effort, to reach into Māori communities who may well be wary of sharing their insights and knowledge. But the alternative, to have one or two Tiriti focused workshops as part of a suite of other sessions, which are then open to (and often dominated by) non-Māori, with their fragilities and learning journeys, is not sufficient. To have Māori experts unable to attend Māori/Tiriti sessions because they were full of non-Māori is not sufficient. To have Māori/Tiriti sessions that are formatted in the same way as

the other sessions (albeit with Māori hosts) is not sufficient. To send out a consultation paper and expect Māori respondents to imagine a future where our priorities are centred, and then ask them to tell a Crown agency how to do it, is not sufficient. Māori need the autonomy and resourcing to collectively make those decisions and operationalise them for ourselves.

15. 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)

We are not interested in minor tinkering that will produce a lukewarm Vision Mātauranga 2022 policy. We want a system that can support mātauranga Māori in all its forms. It is our firm view that Māori should be in charge of looking after the development and use of mātauranga Māori. We are open to the development of a dual system, where a Māori model is established to match (and balance) the existing Pākehā systems. We envisage a type of mātauranga Māori commission, that would sit outside the public service with its own baseline funding, along the lines of what has been advocated by Te Pūtahitanga. A new commission could potentially create regulations, frameworks, guidelines, etc., around the protection of mātauranga Māori. It could also employ staff who have the resources to think about issues like the protection of mātauranga Māori instead of people having to do it on top of their other jobs. Critical to this dual system, however, is the need for the Māori entity to be given the respect, value, standing, and resourcing necessary. Having a parallel system is good in theory but without proper resourcing it is doomed to fail.

We are interested in whether the new Māori health authority can provide a model here, with its efforts to set up bases in different localities and create space for iwi leadership.

Similarly, our members' experiences of the Māori Language Commission – where the MLC technically sits within the Crown and receives direct funding but works 'independently' – give us faith that such a by Māori, for Māori entity can work.

Aside from the establishment of a Māori entity, the other area of mātauranga Māori protection that we are concerned about is intellectual property rights. In our experience, there is a desperate need for some clear guidelines around the protection and culturally appropriate, ethical use of mātauranga Māori. For example, there is no consistency in approach across the eight universities in Aotearoa New Zealand and none of those institutions are currently doing an adequate job of identifying and managing the use of mātauranga Māori in ways that centre Māori rights and risks. There is also a growing practice of non-Māori researchers drawing on mātauranga Māori and claiming expertise in that space. This also needs to be moderated more effectively.

*16. 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)*

Initially, we were concerned that the idea of establishing regional hubs sounds disturbing like the ‘large natural groupings’ approach favoured by the Crown in the Treaty settlements process. Our view when that approach was introduced, and now, is that it undermines the tino rangatiratanga of iwi and hapū and stifles the development of smaller but otherwise independent groupings.

However, we can also see the sense in taking a regional approach to supporting research activity, particularly if it was structured in a way that still engaged and recognised the independence of hapū and iwi structures. We believe that it is impossible (nor is it desirable) to divorce Māori research from whānau/hapū/iwi aspirations but acknowledge that the impact of colonisation and decades of racist and discriminatory Crown policy and practice has reduced Māori access to research resource and capability development opportunities, particularly in regional spaces. Thus, one of the challenges likely to be faced is identifying suitable people to fill regional representation roles. This inequity has to be taken into account in any funding model of regional approaches in terms of a focus on building research capacity from mātauranga Māori perspectives.

Section 5: Funding

In this section, we ask for information to help us define “core functions” and how they should be funded as well as your views on a base grant funding model.

(See pages 42-43 of the Green Paper for context on these questions)

*17. 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)*

A core function would be to redress te Tiriti o Waitangi gap and address core inequities through more equitable funding opportunities.

*18. 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)*

For too long, Māori focused research has been reliant on the drip feeding of little pockets of funding. We believe the time is right for an independent Māori research entity, with its own based funding, and capacity to support the diverse range of Māori research and researchers across the sector, as outlined in Te Pūtahitanga’s response.

*19. 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)*

-

Section 6: Institutions

In this section, we ask for information to help us understand how institutional forms can serve current and future needs, how institutions can support workforce development, and how we can improve coordination of capital works.

(See pages 52-56 of the Green Paper for context on these questions)

*20. 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)*

-

*21. 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)*

-

*22. 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)*

-

*23. 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)*

-

*24. 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)*

Section 7: Research workforce

In this section, we want information to help us understand how workforce considerations affect Research Priorities and how base grant funding would affect the research workforce, as well as information to help us design funding focused on workforce outcomes.

(See pages 66-68 of the Green Paper for context on these questions)

25. 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)

The Māori research workforce is diverse and spread across regional and institutional boundaries. As the Toihuarewa collective, we represent Māori academic staff working within a mainstream university, so we have a particular view about workforce pressures and opportunities. Several of us have written about and advised on projects that have explored the situation of Māori staff within universities and the challenges of not being valued, of our work not being respected, and of its impact on our promotions and career progression. Our Tiriti relationship within universities, our translation and facilitation roles, are not always understood or appreciated. That needs to change. An obvious place to start that change is to get more Māori into the university system. We need to make it more attractive for future Māori academics and students to study and work with us, including decolonising our systems and processes. We also need more Māori in senior leadership roles to influence those systems and processes. If the national research priorities also factored in an expectation of Māori capacity and capability development, that would support our internal goals and enable us to contribute more to the national priorities.

This question also prompts us to think about the role of universities into the future. We believe that one of the benefits of working at a university is the diversity of mātauranga that we are exposed to. We welcome the opportunity for inter- and cross-disciplinary collaboration in our research, and the university environment makes that more possible. However, we also recognise that, even though we are Māori, we are often perceived as being part of the mainstream as university staff. Our reading of some of the material around potential changes in the SRI section suggests a focus towards setting up structures and funding with iwi and wānanga. Within that kind of approach, how would Māori within universities connect to those iwi research hubs? If the research funding was pushed out to iwi or hapū groups, then there would be movement of Māori academics into those spaces. While on the one hand that would be great for iwi development, we could end up with fewer Māori within universities, rather than more.

26. *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)

-

27. *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)

-

Section 8: Research infrastructure

In this section, we want information to help us understand how we can improve the efficacy of investment in research infrastructure.

(See pages 74-76 of the Green Paper for context on these questions)

28. *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)

-