

SCHOOL OF INFORMATICS

Strategy Committee

22 February 2017

Teaching and Admin Workload Policy and Model

Author

Martin J Wright
Director of Professional Services

Background

The revised Teaching and Admin Workload Policy and Model is now available on the School intranet and was presented at the recent School General Meeting.

Subsequent to making available the revised policy and model, a number of further clarifications and one change have been suggested.

This paper details the clarifications that have been made and raises other suggested clarifications and one change, for further discussion.

Action requested from the committee

Discuss and agree what further clarifications and/or changes should be made to the revised Teaching and Admin Workload Policy and Model, currently published on the School intranet.

Main subject text

Following publication and presentation of the revised Teaching and Admin Workload Policy and Model, a number of clarifications have been suggested.

Two of these are uncontroversial and have been incorporated in the revised policy and model, available online. These are:

- Clarifying the default 'handover' date as 1 August (this was included in the previous iteration) – para A11.
- Extending the requirement for proposals for student projects to 'include projects that any reasonable Masters student can undertake' to Honours projects and undergraduate students – para B2.

Two further clarifications have been suggested:

- A proposal that one of the two tutorials to be undertaken by default by each member of academic staff should be in year one or year two (as specified in the previous iteration) – para B1.2.
- Clarification that the total number of Master projects (normally three to five) to be supervised, by default, by each member of academic staff, includes the number of projects that staff are supervising that are being undertaken by MSc(R) students in CDT cohorts – para B1.4.

In addition, the paragraph (A8) stating that course allocations will normally be rotated after three to five years has been queried. It has been pointed out that arbitrarily rotating course allocations

increases the workload on staff as they need to become familiar with, and potentially prepare revised, teaching materials. It has been suggested that this paragraph should be removed.

Equality and diversity implications

Increased transparency in duty allocation will help to highlight and thereby address any potential equality and diversity issues within the workload allocation process.

Resource implications (staff, space, budget)

The revisions to the workload model are resource neutral in terms of implementation and administration.