Workload Planning Review Group Meeting

Meeting Minutes – Monday 20th June 2022

Teams Meeting

Attendees:
Karl Leydecker, Chris Collins, Sarah Duncan, Garry Fisher, Brian Henderson, Brian Paterson, Adam Price, Syrithe Pugh, Tracey Slaven, Hulda Sveinsdottir, Ruth Taylor, Sam Waldram (Clerk)

Apologies:
Laura Benvie, Marion Campbell, Debbie Dyker, Amanda Lee, Laura McCann, David Muirhead, Neil Vargesson,
_____

1. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING & MATTERS ARISING**

1.1 The contents of the minutes were agreed.

2. **MATTERS ARISING**

2.1 It was confirmed that the issue regarding sabbaticals was ongoing as was the subject of the annual cycle of workload.

2.2 It was agreed that further consultation in relation to Scholarship activities should be done in parallel with the Promotions group and moving forward this should come under the remit of that group rather than the Workload group.

2.3 RT confirmed that she had spoken to Timetabling and asked that they do not schedule classes or exams when the University is closed. This will continue to be part of the wider review of the curriculum.

3. **UPDATE ON GENERAL WORKLOAD ISSUES**

3.1 There was no further update on general workload issues as the current focus was on finalising the academic workload report.

4 **REVIEW OF CAREER TRACK ACTIVITIES**

4.1 There was discussion around how the Management Tasks fitted into the Career Track lists and whether the tasks would all be allocated under one of the four headings. It was clarified that these tasks were beyond what would be included in the Research/Teaching/Scholarship/Citizenship roles. They were tasks that could be assigned by Schools over and above day to day duties. There would be differences in the tariff given to the tasks and this may depend on issues such as the size of the School for example. It was thought that these tasks would generally be taken out of the Teaching allocation. There needed to be a list of the tasks, so that in the future when a digital system was implemented, there would be a drop-down menu for Schools to choose from.

4.2 The language in respect of REF outputs within the lists was discussed and it was agreed to change the wording whilst recognising that it would still reflect the need for strong research. It was agreed that helping publish postgraduate research would be classed as student support not as publishing research in itself and therefore the REF references were not applicable in those instances. **Action: KL**

4.3 It was confirmed that the heading for Scholarship would not change to Scholarship and related administration.

4.4 In respect of REF outputs, it was confirmed that there was no intention to look backward or punish people because their research was not at REF standard. However, it was important for the University, for a number of reasons, to do better in the next REF. To do this the University needed to create the right conditions for research and discussions needed to be held to see how to drive better quality research with the institution.

4.5 There was concern that what had been compiled and agreed by the Group needed to be modelled prior to being released for wider consultation, especially if the admin duties that had been identified were coming out of the teaching allocation. Following discussion the next stages in the process were confirmed as:
   - Draft report to be updated with changes to the final report stage, which would include all the appendices
   - Wider circulation/consultation of final report to SMT, Senate, Heads of School etc.
   - Set up of a new 'Implementation Group' to look at modelling the proposals that had been put forward to evaluate how it worked in practice, identify any unintended consequences, and to generally check if staff were okay with it.   **Action: KL**

4.6 There were some concerns that the model being put forward had not provided any additional time for staff and it may raise expectations which can't then be fulfilled. It was felt that modelling it before the final report was released might help identify any issues in advance. KL acknowledged this concern but felt that the Group needed to move forward to finalise the report and hand over to a technical group to model the proposals.

4.7 It was agreed that everyone was broadly happy with the list under the citizenship category, which would be amended if the same list from the Promotions group was updated following discussion. It was important to ensure the lists were consistent.   **Action: SW**

4.8 There was additional discussion following the last meeting in respect of where 'learned society roles' should sit. It was confirmed, following the previous discussions, that it would sit under Research as this was an accepted part of those roles.

4.9 The question was raised about what would happen if someone never performed any Citizenship roles – would they be forced to do so? It was agreed that these activities should be encouraged during the Annual Review process, however it was felt that most people would already be undertaking some of those roles.

5 **UPDATE IN RESPECT OF MANAGEMENT RELATED TASKS IN SCHOOLS**

5.1 This item was fully discussed under Item 4.

6 **REVIEW OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES – ACADEMIC WORKLOAD ALLOCATION**

6.1 KL confirmed that within the Promotions categories there was an additional pillar under the heading Engagement, Innovation & Impact. This would help with the development of both staff and the institution in respect of impact, industry engagement etc.. There was no fixed time allocation currently for this activity in the draft workload model proposals and a decision needed to be made regarding the mechanism for doing this, and for allocating additional time for those with very large or multiple research grants:
   - Should discretionary allocation be allowed?
   - Should discretionary allocation be allowed in respect of those with very large research projects which were over the 45% allocation for T&R staff, i.e. should they be allowed more than 45%?

6.2 There was a general consensus that discretionary allocation in respect of both very large/multiple large grants, and for Engagement, Innovation & Impact activity should be allowed. However, the mechanism for the second option would have to be explored further.

6.3 It was confirmed that a list of activities under Engagement, Innovation & Impact would be developed for the workload model report in due course based on work being done in the Promotions Review Group.

Action: PE (Pete Edwards)

7   METHODOLOGY FOR ALLOCATION OF TEACHING

7.1 There was discussion about the various models and how some of them were too granular in the information that was needed. The flex option was generally preferred but it was agreed by all that the paper would need to be updated.

7.2 It was agreed that, from a practical point of view, it would be better to look at this element of the model while the other elements were being piloted, to see which approach worked best. The finalised report could set out the pros and cons in the meantime and give a higher-level overview of the proposed models.

7.3 The group were asked to review the Allocation of Teaching paper and provide any feedback to KL and SW within a two-week timeframe to enable the report and appendices to be finalised.   **Action: All**

7.4 KL confirmed that the work being done on the workload model in general was important from a cultural perspective as it would be signalling to the University what was important and what people should be spending their time on.

8   WIDER CONSULTATION OF ACADEMIC WORKLOAD ALLOCATION MODEL

8.1 This was discussed under Item 6.

9   ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9.1 No other business was discussed.

10   DATE OF NEXT MEETING

10.1   The next meeting will be after the summer break with the date still to be agreed.   **Action: SW**

MEETING CLOSED.

11 ACTIONS

Reference	Description	Action by	Action Date
02Mar22 Section 3.3	Develop roadmap of the next steps for further analysis of the Staff Survey data	K Leydecker	Ongoing
02Mar22 Section 4.5	Teaching Model Allocation within section 5.3 to be on next agenda.	S Waldram	Ongoing
26Apr22 Section 6.2	Review of Sabbatical Leave process and application in Schools	M Campbell	Ongoing
26Apr22 Section 7.2	Discuss how to address the issue of identifying workload on an annual cycle.	K Leydecker T Slaven	Ongoing

26Apr22 Section 8.3	Further discussion on feedback regarding personal tutoring and where this element should sit in the Workload Model.	All	Include on agenda for future meeting.
26Apr22 Section 8.6	Wider consultation with Scholarship staff on duties which are undertaken.	R Taylor	To sit with the Promotions Group
26May22 Section 6.1	Transparency element of report to be clarified in respect of anonymity for other staff's allocations	K Leydecker	Complete
26May22 Section 6.3	Updating of the Principles within the model to accurately reflect the ability to flex for undertaking strategic projects	K Leydecker	Ongoing
26May22 Section 6.6	Make the Regrading Group aware of the elements contained in the Citizenship category.	B Paterson	Complete
26May22 Section 6.7	Finalise the Citizenship category list	K Leydecker S Waldram	Complete
26May22 Section 8.1	Review the Research element of the outstanding issues list with P Edwards	K Leydecker	Complete
26May22 Section 8.3	Review the Teaching element of the outstanding issues list with a view to completion	R Taylor	Complete
26May22 Section 8.4	Delete last item in the 'Other' element of the outstanding issues list	S Waldram	Complete
26May22 Section 8.5	Review of University being open on a public holiday	R Taylor	Complete
26May22 Section 10.1	Finalised outstanding documents to be presented to Senate and for wider consultation	All K Leydecker	Ongoing
20Jun22 Section 4.2	Change REF language in first point under Research in Activities list	K Leydecker	
20Jun22 Section 4.5	Finalise next stages of the consultation process	K Leydecker	
20Jun22 Section 4.7	Ensure Citizenship Activity list is consistent with the Promotions one	S Waldram	Ongoing
20Jun22 Section 6.3	More clarity to be provided in respect of the Promotions list - Engagement, Innovation & Impact.	P Edwards	
20Jun22 Section 7.3	Review the Methodology for Allocation of Teaching paper and provide feedback to KL and SW.	All	**Feedback to be received by 4/7/22**
20Jun22 Section 10.1	Next meeting to be arranged for after the summer break.	S Waldram	