UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

WORKLOAD PLANNING REVIEW GROUP

Workload Planning Review Group Final Report

1.   Introduction

1.1   Previous Workload Review Group (2019)

In 2019, a Workload Review Group was established. That Group, comprising 5 trade union members and 5 senior members of staff, was formed in response to two UCU papers on workload that had been considered by PNCC. Its remit included:

- gathering and collating relevant data in order to investigate whether and where the problem of overwork existed among employees;
- investigating any evidence of a link between overwork and employee health and wellbeing;
- devising strategies to monitor and minimise excessive workload.

When the current Workload Planning Review Group (WLPRG) was established, with more extensive representation from across the University including SMT, Senate, Heads of Schools, Directors, as well as the three Trade Unions (the terms of reference and membership of the Group and the timeline of its meetings are set out in Appendix 1), it was agreed with the Campus Trade Unions that the WLPRG would subsume the work of the previous Workload Review Group, including 10 recommendations arising from its report.

1.2   Purpose of the Workload Planning Review Group

The Workload Planning Review Group (WLPRG) was established in July 2020 to take forward two strands of work. The first strand was to consider what actions might be taken to address **workload pressures for all staff** – academic and professional services – and in so doing to take into account the work of the previous Workload Review Group. This strand of work had become all the more urgent following the start of the Covid-19 pandemic in the spring 2020, so that the initial immediate priority was to consider working arrangements and workload pressures arising from the pandemic.

The second strand of work was to undertake a full review of the University's approach to **workload allocation for academic staff**.

2   Workload Pressures for All Staff

In addition to the recommendations of the previous Workload Review Group, the WLPRG has considered the following information as part of its work:

2.1   Pulse Staff Survey June 2020

A pulse staff survey was undertaken in June 2020 (Remote Work in the Context of the Covid-19 Pandemic). The WLPRG considered the statistical outcomes from the survey alongside additional comments which were received from the Parents and Carers Network and from Mental Health Champions. In considering these results, the WLPRG recognised the extent of workload pressures experienced by staff during the pandemic and particularly by parents and carers as they juggled the demands of home-schooling whilst working from home.

A detailed breakdown of the Pulse Staff Survey outcomes is available online at:
https://www.abdn.ac.uk/staffnet/documents/Remote%20Work%20in%20the%20Context%20of%20the%20Covid-19%20Pandemic%20-%20Results%20of%20the%20Baseline%20Questionaire.pdf

2.2   Staff Survey November 2020

The Staff Survey was conducted in November 2020 by an external provider, Capita. Further information about the process underpinning the survey and the results are available online at:
https://www.abdn.ac.uk/staffnet/working-here/staff-survey-2020-12154.php

The results of the Staff Survey gave further impetus for the work of the group given that one of its key findings was the extent of high workloads for staff. The WLPRG established a subgroup (the membership of which is set out in Appendix 1), to interrogate the results of the staff survey pertaining to workload using the Investigate Tool. While noting that there is evidence in the survey of high workloads for all staff – academic and professional services – It sought to understand further the particular pressures facing certain groups as evidenced by the Staff Survey, notably academic staff, and professional services staff in higher grades in particular. Detailed intersectionality analysis was, however, limited by the nature of the summary data (as opposed to individual pseudo-identified data) by the external provider.

2.3   Actions in response to the Pulse Survey

In response to the Pulse Staff Survey in June 2020 SMT agreed that the following actions would be implemented to provide additional support to staff during an unprecedented and turbulent period:
1. Heads of School were asked to ensure that all ALMs considered the individual personal circumstances of each member of staff within their area of responsibility in relation to workload during the lockdown period;
2. 'Rest Days' were provided in addition to normal annual leave entitlement during the 2020 winter break and the 2021 spring break, with staff encouraged to take their annual leave wherever possible; and
3. The number of unused days that staff could carry over in their annual leave allowance was extended (raised to 10 days from 7 days).
4. A number of activities were paused or slowed in the second half of 2020 to try to reduce the overall volume of work.

2.4   Actions in response to the Staff Survey

Following publication of the results in December 2020/January 2021, the WLPRG, working closely with SMT, oversaw the development and launch of the Workload Reduction Toolkit which contained a range of measures for implementation at the University level, plus a menu of options that Schools and Directorates were empowered to take forward locally in a way that best suited their circumstances and workload challenges.

The WLPRG met again in February 2021 and again in November 2021 to review the effectiveness of the Workload Reduction Toolkit and to consider the findings of the Subgroup that looked in detail at the findings of its Investigate Tool Staff Survey Subgroup. An updated Workload Toolkit was launched in January 2022.

While seeking ways to reduce the workload pressure on existing staff, it is recognised by both the WLPRG and SMT that the most effective way to reduce workload pressures is to employ more staff. To that end over 50 academic posts were approved for recruitment in summer 2021 as a key outcome from the 2021 planning and budgeting round. A number of roles across Directorates were also approved at that time to address areas of particular pressure, and in January 2022 a further 36 professional services posts were approved.

2.5   Next Steps Regarding Workload Pressures for All Staff

The WLPRG recognises that there is further work to do to further understand the causes of workload pressures for particular categories of staff (notably academic staff and professional services staff in higher grades) and for staff in particular areas (be it Schools or Directorates) in the University. Further consideration is being given to deep dives and focus groups to understand the causes of these pressures and to try to understand whether there might be any variances in workload pressures

experienced at different points in the year, noting that the staff survey is conducted at a single timepoint in the year, making longitudinal analysis impossible.

It is also recognised that there is also further work to do to ensure that there are sufficient staff in the right areas to deal with the volume of work. In relation to academic staff, a student:staff ratio modeller had been developed and distributed to Heads of School, which enables modelling of staffing levels required to achieve a particular student:staff ratio. The WLPRG has also noted that composition of the student body is changing quickly from a predominance of UG students to a much higher proportion of postgraduate students and a higher proportion of international students. This creates a need for higher levels of student support. This is in addition to higher numbers of January PGT starts and higher numbers of on-line students who joined at various points throughout the year. It is important to move from a situation where increases in staffing levels follow on from growth to one in which staffing levels and student population growth go hand in hand in a carefully planned way. One of the University's objectives for 2022-23 included in the Aberdeen 2040 Operational Plan 2022-23 agreed by the University Court on 4 October 2022 is to develop a plan for growth and investment to 2030 to enhance planning for the anticipated growth and ensure resources, especially staffing resources across Schools and Directorates, are aligned in timely fashion with planned growth in student numbers.

The Group has also recognised the clear need for Schools to consider the distribution of teaching allocation across the academic year given that the rapid growth of PGT programmes is leading to a much higher prevalence of teaching and postgraduate dissertation project supervision across the summer months, outside the two half session term dates. The Senior Vice-Principal has therefore asked Heads of School to give this matter careful consideration in their workload allocation practices.

3   Workload Allocation for Academic Staff

While initially the focus of the Group was workload of all staff, a second strand of work was initiated in November 2020 to review the University's current approach to workload allocation for academic staff. The aim of this strand of work was to develop a framework that (i) underpins a fair and transparent approach to workload allocation for academic staff and (ii) simplifies and enhances data collection to ensure the effective monitoring of the impact of workload allocation. The WLPRG established a sub-group to support it in taking forward this aspect of its work: the Academic Workload Sub-Group. Details of the composition of this Group are listed in Appendix 1.

3.1   Workload Policy, Modelling Principles and Parameters Policy (2015)

The starting point for the Academic Workload Subgroup was the Workload Policy, Modelling Principles and Parameters Policy introduced at the University in 2015. The purpose of this policy was to support the efficient utilisation of staff resources in line with the University's strategic priorities.

The Policy introduced a notional figure of 1650 hours for ensuring a fair allocation of work (it was not intended to imply a contractual or defined working period). It also defined a baseline for the spread of activities across three major categories of activity, namely (i) research / scholarship, (ii) teaching, and (iii) administration as follows:

Career Track	Research / Scholarship (%)	Teaching (%)	Administration (%)
Teaching & Scholarship	15	85	
Research & Teaching	40	40	20
Research	85	15	

When the Policy was introduced, each School was tasked with creating individual workload models. Schools were also asked to:

- Give detailed consideration to the impact of the policy and parameters on what they were able to deliver (e.g. number of courses etc.); and
- Confirm that any existing workload model conformed to the core principles set out in the policy.

As a result of the development and implementation of workload models being devolved to School level, varying approaches were adopted across the University. Therefore, there was no consistent institutional approach towards allocating hours to specific tasks. For example, there was no fixed time allocation for Course Co-ordinators to undertake tasks specific to their role, or to support activities such as Athena Swan. In addition, Schools did not always recognise the same activities and/or allocate equivalent time to them within their workload processes.

3.2   Summary of School Workload Models

A summary of the workload models used in each School was developed by the Lead School Administration Manager in spring 2021. This identified the range of leadership and administrative roles that exist in each School, and started a process of identifying equivalences that will be vital in the development of a common workload allocation model across all Schools. It also confirmed the very different allocations that are currently being made for apparently the same activity in different Schools, for example PhD supervision, and the very different approaches being taken to the question of how teaching and administrative tasks in particular are accounted for in the workload models in operation. It became clear that a key task for the group would be to consider how a common approach to teaching allocation might be developed, and how the different understandings across the University with regard to what constituted routine administration associated especially with teaching could be resolved within a common framework. Moreover, it should be noted that it has not been possible to distil a complete set of information from the workload allocation models which were provided by Schools. For example, not all Schools recognise the same activities within their allocation processes and some Schools were and are still engaged in a transition process to change some elements of their existing model, with workload allocation models and their use clearly at different levels of maturity and transparency across Schools. Nevertheless, this vital background work has helped to inform the thinking of the Subgroup.

3.3.   Development of Principles of Workload Allocation

In view of the complexity of the starting point, with multiple workload models in operation across Schools with very little by way of common definitions of tasks, and with the University framework recognising administration as a separate category only for staff on a Teaching and Research contract, the Academic Workload Sub-Group agreed that it was necessary to thinking radically. It agreed to start by developing a comprehensive set of principles that should underpin the University's future approach to academic workload allocation, for consideration by the University.

The following were identified as key considerations in any future approach to workload models and allocation at the University:

- Clear links to the Aberdeen 2040 Strategy (Research, Education, and the four Themes: Inclusive, Interdisciplinary, International, Sustainable);
- A clear definition of the underlying principles and activities that the University of Aberdeen values, and how their delivery could be incentivised;
- Demonstrable links to supporting the University in achieving financial sustainability, and how activity that does so could be rewarded;
- The policy underpinning the model has to be transparent, evidence-based and 'truth grounded' (e.g. data evidenced by information from TRAC or other objective sources);
- Adoption of a common suite of institutional-level guiding principles underpinning workload allocation to ensure transparency, effectiveness and consistency across the University (recognising that some Schools may wish to adopt a bespoke approach to a limited number of elements of allocation that best suit local circumstances);
- A clear set of parameters around how workload allocation can be adapted to best suit specific situations, e.g. new starts / probationers, E&D roles such as Athena Swan leads, for individuals following periods of family leave (maternity / paternity/shared-parental leave) etc.; and
- Clear links and cross-references as appropriate to other institutional policies that impact on workload issues e.g. the policy on work-related stress, mental health and wellbeing policy and Staff and Student Wellbeing Strategy 2021-2025.

3.4   The Proposed Principles

The WLPRG has agreed to propose to the University that the new common workload model should:

1. Be transparent and equitable, promoting trust and accountability (including giving colleagues access to anonymised workloads allocated across their School or discipline);
2. Be fair (in the sense of ensuring that staff have adequate time to carry out their duties, thereby contributing to staff wellbeing);
3. Be expected to fit into the contractual working arrangements of colleagues, in terms of required hours of work;
4. Be simple and as understandable as possible (avoiding the temptation to try to capture all activity at a high level of detail);
5. Establish a consistent approach across all Schools, including the establishment of a baseline estimate for calculating hours of work;
6. Recognise that a diverse range of activities is undertaken in each School and so a 'one size fits all approach' may not be appropriate in all circumstances, so that the model needs to be customisable within the agreed overall parameters of the model;
7. Capture and incentivise all valued activity;
8. Be flexible and dynamic (therefore capable of capturing changes to workload allocation during the year e.g. in response to unforeseen circumstances);
9. Include a rigorous review of activity of each academic staff member at least annually;
10. Be capable of supporting Workforce Planning (helping to identify where there is insufficient staffing resource to deliver education and research in the School effectively);
11. Be capable of potentially replacing time allocation surveys for the purpose of TRAC;
12. In recognition of the importance of citizenship and a range of activities beyond education and research that support the delivery of the Aberdeen 2040 themes of Inclusive, Interdisciplinary, International and Sustainable, the model should include a small allocation to incentivise those activities;
13. Define Scholarship time separately from teaching for those on T&S contracts, with the separate Promotion Review Group defining a clearer promotion track for staff on T&S contracts;
14. Recognise the need for flexibility and additional discretionary allocation of time where staff are undertaking research involving very large research grant awards;
15. Introduce a discretionary category of workload allocation for Engagement, Innovation and Impact for staff making a significant contribution in this area;
16. Recognise the need for flexibility where colleagues undertake an additional role involving major leadership/managerial tasks, e.g. Head of School, which combined with other research and education would exceed a full workload allocation;
17. Resolve the fact that according to the current Workload Policy, Modelling Principles and Parameters Policy only staff on T&R contracts have a time allocation for administration, the use of which is ill defined.
18. Incorporate Work Life Balance and HR Policies (Maternity, Parental, Shared Parental, Paternity, Adoption Leave, etc). This involves the adoption of specific measures to recognise these kinds of life events in workload allocation. This also includes ensuring staff who are scheduled to work on University holidays, or weekends to cover University events, are given the appropriate time off in lieu;
19. Include an agreed standard approach to workload allocation for Academic staff on probation.

3.5   The Proposed Revised Model

It is proposed that the model set out in 3.1 above is modified. It is proposed that administration ceases to be a separate standalone category for T&R staff only, but is instead incorporated into teaching and research, since all teaching and research activity involves an element of administrative activity. The model aims to send a clear signal of the importance of teaching and research time as core activities under Aberdeen 2040, through the increased time allocated.

In view of the importance of recognising the workload involved in leading very large research grants, or engaging in major Engagement, Innovation and Impact activities, an additional allocation of time can be allocated for these activities on a time-limited basis, with a consequent reduction of allocation of time to other activities as best suits the circumstances of the individual and School.

The model also proposes the allocation of 10% dedicated time for all three academic tracks for citizenship and wider activities beyond research and education that contribute to the delivery of Aberdeen 2040. This will ensure that all academic staff are incentivised and accountable for a wider contribution to the life of their School and University to complement their core activities of Education and Research.

Career Track	Research (and associated administration)	Very large research grant or major Engagement, Innovation and Impact activities	Education (and associated administration)	Scholarship and/or Professional Practice (T&S Track only)	Citizenship and wider activities that support the delivery of Aberdeen 2040
Teaching & Scholarship		Individually determined	75%	15%	10%
Teaching & Research	45%	Individually determined	45%		10%
Research	90%*	Individually determined	*a small amount of teaching may be undertaken as part of career development		10%

In proposing this model, the Group noted the following key points:

- The model would need to be clearly explained to avoid misconceptions. 45% time for education and education related administration would not mean that staff would be allocated more teaching.
- The introduction of the revised workload model is not a means of addressing workload pressures, rather the aim is to ensure greater consistency, transparency, fairness, and the capturing of activities not currently accounted for in model – the 'hidden' important work for which staff feel there is little recognition.
- The relationship between the model and range of formal tasks in Schools will need to be worked out in detail, to distinguish between routine administration associated with research and education, and roles allocated by Heads of School and Line Managers.

3.6   What activities are covered by each category?

In proposing this revised model, the WLPRG recognised the need to set out clearly what kind of activities are covered by each of the categories (Research, Education, Scholarship and/or Professional Practice and Citizenship) in the model. The activities proposed within each category can be seen in Appendix 2. In addition, Management related tasks, which involve duties over and above the activities identified are included in Appendix 3. The WLPRG has ensured that there is a clear link between activities recognised as being valuable in the workload model, and activities that are recognised as valuable in the proposed new criteria for promotion.

This work is ongoing and it will need to be refined in consultation with our academic community, to reflect the different activities that staff in different disciplines may engage in so that all valued activity is captured.

3.7   Allocation for Education activities (teaching, assessment, pastoral support for students etc.).

There are several existing models in place across Schools with respect to how teaching is allocated to staff. These aim to provide guidance to Academic Line Managers (ALMs) and academic staff on the expected time to be dedicated to particular teaching related tasks. Each of the models seek to provide a fair, transparent and easy to understand breakdown of the teaching activities and the time commitment associated to them. This will ensure that staff are given appropriate time to complete teaching related tasks and will provide a tool to see where workload challenges are within particular areas.

Whatever model is adopted needs to be simple enough to read, understand and implement as well as striking a fair balance between tasks and efficiency.

Models considered by the Group include:

(i)   The separable-task model – this is what is used at the moment, albeit with 12 variations on the same theme. This model requires an allocation for each element included in the delivery of a course. The main benefit of this model is that staff are familiar with it. However, it is overly detailed and it would be difficult to come up with a combined model to suit all Schools.

(ii)   The light-touch model – the University sets universal principles but the detail on teaching allocation is left to the Schools. The main benefit is that each School can continue with its own allocation but there will be some University wide similarities for the allocation of teaching. There is also increased transparency for all. One downside of this approach is that there will be some cross School disparities of allocation for the same activities and this may cause concern.

(iii)   The basic flexible model – this aim of this model is to assign a set number of hours to the assessment of a course based on course credit, flexed for student numbers and a standard allocation for teaching delivery. This model sets guidance for the amount of time staff should give to assessing a course and can be flexed to suit individual circumstances. Issues with this model are that agreeing the flexing element could be time consuming, the flexing element could lead to claims of unfairness and it doesn't allow for courses which are light on marking.

The WLPRG favoured a version of option (iii), as it provides greater simplicity than option i), greater consistency than option ii) and relates staff workload both to activity and to credits delivered. It was noted by that it will be essential to have a system which allows flexibility within the allocation of education activities (including teaching) to ensure it can be reactive to challenges which can arise.

It is recommended that the Implementation Group models the implementation of option iii) with a view to piloting it in one or two Schools / disciplines, prior to any wider rollout across the University.

3.8   Next Steps regarding Workload Allocation for Academic Staff

Should the recommendations in this report be approved, the next step will be to establish an Implementation Group to consider the practical implementation of the recommendations. This will include:

- Overseeing the modelling, trial and implementation of the new workload planning framework that underpins a fair and transparent approach to workload allocation across the University.
- Ensuring a joined-up approach with other University Groups that are taking forward activities which impact on the implementation of workload planning.
- Investigating and reviewing digital solutions to aid, enhance and streamline the workload planning process
- Monitoring and reviewing the framework to embed a culture of continuous enhancement within the institutional approach to workload planning.

4   A Joined-Up Approach: Links with Other Groups

It is recognised that other committees/working groups and professional teams within the University are taking forward activities which will impact upon the implementation of the recommendations in this report. In particular, the following ongoing activities are of direct relevance:

4.1   Mental Health & Wellbeing Working Group
The Heads of Health, Safety and Wellbeing and Student Experience lead the Mental Health and Wellbeing Working Group, which is taking forward the annual action plan for the wellbeing strategy. This includes a wide variety of tasks including developing training/guidance to help managers recognise the signs of overworking and providing various forms of support.

4.2   Digital Strategy Committee
The Digital Strategy Committee is developing a priority list to support digital improvements across the University.

4.3   School Administration Managers (SAMs)
The SAMs have been examining business processes, including a review of whether there is any duplication of work/effort in tasks being undertaken across the Schools and Directorates that could be reduced, or where improvements to our systems could reduce workloads. In addition, following the

School Administration Review the SAMs have been continually reviewing the capacity of administration teams to understand where more support could be provided to Academic colleagues to alleviate some administrative burdens. Following the School Administration Review, they have also been considering the size and shape of their School administration teams and a number of additional posts in School administration have been approved over the last year.

4.4 Research Culture Task & Finish Working Group

The Dean for Interdisciplinary Research and Research Impact led the Research Culture Task & Finish Working Group, which was established in 2020 by the Research Policy Committee as part of the University's commitment to support the institutional research culture. The Group has (i) identified the existing work that has already been undertaken by the University to enhance our research culture, (ii) identified where gaps exist, and (iii) has proposed a range of measures to address these issues and is promoting them to both internal and external audiences. Further information about the work of the Group is available online at:

https://www.abdn.ac.uk/research/support/activities-to-date-657.php

4.5 Promotion Review Group

The remit of the Promotion Review Group is to evaluate current arrangements pertaining to the annual promotion procedures within the University and to formulate recommendations for improvements. In particular, the Group is clarifying the three existing career tracks for Academic staff (Research, Teaching & Research, Teaching & Scholarship) and ensure that activities such as citizenship and commercialisation are properly recognised and rewarded There is a clear alignment between the work of the WLPRG and the Promotions Review Group.

4.6 Recognition Working Group

The remit of the Recognition Working Group will include consideration of our existing Contributions Procedure, honoraria payments and the development of additional recognition mechanisms for staff. This will include consideration of how citizenship activities undertaken by Professional Services staff, often on a voluntary basis, can be recognised and/or rewarded appropriately.

4.7 Dignity at Work & Study Group

The Dignity at Work & Study Group is tasked with creating policies, procedures and guidance that will form a Toolkit for staff and students. The Group's considerations have included ensuring respect for staff at all levels in the University and working together as a community rather than individuals. This discussion has included development of a positive culture where everyone considers the challenges facing other staff and demonstrate kindness to each other, including with respect to workload issues. The Group will be finalising policy, procedure and guidance material in the coming months, for launch late in 2022/early 2023.

4.8 Technician Review

The coming on stream of the Science Teaching Hub has necessitated a reorganisation of technician teams across several Schools which is ongoing, and beyond that there is further work to do to ensure that technical teams are of the right size and shape to support the ambitions of the University with regard to research as well as teaching. This review will contribute to our activity pertaining to the Technician Commitment.

4.9 Pastoral Support and Monitoring, Absence and Engagement Reviews

These reviews led by the Dean for Student Support is proposing recommendations which, if accepted, may lead to changes that will impact on the activities of academic staff pertaining to Education and associated administration.

5 Further Information

Further information is available from Karl Leydecker, Senior Vice-Principal and Convener of the Workload Planning Review Group (email: karl.leydecker@abdn.ac.uk).

September 2022

WORKLOAD PLANNING REVIEW GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

Overall Purpose

Shorter term – to consider current working arrangements and demands arising as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and their impact on workload. Thereafter to inform development of further guidance and suitable interventions as appropriate.

Longer term - To undertake a review of the workload planning process across the University and develop a framework that (i) underpins a fair and transparent approach to workload allocation and (ii) simplifies and enhances data collection to ensure the effective monitoring of the impact of workload allocation e.g. staff health and wellbeing/the preparation of institutional statistics/returns (TRAC/ HESA). The review will also seek to identify opportunities where digital/IT systems could be used to enhance the effectiveness of workload planning.

Specifically, the Review will:

Shorter term

- Consider current working arrangements and demands arising as a result of Covid-19 to inform guidance material and interventions as appropriate:
  o Consider feedback received in the Staff Survey regarding workload, identifying key trends;
  o Consider any workload issues arising from the recommendations of the planning groups on campus return, learning and teaching and research;
  o Develop guidance material and identify suitable interventions to address workload issues in an appropriate manner.

Longer term
- Consider existing workload allocation practices with particular focus on identifying:
  o common requirements, functions and processes that will form the basis of the workload planning framework;
  o areas of strength within existing models which could be enhanced further;
  o challenges within existing models which could be addressed through an enhanced workload planning framework;
  o aspects of workload planning where a coherent and unified cross-University model would be beneficial;
  o aspects of workload planning where flexibility within a common framework would be beneficial.

- Develop a workload planning framework that underpins a fair and transparent approach to workload allocation across the University.

- Oversee the implementation, monitoring and review of the framework to embed a culture of continuous enhancement within the institutional approach to workload planning.

Methodology

A short-life Workload Planning Review Group will be established to take forward the review with a focus on the short-term activities outlined above in the first instance. Thereafter, with a timescale to be determined the Group will focus on the longer term aims of the Review. Representatives from Schools/Professional Services Directorates will play a key part in the review and in communicating its findings to relevant stakeholders within their constituencies.

Membership of Workload Review Planning Group (WLRPG)

Senior Vice-Principal (Chair)	Karl Leydecker
Vice-Principal Research	Marion Campbell
Vice-Principal Education and	Ruth Taylor
UCU representative	Adam Price
(Convener of Workload Review Group)	
UCU representative	Syrithe Pugh
Unison representation	Laura Benvie
Unite representative	Brian Paterson
Elected Senate representatives:	Neil Vargesson
	Laura McCann
Heads of School Representatives:	Amanda Lee (Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition)
	Dave Muirhead, (Geosciences)
	Chris Collins (Language, Literature, Music and Visual Culture)
Lead School Administration Manager	Sarah Duncan
Director of Planning	Hulda Sveinsdottir
Director of People	Debbie Dyker
University Secretary and Chief Operating Officer (from January 2021)	Tracey Slaven
Director of Digital & Information Services	Brian Henderson
Head of Human Resources	Tracey White
Head of Health, Safety & Resilience	Garry Fisher
Clerk	Lindsey Hamilton / Sam Waldram

Meeting Dates:

09 July 2020	19 January 2021	26 April 2022
12 August 2020	24 February 2021	26 May 2022
21 September 2020	30 November 2021	20 June 2022
29 October 2020		29 September 2022

Composition of Academic Subgroup

Karl Leydecker (Chair)
Marion Campbell
Chris Collins
Sarah Duncan
Amanda Lee
Laura McCann
David Muirhead
Adam Price
Syrithe Pugh
Hulda Sveinsdottir
Ruth Taylor
Neil Vargesson
Lindsey Hamilton (Clerk)

Meeting Dates:

18 November 2020	24 March 2021	02 March 2022
	23 September 2021	
	19 October 2021	

Composition of Investigate Tool (Staff Survey) Subgroup

Hulda Sveinsdottir	(Chair)
Adam Price	
Amanda Lee	
Sam Waldram	(HR Partner, Organisational Development)
Chris Souter	(Lead Planning Analyst)
Lindsey Hamilton	(Clerk)

Meeting Dates

14 April 2021
04 May 2021
05 October 2021

Suggested Activities for each Category of the Workload Model*

Research (and associated administration)

- Outputs: writing and publishing world leading or international excellent research outputs appropriate to the discipline (e.g. peer reviewed journal articles, monographs, book chapters but also exhibitions, artefacts, patents, software, government reports etc.)
- Organising conferences, and presenting at conferences
- Applying for grant funding
- Carrying out research in preparation for the production of outputs
- Internal/external peer review of papers/grants
- External editorial Board/grant panel membership
- Administration of grant(s)
- Developing impact, including REF Impact Case Studies, liaison with industry, funding bodies and other external stakeholders of research
- Knowledge exchange activities, including delivery of KTPs, Innovation Vouchers, etc.
- Commercialisation including early stage start-up/spin-out activities.
- Advisory/consultancy work (e.g. advising NHS, government, industry)
- Leadership/involvement in REF/School & University research groups
- Building international research partnerships
- Collaborative/Group/Interdisciplinary research activities
- Professional/learned society activities
- Professional development activities to support research
- PhD supervision and advising (lab-based disciplines - in non-lab based disciplines this will typically be included under teaching)
- Internal/external PhD examining
- Patient & Public Involvement (PPI) engagement with research/outreach activities

Education (and associated administration)

- Course and programme design
- Preparation of teaching and assessment approaches and materials
- Face to face, blended, online delivery of teaching (including lectures, seminars, tutorials, labs, field work etc)
- Course coordination
- Programme coordination
- Student:staff liaison committee meetings
- Examination meetings
- Setting and marking of assessments/projects, including feedback on assessment
- Gaining, responding to and monitoring student feedback
- Application for new course/programme approval or modification
- Supporting new staff in relation to teaching delivery
- PSRB / accreditation requirements
- Liaison with employers and other external stakeholders of education
- PhD advisor
- PhD supervision (typically in non lab-based disciplines)
- UG/PGT supervision

- Personal tutoring
- Professional development activities (e.g. CAD training, HEA recognition)
- Internal examiner roles
- External examiner roles
- External visiting teaching activities

Scholarship and/or Professional Practice

- Engaging in pedagogic and/or disciplinary research/scholarship leading to outputs directly relevant to own education activities
- Contributing to teaching/learning working groups
- Attending/presenting at learning and (national/international) teaching network events
- Attending/presenting at university pedagogic groups
- Leadership of 'education' at the University (e.g. integration of accreditation standards into teaching) or external (engaging with Professional societies to set standards)
- Submitting case studies for Principal's excellence award/ELIR report
- Applying for pedagogic grants (including LTEP, hotstart studentships, Elphinstone PhDs)
- Applying for AdvanceHE recognition
- Offering pedagogic projects to UG/PGT/PGR
- Involvement in leadership of quality enhancement projects and activities (e.g. QAA Enhancement Theme)
- Organising and presenting at conferences
- Membership/leadership of national/international education-related groups and committees
- Public engagement/knowledge exchange/outreach activities

Citizenship and wider activities linked to Aberdeen 2040

- Activities that further A2040 commitments across the four Themes of Inclusive, Interdisciplinary, International, Sustainable.
- Activities that contribute to promoting positive collegial behaviour across a department or School; as well as contributing to the effective running of the administration and governance of the University.
- Informal and formal mentoring and/or coaching colleagues and students and supporting the career development of others.
- Activities that enhance the student or staff experience.
- Activities that support colleague and student wellbeing, including mediation.
- Undertaking training and personal development.
- Actively contributing to School and University committees (including Court), fora, policy development, Task & Finish groups.
- Actively supporting initiatives which enhance and support student, staff, visitor and alumni experiences of the University's campuses;
- Activities that support student recruitment, widening access, open days and graduations.
- Bringing people together/facilitating sessions/organising or chairing an event or conference (that is not directly linked to research or scholarship), or the building of sustainable partnerships which support the University.

- Supporting EDI activities, including Athena Swan, Race Equality Charter, Equality Network groups, acting as a visible champion and progressing actions which support positive outcomes for specific groups.
- Voluntary or civic engagement activities e.g. initiatives which enrich society including contributing to the cultural, social and economic life of the city/region and enhance the reputation of the University at the local, regional, national or international level.
- Academic community, voluntary and civic engagement activities at a national level such as attendance at national fora to present on how to undertake research, to champion EDI, sustainability, international, or interdisciplinary activities.
- Undertaking trade union representative activities that contribute to effective partnership working between the University and campus trade unions.

* Workload model relates to academic time, activities will be pro rata for clinical academics

Leadership/Management/Administrative roles for academics
(this list is not exhaustive, Schools may have additional roles depending on their activity)
Head of School Deputy Head of School Head of Institute Deputy Head of Institute Head of Discipline, Subject, Department Academic Line Manager Director of Education Discipline/Institute education lead Director of online programmes Exams officer Field trip co-ordinator Disabilities officer Work placement co-ordinator Employability officer Graduate School Co-ordinator/PGR Director Erasmus/study abroad co-ordinator Director of UG studies Director of PGT studies Disciplinary/appeals/complaints co-ordinator Director of Research Discipline/Institute research lead Research ethics officer Research seminar co-ordinator Impact co-ordinator Student journal adviser Director of School research centre Research lab co-ordinator Internationalisation co-ordinator/Director of Internationalisation Student progress convenor Website co-ordinator Senior Personal Tutor EDI Lead Athena Swan lead / race equality champion Health and wellbeing/mental health lead Health and Safety lead/officer Environmental sustainability champion Convenor/chair of school committee (where not part of office bearing role) Library rep eLearning champion Schools liaison/outreach co-ordinator Retention co-ordinator Admissions selector Copyright officer Scholarships co-ordinator Director of External Engagement