



GLOBAL SERVICE/ INDUSTRY

# Analysis of the Results: Part 2

## Audit Findings

ADVISORY / INTERNAL AUDIT SERVICES

# Contents

- ◆ **Why Audit?**
- ◆ **2003 audit approach vs 2006 audit approach**
- ◆ **Audit results – PBRF-eligible staff**
- ◆ **Audit results – NROs & OROs**
- ◆ **Escalation process**
- ◆ **Escalation process – three audits**
- ◆ **PBRF Audit - Learnings to TEC**
- ◆ **PBRF Audit - Learnings to TEOs**
- ◆ **PBRF Audit - Findings**
- ◆ **Summary & Questions**

# Why Audit?

- ◆ Assurance to the TEC, panel members and the sector
- ◆ To assist panel members with additional audit queries arising out of panel assessment process (every EP was assessed)

# 2003 audit approach vs 2006 audit approach

## ◆ 2003 approach

- Steep learning curve for the TEC & the sector
- Feedback from sector – invasive
- Feedback from the TEC – expensive (\$ & people)

## ◆ 2006 approach

- We listened to the sector
- We redesigned the audit methodology and consulted with the sector
- Adopted a risk-based approach

# 2006 approach

- ◆ Preliminary questionnaire to 46 TEOs
- ◆ Process assurance site visits to 16 TEOs prior to PBRF Census and EP submission dates
- ◆ Auditing of staff-eligibility & NROs
  - Smaller sampling size (compared to 2003) that provided
    - 95% confidence level for PBRF-eligible staff
    - 99% confidence level for NROs and OROs
- ◆ Full site visits to three TEOs

# Audit results – PBRF staff eligibility

- ◆ Audited +/-28% of total staff on PBRF Census - eligibility, NROs & OROs

## Staff eligibility audit stats

- ◆ 676 or 7.4% PBRF-eligible staff audited (vs min. of 5%)
- ◆ Audited 1329 non PBRF-eligible staff
- ◆ 11 TEOs excluded 27 staff from their PBRF Census
- ◆ 4 TEOs incorrectly categorised 61 staff as new & emerging
- ◆ 868 staff on 2003 PBRF Census but not on 2006 PBRF Census queried across all TEOs who participated

# Audit results – NROs & OROs

## NROs & OROs audit stats

- ◆ 915 or 5% - NROs audited (vs minimum of 4.7%)
- ◆ 722 or 1% - OROs audited (actually more than 1%)
- ◆ 11 ineligible ROs
  - 4 NROs
  - 7 OROs
  - All other NROs in EP that had one ineligible NRO were audited

# Escalation process

## ◆ Panel members referred

- An additional 42 PBRF-eligible staff for auditing
- An additional 31 NROs for auditing
- 6 TEOs incorrectly categorised 9 staff as new & emerging
- 2 TEOs should have categorised 4 staff as new & emerging
- 1 TEO had their PBRF-eligible status and therefore their EP withdrawn
- 4 NROs ineligible

# Escalation process – three TEOs audited

- ◆ Focused on staff eligibility – audited staff on 2003 PBRF Census, employed at TEO in 2006 but not recorded on 2006 PBRF Census and supervised staff
- ◆ TEOs overall correctly applied the PBRF-eligibility criteria
- ◆ Identified that 4 PBRF-eligible staff were omitted from PBRF Census by 2 TEOs
- ◆ TEO-employed “professional practitioners” under contract
- ◆ TEOs employed staff under supervision and not involved in research

# Escalation process

---

- ◆ **Audit process activated when we identified large shifts in subject area designation**

# PBRF Audit - Learnings to TEC

- ◆ **Tight timelines to adopt**
- ◆ **Auditing vs advise/education**
- ◆ **Difficulty in obtaining information from TEOs for Census data**
- ◆ **Audit now complete – loss of institutional knowledge**
- ◆ **TEOs interpreted the PBRF Guidelines differently – greater clarity required?**
- ◆ **Can the audit process be streamlined further?**

# PBRF Audit - Learnings to TEOs

- ◆ Don't underestimate the time required to complete the requirements for the Quality Evaluation phase
- ◆ PBRF Guidelines – more clarification required?
- ◆ Internal processes
  - Internal panels for assessing EPs
  - Capture the research output sooner rather than later
    - Turn the output into an object
  - Consider all staff for eligibility requirements
  - Engage with your internal colleagues (HR and the PBRF team)
  - Where is the information held – centralised/decentralised?

# PBRF Audit - Findings

- ◆ 2006 audit process – went well & well received
- ◆ TEOs generally showed a better understanding of the complex PBRF Guidelines
- ◆ TEOs generally abided by the PBRF Guidelines and claimed others didn't
- ◆ TEOs focused on R rated staff.
  - Pushed the application of the PBRF Guidelines to the boundary
  - New employment contracts
    - For less than a year
    - With revised job titles & responsibilities
    - Strict supervision
    - Start dates/end dates

# Summary

---

- ◆ **TEOs better understanding of the complex PBRF Guidelines**
- ◆ **Audit methodology provided assurance to the TEC and panel members that TEOs had correctly applied the PBRF Guidelines**
- ◆ **Take the audit learnings from 2006 through to the 2012 Quality Evaluation**
- ◆ **Need to prevent the loss of institutional knowledge**

# Questions

---

# Final question

---

- ◆ Have you started to prepare for the 2012 Quality Evaluation?



## **Presenter's contact details**

**David Sinkins**

**KPMG New Zealand**

**04 816 4827**

**dsinkins@kpmg.co.nz**

**www.kpmg.co.nz**

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavour to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.