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**1. Introduction**

We have made considerable progress in developing a set of guidance to inform the use and development of Workload Allocation Models (WAMs) across the College since the Staffing Management Committee first discussed the issue in January 2013. Following discussions at our Committee meetings over the past 2 years, we now have revised the model taking account of local experiences of using it while still promoting the achievement of standardisation and consistency across the College, where this is possible and desirable, and understanding where local variation is required to take account of disciplinary differences in academic practice.

This document provides guidance for each School in constructing a School-specific WAM which is consistent with College norms and expectations.

**2. Limitations of WAMs**

WAMs are one tool among several available to School managers to help them to determine the appropriate contribution which each academic colleague makes to fulfilling a School’s objectives. WAMs cannot, of themselves, resolve tensions or conflict between colleagues and they cannot address capability issues. However, if combined with School planning and resourcing discussions at the macro level, and with annual review at the micro level, then the information collected when updating WAMs, and the issues thrown up by those data, can assist School managers in balancing variable contributions to multiple School responsibilities in ways which are demonstrably fair.

In utilising WAMs, School managers have to realise that the goal of fairness and equitable treatment of staff in the distribution of workloads and contributions to School activities are likely to be only achievable over a period of 3 to 5 years, since it is not necessarily possible to re-assign duties or to increase or re-deploy academic capacity quickly or to make in-year adjustments. Furthermore, the proportions of time devoted to particular activities (teaching, research/KE, management and administration) which are set out in this guidance are not intended to apply to every week and month of the academic year; but are intended to be achieved across a whole year or the longer time period indicated. For example, it should be recognised that across a 52 week year, excluding annual leave, someone contributing 40% of their time to teaching and student support is likely to have some weeks of 100% teaching and some weeks of 0% teaching. Similarly, a 40% allocation of time for research might be understood to be achieved across a 3-5 year period, if a semester or year of sabbatical leave is included in the calculations. Given the different cycles of work in the teaching and research domains, and the likely differences of expectation for individual academics to be involved in teaching and research (see sections 4.4 and 6 below), it might make sense to try to achieve a balanced contribution to teaching on an annual basis, with the balance in research being achieved across a longer timescale.

**3. Professional Development and Engagement in Scholarship**

It is important for our WAMs to allocate time for colleagues to engage in professional development and scholarly activities. We will need to be clear that when we describe typical or possible ranges of time allocated to a set of duties (teaching, research/KE, management/administration) that the time allocation includes within it an expectation of engagement in professional development related to that set of duties. Colleagues carrying out teaching, research and management/administrative duties should expect to have between 5% and 10% of their deployable time devoted to professional development inclusive of time devoted to training and development in each of the three main work domains.

**4. General Principles**

***4.1 Coverage***

Schools should use a single, whole-School WAM, with a degree of subject-specific flexibility applying where factors unique to that subject pertain.

***4.2 Hours-based Calculation***

Schools should approach workload allocation in terms of a notional numbers of hours per year relative to the total available number of hours. This should be (for one FTE) 1,540 hours per year (a total of 1,820 hours, less 280 hours of annual leave (inclusive of public holidays)).

Calculations of hours should be adjusted proportionately for part-time staff, or as necessary to take account of legacy contractual terms and conditions.

***4.3 New Colleagues***

For WAM purposes a new colleague is defined as: a person in the first year of their first academic appointment at lecturer level. New colleagues should receive an additional 15% time allocation for engagement in professional training and development. For a full-time member of staff this would equate to 230 hours per year. This would be in addition to the time which should be allocated to all staff in support of their professional development and scholarly engagement in teaching, research and management/administration.

***4.4 Minimum Contributions***

We recognised that is was undesirable to create mechanisms within our WAMs by which academic colleagues could become separated from engagement in teaching and student support. In light of this, we agreed that all academic staff with a contractual expectation of involvement in teaching should have a minimum teaching-related allocation of 40% of their deployable time (inclusive of the time allocated to them for engagement in professional development related to teaching and student support). For a full-time member of staff this would equate to a minimum contribution to teaching and student support of 615 hours per year.

In much the same way, we agreed that each academic colleague should make some contribution to management and administration within their School; to the idea of good citizenship in the running of the School. Against other WAM values for management and administrative activities, it was agreed that the minimum level for ‘active citizenship’ might be set at 10% of deployable time, or 150 hours per year for a full-time member of staff (inclusive of the time allocated to them for engagement in training or development related to management and administration).

These minima would not apply to colleagues during periods of sabbatical leave, funded full-time research or other leave.

***4.5 Sabbatical Leave and Bought-out Time***

The allocations of time outlined in this paper would not apply during periods of sabbatical leave, or where someone was bought-out 100% from their contractual duties. However, in a situation where a colleague was partially bought-out of their contractual duties, the partial buy-out would effectively reduce the FTE of deployable time, and then the principles outlined in this paper would apply to the remaining FTE. For example, if a colleague has a 50% buy-out of their time, then 40% of the remaining 50% (20% of the total) would be allocated to teaching and student support, etc. The most frequent reason for a partial buy-out of a colleague’s time is to undertake an externally-funded research project, but the same approach would apply in internal situations, such as when the College Office compensates a School for the time an individual devotes to roles such as Dean of Students or Dean of Research. In such circumstances, the 40% of time devoted to the Dean role would reduce a colleague’s deployable time in the School to 60%, of which a minimum of 40% (24% of the total) would be devoted to teaching and student support, etc.

***4.6 Consultancy and Additional Salary Payments***

Where colleagues engage in consultancy activities or deliver CPD for other organisations as part of their contribution to the range of the School’s academic activities, and receive no additional payment, it is important for managers to take account of that contribution within the workload allocation. However, if colleagues engaging in such activities receive additional salary payments, or a share of the income generated from the activity, then the additional salary/income should be regarded as sufficient recognition of the contribution to the School, and the time spent on such activities should not be included within the workload allocation. All consultancy activity should be conducted in accordance with the University’s consultancy policy. Further information is available at <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/edinburgh-research-innovation/consultancy/overview>

**5. Teaching-related Responsibilities**

***5.1 Personal Tutors***

The time allocation within the WAM for Personal Tutor duties should be 2 hours per tutee per year, and 210 hours per year should be allocated to the School’s Senior Personal Tutor. If a Senior Personal Tutor is also a Personal Tutor, they should be allocated 2 hours per tutee per year in addition to the Senior Personal Tutor allowance of 210 hours per year. All of this time allocation should be regarded as teaching/student support time.

***5.2 Multipliers/Weightings for Teaching***

We agreed that the most practical means of determining overall teaching-related workloads was to use contact time as a basis of multiplication, and to apply consistent multipliers (or weightings) for a range of activities and circumstances. The following set of multipliers/weightings was accepted as reasonable, subject to local adjustments (with justifications noted for the amendments), to be applied to actual class contact time to arrive at a notional number of hours of teaching-related work:

Delivery of routine lecture/seminar x 2

First time creation of new content x 6

Tutorials x 1.5

Studio teaching/lab demonstration/supervision x 1

In addition to these weightings, School managers need to factor into their workload allocations time devoted to assessment. The following multipliers were agreed for assessment and supervision of students:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.2 Assessment and Supervision** | **Number**  | **Proportion marked** | **Multiplier** |
| 1.5 hour exam script |  |  | 0.5 |
| Two hour exam script |  |  | 0.75 |
| Three hour exam script |  |  | 1 |
| Summative Essay (up to 3000 words) |  |   | 0.5 |
| Summative Essay (3001-4500 words) |  |   | 0.75 |
| Summative Essay (4501 words or more) |  |   | 1 |
| Summative assignment other than an essay |  |   | 0.25 |
| Summative Hons/Masters Essay moderation |  |   | 0.25 |
| Honours/Masters Dissertations/MSc Research Methods Marked |  |   | 2 |
| Masters by Research Dissertation examination |  |   | 4 |
| Internal PhD Examination |  |   | 20 |
|  |  |  |  |

**\***LLC has additional common weightings for the different requirements of marking language assignments.

***5.4 Grade UE06 Tutors***

The teaching-related weightings outlined in section 5.2 should apply equally to all staff with a contractual expectation of involvement in teaching and student support from grade UE07 to grade UE10. We should, however, recognise in our WAMs that for colleagues employed as tutors on grade UE06 contracts, many of whom are PhD students just beginning their academic careers, it will be necessary to allocate more time to preparation and assessment. Accordingly, for UE06 tutors who have yet to complete their PhD the following weightings should apply to contact time and to assessment, again subject to local requirements (with justifications for the amendments clearly noted):

Tutorial x 2

 Assessment values above x 1.25

***5.4 PhD Supervision***

The following time allocations should be used for the teaching-related work involved in supervising PhD students:

First supervisor 45 hours per full-time student per year

2nd supervisor 15 hours per full-time student per year

Joint supervisors 30 hours each per full-time student per year

These rates would be halved for part-time students. These values for PhD supervision should apply for four years of full-time PhD study only. Similar allocations, or a variation of them (with justifications supplied) should be used for supervising Honours or Masters dissertations.

**6. Research/Knowledge Exchange-related Responsibilities**

The allocation by managers of time to be deployed on research and knowledge exchange activities should take account of the ability of individual colleagues to contribute to their School’s research activities. Against that background, a typical academic performing to a satisfactory standard across the full range of academic activities would normally have an allocation of 40% of their time for research (inclusive of the allocation of time for engagement in research-related professional development). But that would be an allocation made by their manager(s), and could not be regarded as a contractual entitlement.

For those colleagues less able to contribute to their School’s research activities a lower allocation than 40% of their deployable time would be more suitable, and for research-inactive colleagues an allocation of deployable time for scholarly engagement would be appropriate. Accordingly, the guiding principle for our College-wide WAM is that the time allocated to research and knowledge exchange activities should be considered on an individual basis, and could reasonably vary within a range from 5% to 45/50% of an individual academic’s deployable time (unless they are bought-out for all or part of their contracted time, when a larger overall allocation of research time would be possible).

**7. Management Responsibilities**

***7.1 Head of School Allocation***

The Head of School (HoS) allocation should be 80% of total time available, irrespective of size of School; that is, 1230 hours per year. The other management and administrative roles described below are calibrated against this HoS time allocation.

***7.2 Other Senior Academic Management Roles***

Other senior academic management roles within a School should have a time allocation of 50% of the HoS allocation, or 40% of the total workload (615 hours per year), with the remaining 60% of deployable time split between teaching/student support and research/knowledge exchange in accordance with the principles of this guidance. The term *Senior Academic Management Role* applies to the following roles: Head of Department/Subject Area, Undergraduate Director, Postgraduate Director, and Director of Research/Knowledge Exchange. These are academic management roles which are required in each School and where we have developed common job descriptions and person specifications. Accordingly, they will have similar representational and other responsibilities, irrespective of the size of the School. As such, it makes sense for them to have a standard workload allocation across the College.

***7.3 Other Standard Academic Management/Administrative Roles***

There are other standard academic management and administrative roles which are required in each School in the College, where we have common role descriptors and expectations, and which, accordingly, lend themselves to consistent workload allocations.

These include the School’s Quality Assurance Director, which should be regarded as 25% of the Head of School allocation, or 310 hours per year, given that the duties of the role would be more concentrated at certain times of the year. It was also agreed that for several other academic management/administrative roles 5% of the Head of School allocation (60 hours per year) would be an appropriate time allocation. These roles would include: School Academic Misconduct Officer, Co-ordinator of Adjustments/Teachability Officer, Equality and Diversity/Athena Swan Co-ordinator, Library/IT representative, School Academic Promotions representative. As a general point of principle we regarded it as preferable to appoint additional people to such administrative/management roles to take account of School size, rather than to increase the workload and time allocation of any individual member of staff. For example, if a large School has four times the workload that can be accommodated reasonably in a 60 hours per year allocation of time to its School Academic Misconduct Officer, then the HoS should appoint another three SAMOs, rather than increase the time allocation of the single SAMO to 240 hours per year.

Despite having a standard role descriptor and set of responsibilities, there is currently considerable variation among our Schools in the time allocated to the role of Programme Director. The Staffing Management Committee recognised that some variation in the time allocated to this role across subject areas and Schools was to be expected, if it reflected variation in scale and complexity of the work undertaken. Each School should identify an appropriate time allocation for Programme Directors, which is calibrated against the other academic management values outlined in this paper, and which takes account of the number of students enrolled on each programme. Similarly, there will be variation in the allocation of time to the role of Course Organiser across the Schools due to size and complexity.

***7.4 School-specific Management/Administrative Roles***

Our survey of existing School WAMs indicated that there was another set of academic management/administrative roles which were not standard across every School, but which individual Schools had created to help them manage their operations. For example, some Schools created Deputy Head of School roles, while others had not found it necessary to do so, and ECA has an exhibitions-related role that does not feature in any other School. It is not necessary for us to standardise the workload allocation of such roles across the College, given the very different School requirements which they are intended to meet. However, Schools should calibrate the time allocation for such roles against the range of other, more standardised academic management and administrative roles outlined in sections 7.2 and 7.3.

**8. Variations from Standard WAM Principles**

In our discussions we recognised that there would be occasions or circumstances particular to a School where it would be sensible to introduce variations to these standard WAM principles. For example, in some Schools with particularly onerous professional body accreditation requirements it may make sense to use a larger time allocation than outlined here for their Quality Assurance Director.

We should not feel unduly constrained by these general principles and guidelines, and should have the managerial confidence to vary our practice to take account of local conditions. However, if we are to move forward together as a group of managers with some sense of consistency across our College, it is necessary to accept the discipline of (i) keeping a record of the reasons for variations from the application of our general WAM principles, and (ii) reviewing the operation of our WAM, and the extent of variation from our norms, with some regularity, and no less frequently than once every three years.

**9. Typical Workload Allocation**

As the table below illustrates, these standard WAM principles should not necessarily result in much change from the typical split of academic responsibilities of 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% administration for the majority of our colleagues who are performing the various duties of their academic roles satisfactorily, and who are not bought-out for all or part of their contractual duties. However, these guidelines would allow managers to vary the actual deployment of time for individual colleagues around that average split, whilst still being able to demonstrate that such variation was fair and reasonable.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Typical Value** | **Possible Range** |
| Teaching/Student Support | 40% | 40% - 85% |
| Research/KE | 40% | 5% - 45/50% |
| Management/Administration | 20% | 10% – 80% |
|  | Inclusive of CPD time. | Inclusive of CPD time. |

**10. Implementation and Review of the College-wide WAM**

It is the intention of that all Schools will implement the College WAM with local variations as necessary but within the stipulated guidelines noted in this document. Regular review will ensure that this document is updated to continually to meet the needs of our Schools and academic colleagues.
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