

# **The Humanities - Charting a way forward**

**Report to the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology**

**Sally Munro**  
August 2005

# Contents

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Executive Summary</b>   | <b>p3</b>  |
| <b>Background</b>  | <b>p4</b>  |
| <i>Sector support for a national humanities organisation</i>                           |            |
| <i>Changing research context</i>   |            |
| <i>Humanities and the Growth and Innovation and Sustainable Development frameworks</i> |            |
| <b>Humanities Representation and Public Objectives</b>                                 | <b>p6</b>  |
| <i>Role of a national body in fostering a strong humanities sector</i>                 |            |
| <i>Government interests in a national body</i>   |            |
| <b>Perspectives and Issues</b>   | <b>p7</b>  |
| <i>Demand pull from government agencies for relevant, quality humanities research</i>  |            |
| <i>Humanities and contestable research funding</i>                                     |            |
| <i>A separate national body for the humanities?</i>                                    |            |
| <b>Suggested approach for moving forward</b>   | <b>p11</b> |
| <i>Options that could be implemented in the short-term</i>                             |            |
| Options for the medium – long term   |            |
| <b>Conclusion and Recommendations</b>  | <b>p14</b> |

## **The Humanities – Charting a Way Forward**

### **Purpose**

This paper proposes a number of pragmatic steps and options that the government could take to progress a relationship with the Council for the Humanities, in a way that fosters development of humanities knowledge and research and contributes to New Zealand government policy.

### **Executive Summary**

This report argues that a serious attempt to lift the game of connecting effective contributions from humanities research to policy development requires attention on the demand side. Clear lessons have been learnt from the experience of strengthening the links between research and policy in the social sector. These lessons can be adapted to address the challenge for the humanities research - policy interface.

This report takes as a given that humanities researchers agree that their grouping together under the umbrella of the Council of the Humanities is a useful basis for the government to interact with the sector. This is stated as an explicit assumption not to call it into question but because it follows from this assumption that it would be constructive for government to engage with a representative body, the Council for the Humanities, as a basis for strengthening its interaction with this area of research.

A number of stepped options are proposed to enable a productive relationship between the Council for the Humanities and government. An essential element is the need for a lead agency on the government side. A key role for the lead agency would be to lead a research prioritisation exercise that would provide a strategic framework for the contribution of humanities research to desired government outcomes, whether through government agencies' research budgets, the Cross-Departmental Research Fund (CDRF) or Foundation for Research, Science and Technology (FRST) funding. It is proposed that the Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH) should take this whole-of-government lead role, with funding to support this role.

Hand in hand with this proposed prioritisation exercise the report also highlights the need for focus and funding to pursue policy relevant research in important areas of policy that are currently 'underdone' in terms of access to and use of research. These include culture and heritage policy, archives and museum, policy, broadcasting, media and digitisation policy, citizenship, national identity and language policy.

For the humanities sector the Council for the Humanities has the potential to provide a leadership mechanism, bringing together and communicating sector perspectives. It also has the potential to develop as an effective portal through which government could interact with a diverse set of humanities interests and perspectives.

A successful relationship can only be worked on, not guaranteed. Goodwill on both sides is needed to move forward constructively. Both parties will also need effective liaison people who are skilled at coordination and communication. The Council for the Humanities will rightly want to maintain its independent non-government organisation status. For this reason the report emphasises that any government funding to the Council should be on the basis of clear expectations and purchase arrangements.

It should be noted that the main focus of this report is on how the Council for the Humanities and government can work together to better connect humanities thinking and research with government policy development. The broad aim of promoting and fostering the study of humanities through the education system is traversed only lightly in this report.

## **Background**

### *Sector support for a national humanities organisation*

HUMANZ<sup>1</sup> held discussions with officials and ministers in late 2000 seeking government funding for a representative body for the humanities. The development of the HUMANZ strategic business plan was funded by government at the end of 2001 to make a case for government funding. While endorsed in principle the strategic plan failed to convince officials or ministers that HUMANZ had developed a mandate among their peers or identified an obvious role that government would wish to fund.

The then Minister of Research, Science and Technology, Hon Pete Hodgson, challenged HUMANZ to gain the wider support of the sector it purported to represent, particularly the universities. A number of positive developments have now been put in place:

- The establishment of the Humanities Trust of Aotearoa NZ, with a governing council, the Council for Humanities, comprising wide senior membership;
- Development of the virtual Humanities Research Network (HRN);
- Commitment of ongoing funding from seven universities<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> HUMANZ - Humanities Association of New Zealand, now superseded by the more nationally representative Humanities Trust of Aotearoa New Zealand, with its governing council, the Council for the Humanities.

<sup>2</sup> \$10,000 from each per year for the Council, \$50,000 from 3 universities over 3 years for the HRN, plus travel and time costs for Council members, provided by participating organisations.)

Reporting progress to the present Minister of Research, Science and Technology in early 2005, the Minister indicated that a way forward for the humanities might now be progressed provided the sector could demonstrate;

- how they can contribute to “a rich and full New Zealand society” and connect more effectively with the community; and
- where they can add value to government policy.

To further this matter the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology (MoRST) engaged Sally Munro, Munro Duignan Ltd, to engage sector stakeholders<sup>3</sup> and identify options for a way forward that takes account of these challenges. This report, written by Sally Munro, is directed to the Ministry who will forward it to the Minister, with their comments.

### *Changing research context*

Since the 2000-2001 discussions regarding a national humanities body there have been significant developments in the New Zealand research environment that need to be taken into account when considering options for moving forward. Of particular note are:

- Development of Performance Based Research Funding (PBRF), which is geared to recognising and rewarding research excellence. In the first round of PBRF some of the humanities disciplines, notably philosophy, scored well. Some humanities academics question whether the allocation of research funding within institutions reflects the performance of the humanities.
- A greater emphasis on collaboration, multidisciplinary perspectives and linkages with end-users e.g. FRST funded research consortia, Centres of Research Excellence, initiatives such as the Smash Palace arts and science collaboration projects.
- Sustained and multi-pronged approaches towards building social science research capability and connecting research to government policy (Social Policy Evaluation and Research Committee [SPEaR], Building Research Capability in Social Science [BRCSS], Social Science Reference Group [SSRG], Royal Society Social Sciences Advisory Committee)
- Current developments under ‘Picking up the Pace’, which could see greater devolution of outcomes-focused research funding to providers.

### *Humanities and the Growth and Innovation and Sustainable Development frameworks*

In recent years considerably more thinking has gone into increasing our understanding and developing policy that supports the levers for innovation and sustainable growth and development in New Zealand. Innovation

---

<sup>3</sup> Appendix One lists sector stakeholders with whom the consultant met.

studies<sup>4</sup> show that many broad factors shape the extent to which enterprises can make innovation decisions and which kinds of innovation are undertaken. These factors include social and cultural context, the institutional and organisational framework, regulatory systems, infrastructures, and the processes that create and distribute knowledge. Humanities research can inform understanding on many of these areas.

Innovative links and dynamic interfaces between economic, social, cultural and environmental spheres of activity have come to be seen as critically important for a vibrant, growing New Zealand. The importance of creative content and design has also been recognised through the Growth and Innovation Framework (GIF). It can be argued that ensuring a strong arts and humanities sector will be a key factor in sustaining creativity in New Zealand.

## **Humanities Representation and Public Objectives**

### *Role of a national body in fostering a strong humanities sector*

A strong humanities sector is important to society in a number of ways, including bringing research and understanding of how knowledge is constituted and developed; of how cultures, religions, language, identities and knowledge systems interact; how rights, obligations and civil institutions take shape.

The study of humanities provides tools for understanding through conceptualising, recording and interpreting ideas, theory and narratives in the full range of media. Humanities education extends the cognitive, imaginative, interpretative and communicative capabilities of New Zealanders as active democratic citizens and as knowledge workers. Humanities research can sustain the vitality of the cultural sector; the museums, galleries, archives, heritage collections and cultural institutions that are so important to the vibrancy of city centres, the construction of inclusive communities and for tourism. For all these reasons humanities education and research is worthy of public support.

The humanities sector has the potential to benefit from sustained activity of an effective national body, to foster development and excellence, as well as to facilitate productive linkages in the sector and between humanities and other areas of activity, including government policy.

The stated purpose of the newly formed Trust and its governing Council for the Humanities is “to promote recognition of the value of humanities /aronui in the creation, conservation and transmission of knowledge essential to

---

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Edquist, C (ed) *Innovation Systems: Institutions, Organisations and Dynamics* (London: Pinter), 1997

personal well-being and the cultural, social and economic development of Aotearoa New Zealand”.

To carry out its purpose the Trust’s objectives are to:

- Engage in research-based advocacy for the humanities/aronui
- Secure the inclusion of the Trust in the process of public policy-making
- Promote public awareness of the value of humanities/aronui in a democratic and inclusive society
- Recognise distinction and excellence in the humanities
- Encourage cooperation between institutions engaged in work in the humanities/aronui
- Support the formation of networks amongst individual engaged in work in the humanities /aronui
- Engage in discussion and cooperation with related organisations in New Zealand and overseas

In its policies and practices the Council for the Humanities acknowledge the partnership principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and recognise the importance of Mātauranga Māori.

#### *Government interests in a national body*

Government, in other contexts, has provided time-limited seeding finance to help support the establishment phase of national sector bodies; e.g. NZ Bio (an incorporated society representing the biotechnology sector), NZ Screen Council, both established in the GIF context.

A more usual, and generally preferred, funding approach is one which allows the government to purchase or subsidise specific activities of the national body that are closely aligned with government desired outcomes. This funding approach enables the government to achieve a focus on particular objectives. Such an approach also enables better management of the inevitable tension that exists where a national body is an advocacy body that makes representations to government concerning sector funding.

Discussions and analysis have led to my view that there are particular areas of Council for the Humanities activity that government could be justified in supporting through purchase arrangements, particularly where these support fostering a better connection between humanities research and policy development. There is opportunity to:

- Enhance the development of the Humanities Research Network and pilot development of collaborative research tools as part of the Advanced Network capability building;
- Have the Council for Humanities act as an external reference group to work with officials as officials, led by MCH, develop a strategic framework for research priorities for the contribution of humanities

research to government outcomes and specific areas of policy e.g. cultural/heritage policy;

- Have the Council for the Humanities work with the sector to promote the government's objective to strengthen collaborative and interdisciplinary approaches; among the humanities, and across humanities and other areas of knowledge.

Possible options for proceeding along these lines are discussed below. Discussions with sector stakeholders also brought into focus some broader issues and perspectives, including overseas experience, relevant to the way forward.

## **Perspectives and Issues**

*Demand pull from government agencies for relevant, quality humanities research*

A clear lesson learnt from the experience of the social science sector is the value of:

- A focusing mechanism (Social Policy Evaluation and Research Committee [SPEaR] located in the Ministry of Social Development) within government itself that enables cross departmental priorities for social research to be set and communicated to the social science research sector;
- Use of an external Social Science Reference Group to work with officials and test the priority framework.
- A lead agency (Ministry of Social Development [MSD]) through which the relationship with the sector is conducted, although it should be noted that MoRST continues to hold a key interest;
- Use of a government sponsored biennial conference as a way of stimulating research around particular policy areas; and
- A strong pool of research funding within agencies (particularly MSD) that allows agencies to directly conduct or contract for research, thus funding capability in direct areas of need.

By contrast, areas of government policy that could be better informed by humanities research are not well focused nor funded to exert strong and effective demand for relevant quality humanities research. In particular, there is a nexus of agencies concerned with culture, heritage, tourism, archives, broadcasting and media, citizenship and national identity that arguably could be in a much stronger position to set a shared agenda for policy research priorities and stimulate demand.

This suggests a possible role for the Ministry of Culture and Heritage as the lead agency in bringing together a cross agency research priority setting process and coordinating the government relationship with the humanities sector, potentially using the Council for Humanities as an external reference group. At present, however, MCH is not currently funded or configured to take on such a role, having only minimal policy research capacity<sup>5</sup>. (It does have the history group – this group however is not focused on policy relevant research.<sup>6</sup>)

A serious attempt to lift the game of connecting effective contributions from the humanities to policy requires attention on the demand side, with a commitment to research informed policy and resources to drive this. Stimulus on the supply side is unlikely to lead to better contributions to policy unless government agencies are focused and funded to pursue policy relevant research.

#### *Humanities and contestable research funding*

A perception reflected during discussions is a view that humanities research has a low profile and gets crowded out in the contestable funding processes of Marsden and FRST funding.

With the Marsden Fund, which has a focus on excellent investigator-led research, people acknowledged that the fund was heavily over subscribed, but suggested that a strengthening of the humanities representation on the Marsden Fund Committee could potentially lift the success rate for humanities research.

More relevant to the concern of stimulating outcomes related research is the view that humanities research does not feature strongly in successful bids to FRST funding.

An examination of overseas humanities bodies and research funding indicates that in a number of countries, notably Australia, Canada and the UK, funding for humanities research is more transparent in its size and application because it is funded through Humanities (or some combination of Arts/Humanities/ Social Science) research councils.

The allocation of RS&T funding in New Zealand operates within a different funding framework, with a single funding agency allocating funding to a range of providers to meet a set of government agreed broad outcomes. With the increasing emphasis on outcomes it is opportune to examine where humanities research could be usefully linked and add value to outcomes

---

<sup>5</sup> MCH has initiated a number of research projects including cultural statistics and indicators work, research on sponsorship trends and a review of TV violence. The policy research capability and capacity is embryonic and needs funding to grow.

<sup>6</sup> Although the History Group does not direct its work toward policy outcomes it is responsible for producing major humanities research projects concerned with cultural heritage and identity, including the Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, the Historical Atlas and the Encyclopaedia of New Zealand.

through FRST funding (e.g. as part of multi-disciplinary teams contributing to outcomes across a number of output classes and/or giving it a more explicit profile as part of a renamed and extended social science and humanities output class).

A notable feature of new directions in humanities research funding in other countries is the increasing emphasis governments are putting on humanities researchers to link with other disciplines and examine contemporary issues vital to informing complex economic and cultural changes associated with a knowledge-based society. There is also increasing emphasis on the transfer of research to policy makers and the general public.

Overseas humanities bodies, working jointly with government, tend to play a significant leadership role to monitor emerging research trends and to help articulate national research priorities and structure the national research effort. In the New Zealand context this would suggest the potential benefit of a relationship between FRST and the Council for the Humanities as part of a broader set of government relationships and a strengthening profile for humanities research.

*A separate national body for the humanities?*

The question of institutional form was raised during discussions. In particular what is the case for a separate humanities body? Would there not be advantages in coming under the umbrella of the Royal Society and /or partnering with the social science sector?

In one sense, if the government conducts a 'purchase' relationship with a NGO national body it does not have to be overly concerned with institutional form, provided the body is accountable for delivery of services purchased. On the other hand in a context where government is seeking to promote collaborative, interdisciplinary linkages, government may be reluctant to support separate bodies that might be better integrated or linked with other sectors.

While there is a certain 'logic' to the idea of a humanities grouping coming under the umbrella of the Royal Society (e.g. as is the case in Canada), in New Zealand the present science-oriented legal charter and culture of the Royal Society would not make it easy to gain significant traction in promoting and fostering the humanities. The most constructive linkage with the Royal Society is probably on the basis of an affiliated organisation membership, which preserves independence but allows for productive connections.

Similar fears of being crowded out, as well as the desire to get early traction, applies to the idea of integrating humanities and social science in a single representative body. A possible single body is however seen by some as a viable and potentially productive medium term path, with the Council for the

Humanities working with a social science sector body<sup>7</sup> to form an umbrella body, which could deliver development and government relationship objectives for both humanities and social science.

From a government perspective this suggests an approach that funds particular activities with the Council for the Humanities that will contribute to specified government outcomes, with an eye to also encouraging productive linkages at a national level with the Royal Society and the social science sector. Depending on discussions and developments regarding a possible social science academy the government may wish to incentivise an integrated national body of humanities and social science.

### **Suggested approach for moving forward**

Now that there is a national representative body for the humanities that has wide support of the sector, there is an opportunity for government and the Council for the Humanities to develop a continuing relationship, which can effectively serve mutual objectives and be adaptable to changing contexts and needs.

*Necessary steps to support an effective relationship are:*

- The government relationship with the Council for the Humanities needs to be managed from a lead Ministry. As discussed earlier there is a case for the lead agency to be the Ministry of Culture and Heritage. It would however be vital that MCH takes a whole-of government perspective in leading the relationship, keeping links with key government agencies including, MoRST, FRST, National Library, Archives New Zealand , Dept of Internal Affairs (DIA), Ministry of Economic Development (MED), New Zealand Trade and Enterprise (NZTE), Ministry of Tourism, Te Papa, Te Puni Kokiri (TPK), Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (PIA).
- Liaison people on both sides who are skilled at co-ordination and communication. All too often these relationships can break down because these key liaison roles are not held by people with the right skills for the role.
- Clear expectations –the government should reflect these in agreements to purchase activity designed to contribute to specified outcomes.

*Options that could be implemented in the short-term (over the next 6- 24 months)*

- Funding contribution for further development and enhancement of the Humanities Research Network (HRN). The early stage development of

---

<sup>7</sup> No such social science body yet exists: proposals for an Academy are on the table and discussions underway.

this web-based initiative sponsored through the Council for the Humanities has been funded through university contributions. Government and its agencies have an interest in supporting accessible information about humanities researchers and their research projects. A number of government agencies are likely to be users of this researcher database. Such agencies, if requested by the Council, for the Humanities could consider making a contributory payment towards the development and maintenance of the HRN.

There is also an opportunity as part of the development of the Advanced Network. On implementation of the forthcoming Advanced Network MoRST will be managing a Capability Building Fund for its users. Potentially the Council for the Humanities could apply for funding to develop collaborative research tools for the HRN, such as collaborative workspaces.

- Funding for a focused set of workshops with key government departments to better identify knowledge theme areas and policy objectives that humanities research can contribute to. The purpose of these workshops would be to provide a strategic framework and research priorities for the contribution of humanities research to desired government outcomes, whether through government agencies' research budgets, the CDRF or FRST funding.

What is proposed here is similar in some ways to the approach taken back in 2001 to improve the social research/social policy connection. In that instance a Social Science Reference Group worked with officials to inform the development of a recommended framework. A dedicated secretariat, SPEaR, was established to support the relationship. SPEaR and its associated communication and linkage activity have been ongoing since that time. In this case the Council for the Humanities could operate as the external reference group. On the government side, in line with the earlier discussion, it would be appropriate for MCH to be the lead agency. The resources required are time (officials and reference group), some travel and meeting costs, and if considered desirable, contracting an external facilitator. A serious approach to this exercise would require new money in MCH to support it. (The annual budget for this exercise in the social science sector has been of the order of \$0.5 – 0.7m).

- Sponsorship funding and government agency support for a conference/seminar series that links humanities research with directions in the identified knowledge theme areas; for instance, humanities research and thinking about cultural policy, knowledge and cultural institutions, communications networks and economic development. Such a conference could be a sensible progression following identification of knowledge theme areas and government research priorities. The conference could be organised by the Council for the Humanities, in

consultation with an officials group<sup>8</sup>, chaired by MCH, and would provide an opportunity for a structured engagement that links current humanities research to focused domains of policy thinking. Such a conference would be a useful stimulus to both researchers and policy makers. If successful it could become a regular (say biennial) event thus contributing to building an environment where researchers and policy analysts can actively engage. A successful seminar along these lines was organised by HUMANZ in 2000, with support from the National Library and other agencies. It was entitled the DICE seminar – Directions in Information, Culture and Economy.

The total cost and cost sharing of such a conference is variable.<sup>9</sup> Given the proposed leadership role for MCH in managing and coordinating the government relationship with the humanities sector, it would make sense that MCH underwrite such a conference, with contributing sponsorship from other agencies, including the MoRST, National Library, ArchivesNZ, DIA, TPK, PIA and MED/ NZTE. As with the workshop proposal this option will not be possible without an injection of new money, which could possibly as part of a wider MCH bid to support the development of research informed culture, heritage and identity policy.

#### *Options for the medium – long term*

There are a number of steps that could be taken in the medium to long term (2-5 years) which, depending on the outcomes of the proposed workshops and other developments in research and government policy, could strengthen the connections between quality humanities research and its contribution to government policy. These include:

- Strengthening demand from key government ministries for relevant humanities research to inform key areas of policy, in particular cultural/heritage policy, archives, museum, and digitisation policy, broadcasting and media policy, citizenship, national identity and language policy.<sup>10</sup> For this to happen in any significant way would require a focusing of capability and funding, particularly within MCH, to enable policy development to become better informed by research.
- In addition, while the proposed workshops will provide a useful foundation for identifying priorities for humanities research, an ongoing

---

<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, if a stronger government imprimatur is wanted, as is the case with the biennial social science conference, the conference could be organised by MCH, drawing on design, sector knowledge and organisational input from the Council for the Humanities.

<sup>9</sup> The cost of the biennial social policy conference approximates \$100,000. MSD is the major sponsor of this conference and contributes both direct funding and considerable in-kind support through its own Centre of Research and Evaluation.

<sup>10</sup> Some concrete issues could include:

- Examining the concept of 'public value' in broadcasting
- Cultural archiving issues
- Exploring notions of 'identity' and 'values' in relation to cultural well-being

process will be needed to review and recalibrate cross departmental research priorities. (Such a process could be a variation on SPEaR and should certainly coordinate with SPEaR.)

This proposal to strengthen government agency capability to seek and use relevant humanities research, like all R&D, has the potential to blow out into questionable commissioning and use of research – however my present assessment suggests that effectively integrating humanities research into policy thinking is ‘underdone’ in some key policy areas.

Depending on how well (quality and quantity) the capability of the humanities research sector is able to respond to identified policy issues there may be a need to consider approaches that would stimulate research in specific areas and/or emphasise particular aspects of capability building, such as interdisciplinary links between humanities and science and technology. Two possible approaches could be:

- Strengthen the contribution humanities research can make to outcomes through FRST funding e.g. potentially broadening and funding the social science output to become a social science and humanities output class; also seeking to see where humanities research can be usefully linked with research in other FRST output classes to provide broad perspectives to inform outcomes.
- Implement a BRCSS type initiative i.e. establish a virtual centre for humanities to actively build capability with a focus on collaborative, interdisciplinary research that contributes to national development aims and sits between the investigator driven Marsden Fund and targeted outcome funding of much FRST funding.

The Council for the Humanities could be expected to be able to offer advice about such developments. It could also potentially act as a co-ordination agent for a BRCSS type initiative – although any such role would have to be put out to tender.

## **Conclusion and Recommendations**

There is a risk that humanities research is seen as a dispensable luxury by governments sharply focused on the contribution of science and technology to economic well-being. Increasingly however the literature on innovation is demonstrating the relevance of social and cultural institutions as important determinants of how knowledge develops and how innovation happens in practice. Humanities research increases understanding of our social and cultural environments, and provides conceptual frameworks and tools to enable people to continuously interpret and critique their world. It is part of the knowledge base that is essential to growing an informed and dynamic citizenry, capable of shaping their future.

The recent establishment of a nationally representative humanities body, the Council for the Humanities, is an opportunity to foster an active and collaborative humanities sector that can facilitate productive linkages between humanities and other areas of activity, including government policy.

An effective relationship between the Council for the Humanities and government requires 'two to tango'. Government needs to manage its relationship through a lead agency and clear expectations. The Council for the Humanities needs to develop as an effective portal through which government could interact with a diverse set of humanities interests and perspectives. The Council also needs to take on board the government's interest in interdisciplinary, collaborative research that can contribute to policy thinking.

To progress the relationship I recommend the government take a stepped approach that allows the relationship to grow and develop as milestones are achieved.

### *Recommendations*

It is recommended that:

- 1) Government agencies that are potential users of the Humanities Research Network (including Ministry of Research, Science and Technology, Ministry for Culture and Heritage, National Library, Archives New Zealand) give favourable consideration to making a contributory payment towards the development and maintenance of the network.
- 2) The Council for the Humanities and Ministry of Research, Science and Technology work together to explore the potential for the Humanities Research Network to develop collaborative research tools as part of the capability building associated with the forthcoming Advanced Network.
- 3) The Ministry for Culture and Heritage be designated as the lead agency to coordinate a whole-of government relationship with the Council for the Humanities.
- 4) As part of the lead agency role;
  - a. the Ministry for Culture and Heritage bring together a set of focused workshops with key government departments to identify knowledge theme areas and policy priorities that humanities research can contribute to; and use the Council for the Humanities as an external reference group in this process;
  - b. following a priority setting process, the Ministry for Culture and Heritage work with the Council for the Humanities to organise a

conference(possibly on a biennial basis) that links current research with the policy priorities.

- 5) Ministers support with adequate funding;
  - a. the capability and capacity to strengthen demand for and use of research in areas of government policy that are currently 'underdone' in terms of research content, including cultural/heritage policy, archives, museum, and digitisation policy, broadcasting and media policy, citizenship, national identity and language policy;
  - b. the capacity of the Ministry for Culture and Heritage to undertake the proposed lead agency role in coordinating a whole-of-government perspective on research priorities across these policy areas and managing the relationship with the Council for the Humanities.

*Longer term actions*

- 6) Depending on the outcome of the first steps it is recommended that consideration be given to;
  - a. an ongoing process to review and recalibrate the cross-departmental policy research priorities;
  - b. approaches that would stimulate humanities research in specific outcome areas and/or particular aspects of capability building, such as interdisciplinary links between humanities and science and technology. Options could include strengthening the contribution humanities research makes to targeted outcomes through Foundation for Research, Science and Technology funding and/or an initiative (similar to the Building Research Capability in Social Science [BRCSS] initiative) to actively build capability in collaborative interdisciplinary research relevant to national development aims.

Sally Munro  
Munro Duignan Ltd  
August 2005

## Appendix One – Interviews conducted

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Ministry for Culture and Heritage               | Martin Matthews, Chief Executive, Jane Kominik<br>Deputy Chief Executive and Policy Group Manager,<br>Marten Hutt, Martin Durrant<br>Deborah Tennet  |
| National Library                                | Margaret Calder – Chief Librarian, Alexander Turnbull Library  |
| Archives New Zealand                            | Dianne Macaskill - Chief Executive<br>Greg Goulding – Group Manager, Government Recordkeeping  |
| Creative New Zealand                            | John McDavitt, Arts adviser  |
| New Zealand Trade & Enterprise                  | Cheryll Sotheran – Director, Creative Industries.<br>member of Council for the Humanities  |
| Tertiary Education Commission                   | Margaret Wagstaff<br>Paul Pearson  |
| Ministry of Education                           | Jane Von Dadelszen, Policy Manager, Tertiary Group   |
| Foundation for Research, Science and Technology | Shane Stuart, Strategy Manager<br>Craig Holmes, Strategy Manager   |
| Royal Society of New Zealand                    | Steve Thompson – Chief Executive   |
| Victoria University of Wellington               | Brian Opie, Executive Officer, Council for the Humanities  |
| Canterbury University                           | Kenneth Strongman – Pro-Vice Chancellor (College of Arts - Canterbury) & Chair of Council for the Humanities<br><br>Karen Nero<br>Director of the Macmillan Brown Centre for Pacific Studies<br><br>Rosemary Du Plessis, Social Science Reference Group member 2001, Former Chair Royal Society Social Sciences Advisory Committee |
| University of Auckland                          | John Morrow<br>Dean of Arts, member of Council for the Humanities<br><br>Raewyn Dalziel<br>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)   |
| Auckland University of Technology               | Sharon Harvey, Associate Dean of the Faculty of Applied Humanities (Research and Postgraduate); former member of HUMANZ  |
| Stout Research Centre for NZ Studies            | Lydia Wevers, member of Council for the Humanities, member of Marsden Committee<br><br>Richard Hill  |

Note: a number of other stakeholders were not formally interviewed but have had the opportunity to contribute and comment.