2025

Ngā Aratohu 2025 mō te Kaunihera me Ngā Mema o te Rōpū Whiriwhiri

Guidelines for Council and Panel Members

FUNDING FOR RESEARCH EXCELLENCE

Version 1.1

MARSDEN FUND
TE PŪTEA RANGAHAU A MARSDEN

ROYAL SOCIETY TE APĀRANGI

Ngā kaupapa
Contents

Ngā rerekētanga mō te tau 2025
Changes for 2025

- New Terms of Reference have been established for the Fund.
    - Two new assessment criteria have been added around benefit and rationale.
        - All proposals must demonstrate how their research could be of economic, environmental or health benefit to New Zealand
        - Proposals should demonstrate a clear rationale for this research being undertaken in New Zealand
    - Approximately 50% of funding will go towards supporting proposals which have the potential to result in economic benefits to New Zealand
    - The Social Sciences and Humanities panels have been disestablished
    - Scholarly impact has been changed to quantifiable impact
- These changes have led to some alterations in the proposal structure
    - New section on "benefit" added, with:
        - Tick boxes indicating potential benefit categories
        - a 400-word statement to articulate "Benefit and rationale for the research in New Zealand"
    - Full Proposals / Council Award: Public title and summary now required in addition to the research title and summary
- EOI summary changed to 200 words
- Narrative CV trial expanded to include all applicants across all grant categories
- Both CV templates updated with minor changes
- Vision Mātauranga guidance updated
    - % shares of Vision Mātauranga themes will not be visible
- SEOs, % shares and keywords will be visible in the proposal
- References to Covid-19 removed

From the new Terms of Reference (2024):

Nature of the Marsden Fund

1. The Marsden Fund encourages New Zealand's leading researchers to explore new ideas that may not be funded through other funding streams and fosters creativity and innovation within the science innovation and technology system. Exploring new ideas results in greater potential to develop of new technologies, products, boost economic growth, and enhance New Zealand's quality of life.
2. The Marsden Fund invests in excellent, investigator-led research aimed at generating new knowledge, with the potential for long-term economic, environmental, or health benefit to New Zealand.
3. It supports excellent research projects that advance and expand the knowledge base and contributes to the development of people with advanced skills in New Zealand.

Objectives of the Fund

4. The objectives of the Marsden Fund are to:
   a) enhance the quality of research in New Zealand by creating increased opportunity to undertake excellent investigator-led research.
   b) contribute in the long-term to economic, environmental, and health impacts for New Zealand.
   c) support the advancement of knowledge and technology in New Zealand and contribute to the global knowledge base.
   d) contribute to the development of advanced skills in New Zealand, including support for continuing training of post-doctoral level researchers and support for the establishment of early careers of new and emerging researchers.
   e) support research where there is a clear rationale for the research to be undertaken in New Zealand.

Types of Proposals Supported

11) All proposals must demonstrate why their research could be of economic, environmental, or health benefit to New Zealand.
12) Approximately 50% of funds will go towards supporting proposals which have the potential to result in economic benefits to New Zealand.

The full 2024 Terms of Reference are on the Marsden Fund website: https://royalsociety.org.nz/what-we-do/funds-and-opportunities/marsden/about/tor/

Kōrero whakataki
Introduction

These guidelines are intended to facilitate the smooth operation of the Marsden Fund Council and Assessment Panel meetings. They are retained as a permanent record, as required by the Auditor-General, and are publicly available.

Te mahi a te Kaunihera Pūtea a Marsden
Role of the Marsden Fund Council

The Marsden Fund Council (the Council), appointed by the Minister of Science, Innovation and Technology, makes decisions on Marsden Funding. The Council consists of nine eminent researchers spanning a range of disciplines.

Council members have the responsibility for developing the strategic direction of the Fund and for choosing which applications are to be funded.

Terms of Reference are available on the Marsden Fund website: https://royalsociety.org.nz/what-we-do/funds-and-opportunities/marsden/about/tor

To assist the Council, eight discipline-based assessment panels make recommendations on the proposals in their area of research. The panels are each convened by a Marsden Fund Council member who is responsible for the effective conduct of the assessment process.

Each panel convenor needs to ensure that the funding recommendations made are defensible, by:

- ensuring the framework for assessment is followed
- identifying and taking appropriate action over conflicts of interest
- ensuring that information provided for feedback to applicants is appropriate (all feedback to applicants will be given by the convenor).

Convenors are expected to attend two panel meetings scheduled during the year, as well as grade and comment on all proposals submitted to their panel (except where conflicts of interest apply) and provide feedback to applicants after the Full Proposal round. See the section 'Procedures for allocation consideration' for assessment procedures.

Marsden Fund Council members may not apply for funding to any panel during their appointments, either as a Principal (PI) or an Associate Investigator (AI). They also may not apply for a Marsden Fund Council Award grant. However, they may act as Mentors on Fast-Start proposals.

Ngā take tapu
Sensitive issues

Privacy

Royal Society Te Apārangi and the Marsden Fund Council have obligations under the Privacy Act to keep confidential certain information provided by individuals. Moreover, the records of deliberations by the Council and panels are regarded as strictly confidential, as are the contents of unsuccessful applications.

- The contents and ideas contained in the proposals are strictly confidential. The proposal material must not be used for any purpose other than assessment of the proposal.
- Council and panel members must ensure the safekeeping of all proposals and related confidential documents. Access to electronic information must be password protected and not accessible by any other person.
- Ideally, documents should not be printed unless it is impractical to read directly from a laptop or tablet.
- Hard copy documents must be secured (for example: in locked case) so they are not accessible to any other person.
- All hard and soft copies of proposals and related information must be securely destroyed once the assessment process is completed.

Conflicts of interest

Royal Society Te Apārangi takes the issue of conflict of interest very seriously. A rigorous position must be taken to maintain the credibility of the allocation process and to ensure that applications are subjected to fair and reasonable appraisal.

Royal Society Te Apārangi wants to ensure that the Council and panel members are active researchers with an excellent background in research. As these researchers will invariably have connections with some applicants, conflicts of interest will arise.

Where these occur for Council and panel members, the following rules will apply:

- Where a Council member or panellist is a partner, spouse or a family member of any applicant(s) on a proposal, that Council member or panellist shall take no part in the consideration of that proposal and will have no prior knowledge of the outcome. They will hear about the success of that proposal when official letters are sent to all applicants.
- If a Council or panel member has an interest in an application, such as collaborating with an applicant or an applicant's group, or is conflicted with the applicant*, then that member shall not assess the proposal and, at the discretion of the chair or panel convenor, shall either leave the room, remain silent or answer technical questions only.
- If the Council Chair has a conflict of interest, then the duties of chairing the Council meeting shall be passed to another Council member.
- If the panel convenor has a conflict of interest, then the duties of chairing the panel meeting will be passed a senior member of the panel, or to the Council observer, if present.

- All the above conflicts of interest must be declared in writing to Royal Society Te Apārangi.
- Royal Society Te Apārangi staff will minute all conflicts of interest and actions taken.

** A Council or panel member is generally deemed to be conflicted if:*

- They work in the same department as the applicant(s). Where the department is large and contact between the panel member and applicant(s) is minimal, the convenor may deem there to be no conflict
- They work at the same Crown Research Institute (CRI) AND are in the same team as the applicant(s) (the level of conflict will depend on the size of the organisation)
- They work at the same company as the applicant(s). The level of conflict will depend on the size of the company
- They have co-authored publications with the applicant(s) in the last 5 years
- They are listed as a mentor on a Fast-Start application to their panel
- They have a low level of comfort assessing the application due to their relationship with the applicant(s).

When all conflicts of interest are taken into account, the panel convenor may decide that the remaining panellists' expertise is not sufficient for assessment of a particular proposal. In this case, an additional opinion from an external independent person may be sought at the panel convenor's discretion. A panel convenor may also seek an opinion of a particular proposal from another panel if this is thought to be necessary.

Unconscious bias

Unconscious bias refers to a bias which we are unaware of, and which happens outside of our control. Royal Society Te Apārangi wants to ensure that this bias has minimal influence on funding recommendations being made by panellists. The literature suggests that awareness of unconscious bias can limit the impact of this bias. We therefore encourage panellists to watch the short (3 minutes) introduction video below from the Royal Society London to familiarise or reacquaint yourself with the topic.

Royal Society London – Understanding unconscious bias

Some recommendations to blunt the impact of unconscious bias are to:

- Be prepared to recognise the impact of unconscious bias;
- Deliberately slow down decision making;
- Reconsider reasons for decisions;
- Question cultural stereotype.

The Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) recognises the need to improve the ways in which researchers and the outputs of scholarly research are evaluated. Therefore we encourage panellists to read the Rethinking Research Assessment - Unintended Cognitive and System Biases resource:

https://sfdora.org/resource/rethinking-research-assessment-unintended-cognitive-and-systems-biases/

Please also feel free explore some of the additional resources below:

Link to Harvard University implicit association tests (IAT) on unconscious bias in relation to Gender and Science, and Gender and Career.

- https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html

Short Microsoft eLesson course designed to help participants understand what unconscious bias is, how it works, and strategies to counter it in the workplace.

- https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/inclusion-journey/learn

"State of the Science: Implicit Bias Review" – this publication covers a wide range of issues relating to implicit or unconscious bias and general mitigation strategies.

- http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/2017-SOTS-final-draft-02.pdf

Guidance around the use of generative AI technologies in assessment

There is growing concern around the use of generative AI tools (large language models, e.g. Chat GPT) in the writing or assessment of grant proposals, as they could lead to confidentiality breaches and may generate fabricated content and citations.

Panellists and external reviewers **must not** use large language models (LLMs) or other generative artificial intelligence (AI) technologies for assessing proposals. This is due to confidentiality concerns. Inputting substantial, detailed information into a generative AI tool forfeits control of where that data may be sent, saved, viewed, or used in the future.

See the "Referees" section for guidance around the use of generative AI tools for referee finding.

Paearu aromatawai
Assessment criteria (UPDATED)

The assessment criteria have been updated due to the new Terms of Reference. The key assessment criteria are:

Research

- Proposals must use an interdisciplinary approach to significantly expand research possibilities and ambition through new researcher and institutional links *(Council Award only)*
- Proposals must have the potential to lead to quantifiable impacts[1] because of the proposal's novelty, originality, insight and ambition.

---

[1] ***Quantifiable impacts** can be defined in various ways including:*

- how the research will contribute to shifting the understanding, and advancing methods, theory and application across and within disciplines;
- the potential of the research to improve the economy, environment, or health outcomes beyond its contributions to knowledge and skills development.

- Proposals must be rigorous, and should have a basis in prior research and use a sound research method.
- The research team must have the ability and capacity to deliver.

Benefit

- Proposals must demonstrate why the research could be of economic, environmental, or health benefit to New Zealand. (NEW CRITERION)
- Proposals should demonstrate a clear rationale for the research to be undertaken in New Zealand (NEW CRITERION)
- Proposals should develop research skills in New Zealand, particularly those at the post-doctoral level and emerging researchers.

Vision Mātauranga

- Proposals must consider the relation of the research to the themes of Vision Mātauranga and, **where relevant**, how the project will engage with Māori.

The cost of the project is not considered until the full proposal stage. There, once the overall grades and rankings have been determined, the cost of each proposal is then considered with a view to each panel funding the top ranked proposals up to the overall level of funds available. The Marsden Fund Council may recommend an offer of funding which differs from that requested.

All proposals funded must:

- Comply with the terms and process of any government policy or directive; and
- Be consistent with the nature and objectives of the Marsden Fund and the assessment criteria set out above.

How the criteria will be assessed

Proposals submitted to the Marsden Fund must meet each individual criterion to the satisfaction of assessors to be considered for funding.

Once assessors are satisfied that a proposal meets each criterion individually, they will score the proposal based on a holistic assessment across all relevant criteria and relative to other proposals being considered by the panel.

Research: Proposals with an inspirational, robust and sound research goal that transcends the sum of the individual assessment criteria are likely to score more highly in this process.

The 'ability and capacity to deliver' criterion will be judged relative to opportunity, with career achievements assessed in the context of career history, allowing for breaks for family or other responsibilities. Where applicants already hold a Marsden Fund contract in a related area, performance on this will also be considered as evidence of ability, but existing award holders will not be privileged versus new applicants because of this.

Fast-Start: Note that a Fast-Start applicant is at the start of their career so in assessing the 'potential', the track record must be considered in relation to the years of research experience. Other factors are the quality of their research training and its appropriateness for carrying out the proposed research.

***Benefit**:* Research should have direct and indirect benefits or effect on individuals, communities or society as a whole, including broad benefits to New Zealand's economy, environment or health. All proposals **must** demonstrate how their research could be of economic, environmental, or health benefit to New Zealand. Proposals **should** demonstrate a clear rationale for this research to be undertaken in New Zealand. This does not mean the Fund will not support globally relevant and impactful research. Rather, consider why a New Zealand-based team would be uniquely positioned, what comparative advantages there are, and what the likely benefits would be, if the research is conducted in New Zealand.

Proposals that clearly demonstrate the following are likely to score more highly:

- The comparative advantages of a New Zealand-based team
- The benefits that could accrue if the research were carried out in New Zealand
- That the team is well positioned to carry out globally relevant research with a high likelihood of bringing benefit (economic, environmental, health) to New Zealand
- Ways in which the proposed research has the potential to lead to economic[2] benefits to New Zealand

Panellists should give particular regard to how the applicants have addressed:

- the scale and extent of potential benefits from the proposed research, science or technology, or related activities
- the extent of alignment with one or more areas of future additional value, growth, or critical need for New Zealand
- **where relevant**, the extent to which the project has identified and evaluated the potential impacts for Māori.

The development of research skills in New Zealand **should** be addressed in the Roles and Resources section.

Vision Mātauranga: Where Vision Mātauranga is deemed applicable, proposals that clearly demonstrate the following are likely to score more highly:

- Engagement with the idea and appropriateness of Vision Mātauranga
- The justification for Vision Mātauranga in terms of that research
- A description of how Vision Mātauranga is integrated and resourced

It is appreciated that panellists will have differing views and understanding of how to assess Vision Mātauranga. Please refer to Appendix 1 for more detailed guidance on assessment.

---

[2] *Council will monitor awarded grants to ensure approximately 50% of the Fund supports proposals that have the potential to result in economic benefit to New Zealand*

Other changes

Narrative CVs

In an extension of the initial trial for Fast-Start applicants, **in 2025 all applicants will have a choice of the usual (standard) CV template OR a narrative CV template**. Both templates will follow the same assessment process.

Further information on Narrative CVs including examples can be found on the MBIE website: https://www.mbie.govt.nz/science-and-technology/science-and-innovation/funding-information-and-opportunities/process/pitau-investment-management-system-portal/

A useful webinar is on the MBIE website too: https://www.mbie.govt.nz/dmsdocument/26222-endeavour-fund-narrative-cv-webinar-for-researchers-slide-deck

Guidance and resources for filling out the individual narrative profile (from the Luxembourg National Research Fund; www.fnr.lu)

- The University of Glasgow has created an online resource giving guidance on filling out narrative-style CVs. Here is the link to the website and accompanying videos.
- The Royal Society has created a video on how to talk about research output – Here is a link to the video.
- The FNR hosted a guidance workshop on how the Narrative Profile. The slides, mural, and pre-workshop survey are available as resources – Here is the link to the website
- Imperial College has a webpage giving guidance for filling out a narrative-style CV – Here is a link to the website.
- Maastricht University provides guidance for evidencing impact of a broad range of outputs: https://library.maastrichtuniversity.nl/research/evaluating-research/research-intelligence/narrative-cv/
- Oxford University has published: "Narrative CVs: a Guide for Applicants" as well as a companion presentation: "How to write Narrative CVs"
- Trinity College has created the "Researcher Impact Framework", which can help researchers develop evidence-based impact narratives.

For panellists:

- The Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR) and DORA have co-produced a video that gives evaluators practical advice around responsible research assessment, including tips for understanding the broader nature of a narrative-style CV – Here is a link to the video.

CV templates have been updated

Both templates have been slightly updated for the 2025 round (agreed between MBIE, Te Apārangi, and HRC).

The page limits are five for the standard CV, and four for the narrative CV.

Te Tohu Kaunihera Pūtea a Marsden

Marsden Fund Council Award

In addition to the tasks mentioned previously, Council members are required to grade and comment on all proposals submitted to the Marsden Fund Council Award category (except where conflicts of interest apply).

For the Marsden Fund Council Award, all criteria for Standard grant proposals (see 'Assessment criteria' section) must be satisfied, plus the additional criterion:

Proposals must use an interdisciplinary approach to significantly expand research possibilities and ambition through new researcher and institutional links.

The same conflicts of interest as for Fast-Start and Standard proposals apply here – see 'Conflicts of interest' section.

The application process consists of one Full Proposal only, to be submitted by the Expression of Interest (EOI) deadline of 26 February 2025, and a two-stage assessment process. The timeline is similar to that for Fast-Start and Standard proposals.

- At Stage 1, Council will consider all proposals, and after initial grading, will select a number to go forward to Stage 2 (international peer review). Applicants will be advised on May 8 of the outcome.
- Applicants who proceed to stage 2 will have the chance to respond to all referee reports. Council will then consider referee reports and responses for all proposals that go forward to Stage 2, before making their final decision in October. Applicants will be advised of the outcome in early November.
- At any time if Council members have specific queries about aspects of the proposals, they may request a short video interview with one or more of the PIs, to be arranged at a mutually convenient time.

Grade descriptors are as follows:

Stage 1:

Grade 1: The proposal fulfils all the relevant criteria. Very enthusiastic. Must go out to review.

Grade 2: The proposal fulfils all the relevant criteria. Enthusiastic with some minor reservations. Should go out to review.

Grade 3: Proposal appears to fulfil all the relevant criteria. Some reservations. Could go out to review (also a holding grade).

Grade 4: Proposal appears to fulfil all the relevant criteria. Some reservations. Uneasy about supporting.

Grade 5: Proposal may fulfil all the relevant criteria. Some major reservations. Uneasy about supporting.

Grade 6: Proposal does not fulfil all the "must" criteria. Serious reservations. A definite no.

Stage 2:

Grade 1: The proposal fulfils all the relevant criteria. Any concerns raised by referees rebutted well. Very enthusiastic, must fund.

Grade 2: The proposal fulfils all the relevant criteria. Concerns raised by referees mostly addressed. Enthusiastic with some minor reservations. Would fund it.

Grade 3: Proposal appears to fulfil all the relevant criteria. Concerns raised by referees partly addressed. Some reservations. Possibly fund. (Also a holding grade).

Grade 4: Proposal appears to fulfil all the relevant criteria. Some concerns raised by referees that were not rebutted well, or not responded to at all. Some reservations. Uneasy about funding.

Grade 5: Proposal may fulfil all the relevant criteria. Serious concerns raised by referees not rebutted well or at all. Some reservations. Not keen on funding.

Grade 6: Proposal does not fulfil all the "must" criteria. Serious concerns raised by referees that were not rebutted well or at all. A definite no.

Ngā rōpū aromatawai o te Pūtea a Marsden
Marsden Fund assessment panels

Each discipline-based assessment panel consists of a convenor and seven to nine other researchers who are experts in their field, who have a broad knowledge of the research area, and are experienced in assessment. They are appointed by Royal Society Te Apārangi, after being recommended by the Marsden Fund Council. Assessment panels are advisory only, providing recommendations on the relative merits of proposals to the Marsden Fund Council. The panels are:

Biomedical Sciences (BMS) – research related to human health and disease in: biochemistry, physiology, pathology, pharmacology, molecular biology, genetics, cell biology, microbiology; neurobiology (including animals as a model species for humans); human genomics and related bioinformatics.

Cellular, Molecular and Physiological Biology (CMP) – studies related to understanding the activities that occur in cells and tissues, and their integration within living organisms across the biological, agricultural and veterinary and biochemical sciences. This includes: plant physiology; animal physiology; biochemistry; cell biology; plant and animal genetics; molecular biology and molecular genetics; functional genomics and related bioinformatics; microbiology excluding microbial ecology; animal and plant pathology.

Ecology, Evolution and Behaviour (EEB) – studies related to the interrelationships between organisms and their environment, evolution and behaviour. This includes: animal, plant and microbial ecology; biogeography; biodiversity; phylogenetics; systematics and evolution; population biology and genetics; animal behaviour; physiological plant ecology; biostatistics and modelling.

Economics and Human & Behavioural Sciences (EHB) – including: economics; psychology (experimental, cognitive, neuro-); cognitive science; cognitive linguistics; archaeology; biological anthropology; business studies; commerce; management studies; marketing; communication science and demography.

Engineering and Interdisciplinary Sciences (EIS) – including: fundamentals of engineering (biomedical, bioprocessing, civil, chemical, electrical, electronic, environmental, materials, mechanical and robotics); and cross-disciplinary research relating to engineering.

Earth Sciences and Astronomy (ESA) – including: geology; geophysics; physical geography; oceanography; hydrology; meteorology; atmospheric science; earth sciences; astronomy and astrophysics; also cross-disciplinary topics which include substantial components in some of these areas.

Mathematical and Information Sciences (MIS) – including: pure mathematics; applied mathematics; statistics; operations research; logic; computer science; information systems; and software engineering.

Physics, Chemistry and Biochemistry (PCB) – including: materials science; physics; chemistry; biophysics, chemical biology and structural biochemistry.

Te mahi a ngā mema o te rōpū whiriwhiri o te Pūtea a Marsden
Role of Marsden Fund panel members

The role of a panellist is essential to the Marsden Fund appraisal process. Panellists are expected to grade and comment on all proposals submitted to their panel, unless otherwise decided by the panel convenor. Spreadsheets for the EOI and full rounds will be supplied by the Marsden Fund administration team to help with this task.

Panellists are expected to attend two panel meetings scheduled during the year to discuss allocated grades and reach consensus for recommendations to the Marsden Fund Council. Panellists are not expected to give feedback to applicants. All feedback to applicants will be given by the Convenor of the panel. Along with the recommendation process, panellists will be asked to suggest referees for several full proposals within or near their area of expertise.

The contents and ideas contained in the Marsden Fund proposals are confidential in every respect. This includes intellectual property, financial and all other information. For this reason, the proposal material is not to be used (and should be destroyed) once the panellist's reviews are completed.

Panellists are not permitted to apply for funding to the panel on which they sit, either as a Principal Investigator (PI) or as an Associate Investigator (AI). Panellists should step down in a year in which they will apply to their panel for funding and may return in future years to the panel if needed. Panel members are permitted to be mentors on Fast-Start proposals submitted to their panel.

All Marsden Fund panellists are listed on our website: https://www.royalsociety.org.nz/what-we-do/funds-and-opportunities/marsden/about/marsden-fund-panels

As stated above, the role of a panellist has several different tasks associated with it. In the following section, the tasks are explained, and timings given where appropriate.

Te mahi a ngā kaimahi a Te Apārangi
Role of Society staff

The role of Royal Society Te Apārangi staff is one of facilitation of and "guardianship" over the assessment process, ensuring that the process is credible and defensible. To achieve this, staff will:

- organise all logistical aspects of the process
- assist the Chair of the Marsden Fund Council and the panel convenors in determining realistic timetables for meetings
- provide a framework for assessment
- record funding decisions and collate generic feedback for applicants
- record any conflicts of interest and identify problem areas

- convey funding decisions to providers - all discussions related to a decision should occur through Royal Society Te Apārangi staff or the relevant panel convenor
- negotiate contract details with providers.

It is not the role of Society staff to make funding decisions.

Ngā hātepe mō ngā hui a te rōpū whiriwhiri
Procedures for panel meetings

Meeting formats

- EOI meetings will be held via Zoom unless the convenor wishes otherwise.
- Full round meetings will be held face-to-face unless the convenor wishes otherwise.

Expression of Interest (EOI) round (March-April)

Pre-meeting

All EOIs will be received by the Marsden Fund administration on 26 February 2025. It is anticipated that each panel will receive approximately 100 proposals (Fast-Start and Standard).

The Council members designated to convene each of the panels will receive a list of EOIs allocated to their panel by late February. If the numbers are so large that the panel convenor has to divide up the applications among the panel, each application should be assessed by at least five panel members.

By early March panel members will receive a URL for the portal from the Marsden Fund administration team. The portal will contain:

- All of the EOIs submitted to their panel. The information will be in PDF form that can be downloaded from the portal and read offline.
- Comments sheets. These are available on the portal for download and can be used to make personal notes and record scores for the panel discussion.
- A blank scoresheet for each panellist to download, record their scores in and send back to the Marsden Fund administration before the meeting. This will enable proposals to be given an initial overall ranking for discussion at the meeting.

For a given panel, **each panel member will be asked to start reading applications at different points through the order of the proposals,** to avoid proposals from researchers first in the alphabet always being read first.

Panel members also need to identify to Marsden Fund staff, proposals for which they have a conflict of interest, explaining the nature of the conflict. See 'Conflicts of interest' section for further details.

If the proposal seems to be more suited to other funding sources this should be discussed at the meeting.

Proposal formatting breaches

From time to time, panellists raise issues with the Marsden Fund office and panel convenors around irregularities in proposals as they proceed with assessment If anything is raised, the Marsden Fund office

will investigate. If the issue is not due to a portal error, it may lead to the proposal being deemed ineligible. Below is a list of irregularities which could lead to an EOI being deemed ineligible. It is not exhaustive.

Significant material advantage

- The abstract (section 3a), including any diagrams or footnotes, is greater than one page long
- Font size, line spacing and/or margins have been altered from the templates to give the applicant a material advantage
- The description of the proposed research has expanded significantly from the abstract (3a) into other sections (e.g. as footnotes in the reference section (3b) or added to the roles and resources section (3e).

Applicant error

- The abstract (section 3a) is missing (e.g. overwritten by a different template), thus making it impossible to assess the proposed research
- The contact PI's CV is not there (e.g. it may have been duplicated with an AI's CV), thus making the track record of the PI impossible to assess from the proposal.

Panellists are requested to flag anything that looks untoward with their panel convenor or the Marsden Fund office.

Scoring EOIs

The Marsden Fund Terms of Reference require that the applications should be assessed primarily on the assessment criteria.

The difficulty in the EOI round is in screening out the small number of applications to go forward to the full proposal stage (20-25% of the total), from usually a very large number of EOIs. **Please take this into account when assessing proposals**.

The cost of the proposal is considered at the Full Proposal stage, and only after rankings have been made based on the assessment criteria.

Grading and distribution

Panel members should grade each proposal on the **combined basis of the assessment criteria. The** range is from Grade 1 (best) to Grade 6 (worst). Proposals should be assigned one of the six grades.

Each panel member should use the following target distribution for the proposals that they assess, taking both the Fast-Start and Standard proposals into account separately.

Grade	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
% of proposals	10-20	15-25	20-30	15-25	10-20	5-15
Example 60 proposals	6-12	9-15	12-18	9-15	6-12	3-9

In the example above where 60 Standard proposals are assessed, between 6 and 12 proposals should be assigned a grade of 1, between 9 and 15 proposals should be assigned a grade of 2, between 12 and 18 proposals should be assigned a grade of 3, and so on.

The purpose of the target distribution is to ensure that the proposals are ranked in a fair manner, and that no proposals are unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged by a skewed distribution. **For this reason, please ensure you keep to the distribution and use the whole range of grades from 1 to 6.** The scoresheet has a built-in distribution that automatically reflects the grades entered. Any panellist who does not meet the target distribution will be asked to re-score the proposals.

The grade for each proposal should then be recorded on the scoresheet (Fast-Start and Standard proposals will have separate tabs) and the list of grades returned to the Marsden Fund office. You will be notified of grade deadlines when the initial email is sent out.

If you are unsure how to grade a proposal, please give a "placeholder" middling grade (3 or 4) – not a grade 1 or a grade 6. You will have the chance to change grades following discussion of each proposal at the meeting.

You may find the following grade descriptors useful when working out how to score proposals. The descriptors apply to Marsden Fund Council Award proposals, but the same principles would apply to Standard and Fast-Start EOIs.

- **Grade 1:** The proposal fulfils all the relevant criteria. Very enthusiastic. Must go out to review.
- **Grade 2:** The proposal fulfils all the relevant criteria. Enthusiastic with some minor reservations. Should go out to review.
- **Grade 3:** Proposal appears to fulfil all the relevant criteria. Some reservations. Could go out to review (also a holding grade).
- **Grade 4:** Proposal appears to fulfil all the relevant criteria. Some reservations. Uneasy about supporting.
- **Grade 5:** Proposal may fulfil all the relevant criteria. Some major reservations. Uneasy about supporting.
- **Grade 6:** Proposal does not fulfil all the "must" criteria. Serious reservations. A definite no.

Please note that panellists should assume all proposals they are provided with are eligible for funding and appropriate to their panel. In the case of Fast-Start proposals, panellists should assume the Principal Investigator has been deemed eligible to apply for a Fast-Start grant. Concerns about the eligibility or appropriateness of a proposal should not be reflected in the score the panellist assigns to that proposal.

Participation in EOI assessment meeting (April)

The EOI panel meetings will be held by Zoom, unless the panel convenor requests a face-to-face meeting. Any face-to-face meetings will be held in Wellington, at Royal Society Te Apārangi's building. All travel booking and costs will be covered by the Society. The EOI panel meeting is a full day of discussion. Fast-Start and Standard proposals are discussed separately. The initial combined scores are used as guidance to begin the discussions, but grades are altered during the day as panellists feel fit.

To assist panellists and applicants, the Marsden Fund Council has prepared notes on the qualities expected of good applications to the Marsden Fund. These are available on the Marsden Fund website.

Ranking and cut-off point

There may be some proposals clustered around the cut-off point that are very hard to separate. In this case, panel convenors may ask panellists for their comparative rankings of a small number of proposals around the cut-off point, to obtain a ranked list.

Once the final grades have been recorded an ordered list is presented to the panel for their recommendations to Council. Approximately 20-25% of the EOIs will be recommended for the full proposal stage.

Referees

External referee reports aid the panels in their assessments of full proposals. Marsden Fund staff work with panellists to acquire at least two, and preferably three referee reports for each full proposal.

At the end of the EOI assessment meeting, panellists will be assigned a small number of proposals to take responsibility for suggesting referees. Panellists are requested to initially identify, in order of preference, six to eight potential referees for each proposal. Once identified, referees will be contacted by the Marsden Fund staff and asked to provide reports for the full proposal round. Panellists are not required to approach the referees themselves. The average number of potential referees approached to secure three reports usually ranges from seven to nine per proposal, depending on the panel. The timeframe for the referee finding process is usually May to August.

Advice on the use of generative AI tools for referee finding

If panellists wish to use a generative AI tool such as Research Rabbit for referee finding, they may do so. However please note the following:

- **Do not input any personal, private and confidential information into any generative AI search tool.** This includes but is not limited to the proposal summary, aims and proposed research. Applicants provide the Society with confidential information in their proposals for the purpose of assessment only.
- **You must also review any outputs** from a search tool to check for accuracy and appropriateness to be a reviewer for the proposal(s) you are finding referees for.
- **Please be transparent** about your use of any generative AI search tools.
- **Please be aware** AI training data used within these referee finding tools may contain biases.

Feedback on EOIs

Because of the very large number of EOIs received, the Marsden Fund Council is not able to give specific feedback to applicants about individual proposals except in the following situations:

- Fast-Start applicants who are unsuccessful and ranked in the second and third quintiles will be able to seek qualitative feedback from the panel convenor.
- The applicant is considered ineligible to apply for Fast-Start funding.
- The applicant is considered ineligible to apply for Marsden funding.
- The proposal is considered ineligible (e.g. formatting breaches; see "Proposal formatting breaches" section from earlier).

All feedback to applicants will be managed by the panel convenors and the Marsden Fund Council. No panellist should engage with any request from an applicant for feedback. Please refer all enquiries to the panel convenor or Royal Society Te Apārangi staff.

Full Proposal round (July – September)

Pre-meeting

Full proposals will be received by the Marsden Fund administration on 19 June 2025. The proposals will be collated and placed on the portal system as soon as possible. URLs for the panellist portal will still be active for the Full Proposal round. The portal will contain all the full proposals and CVs for applications to each panel. The information will be in PDF form and can be downloaded from the portal.

Along with each Full Proposal, three referee reports and applicant responses will be presented later on the panellist portal. Most referee reports will be available by 13 August 2025. Applicant responses will also be posted on the portal. Most of these will be received at the end of August. You will need to integrate all this information into your comments and scoring for each proposal.

Referee reports and applicant responses

As well as receiving referee reports, applicants are given the opportunity to respond to each referee's comments. The length is limited to **one page for each referee report**. For example, if a proposal has three referees, then three responses of one page each can be submitted. Referees are not identified to applicants, nor are grades made available to applicants; only the referee comments are provided to the applicants.

Where referees disagree, the Council and panel members must use their own judgment in determining which referee reports to emphasise and what score to assign. These deliberations should be guided by considerations such as:

- the member's own level of expertise on the subject
- the comments made by referees to explain their grades
- the relative competencies of the referees
- the responses by applicants to the referees' comments
- possible conflicts of interest.

Grading full proposals

Grading of the full proposals is identical to the EOI system described above with the exception that added information is given from the external referee reports and applicants' responses. You will have the full proposals, referee reports, and applicant responses for each proposal to help you with your scoring. Scoresheets and comments sheets will be available on the portal for download. The comments sheets can be used to make notes and record scores for the panel discussion.

The importance of using the full range of grades (1 to 6)

As for the EOI round, it is very important that all panel members use the full range of grades, i.e., between 1 (highest ranked) and 6 (lowest ranked). The purpose of the target distribution is to ensure that the proposals are ranked in a fair manner, and that no proposals are unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged by a skewed distribution.

By using the full range of grades in the full round, it is much easier to obtain a relative ranking of the full proposals. Even if you think that none of the full proposals merit low grades, please ensure you allocate at least one grade 1 and one grade 6 for each category (assuming that there are 6 or more proposals to be assessed) – as the panel will need to cut out roughly half the proposals in each category regardless of the

overall quality. **For this reason, please ensure you use the full range of grades** – the scoresheet has a built-in distribution that automatically reflects the grades entered.

At the full round, there may not be enough proposals to fit the curve properly. If there are 6 or more, please ensure that you use the full range of grades. If there are fewer than 6, try to spread the grades out as much as possible.

Any panellist who does not meet the target distribution may be asked to re-grade the proposals.

Your completed scoresheet should be sent back to the Marsden Fund administration prior to the meeting to create the initial rankings.

Participation in the full round assessment meeting (mid-late September)

The full proposal panel meetings will be held in Wellington, unless the convenor requests an all-Zoom meeting. All travel booking and costs will be covered by the Society. Fast-Start and Standard proposals are discussed separately. The initial combined scores are used as guidance to begin the discussions, but grades are altered during the day as panellists feel fit.

Once the overall grades and rankings have been determined, the cost of each proposal will then be considered with a view to the panel funding the top ranked proposals up to the overall level of funds available.

Indicative budgets are set by the panel and trading Fast-Start and Standard proposals is done based on budget and merit of the proposals.

Once the final grades have been collated, an ordered list is presented to the panel for their recommendations to Council. Approximately 50% of the Full Proposals will be recommended for funding. The Marsden Fund Council may recommend an offer of funding which differs from that requested.

Feedback on Full Proposals

All unsuccessful applicants may contact the relevant panel convenor for further information on their Full Proposal.

All feedback to applicants will be managed by the panel convenors and the Marsden Fund Council. No panellist should engage with any request from an applicant for feedback. Please refer all enquiries to the panel convenor or Royal Society Te Apārangi staff.

Ētahi atu whiriwhiringa
Other considerations

Guide on project size

Although the cost of the project is not considered until the Full Proposal stage, information is included here on what can be funded, as well as the maximum size of Standard proposals. The Terms of Reference state that funds awarded are to cover the full costs of a proposal. Full costing includes direct costs, associated personnel costs and overhead costs. Please note that collaborating researchers from outside New Zealand can be included in proposals but are not able to receive direct funding support for their time

or institutional costs. However, costs associated with collaboration (in other words: travel and accommodation) may be covered under "direct costs".

The Marsden Fund Council particularly wants to provide support for individual researchers in contrast to supporting large teams assembled to undertake programmes of research that could be supported by other funding agencies.

The preferred types of projects are those from individuals or small teams, to investigate bright new ideas, involving the assistance of a post-doctoral fellow, research assistants or postgraduate students where appropriate.

The Council has set a maximum amount per application, which differs between panels. There is no minimum. Note that the **maximum total amount** is a strict cap. Amounts applied for may vary from year to year, as long as the total amount over 3 years is no greater than the maximum total amount.

Panel	Maximum total amount over 3 years	Average maximum amount per year
BMS	$960k	$320K
CMP	$960k	$320K
EHB	$870K	$290K
EIS	$960k	$320K
EEB	$960k	$320K
ESA	$960k	$320K
MIS	$720k	$240K
PCB	$960k	$320K

Fast-Start programme

The grant size for a Fast-Start is $120,000 per year, or a maximum of $360,000 over three years.

The Fast-Start programme is targeted at early-career researchers who are employed at New Zealand universities, Crown Research Institutes (CRIs) and other research organisations, and who are trying to establish independent research careers and create research momentum. **The applicant should be involved in their own independent research, and not merely be part of a larger group's research programme.**

It is not mandatory for an applicant to have a permanent position, but the host organisation must agree to employ the applicant for at least the duration of the grant, and in a position that allows them to develop an independent research career.

The purpose is to support excellent research by promising individuals and to give an impetus to their careers by promoting them as sole Principal Investigators in their own research programmes. While linkages with established researchers, as Associate Investigators, both within and outside New Zealand are useful and encouraged, the emphasis for this funding is on individual researchers in the early stages of their careers.

Fast-Start eligibility

Researchers are eligible to apply if they:

- Have not previously been a PI on a Marsden Fund contract
- Have a PhD degree, or an equivalent NZQA level 10 qualification. Recent graduates must have completed all requirements for conferment of their PhD by the EOI closing date in February.
- Are normally within 7 fulltime years of their PhD (track A) or 10 fulltime years of the start of their research career (Track B). Career interruptions can extend the eligibility timeframe.

Any applicants who have had career interruptions due to being primary carers of dependent children should explain this in section 1e (Research Experience) of their CV (section 1e of the standard CV template, or the "career break" section of the narrative CV).

Should any panel members assessing proposals be unclear about Fast-Start eligibility, the Marsden Fund office will check with the relevant Research Office. If information provided by the relevant Research Office cannot confirm eligibility, the proposal will be deemed ineligible and feedback to this effect will be provided.

Te nui o te pūtea ka tohaina
Amount of funding to be allocated

Current estimates are that the anticipated amount available to the Marsden Fund Council to allocate in 2025 will be approximately $77 million (GST exclusive) across all grant categories.

Amount of funding in each research area

The funding available for allocation for Fast-Start and Standard proposals will be distributed across the eight panel areas according to the number of high-quality applications in each area and the typical cost of proposals in each area; and with reference to the past distribution.

Ngā mihi
Thank you

Royal Society Te Aparāngi appreciates the time and effort that Council and panel members put into the Marsden Fund assessment process. The time, advice, contribution to the research community and suggestions for improvements from both panellists and Council members to the Marsden Fund assessment process are highly valued.

Wātaka
Timetable

December 2024	Guidelines available and portal active
February 26, 2025	**Closing date for EOIs and Marsden Fund Council Award proposals**
April 7-17	EOI Assessment Panel meetings
May 6	Marsden Fund Council meeting

May 8	Invitations for Full Proposals sent to applicants (Fast-Start and Standard); notifications of Stage 1 outcome sent to Marsden Fund Council applicants
June 19	Closing date for Full Proposals
August 5-6	Marsden Fund Council meeting
August 13	Referee reports available from web portal (for applicants and panellists). *Note that inevitably some reports will come in after the deadline*.
August 27	Closing date for responses to referee reports (*except for reports received late*)
September 15-26	Assessment Panel meetings
October 9	Marsden Fund Council meeting
TBA: Approximately early November	Results announced

Āpitihanga 1

Appendix 1: Vision Mātauranga

Guidance for assessing Vision Mātauranga (for panellists)

Vision Mātauranga

Vision Mātauranga is a policy about innovation, opportunity and the creation of knowledge that highlights the potential contribution of Māori knowledge, resources and people.

https://www.mbie.govt.nz/science-and-technology/science-and-innovation/agencies-policies-and-budget-initiatives/vision-matauranga-policy/

For a glossary of te reo Māori terms which may be used in proposals, please refer to Appendix 2.

Vision Mātauranga is included as an assessment criterion:

- *Proposals must consider the relation of the research to the themes of Vision Mātauranga and,* ***where relevant****, how the project will engage with Māori.*

For the EOI round, applicants indicate whether Vision Mātauranga is relevant and, if so, which themes apply, with a brief justification.

Assessors should focus their overall assessment on the appropriateness of Vision Mātauranga to the proposed research, the justification for Vision Mātauranga in terms of that research and, in cases where Vision Mātauranga is deemed applicable, how it is integrated into the overall EOI. This assessment should then contribute to the overall holistic grade for the EOI. The following considerations may help:

1. Does the decision (yes/no to relevance) seem appropriate?
2. Does the statement provide a clear justification for the decision? This can vary considerably, from institutional statements to narrative accounts. The main thing to look for is whether applicants have engaged with the idea and appropriateness of Vision Mātauranga, even if they have chosen N/A.
3. Do you have any concerns regarding how Vision Mātauranga is addressed (or not addressed) in the statement and proposal as a whole? Examples might be when Vision Mātauranga is indicated as:

    - N/A: however, there is no justification given and the project appears highly relevant for Māori (for example the use of taonga species/artefacts);
    - Relevant: however, it seems like it might not be, and the justification is absent or inadequate;
    - Relevant: there is significant inclusion of mātauranga Māori and even kaupapa Māori approaches, yet there is no further mention of this in the proposal and/or no Māori are involved in the research.

At the Full Proposal round, up to one additional page will be available for statements on Vision Mātauranga immediately following the description of research in Sections 3a-3c. This is to enable Vision Mātauranga to be more easily integrated into the conceptual framework and/or research design. Where Vision Mātauranga is appropriate to a proposal, it can contribute to the assessment of its overall excellence.

Compliance aspects, such as access to culturally sensitive material and knowledge, should be covered in Full Proposal Section "Ethical or Regulatory Obligations".

Aspects of Vision Mātauranga relating to relevant experience may be included in the "Roles and Resources" section of the Full Proposal.

There is a comment box on the portal for applicants to explain their rationale for either choosing N/A, or their choice of Vision Mātauranga theme(s). This is to provide affirmation for panellists that applicants have considered whether their proposed research has Vision Mātauranga theme(s). The maximum size for this is 200 words.

Vision Mātauranga costs (Full Proposals)

If a proposal contains one or more Vision Mātauranga themes, it is essential that any costs associated with Vision Mātauranga capability development and engagement are accounted for in the full proposal budget (sections 6 and 7), as stated in the guidelines for applicants:

- Is there appropriate Māori researcher involvement in the project, both in terms of PI/AIs and capability development?
- Has budget been disclosed and agreed to with Māori partners? Is there appropriate provision in that budget for Māori involvement, capability development and consultation?

Examples include (but are not limited to):

- Salary (and associated overhead) costs for any PIs / AIs.
- Salary, koha or other form of acknowledgement for colleagues and mentors who offer cultural guidance.
- Research assistant time.
- Student scholarship support.
- Costs of engagement or consultation (direct expenses). Examples could include: donation to the organisation or marae committee as a way of recognising expertise and contribution; koha; vouchers; providing resources such as books or research findings to the communities involved.
- Costs of dissemination (for example: hui) – direct expenses.

We ask that panellists check whether budgets of Full Proposals with one or more Vision Mātauranga themes are appropriately resourced for Vision Mātauranga costs.

Please also assess each proposal for Vision Matauranga relevance, whether the applicant has indicated N/A or not.

Information for Applicants (provided in EOI Guidelines)

Background

Vision Mātauranga is a policy about innovation, opportunity and the creation of knowledge that highlights the potential contribution of Māori knowledge, resources and people.

https://royalsociety.org.nz/what-we-do/funds-and-opportunities/marsden/application/submitting-a-proposal/vision-matauranga/

https://www.mbie.govt.nz/science-and-technology/science-and-innovation/agenciespolicies-and-budget-initiatives/vision-matauranga-policy/

There are four themes:

- **Indigenous innovation:** Contributing to economic growth through distinctive research and development
- **Taiao:** Achieving environmental sustainability through iwi and hapū relationships with land and sea
- **Hauora/Oranga**: Improving health and social wellbeing
- **Mātauranga**: Exploring indigenous knowledge and science and innovation

Vision Mātauranga and the Marsden Fund

Please note that Vision Mātauranga is included as an assessment criterion:

- Proposals must consider the relation of the research to the themes of Vision Mātauranga and, **where relevant,** how the project will engage with Māori.

For the EOI round, applicants indicate whether Vision Mātauranga is relevant and, if so, which themes apply, with a brief justification. Please refer to instructions for Section 2.

At the Full Proposal round, up to one additional page will be available for statements on Vision Mātauranga immediately following the description of research in Sections 3a-3c. This is to enable Vision Mātauranga to be more easily integrated into the conceptual framework and/or research design. Where Vision Mātauranga is appropriate to a proposal, it can contribute to the assessment of its overall excellence.

If applicants check Vision Mātauranga, they should use the extra page appropriately to discuss aspects of the research project pertaining to Māori and Vision Mātauranga (including any kaupapa Māori research design, if appropriate). If Vision Mātauranga is checked, and the extra page is not used appropriately, the proposal may be downgraded as a result.

Panellists are asked to check that applicants use the additional page for Vision Mātauranga, and to take this into consideration in their assessment.

How do I decide whether to include a Vision Mātauranga statement in my proposal?

A Vision Mātauranga statement must be included for all research that has relevance for Māori. The research category descriptions outlined in the next section may help you decide if this applies to your project. Please note, however, that those categories are fluid, there may well be overlap between them, and not every point in each category need apply. It is important to explain your choices.

Categories of Research

The five categories identified below have been adapted from those on the National Science Challenge, Biological Heritage website https://bioheritage.nz/about-us/visionmatauranga/ hosted by Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research. Please note that there may well be overlap between categories as in categories 2 and 3 in terms of the nature and degree of relevance to Māori.

The original categories were set out by MBIE in information for the Endeavour Fund 2015.

RESEARCH WITH NO SPECIFIC MĀORI COMPONENT

This category includes research projects where:

- No mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) is used.
- Māori are not associated with the research process (for example: there are no Māori involved in relation to any research management / advisory / governance panels; the proposal does not involve or relate to Māori land or institutions; Te Ao Māori or Māori communities are not part of any component of the research).
- Work is not likely to be of direct relevance to Māori.
- It is critical that the researchers involved carefully consider the possibility whether the proposed research has direct (and possibly indirect) implications or benefits for Māori. For example, if a research project is developing a virtual reality programme that seeks to simulate a societal context, the panel should reasonably expect that it would have a Vision Mātauranga dimension.
- There are occasions where researchers have consulted with their organisation's appropriate advisor, who may have indicated the researchers that Vision Mātauranga is not applicable. It is best to explain why this was deemed to be the case (for example, the applicant may be new to New Zealand)

RESEARCH SPECIFICALLY RELEVANT TO MĀORI

This category includes research projects where:

- There is specific relevance to Māori.
- Mātauranga Māori may be used in a minor way to guide the work and its relevance to Māori. It includes work that contributes to Māori aspirations and outcomes.

RESEARCH INVOLVING MĀORI

This category includes research projects where:

- Mātauranga Māori may be incorporated in the project, but is not central to the project.
- Research is specifically and directly relevant to Māori and Māori are involved in the design and/or undertaking of the research.
- The work typically contributes to Māori (for example: iwi, hapū, organisations) aspirations and outcomes.

MĀORI-CENTRED RESEARCH

This category includes research projects where:

- The project is Māori-led, and where mātauranga Māori is used alongside other knowledges (for example: through frameworks, models, methods, tools, etc.).
- Kaupapa Māori research is a key focus of the project.
- Research is typically collaborative or consultative, with direct input from Māori groups, commonly including Māori researchers or a collaboration with Māori researchers or researchers under the guidance/mentoring of Māori.
- There is alignment with and contribution to Māori (for example: iwi, hapū, organisations) aspirations.

KAUPAPA MĀORI RESEARCH

This category includes research projects where:

- Mātauranga Māori is incorporated, used and understood, as a central focus of project and its findings.
- Research is grounded in te ao Māori and connected to Māori philosophies and principles.
- Research typically uses kaupapa Māori research methodologies.
- Te reo Māori may be a central feature to this kaupapa or research activity, and key researchers have medium to high cultural fluency or knowledge of tikanga and reo.
- The research is generally led by a Māori researcher; non-Indigenous researchers may carry out research under the guidance/mentoring of a Māori researcher.
- Māori participation (iwi, hapū, mara, individual) is high.
- The work contributes strongly to Māori (for example: iwi, hapū, organisations) aspirations and outcomes and is mana enhancing.

Māori Research Workforce Development

One of the purposes of the Vision Mātauranga policy is capability development. This is to build the capability of Māori individuals, businesses, incorporations, rūnanga, trusts, iwi, hapū, and marae to engage with research, science and technology. All applicants are asked to consider opportunities in addition to the categories of research above, for building the capacity of Māori researchers or students in their discipline.

Developing a Vision Mātauranga statement

It is important to keep in mind that there is no single approach or prescription for Vision Mātauranga: one size does not fit all and there are many possible ways of addressing it. Vision Mātauranga should not, however, be seen as an add-on, nor should it be treated as separate from the research, methods or people involved in the project. A holistic approach that considers reciprocity and relationships is therefore desirable.

Vision Mātauranga does not begin and end with your Vision Mātauranga statement. You should document how you have considered Vision Mātauranga and demonstrate applicable actions and relationships throughout the research proposal and in relation to the various stages of the research that is proposed.

If you have indicated that the research is relevant to Māori, involves Māori, is Māori-centred or is a kaupapa Māori proposal, you need to demonstrate how you have considered Māori throughout all parts of the research, and how it underpins different dimensions of the research including the problem identification or design, research team composition, community partners, methods, analysis and intended impact.

The following questions may be useful to consider when conceptualising and writing your project:

- Have you co-created the research topic/issue with an iwi or Māori organisation?
- What does working in partnership with iwi mean to you as researchers?
- To what extent have you discussed the research with Māori partners and agreed on the methodology you will use?
- Was there full disclosure and informed consent to the proposed research with Māori partners? How has that agreement/informed consent been agreed to?
- Has the budget been disclosed and agreed to with Māori partners? Is there provision in that budget for Māori involvement, capability development and consultation?
- Is there appropriate Māori researcher involvement in the project, both in terms of PI/AIs and capability development?
- What provisions have you made to ensure there is advice from appropriate Māori organisations throughout the life of the research project? If there are concerns or disagreements with Māori partners, how are these to be resolved?

- What provisions have you made to ensure there is appropriate technology transfer to Māori partners as the research proceeds and as findings become available towards the end of the project?
- Are there benefits to Māori? What are they? And how have these been agreed with Māori partners?
- Have all people named in the proposal given their support or endorsement to the proposed research or to be involved?
- How is the project an opportunity to build the capacity of Māori researchers or students in your discipline, both now and for the future?
- How are you and your team working to increase understanding of te ao Māori and iwi aspirations in your area of research?
- How might this research build new, or enhance existing, relationships with Māori?
- How will you share the research outcomes with Māori?
- Has there been agreement about the intellectual property ownership of research findings with Māori partners? What is the nature of that agreement?
- Is there a need for members of the research team to be proficient in te reo? How has this aspect been addressed?
- Is there a Tiriti o Waitangi component or requirement in your research?

Vision Mātauranga resources

Below you will find a non-exhaustive list of published resources that describe, discuss, and talk about how researchers have engaged with Vision Mātauranga and kaupapa Māori research. These range from early conceptions of Vision Mātauranga to more recent frameworks. The resources underscore the diverse ways Vision Mātauranga may be approached across disciplines and methodologies.

Allen, W., Jamie M. Ataria, J. M., Apgar, J. M., Harmsworth, G., and Tremblay, L. A.

(2009). Kia pono te mahi putaiao—doing science in the right spirit. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39:4, 239-242. DOI: 10.1080/03014220909510588

Crawford, S. (2009). Mātauranga Māori and western science: The importance of hypotheses, predictions and protocols, Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand, 39:4, 163-166. DOI: 10.1080/03014220909510571

Broughton, D. (Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti, Taranaki, Ngāti Porou, Ngāpuhi), and McBreen, K. (Waitaha, Kāti Māmoe, Ngāi Tahu). (2015). Mātauranga Māori, tino

rangatiratanga and the future of New Zealand science. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 45:2, 83-88. DOI: 10.1080/03036758.2015.1011171

Kana, F. and Tamatea, K. (2006). Sharing, listening, learning and developing understandings of Kaupapa Māori research by engaging with two Māori communities involved in education. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 12, 9-20.

https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10289/6198/Kana%20Sharing.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y

Macfarlane, S., Macfarlane, A. and Gillon, G. (2015) Sharing the food baskets of knowledge: Creating space for a blending of streams. In A. Macfarlane, S.

Macfarlane, M. Webber, (eds.), *Sociocultural realities: Exploring new horizons*. Christchurch: Canterbury University Press, 52-67.

Moewaka Barnes, H. (2006). Transforming Science: How our Structures Limit Innovation. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand Te Puna Whakaaro*, 29, 1-16. https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publicationsresources/journals-and-magazines/social-policy-journal/spj29/29-pages-1-16.pdf

Pihama, L., Tiakiwai, S.-J., and Southey, K. (eds.). (2015). *Kaupapa rangahau: A reader. A collection of readings from the Kaupapa Rangahau workshops series*. (2nd ed.). Hamilton, New Zealand: Te Kotahi Research Institute.

https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10289/11738/Kaupapa%2 0Rangahau%20-%20A%20Reader_2nd%20Edition.pdf?sequence=7&isAllowed=y

Smith, L. T., Maxwell, T. K., Puke, H., and Temara, P. (2016). Indigenous knowledge, methodology and mayhem: What is the role of methodology in producing indigenous insights? A discussion from Mātauranga Māori. *Knowledge Cultures*, 4(3), 131–156.

A video resource is available at: https://www.royalsociety.org.nz/what-wedo/funds-and-opportunities/marsden/marsden-fund-applicationprocess/information-for-applying-to-the-marsden-fund/

He Āpiti Supplement: Ngā Ahua o te Ao Hurihuri - Rethinking our shared futures (2019). Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand, Volume 49, Issue sup1
https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/tnzr20/49/sup1?nav=tocList

New Zealand Science Review (2019). Mātauranga and Science – Part 1.
https://ojs.victoria.ac.nz/nzsr/issue/view/866

New Zealand Science Review (2019). Mātauranga and Science – Part 2.
https://ojs.victoria.ac.nz/nzsr/issue/view/865

Rauika Māngai (2020). A Guide to Vision Mātauranga: Lessons from Māori Voices in the New Zealand Science Sector. Wellington, NZ: Rauika Māngai. https://www.rauikamangai.co.nz/resources-hub/

Kukutai, T., McIntosh, T., Boulton, A., Durie, M., Foster, M., Hutchings, J., Mark-Shadbolt, M., Moewaka Barnes, H., Moko-Mead, T., Paine, S-J., Pitama, S. & Ruru, J. (2021). Te Pūtahitanga: A Tiriti-led science policy approach for Aotearoa New Zealand. Auckland: Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga.
https://www.rauikamangai.co.nz/resources-hub/

Royal Society Te Apārangi (2023). Mana Raraunga Data Sovereignty.
https://www.royalsociety.org.nz/assets/Mana-Raraunga-Data-Sovereignty-web-V1.pdf

ANZCCART (2024). New animal ethics resources include Māori knowledge (link to further resources):
https://www.royalsociety.org.nz/news/new-animal-ethics-resources-include-maori-knowledge/

Āpitihanga 2: Papakupu o ngā kupu reo Māori
Appendix 2: Glossary of te reo Māori terms

Definitions taken from maoridictionary.co.nz

Ka mihi ki a Ahorangi Angus Macfarlane, Te Whare Wānanga o Waitaha, mō tēnei. With thanks to Professor Angus Macfarlane, University of Canterbury, for his input.

Aotearoa	the Māori name for New Zealand
Aroha	affection, sympathy, charity, compassion, love, empathy
Atua	ancestor with continuing influence, god, demon, supernatural being, deity, ghost, object of superstitious regard, strange being - although often translated as 'god' and now also used for the Christian God
Hapū	kinship group, clan, tribe, subtribe - section of a large kinship group and the primary political unit in traditional Māori society. It consisted of a number of whānau sharing descent from a common ancestor, usually being named after the ancestor, but sometimes from an important event in the group's history. A number of related hapū usually shared adjacent territories forming a looser tribal federation (iwi)
Hau kāinga	home, true home, local people of a marae, home people
Hauora	health, wellbeing
Hui	gathering, meeting, assembly
Iwi	extended kinship group, tribe, nation, people, nationality, race - often refers to a large group of people descended from a common ancestor and associated with a distinct territory
Kāinga	home, address, residence, village, settlement, habitation, habitat, dwelling
Kaitiaki	trustee, minder, guard, custodian, guardian, caregiver, keeper, steward
Kaitiakitanga	guardianship, stewardship, trusteeship
Kaumātua	adult, elder, elderly man, elderly woman, senior person - a person of status within the whānau or iwi
Kaupapa	philosophy, topic, policy, matter for discussion, plan, purpose, scheme, proposal, agenda, subject, programme, theme, issue, initiative
Kaupapa Māori	Māori approach, Māori topic, Māori customary practice, Māori institution, Māori agenda, Māori principles, Māori ideology - a philosophical doctrine, incorporating the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of Māori society

Koha	gift, present, offering, donation, contribution - especially one maintaining social relationships and has connotations of reciprocity
Kōiwi tangata	human bones or remains
Kōrero	to tell, say, speak, read, talk, address; speech, narrative, story, news, account, discussion, conversation, discourse, statement, information
Mamae	be painful, sore, hurt
Mana	prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma - mana is a supernatural force in a person, place or object. Mana goes hand in hand with tapu, one affecting the other. The more prestigious the event, person or object, the more it is surrounded by tapu and mana. Mana is the enduring, indestructible power of the atua and is inherited at birth, the more senior the descent, the greater the mana. The authority of mana and tapu is inherited and delegated through the senior line from the atua as their human agent to act on revealed will. Since authority is a spiritual gift delegated by the atua, man remains the agent, never the source of mana. This divine choice is confirmed by the elders, initiated by the tohunga under traditional consecratory rites (tohi). Mana gives a person the authority to lead, organise and regulate communal expeditions and activities, to make decisions regarding social and political matters. A person or tribe's mana can increase from successful ventures or decrease through the lack of success.
Manaakitanga	hospitality, kindness, generosity, support - the process of showing respect, generosity and care for others
Māori	Māori, Indigenous New Zealander, Indigenous person of Aotearoa/New Zealand - a new use of the word resulting from Pākehā contact in order to distinguish between people of Māori descent and the colonisers
Marae	courtyard - the open area in front of the wharenui (meeting house), where formal greetings and discussions take place. Often also used to include the complex of buildings around the marae
Mātauranga	knowledge, wisdom, understanding, skill - sometimes used in the plural; education - an extension of the original meaning and commonly used in modern Māori with this meaning
Mauri	life principle, life force, vital essence, special nature, a material symbol of a life principle, source of emotions - the essential quality and vitality of a being or entity. Also used for a physical object, individual, ecosystem or social group in which this essence is located
Moana	sea, ocean, large lake
Te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa	the Pacific Ocean

Pākehā	English, foreign, European, exotic - introduced from or originating in a foreign country; New Zealander of European descent - probably originally applied to English-speaking Europeans living in Aotearoa/New Zealand
Pepeha	tribal saying, tribal motto, proverb (especially about a tribe), set form of words, formulaic expression, saying of the ancestors, figure of speech, motto, slogan - set sayings known for their economy of words and metaphor and encapsulating many Māori values and human characteristics
Pūrākau	myth, ancient legend, story
Rangatahi	younger generation, youth
Rangatira	chief (male or female), chieftain, chieftainess, master, mistress, boss, supervisor, employer, landlord, owner, proprietor - qualities of a leader is a concern for the integrity and prosperity of the people, the land, the language and other cultural treasures (e.g. oratory and song poetry), and an aggressive and sustained response to outside forces that may threaten these
Rangatiratanga	chieftainship, right to exercise authority, chiefly autonomy, chiefly authority, ownership, leadership of a social group, domain of the rangatira, noble birth, attributes of a chief
Rohe	boundary, district, region, territory, area, border (of land)
Rūnanga	council, tribal council, assembly, board, boardroom, iwi authority - assemblies called to discuss issues of concern to iwi or the community
Tamariki	children - normally used only in the plural
Tāne	husband, male, man
Tangata whenua	local people, hosts, indigenous people - people born of the whenua, i.e. of the placenta and of the land where the people's ancestors have lived and where their placenta are buried
Taonga	treasure, anything prized - applied to anything considered to be of value including socially or culturally valuable objects, resources, phenomenon, ideas and techniques
Tapu	be sacred, prohibited, restricted, set apart, forbidden, under atua protection; restriction, prohibition - a supernatural condition. A person, place or thing is dedicated to an atua and is thus removed from the sphere of the profane and put into the sphere of the sacred. It is untouchable, no longer to be put to common use
Te reo Māori	Māori language

Te Tiriti o Waitangi	The Treaty of Waitangi
Tikanga	correct procedure, custom, habit, lore, method, manner, rule, way, code, meaning, plan, practice, convention, protocol - the customary system of values and practices that have developed over time and are deeply embedded in the social context
Tino rangatiratanga	self-determination, sovereignty, autonomy, self-government, domination, rule, control, power
Tipuna	ancestor, grandparent, grandfather, grandmother - singular form of tīpuna and the eastern dialect variation of tupuna
Tohunga	skilled person, chosen expert, priest, healer - a person chosen by the agent of an atua and the tribe as a leader in a particular field because of signs indicating talent for a particular vocation
Tupuna	ancestor, grandparent – singular form of tūpuna and the western dialect variation of tipuna
Tūrangawaewae	domicile, standing, place where one has the right to stand - place where one has rights of residence and belonging through kinship and whakapapa
Wairua	spirit, soul - spirit of a person which exists beyond death. It is the non-physical spirit, distinct from the body and the mauri
Wahine/wāhine	wahine - woman, female, lady, wife; wāhine - women, females, ladies, wives – plural form of wahine; female, women, feminine
Wairuatanga	spirituality
Wānanga	seminar, conference, forum, educational seminar; tribal knowledge, lore, learning - important traditional cultural, religious, historical, genealogical and philosophical knowledge; tertiary institution that caters for Māori learning needs - established under the Education Act 1990
Whaikōrero	oratory, oration, formal speech-making, address, speech - formal speeches usually made by men during a pōhiri / pōwhiri and other gatherings
Whakapapa	genealogy, genealogical table, lineage, descent - reciting whakapapa was, and is, an important skill and reflected the importance of genealogies in Māori society in terms of leadership, land and fishing rights, kinship and status. It is central to all Māori institutions. There are different terms for the types of whakapapa and the different ways of reciting them including: tāhū (recite a direct line of ancestry through only the senior line); whakamoe (recite a genealogy including males and their spouses); taotahi (recite genealogy in a single line of descent); hikohiko (recite genealogy in a selective way by not following a single

	line of descent); ure tārewa (male line of descent through the first-born male in each generation)
Whakataukī	proverb, significant saying, formulaic saying, cryptic saying, aphorism. Like whakatauākī and pepeha they are essential ingredients in whaikōrero
Whānau	extended family, family group, a familiar term of address to a number of people - the primary economic unit of traditional Māori society. In the modern context the term is sometimes used to include friends who may not have any kinship ties to other members
Whānaungatanga	relationship, kinship, sense of family connection - a relationship through shared experiences and working together which provides people with a sense of belonging. It develops as a result of kinship rights and obligations, which also serve to strengthen each member of the kin group. It also extends to others to whom one develops a close familial, friendship or reciprocal relationship
Whenua	land - often used in the plural; territory, domain; country, land, nation, state

Whakapā mai

Contact details

The Marsden Fund Te Pūtea Rangahau a Marsden is administered by Royal Society Te Apārangi.

Telephone: +64 (0)470 5774

Email: marsden@royalsociety.org.nz

Postal address:
The Marsden Fund
Royal Society Te Apārangi
PO Box 598
Wellington 6140
NEW ZEALAND

Courier address:
The Marsden Fund
Royal Society Te Apārangi
11 Turnbull Street
Thorndon
Wellington 6011
NEW ZEALAND

https://royalsociety.org.nz/what-we-do/funds-and-opportunities/marsden/

Supported by the New Zealand Government with funding from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. Nā Te Hīkina Whakatutuki te mana hāpai.

Te Kāwanatanga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Government

MINISTRY OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION & EMPLOYMENT
HĪKINA WHAKATUTUKI

MARSDEN FUND
TE PŪTEA RANGAHAU A MARSDEN

ROYAL SOCIETY TE APĀRANGI