

Royal Society Te Apārangi

2021 Catalyst: Leaders Review Guidelines

Table of Contents

Version History	2
Background	3
About Catalyst: Leaders	3
Key Definitions	3
Role of Reviewers.....	4
Appointment.....	4
Guiding Principles.....	4
Unconscious bias.....	4
Conflicts of interest.....	5
Evaluation Procedure	5
Reviewers recommendation video conference.....	6
Confidentiality.....	6
Privacy	6
Catalyst: Leaders Selection criteria	7
Vision Mātauranga	8
Timeline	8
Role of the Royal Society Te Apārangi Staff.....	9
Thank You to the Reviewers.....	9
More information.....	9
Appendix 1: Annual Call times and programme information for Catalyst: Leaders.....	10
Appendix 2: Glossary of te reo Māori terms	11

Version History

History of Document Changes			
Version	Date	Change	Page
1.7	January 2021	Incorporating previous changes to 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 versions	
		China-New Zealand Scientist Exchange Programme is suspended in 2021	10
		JSPS nominations for New Zealand is now 4 Fellows	10

Background

The Catalyst Fund supports activities that initiate, develop and foster collaborations leveraging international science and innovation for New Zealand's benefit. It targets investment in leadership, influence, seeding and strategic cooperation through four funding streams.

Royal Society Te Apārangī (the Society), on behalf of the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE), administers a number of opportunities in the funding streams Catalyst: Leaders, Catalyst: Seeding, and Catalyst: Influence.

These guidelines are intended to facilitate the smooth operation of the Catalyst Fund Assessment process for the appointed Reviewers to Catalyst: Leaders.

About Catalyst: Leaders

Catalyst: Leaders supports incoming and outgoing targeted international fellowships for exceptional individuals that cannot be supported through other means.

The Objectives of Catalyst: Leaders are:

- To promote the importance of international cooperation in science and New Zealand's science and innovation capabilities; and,
- To catalyse science and innovation through placement of international experts in key science and innovation hubs, to meet specific capability needs for New Zealand benefit.

For more information on the specific (sub) programmes included in the respective January, April and July calls for Catalyst: Leaders, please refer to *Appendix 1: Annual Call times and programme information for Catalyst: Leaders*. The published guidelines are available on the Society's **Catalyst: Leaders** [website](#).

Key Definitions

Applicant means the New Zealand research organisation submitting the Catalyst Proposal on behalf of the Leader or Principal Investigator (PI).

Call means request for proposals towards specific Programmes or Sub-Programmes, as outlined in *Table 1: Annual call timelines*.

New Zealand Principal Investigator (PI) means the New Zealand individual nominated by the Applicant, who is responsible for the proposed activity if awarded funding.

Collaboration Partner means the international researcher (and New Zealand researcher(s) from organisations other than the Applicant organisation if applicable) collaborating with the Principal Investigator.

Host means the New Zealand or international research organisation that will be hosting the Leader or Principal Investigator (PI).

Leader or Fellow means the travelling individual researcher nominated by the Applicant, who would carry out the proposed activity if awarded funding.

For Leaders coming to New Zealand, the Leader is the Collaboration Partner. For New Zealand Leaders travelling abroad, the Leader is the Principal Investigator (PI).

Partner Institution means the international research organisation (and New Zealand organisation other than the Applicant organisation if applicable) of the Collaboration Partner.

Programme (or Sub-Programme) means the individual funding opportunity within Catalyst: Leaders, identified in Appendix 1: Annual Call times and programme information for Catalyst: Leaders.

Project means the unique research collaboration proposed by the Proposal.

Project Team means the Principal Investigator, Collaboration Partner and supporting individuals collectively identified in the Proposal as critical to the success of the Project.

Proposal (or Application) means the application submitted by the Applicant to Catalyst: Leaders.

Research Organisation means an organisation that has internal capability to carry out substantive

research, science, technology or related activities. Public service departments as listed in Schedule 1 of the State Sector Act 1988 are not eligible to apply under the Catalyst Fund.

Role of Reviewers

Reviewers are essential to the Catalyst Fund assessment process. Significant funding decisions will be made on the basis of your assessment. As an independent expert, you are asked to grade and comment on the proposals assigned to you in a given call. All proposals will be reviewed remotely and there is no requirement to attend a meeting in person.

- The Society endeavours to ensure that each reviewer will review a **maximum of 25 proposals**, and that the review activities will not take more than one day to complete.
- Each proposal is between 15-20 pages long with the principal content contained within 3-5 pages depending on the programme applied for (excluding CVs, letters of support, etc.). Consequently, we expect few applications will take longer than 30 minutes to assess.
- Reviewers are responsible for carrying out the evaluation of the proposals. Delegating the work to another person is not permitted.
- Reviewers may be asked to review applications that are outside their specific field of research.

Appointment

The Reviewers assessing applications submitted to the Catalyst: Leaders programmes are appointed by the Society. For more information on the appointment process, please refer to the Catalyst Reviewer Expression of Interest document:

<http://royalsociety.org.nz/what-we-do/funds-and-opportunities/catalyst-fund/reviewing-proposals/expression-of-interest/>

All Catalyst Fund Reviewers used by the Society will be listed on our website, but are not expected to give feedback to applicants.

Note, that when you agree to the terms and conditions set out in these guidelines, you additionally agree to being named as a reviewer on the website.

Guiding Principles

In evaluating proposals, Reviewers should be cognisant of the following guiding principles:

- **Independence;** Reviewers are evaluating in a personal capacity, you do not represent your employer
- **Impartiality;** Reviewers must treat all proposals equally and evaluate them impartially on their merits, irrespective of their origin or the identity of the applicants
- **Objectivity;** Reviewers must evaluate each proposal as submitted; meaning on its own merit, not its potential if certain changes were to be made
- **Accuracy;** Reviewers must make their judgment against the official evaluation criteria and the call or topic the proposal addresses, and nothing else
- **Consistency;** Reviewers must apply the same standard of judgment to all proposals

Unconscious bias

Unconscious bias refers to a bias which we are unaware of and which happens outside of our control. The Society wants to ensure that this bias has minimal influence on funding recommendations being made by Society-appointed reviewers. The literature suggests that awareness of unconscious bias can limit the impact of this bias. We therefore encourage reviewers to watch the short (3 minutes) introduction video below from the Royal Society London to familiarise/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 **recognize** the impact of unconscious bias
- Deliberately **slow down** decision making
- **Reconsider** reasons for decisions
- **Question** cultural stereotype

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

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

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

- <https://www.mslearning.microsoft.com/course/72169/launch>

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

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

“State of the Science: Implicit Bias Review” from Ohio State University’s Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity – this publication covers a wide range of issues relating to implicit or unconscious bias and general mitigation strategies.

- https://awis.site-ym.com/?Awards_webcasts

Material from Association for Women in Science.

Conflicts of interest

The Society takes the issue of conflicts of interest very seriously. A rigorous position is taken in order to maintain the credibility of the allocation process and to ensure that applications are subjected to fair and reasonable appraisal. During Reviewer selection the Society will try, as far as possible, to minimise the known conflicts of interest in any Reviewer. However, where further conflicts of interest arise for Reviewers the following rules will apply:

- All conflicts of interest must be declared in writing to the Society. Society staff will note all conflicts of interest and actions taken.
- Where a Reviewer is a family member or close friend of any applicant(s), that person will not assess the proposal and take no part in the consideration of that proposal. They will hear about the outcome of that proposal when official letters are sent to all applicants.
- If a Reviewer has an interest in an application, such as collaborating with an applicant or an applicant’s group, then that member shall not assess the proposal.

Evaluation Procedure

The Society will forward each Catalyst: Leaders Reviewer a PDF containing the applications they will be required to assess and a spreadsheet to record their scores. In the instance where Reviewers are not required to evaluate all proposals, all submitted proposals will still be made available to the Reviewers. The scores are automatically combined in the scoring spreadsheet to produce an overall assessment using the weighting for each of the three scoring criteria below.

In evaluating proposals, reviewers are asked to adhere to the following guidelines:

- Each proposal is graded on three criteria using a scale from 1 (poor) to 10 (exceptional). For a list of assessment criteria for Catalyst: Leaders see below.
- The Reviewer must be cognisant of the Guiding Principles for assessing proposals above.
- The grades must be submitted on the spread sheet template supplied by the Society.
- The grades should be returned to the Society by 5pm, on the deadline for reviewer’s submission of grades as tabled under Timeline.
- The Reviewer will score and rank proposals submitted to each sub-programme independently.

Reviewers are additionally asked to consider if each reviewed proposal is deemed “worthy of funding” if the amount of funding available was not a limiting factor. Due to funding limitations, it is expected that many excellent proposals cannot be funded. However, by answering No to the above question, the Reviewer indicates that a proposal does not have the quality to be considered for funding.

Following the closing of the review round, the Society will use the collated grades from the Reviewers to create a ranked list of applications. The final decision on what proposals will be funded lies with the Society. In making its decisions, the Society will take into account recommendations made by the Reviewers and the total investment across Catalyst: Leaders to ensure it is a balanced portfolio across both research fields and country relationships supported, while still ensuring quality. This means, for example, ensuring that:

- the Society is not over-investing in collaborations with one country or topic area to the neglect of others;
- funding is balanced across longer and shorter-term projects; and
- funding is not disproportionately invested in either research with short-term impact horizon versus research with a long-term impact horizon
- joint decision making with bilateral partners is enabled.

Reviewers recommendation video conference

Reviewers assessing applications for the International Leader Fellowship and the Julius Von Haast Fellowship will be offered the opportunity to have a quick videoconference at the completion of the review process if there is a big discrepancy between reviewers’ individual scores. The video conference MUST take place in the week starting with the deadline for submitting grades as indicated in the timeline below. The video meeting will only take place if all reviewers can participate.

Confidentiality

The applications, Reviewers’ worksheets and grades are confidential in every respect. An application is submitted on the understanding that: (i) it will only be used in the appraisal process; (ii) it is confidential to the Reviewer appointed by the Society; and, (iii) that it will not be made available to the public. The Society takes the issue of confidentiality very seriously.

- Reviewers must ensure the safe keeping of all applications and related confidential documents (e.g. application spreadsheets, scoring summaries, letters of recommendation, referee reports).
- At the conclusion of the assessment (concludes with the announcement of successful applicants), Reviewers must destroy/delete any documentation.
- Reviewers should not enter into correspondence or discussion of the contents of the applications with referees, third parties, or the applicants. Any necessary correspondence shall be addressed by the Society upon receipt.
- The intellectual property of the ideas and hypotheses put forward in the applications must be treated by the Reviewer in strict confidence.

Privacy

The Society has obligations under the [Privacy Act 1993](#) to keep confidential certain information provided by individuals. During the course of assessing applications to the selection round, Reviewers may have access to personal information about individuals associated with an application. Where this occurs, the principles of the Privacy Act must also be adhered to.

Catalyst: Leaders Selection criteria

Criterion 1: Enduring collaboration (weight in assessment 30%)

Will the proposed activity establish an enduring collaboration with world class international partners?

Reviewers should base their grading of this criterion measured by:

- Track record of the Leader (relative to opportunity)
- Potential of the collaboration to create an enduring partnership
- Ability of the Host and the Leader to deliver on proposed activities
- Ability of the Leader to be a catalyst for capability and capacity building in New Zealand
- Ability of the Host to maximise the opportunity of the Leader's visit (where the Leader is a visiting international researcher)
- Clearly demonstrated excellence of the international Partner Institution (where the Leader is an outgoing New Zealander).

In scoring this criterion as 10: the Project Team will have demonstrated a combined record of achievement and/or research translation that is outstanding by the international standards of their research field and for their career stage; there will be evidence of strong commitment to collaboration between these partners, with the Leader able to demonstrate existing leadership, or a plausible path to leadership, in New Zealand. In scoring a 1: the Project Team will have provided no evidence of productivity in a relevant research field; have a team that appears underpowered for the research area; and are without any record of forming stable collaborations.

Criterion 2: Novel knowledge and partnership (weight in assessment 40%)

Will the activity lead to the creation of new knowledge and a novel research partnership?

Reviewers should base their grading of this criterion measured by:

- How the Collaboration Partner will bring world-leading knowledge that complements the expertise of New Zealand Principal Investigator and the New Zealand Host.
- How the proposed collaboration will support a new partnership or a new research focus for an established collaboration.

In scoring this criterion as 10: the Collaboration Partner will possess international standing and skills that complement, and not simply duplicate, those of the New Zealand Project Team; and, the proposed linkage is either an entirely new collaboration between partners, or a novel and exciting change in research direction building from an existing collaboration. In scoring a 1: the Collaboration Partner will not appear able to add anything of significance to the New Zealand Project Team, with the proposal being a continuation of business-as-usual.

Criterion 3: Strategic Benefits (weight in assessment 30%)

Will the activity lead to a collaboration of strategic benefit to New Zealand?

Reviewers should base their grading of this criterion measured by:

- Ability to leverage international investment, and access to facilities and infrastructure not available in New Zealand.
- Clearly demonstrated pathway to build a substantive collaboration that is in line with New Zealand's science priorities.
- Ability of Host to leverage strategic benefit of the Leader to catalyse capability and capacity development in New Zealand (where the Leader is a visiting international researcher).

In scoring 10: the Collaboration partner will provide access to major resources that cannot be found in New Zealand; there will be a clearly defined and practical plan for the project team to extend their networks through this collaboration; and the research programme is clearly aligned with, or complements, an identifiable New Zealand science priority. In scoring a 1, the Collaboration partners

will appear uncommitted or duplicate infrastructure found in New Zealand; there will be no plan for ongoing activity beyond the direct proposal, and the linkage is of marginal relevance to any New Zealand science priority.

New Zealand science priority may refer to any high priority research fields as evidenced by links to a CoRE, NSC, biodiversity documents, central or local government priorities, or any other science priority argued in the proposal.

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.

Where research projects are of particular relevance to Māori or involve Māori, the Society expects that applicants are in consultation with Māori to ensure that the research is well planned, that appropriate etiquette is observed when access to Māori sites, culturally sensitive material and knowledge is sought from their owners, and that Māori intellectual and cultural property rights are respected. Cultural understanding is required to ensure good quality research. As a first step it is expected that researchers will have sought advice from their institution, many of which have established processes for consultation with Māori.

Consultation with Māori is not expected, and may not be appropriate, for proposed projects where no specific interest for Māori can be identified. In this case, the relevant section in the proposal will be left blank.

Vision Mātauranga is not explicitly part of the scoring criteria but, where it is appropriate to a proposal, it can contribute to the overall excellence. Aspects of Vision Mātauranga relating to relevant experience may be included in the “Roles and Resources” section of the proposal application.

Timeline

Tabled below is the calendar of events for the 2020 Catalyst Fund ‘Call for Proposals’ and associated review activities. Each call includes programme activities in both Catalyst: Leaders and Catalyst: Seeding. For more information on included programmes, please refer the Society’s Catalyst Fund [website](#).

2021 Activity	Catalyst Seeding Call For Proposals		
	January Call	April Call	July Call
Call for proposals via Catalyst Portal	28 January	29 April	29 July
Reviewer EOI closing date for current Catalyst Call	25 March	24 June	30 September
Catalyst application closing date	15 April	15 July	21 October
Notification of selected Reviewers No later than	22 April	22 July	28 October
Reviewer briefing video conference (10-11 am) *	22 April	22 July	28 October
Collated applications forwarded to Reviewers	22 April	22 July	28 October
Deadline for reviewer’s submission of grades	17 May	16 August	22 November
Award announcement	27 May	26 August	2 December

*The Reviewers recommendation video conference is only applicable for reviewers assessing applications for the International Leader Fellowship and the Julius Von Haast Fellowship.

Role of the Royal Society Te Apārangī Staff

In addition to the above roles, the Society will furthermore:

- record funding decisions;
- record any conflicts of interest and identify problem areas;
- convey funding decisions to applicants and their host organisations - all discussions related to a decision should occur through Royal Society Te Apārangī staff; and,
- negotiate contract details with host institutions.

Thank You to the Reviewers

Royal Society Te Apārangī appreciates the time and effort that reviewers put into the Catalyst Fund assessment process. The time, advice, contribution to the research community and suggestions for improvements from reviewers on the assessment process is highly valued.

More information

For more detailed information on the funding opportunities the review activity supports, refer to the Catalyst Fund webpage:

<http://royalsociety.org.nz/what-we-do/funds-and-opportunities/catalyst-fund/>

For any queries or further information, please contact the Royal Society Te Apārangī Research Funding (International) team at: International.Applications@royalsociety.org.nz

Appendix 1: Annual Call times and programme information for Catalyst: Leaders

Table 1: Annual call timelines for Catalyst: Leaders

Call	Open Date	Close Date	Sub-programmes
JANUARY	28 January 2021	15 April 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ International Leader Fellowships ▪ JSPS Postdoctoral Fellowships
APRIL	29 April 2021	15 July 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Julius von Haast Fellowship
JULY	29 July 2021	21 October 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 14th HOPE Meeting (tbc)

Table 2: Catalyst: Leaders sub-programmes

Sub-Programme	Brief Description	Duration	NZ\$ Funding (excl. GST)	Awards available per call
International Leader Fellowships	Supports exceptional individuals from any country outside New Zealand to catalyse science and innovation capability and capacity in New Zealand for a minimum of 4 weeks per year for up to 3 years	1 to 3 years	<u>Per annum:</u> \$20,000 Stipend \$20,000 Research support \$10,000 Host admin	Up to 3
Julius von Haast Fellowship Award	Supports an internationally recognised researcher from Germany to undertake research in New Zealand for a minimum of 4 weeks per year	3 years	<u>Per annum:</u> \$20,000 Stipend \$20,000 Research support \$10,000 Host admin	Up to 1
JSPS Postdoctoral Fellowship*	Supports young and excellent New Zealand postdoctoral researchers doing research in Japan	12 – 24 months	Flights, insurance and living allowance	Up to 4
New Zealand to China Scientist Exchange Programme**	Supports the development of research linkages with China by enabling New Zealand researchers to visit Chinese research organisations	4 weeks	Flights and daily living allowance	Up to 10
JSPS HOPE Meeting	Supports excellent PhD students and/or postdoctoral fellows to attend the HOPE meetings with Nobel Laureates in Japan	Approx 4 days	Flights, accommodation, and meeting registration	Up to 5

* Please note these programmes are fully funded by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS)

** Due to the current Covid-19-related travel restrictions, a call for New Zealand-China Scientist Exchange Programme applications has been temporarily suspended.

Appendix 2: Glossary of te reo Māori terms

Definitions taken from maoridictionary.co.nz. 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 whareniui (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 pohiri 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 whakataukāki 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