



<b>Code</b>	QA090
<b>Title</b>	Workload Allocation Models
<b>Policy Owner</b>	Deputy President and Registrar
<b>Date</b>	19 June 2023
<b>Approved By</b>	Academic Council

### 1.0 Purpose

The purpose of an academic Workload Allocation Model is to ensure that there is a fair, reasonable and equitable allocation of work.

An academic Workload Allocation Model must also ensure the following:

- i. The allocation of work is informed by and supports achievement of individual, school, college and institutional priorities.
- ii. There is an appropriate balance of activities assigned to staff, which supports staff health and wellbeing.
- iii. There is a transparent process of allocation with opportunity for staff to contribute to decisions in relation to workload allocation and clear communication to staff of the outcome.
- iv. Workload allocation informs workforce planning and ensures that quality research, scholarship, teaching and citizenship is delivered across the University.

### 2. Scope

The guidelines apply to all academic staff. There should be a single model at an appropriate level of management, usually at the level of School. The Head of School (HoS) is responsible for developing workload allocation aligned with this guidance and the priorities of the School. The HoS may delegate responsibility for workload allocation to nominee(s), subject to HoS oversight.

### 3. Principles

The following principles underpin the approach to workload allocation across the University, creating consistency, while at the same time allowing flexibility to reflect differences specific to Schools.

- i. The approach to workload allocation, including decisions and related discussions, is underpinned by our core values of **respect, excellence, openness** and **sustainability**.
- ii. Workload allocation aims to promote equality of opportunity for all academic staff through collaborative working between colleagues in a collegial environment.
- iii. Workload will be fairly and transparently allocated and distributed among academic staff.
- iv. There will be a transparent process for discussing with and informing staff of individually allocated work.

- v. There will be no significant or protracted over or under allocation of work over a 3 to 5 year cycle relative to peers. Appropriate adjustment may be required due to personal circumstances, disclosed to and documented by HoS and Human Resources (HR). Workload allocation will be compatible with reasonable expectations of work-life balance and Equality, Diversity & Inclusion (EDI) principles, taking into account personal circumstances which may have an impact on workload, such as:
- protected leave such as maternity leave, adoptive leave, parental leave, compassionate leave, force majeure leave, and carer's leave, or other family leave;
  - part-time working;
  - reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities;
  - periods of leave associated with ill-health or disability;
  - periods of absence arising from gender reassignment;
  - career breaks;
  - sabbatical leave.
- Meetings between the employee and the HoS or nominee will provide an opportunity to discuss any flexibility and/or considerations that may be required to achieve a fair allocation of work and facilitate a healthy working environment.
- vi. Comparable allowances will be provided for similar research & scholarship, teaching & learning and contribution & citizenship tasks across the University, while recognising the varying demands of specific roles across Colleges and within Schools.
- vii. Workload allocation will enable the balance of an individual's activity in teaching & learning, research & scholarship and contribution & citizenship to be visualised and to be appropriately distributed over a period of time.
- viii. All academic staff must contribute significantly to teaching & learning, research & scholarship, and other duties, thus fulfilling the basic elements of collegiality as academics in the University.
- ix. A practical and realistic approach to the process of workload allocation will be taken, which acknowledges the difficulties of accounting for staff time.
- x. The process should not require disproportionate effort to maintain.
- xi. The approach should evolve each year to reflect any changes in effort required for duties, as well as identifying and eliminating any inefficiencies in the way that we work.
- xii. Workload allocation will be agile and flexible, enabling the University to respond to internal and external factors which may impact workloads in any given semester or academic year.
- xiii. Workload allocation will be appropriate to the role and take account of School requirements and individual priorities and development goals.

#### **4. Activities**

Workload allocation models should capture the following key areas of academic activities as defined in the Academic Profiles: Research & Scholarship; Teaching & Learning; Contribution & Citizenship. Further detail on the activities in each of these areas is available in the [Academic Promotions](#) resources section.

#### **5. Time Allocation**

##### **i. Institutional**

There is a range of roles that are comparable across the institution. A recommended institutional proportion of time allocation range for individuals in these roles is included

at Appendix 1.

**ii. Colleges**

College Executive Boards should agree time allocation for activities that are common across the College as required. Examples include time for teaching preparation and delivery, assessment activities, curriculum development etc., taking into account student numbers. Further specific adjustments may be made by the School Executive Board, subject to College approval.

**6. Impact of Emergencies or Extraordinary Circumstances**

Academic Workload Allocation will take into account shifts in work patterns in response to emergencies or extraordinary circumstances (such as the COVID-19 pandemic) and will require managers to consider the impact of such events, particularly on those with caring responsibilities, as well as acknowledging any special efforts that staff make to address challenges that arise therefrom.

**7. Operational Guidelines (effective September 2023)**

- i. Managing workload allocations provides a means of capturing data to provide information which will aid decision making on workforce planning. This includes understanding current staffing needs, determining future staffing needs, identifying any existing staffing gaps or gaps between the present and future needs, identifying inefficiencies and improving productivity and quality. In order to support these aims, it is recommended that workload allocation models are developed to aid planning for the next Academic Year and beyond.
- ii. The University recognises that academic staff do not have defined working hours and that this arrangement provides flexibility, which benefits individual members of staff, students and the University as a whole.
- iii. For the purposes of workload allocation a 'notional hour'-based model should be used with a figure of 1635 hours (221 working days x 7.4 hours per day) for research & scholarship, teaching & learning and contribution & citizenship, representing the total hours for a full-time member of staff, as the baseline. The total number of hours will be adjusted for those on part-time contracts or whose University contracted commitment is less than full-time. Workload allocations should factor in sufficient flexible hours so as to permit unplanned duties to be accommodated.
- iv. A working general assumption of proportional time allocation is as follows:

<b>Academic Type</b>	<b>Research &amp; Scholarship</b>	<b>Teaching &amp; Learning</b>	<b>Contribution &amp; Citizenship</b>
A	20%	60%	20%
B	40%	40%	20%

These general allocations should be tailored to the needs of the School and the individual.

- v. It is recommended that appointments have a reduced teaching and contribution load in year one and year two of their employment. An expected teaching and contribution load should normally be
  - Type A: in year one 60 to 70% of the Type A School norm and in year two 80 to 90%

- of the Type A School norm.
- Type B: in year one 50 to 60% of the Type B School norm and in year two 75 to 85% of the Type B School norm.
- vi. Workload allocation should be an annual exercise with planning commencing early spring each year and finalising allocations by early summer. Staff should be encouraged to discuss their workload preferences at the start of the planning cycle and workload allocation should be aligned to priorities and development goals. Time should be allocated for professional development appropriate to the role.
- vii. Grant applications which include a dedicated budget line for academic staff costs that can be used for teaching cover must be agreed in advance with the HoS or nominee. The HoS or nominee will consider the request in line with the individual, research project, School needs/priorities and the viability of recruiting cover. For other grants which require substantial Principal/Co-Investigator time, staff may wish to request some teaching relief, particularly when large amounts of PI/CI time extend above the 40% time typically allocated for research. A College-wide agreed approach, balancing the maximisation of income contribution against teaching needs should be applied, and the HoS or nominee should ensure that teaching relief accurately reflects time spent on the grant.
- viii. When allocating time to teaching, the following should be taken into account: class size, level, methods of teaching (e.g., lecture, practical, tutorial, laboratory, project supervision, on-line), and assessment methods including marking, moderation and feedback. Consideration should also be given to whether the module is new, the individual is teaching in a subject area they have not previously delivered\*, there are significant changes to the delivery approaches or content of the module, and requirements imposed by accrediting and professional bodies if applicable.
- \* Where appointments have reduced teaching load there should be no consideration given, for allocation of time, to the individual teaching in a subject area they have not previously delivered.
- ix. Responsibilities and tasks should be given a notional allocation of hours to complete on an annual basis, recognising that many activities may be concentrated in a small period of time throughout the year.
- x. Key leadership roles should be rotated and when a member of staff is responsible for a number of roles they should receive the appropriate recognition, see Appendix 2.
- xi. A member of staff who considers their workload to be unreasonable or considers that they are being treated unfairly with regard to their workload allocation, should raise concerns with their HoS or nominee. If the concerns are not addressed through discussions with the HoS nominee, the issue will be escalated to the HoS. If the concerns are not addressed through discussions with the HoS, the issue will be escalated to the College Dean.
- xii. A Head of School or nominee may build in some flexibility to account for leave of absence or discontinuation of contract within the workload allocation model.

## 8. Review

It is recommended that workload allocation practices are reviewed annually by Schools and Colleges and that the approach to review is agreed and communicated to staff.

An annual audit of a sample of Schools will be conducted by HR, reporting to the University Management Team (UMT), to ensure adherence to the institutional principles and that fairness and consistency is maintained.

## Appendix 1

### **Institutional Roles**

The allocation provided below is a range, recognising that the actual time taken to carry out the role will depend on a number of variables, such as size of the College/School/Research Institute or Centre, existing School leadership structure, whether there is more than one postholder, the variation in workload from year-to-year etc.

<b>Role</b>	<b>Workload proportional time allocation range</b>
Head of School	70 – 80%
College Executive Dean	80 – 90%
Research Institute Director	60 – 80%
SFI Research Centre Director	60 – 80%
School Athena SWAN lead	5 – 20 %
College vice-Deans	20 – 60 %

## Appendix 2

### Sample Key Leadership & Management roles and activities

The list below is not exhaustive. Where colleagues undertake a leadership role or activity as a constituent part of allocation to an institutional role, no further allocation should be provided for within the model. Colleagues may carry out a number of roles, some of which due to their scope may not have a dedicated allocation within the model. It is therefore important that the cumulative effort of contributions are recognised.

- Deputy Head of School
- Head of Discipline or Section
- Member of College or School Executive
- Chair of College or School Committee
- Research Centre Director
- Programme Director
- Academic Integrity Officer
- Member of Údarás na hOllscoile
- Member of Academic Council
- Chair of University Committee
- Member of Institutional Athena Swan Self-Assessment Team
- Chair of University Working Group
- Chair of School Athena Swan Self-Assessment Team
- Substantial leadership role in a University Club, Society or Staff Network (e.g., Women's Network, LGBT+ Staff Network, International Staff Network etc.)
- Research Integrity Officer
- External partner committee chair membership
- Year Lead
- Professional Lead
- External Examiner (teaching)
- External Examiner (research)
- Editor or Associate Editor of major international journal (subject to limits)
- Special Issue Editor of major international journal (subject to limits)
- Conference Chair, Organising Chair, Programme Chair or other major role with national or international conference (subject to limits)
- Major role in an academic or professional association or external body clearly linked with work within the university (subject to limits)
- Chair of internal Quality Review (assessor panel)
- Chair of internal Quality Review (self-assessment team)
- Chair of Institutional Review committee
- Unit Safety Officer