Faculty of Law

Workload Model

Version 7.0

Version	Comment
1.0	November 2010. Workload Working Party: Mark Israel (Chair), Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching); Joy Gilsenan, Faculty Manager; Peter Sinden; Natalie Skead; Penny Carruthers; Meredith Blake; Eileen Webb
2.0	April 2013. Prepared following review of several models within and external to UWA and consultation with Heads of School from other faculties. Recommendations circulated to and feedback provided by Dean's Advisory Group.
3.0	May 2013. Proposed model developed from recommendations and feedback from Dean's Advisory Group. Consultation and review with Professor Ian MacArthur.
3.1	Minor revisions following discussion with Prof MacArthur.
4.0	June 2013. Revised to reflect new Governance Structure. Circulated to and feedback provided by Dean's Advisory Group.
5.0	July 2013. Draft for circulation to and review, consideration and feedback of Faculty of Law.
6.0	August 2013. Revised in response to feedback from Law Faculty staff.
7.0	September 2013. Model to be implemented in Law.

Workload Model for Law

1. Background

1.1. In September 2001, the University's Academic Workloads Working Party released its report: AWWP Report. The principal recommendation in that document was:

That the head of every UWA department ensure there is a formal workload allocation system in place, within which workload elements are quantified and credited towards the computation of total academic workloads, and procedures are employed to establish fairness in the distribution of these workloads.

1.2. Following that recommendation, it is the University's policy ('the Workload Policy') that every school have and implement a workload allocation system.

1.3. That policy is also reflected in Clause 36 of the Academic Staff Agreement 2010.

1.4. Accordingly, the Law School is required to implement a workload model. Attached to this document is the model to be adopted in Law ('the Model').

1.5. The development of the Model has included:

1.5.1. an initial review, report and recommendations of a Law School Working Party in November 2010;

1.5.2. comparison of a number of workload models, both within and external to UWA and across various disciplines (including but not limited to Law);

1.5.3. consultation with other UWA Heads of School and those responsible for reviewing and implementing workload policies at both a Faculty and University level;

1.5.4. review by and consultation with the Dean's Advisory Group; and

1.5.5. circulation in draft to Law staff for consideration and feedback, and amendments to the Model (as appropriate) in response to that feedback.

2. Guiding and Informing Principles

2.1. In accordance with the Workload Policy, the workload model should be transparent (clearly documented in writing and described in sufficient detail to permit full understanding of supporting workload computations) and accessible. Further, it should enshrine the following principles:

2.1.1. *Equity*: to distribute workloads in an equitable manner across all academics within a School.

2.1.2. *Inclusivity*: to recognise and credit a broad range of academic activities, preferably all those activities to which a School expresses a commitment in its strategic plan.

2.1.3. *Diversity*: to permit the distribution of a variable profile of workload responsibilities to each staff member, enabling each individual to make an academic contribution that best builds on his or her particular experience, abilities and interests.

Workload Model for Law (September 2013)

2.2. The Academic Workloads Working Party identified four main categories of academic activity; namely teaching, research, administration and community service, but noted that these were not all likely to attract equal recognition in workload models. Further, workload models should be responsive to the strategic priorities of the School (and University).

2.3. The Model aims to meet the Law School's commitment to implement a model reflective of the Workload Policy's guiding principles and of the various categories (and various sub-categories) of academic activity.

2.4. Not everything involved in the complex and integrated work of an academic can be completely or effectively reduced to numbers. It is neither possible nor desirable to try to capture everything involved in the effective performance of an academic appointment. Rather, the model is intended to capture the principal activities that constitute the bulk of an academic's core functions.

2.5. The use of any workload model adopted in the School of Law will be one of a range of tools (including PARs and PDRs) used to facilitate effective management, communication and teamwork within the School. The Dean and Deputy Dean are responsible for ensuring that:

2.5.1. workloads are appropriately monitored under the Model;

2.5.2. the Model is not used in a way that produces undesirable workload distributions and practices;

2.5.3. unmeasurable factors are, as far as practicable, taken into account; and

2.5.4. the strategic priorities of the School are given weight in the overall allocation of work within the School.

3. Base Workload and Workload Patterns

3.1. A full time base load for all academic staff within the Law School will be allocated a notional value of 1000 points (to be reduced on a pro-rata basis for part time appointments).

3.2. In accordance with the principles of inclusivity and diversity, differing distributions of workload are recognised under the model. All patterns are of equal value to the School. A standard workload pattern is a distribution of work as between teaching, research and service in the proportion 40:40:20. Possible variations in that pattern are outlined below.

Pattern	Teaching (%)	Research (%)	Service (%)
Standard (Research Active)	40	40	20
Teaching Intensive	60	20	20
Teaching Only	80	0-10	10-20
Service Intensive	10 - 35	10-35	80 (Dean) / 50 (DD / ADS) / 30
Research Intensive	20-30	~60	10-20

3.3. The importance of teaching as a component of academic workload, and the need to protect the quality of teaching and learning, is reflected in the Workload Policy and, in particular in the special conditions that attach to re-allocations of teaching. Consistent with that policy:

Workload Model for Law (September 2013)

      3.3.1.   a reasonable floor level of teaching will be required from all academics appointed to teaching and research positions in order to assure students of continued access to their expertise;

      3.3.2.   responsibility for the re-allocation of any teaching duties (as a result of buy-out or other arrangements) is assigned to the School, rather than to the staff member concerned, in order to preserve appropriate School control of teaching quality;

      3.3.3.   the outcome of any re-allocation of teaching will continue to be monitored and re-evaluated to maintain adequate teaching coverage and quality; and

      3.3.4.   staff returning from academic career breaks of more than one year, and newly appointed staff, will in the first year have a 20% reduction in workload.

4. Process

4.1. Each year:

      4.1.1.   the Deputy Dean (or nominee) will request information from each academic staff member on:

            4.1.1.1.   research undertaken in the current academic year; and

            4.1.1.2.   service roles (University or external) held or proposed to be held during the forthcoming academic year (or part thereof, to be identified); and

            4.1.1.3.   anticipated teaching areas for the forthcoming academic year;

      4.1.2.   provisional individual workload allocations will be provided to staff and a specified period of time will be allowed for discussion and review ('review period');

      4.1.3.   at the conclusion of the review period and no later than the end of the current academic year, the Deputy Dean (or nominee) will settle and notify staff of their individual workload allocations. This can be done without the requested information (referred to in 4.1.1) or discussion and review (referred to in 4.1.2) if the staff member has not provided the same; and

      4.1.4. if any disagreement arises about workload allocation, the staff member should prepare a written statement of concerns.   The Dean will consider the written statement of concerns and determine whether any alteration of the allocated workload ought to be made.

4.2. Adjustments to a staff member's workload allocation can, if necessary and in consultation with the affected staff member (and without increasing the overall base load), be made during the academic year to meet unanticipated circumstances and developments.

4.3. If:

      4.3.1. the actual enrolment in a unit exceeds or falls short of the expected enrolment in that unit at the time that teaching was allocated to an affected staff member in that unit;

      4.3.2. a staff member unexpectedly needs to (and does) assume and the teaching responsibilities allocated to another staff member for a period of more than one week; or

Workload Model for Law (September 2013)

4.3.3.a staff member assumes or relinquishes a service role during the academic year,

and no adjustment has been made under 4.2 in respect of the resultant change of the affected staff member's workload, then points (positive or negative) representing the change in the affected staff member's workload may be carried over into the following academic year.[1]

5. Review

5.1. The Model will be reviewed yearly and updated as necessary to ensure that it supports the strategic directions and needs of the University and the Law School.

---

[1] It is assumed for these purposes that staff will not, without applying for leave, relinquish allocated teaching responsibilities (unpaid guest lectures may be arranged but this should not have the effect of substantially altering a staff member's teaching allocation. The general practice should be that no more than 2 weeks' worth of teaching in any subject be taken by guest lecturers and that the allocated staff member should generally be present during a guest lecture). If, however, that occurred then an adjustment may be made under 4.2 in the current year or under 4.3 in the following year.

Workload Model for Law (September 2013)

6. Proposed Model

6.1. The model below must be read in light of, and consistently with, the principles and processes outlined in paragraphs 2 to 4 above.

6.2. Each academic staff member having a full time appointment should achieve a total base load of **1000 points per year** (those on part time appointments will have workload calculated on a pro-rata basis).

Work Category	Points Allocated	Comments
Teaching (Generally Prospective)		Standard load[2]: 400 teaching points (TP) / year All staff are expected to teach into the non-PG program

Lectures
  o New
  o Original
  o Repeat
	(per contact hour)
	3
	2.5
	1.5
		
		New = never having been taught by the staff member at UWA
		Original = ordinary lecture
		Repeat = same class in same year

Tutorials
  o Original
  o Repeat
	(per contact hour)
	1.5
	1	

Workshops
  o Original
  o Repeat
	(per contact hour)
	2
	1.5	

Marking
  o LLB; UG
  o JD
  o Masters/GradDip
  o Res Papers (<10K words)
  o Theses (>10K words)
	(per student per unit)
	0.5
	0.7
	1
	4
	6
		TPs for marking will be shared pro-rata between non-casual staff allocated to carry out marking in the unit. Where casual staff will share the marking load in a unit, the points allocated to non-casual staff must be reduced to reflect the proportion of the marking that will be carried out by casual staff. Assessment structures for each unit must be approved by the Education Committee and must have the effect that each

---

[2] Teaching intensive (ie not research active) load is 600 points; teaching only load is 800 points (see workload patterns above).

Workload Model for Law (September 2013)

Work Category	Points Allocated	Comments
		student completes no fewer than 2 forms of assessment in a unit. Marking of theses and research papers will be counted retrospectively (that is, in the year following the marking).
Unit co-ordination	(per 50 students) 5	Points split pro-rata for joint co-ordination
New Unit Development	Up to 100 points may be negotiated if development in excess of general expectation for level of appointment.	There is an expectation that within a 3 year period staff above level A/B will contribute to curriculum development which may include new course development from time to time. Associated teaching is captured in 'new lectures' above.

Supervision
  o HDR
  o Honours; Masters/GradDip Supervised research (12 point)
  o LLB Supervised research; Masters/GradDip Supervised research (6 point)
	(per student per year, pro rata)
	50
	10
	
	6
		Points allocated pro-rata between co-supervisors (in accordance with the division of responsibility in the supervision forms). Supervision of part time HDR students will be measured at 50% of the given values.
		All non-casual staff are expected to agree to supervise at least one Honours or Supervised Research student per year. A notional allocation of one student will be made for workload purposes. If the actual allocation exceeds or falls short of this, an adjustment may be made under paragraph 4.2 or points representing the difference may be carried into the following year's workload.
		The total points per staff member for HDR supervision may not, without prior approval of the Dean, exceed 100.

Undertaking Education o Bachelor of Ed; Dip Ed	(yearly, 1st teaching qualification) 150	Points will be allocated per year of candidature, on a pro rata basis for part time enrolments, and subject to maintaining Satisfactory Progress (or institution-equivalent) status

Workload Model for Law (September 2013)

Work Category	Points Allocated	Comments
Research (Generally Retrospective)[3]		Standard load 400 research points (RP) / year The minimum research output to be considered research active is: 4 x A1, B1 and C1 publications over three years (see below). [4]

Research Publications[5]
 	
 o Published research book
  - >300 (A1.1)
  - >150 - 299pp (A1.2)
  - 50-149pp (A1.3, A1.4)
  - New edition (over 50% revision)
 o Edited book (A.2.2, A3)[6]
 o Text book (A2.1)
 o Book chapter (C1)
 o Book Revision/New Edition (<50%) (A4)
 o Published jrnl article (B1)
	(allocated pro rata between contributors)
	
	750 (375 x 2 years)
	650 (300 x 2 years)
	250 (125 x 2 years)
	Half the A1 points above (1 year)
	
	200
	175
	200
	125
		Co-authored works will attract a 20% loading, to be applied before the pro-rata allocation of RP.[7]
		
		The allocated points for all published research books (A1), other than new editions, should be spread pro rata over two years.
		
		It is expected that the four outputs (over three years)[8] representing the minimum research-active load should include:
		 o For Level C: at least one A / A* publication
		 o For level D: at least two A/A* publications
		 o For level E: at least three A/A* publications
		
		It is acknowledged and agreed that there may be good reasons

---

[3] Research output / productivity will be measured by reference to the previous year (so, when considering a staff member's workload for 2015, their research output in 2014 will be measured). To allow for an absence of workload modelling to date, although research output will be taken into account for workload modelling in 2014, staff not on teaching only appointments will be assumed to fall within a standard load. For all years thereafter, staff members' workload pattern will take into account their research output from 2014, measured pro rata – that is, the question will be whether, on each year's performance from and including 2014, the staff member would meet the base minimum for a research active load).

[4] This expectation assumes continuous academic employment over the relevant period. If a staff member has had prolonged periods of leave (other than research leave), has had an academic career interruption, or has an academic career of less than three years, the measure of 'research active' (and associated RP targets) will be adjusted on a pro rata basis.

[5] For publication categories and weightings see: UWA Research Weightings .

[6] Although the HERDC and UWA weightings give no value for these outputs, many other workload models do.

[7] For example, for a co-authored journal article (B1) in a "B ranked" journal, 180 points would be distributed pro-rata between the contributing authors. The loading represents the additional work associated with co-ordinating research activities, and avoids any disincentive (on that basis) for collaboration.

[8] It is recommended that A1.1 and A1.2 publications may be treated as three and four outputs, respectively, for these purposes.

Workload Model for Law (September 2013)

Work Category	Points Allocated	Comments
- A / A* - B - C	225 175 150	for re-evaluating the rankings of individual journals. Where evidence can be provided to support a change in the quality of a journal, then the Research Committee may recommend to the Dean that a journal's ranking be altered for workload allocation purposes. The Dean shall consider the recommendation of the Committee and make a decision about the ranking and report that decision to the Committee and to the School.

Conference publications
  o Refereed conference publication (E1)
  o Edited Volume Conference Proceedings (E4)
  o Conference Publication – Non-refereed (E2)
  o Extract of Conference Paper (E3)
	150 (all staff)
	
	75 (Level A/B and ECR[9] only)
	
	75 (Level A/B and ECR only)
	
	50 (Level A/B and ECR only)
		Staff at level C and above are expected to have evidence of conference papers, seminar presentations or working papers but are ineligible to claim research output points for them.

Research Grant Application (Top 50% Submission Only)
  o ARC grant
    o Large
    o Discovery
    o Linkage
  o Competitive external research grant
    o Large – >$1M
	
	250
	200
	150
	
	200
		Only grant applications ranked within the top 50% of applications submitted to the awarding body will be eligible.
		
		In the event of shared contributions the percentage load allocated for each grant would be shared between the contributors on an agreed percentage basis. First named Chief investigators, or recognised grant leaders, will have loads weighted 20% above the allocated research grant load. Points may be reallocated by recipient staff to other by agreement.[11]

[9] Early Career Researcher (as defined by the ARC)

[11] Reallocation of research points may only be made to other staff members who have been involved in the preparation of the grant application in question (but who may not have been named, or be named as chief investigators, for strategic or other reasons.

Workload Model for Law (September 2013)

Work Category	Points Allocated	Comments

o Other <$1M
 o Other research grant
 	
Research Grant Income[10]
 o ARC / external competitive grant income
  - <$50k pa
  - $50k – $300k pa
  - >$300k pa
 o Research grant income (Other)
  - <$50k pa 4%
  - $50k – $300k pa
  - >$300k pa
	150
	100
	
	150
	200
	300-400
	
	100
	150
	200-400
		Staff at or above Level C (who do not have a current grant) are expected to submit one grant application every two years. RP allocated to the application may be spread over two years.

Undertaking HDR o PhD o Masters (Research)	(yearly, Level A/B and NAA[12]) 350 200	Points will be allocated per year of candidature, on a pro rata basis for part time enrolments, and subject to maintaining Satisfactory Progress (or institution-equivalent) status There will be 50% and 75% reductions, respectively, for level D and E staff (reflecting the expectation that appointments at this level should hold HDRs).

---

[10] In excess of any funds allocated for teaching buyout, since the latter will be allocated under Teaching.

[12] New Academic Appointments: staff who are within five years of their first academic appointment (however, an extension to this limit may be approved for significant career interruptions).

Workload Model for Law (September 2013)

Work Category	Points Allocated	Comments
Service[13] (Generally Prospective)		Standard load: 200 service points (SP) / year The total points accumulated under ESB, ISB 3 and ISB4 may not, without prior approval of the Dean, exceed 250.
o Administrative / Service roles	Internal Service Band (ISB) 1 (Major) – 800 (Dean) ISB 2 (Significant) – 250-500 (Dep Dean; Associate Deans) ISB 3 (Regular) – 50-100 (Regular Work) ISB 4 (Minor) – 0-50 (Infrequent; minor work)	See details of the ISBs and loadings below.
o Committee work (Faculty, University and external Faculty representation)	ISB 3 (Regular) – 50-100 (Regular Committees) ISB 4 (Minor) – 0-50 (Infrequent; generally expected)	See details of the ISBs and loadings below.
o Service: Community / professional (excluding paid work)	External Service Band (ESB) 1 - Outstanding Community and Professional Activity 150-200 ESB 2 - Significant Community and Professional Activity 100-150 ESB 3 - Some Community and Professional Activity 50-100 ESB 4 - Low Community and Professional Activity – 0-50	External (community / professional) service cannot represent the whole of a staff member's service load, and must be demonstrated to: o require a regular service commitment; and o relate to the staff member's work as an academic; and/or serve the interests of the Faculty / University.[14] No SP may be claimed for paid work (excluding nominal[15] sitting fees).

---

[13] See Annexure 1: Bands and Levels of Service.

[14] For example, service for sports clubs, children's schools or other personal interest groups will not qualify.

[15] These must not be calculated on an hourly basis and must be no more than $200 per sitting.

Bands and Levels of Service

Internal Service Band	Recognised Positions	Allocated Service Points (SP)
ISB 1[16] Major ongoing administrative responsibilities within the Faculty and University	Dean of the Faulty of Law	800
ISB 2[17] Significant ongoing administrative responsibilities within the Faculty and University	• Deputy Dean • Associate Dean (Students) • Associate Dean (Research) • Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) • Director of the Business Law Major • Director of Law and Society • Director of Higher Degrees (Research) • Director of Higher Degrees (Coursework)	500 500 250 250 250 250 250 250
ISB 3 Regular ongoing administrative responsibilities throughout the year within the Faculty and University	• Member, University Promotions Committee • Member, University Human Research Ethics Committee • Member, University Board of Studies • Editor, UWA Law Review • Chair, Honours Committee / Honours co-ordinator • Chair, JD Committee/JD Coordinator • Member, Learning and Teaching Committee • Member, Research Committee • Member, Planning and Budget Committee • Academic Conduct Adviser	100 100 100 100 100 75 75 75 75 75
ISB 4 Minor, infrequent or generally expected administrative responsibilities within the Faculty and University	• Member, Honours Committee • Member, Health & Safety Committee	50 50

---

[16] Points allocated will include service on Faculty and University bodies *in the capacity of* Dean of Law.
[17] Points allocated will include service on Faculty and University bodies *in the capacity of* the relevant office holder.

	• Member, Governing Board for JD	25
	• Member, Faculty Appeals Committee	25
	• Member, Ad Hoc Committees and Working Groups	10-25 (to be determined at establishment)

Band 1:

Major ongoing administrative responsibilities within the Faculty and University (ISB 1)

These administrative roles require major involvement of the member of staff on a daily and weekly basis throughout the year. The administrative workload weighting includes all direct and indirect obligations flowing from these roles.

Band 2:

Significant ongoing administrative responsibilities (ISB 2)

These administrative roles require significant involvement of the member of staff on a weekly basis throughout the year. The administrative workload weighting includes all direct and indirect obligations flowing from these roles.

Outstanding (ESB 1) and significant (ESB 2) community and professional activity

These external roles require significant, regular (at least monthly) levels of participation and/or preparation.   Outstanding service in this band will require evidence of high levels of activity as well as of social, community or professional impact.

Band 3:

Regular ongoing administrative responsibilities throughout the year (ISB 3)

These administrative roles require involvement of the member of staff on a regular basis (usually monthly) throughout the year.

Some Community and Professional Activity (ESB 3)

There must be evidence of regular (less than monthly) participation and preparation.

Band 4:

Minor, infrequent (ISB 4) or generally expected administrative responsibilities:

This category of administrative duties involves:

(a) membership of committees that meet infrequently with varying levels of involvement (SP available – see Table); and

(b) the generally expected minimum contribution from all staff to Law school life such as: attendance at faculty and staff meetings; staff seminars; faculty retreats; and involvement with Law school activities and the development of a collegial and supportive work environment (no SP available). These activities may include:

- contributing to student welfare beyond teaching responsibilities, in particular, for indigenous and international students and students from diverse backgrounds;
- attending and participating in School and Faculty meetings, retreats and planning days as required, and participating in Examiners' Board meetings and functions;
- contributing to a positive student experience through support of out of class activities such as student clubs, student interest groups, student functions, student competitions, student initiatives and career guidance;
- participating in personal and professional development workshops and courses
- participating in various school/faculty activities such as the University Expo, Information Sessions for prospective students, Parents Welcome and Graduation Ceremonies;
- fostering teamwork at school and faculty level; and
- mentoring staff and regularly giving invited advice and support to peers or more junior colleagues

Low Level Community and Professional Activity (ESB 4)

For any SP to be allocated, there must be evidence of:

- ongoing (albeit irregular) service commitment; or
- some significant service requirement (albeit on a one-off basis).

All External (Community / Professional) Service

External (community / professional) service cannot represent the whole of a staff member's service load, and must be demonstrated to:

- o require a regular and/or workload intensive service commitment; and

- o relate to the staff member's work as an academic; and/or serve the interests of the Faculty / University.

No SP may be claimed for paid work (excluding nominal sitting fees).