Academic Workload Planning (AWP) Guidance Document

Version	2.0
Published	1st June 2023

For specific queries relating to Academic Workload Planning, please contact the AWP Support Team at the following e-mail address: AWPsupport@gre.ac.uk

Table of Contents

1 Approach to Academic Workload Planning (AWP) 3
2 Academic Workload Framework 5
3 Allocation Process 7
4 Planning Cycle 10
5 Governance 11
6 A - Teaching and Learning 11
7 B - Research and Knowledge Exchange 20
8 C - Leadership and Management 28
9 D - Administration and Academic Citizenship 33

1 Approach to Academic Workload Planning (AWP)

1.1 Introduction to AWP

The University introduced its new approach to Academic Workload Planning (AWP) in the 2022/23 academic year. Components of the framework, associated tariffs and processes were tested, with academic feedback forming discussion during its use. A review of the AWP transition year has allowed staff feedback to shape and improve the tool and user experience for 2023/24.

The University's approach to workload management has three interrelated components:

The academic workload framework	A list of essential academic activities and, where applicable, tariffs to inform the planning of staff workloads
The software platform	The tool – "AWP" – used to plan work, and visualise workload data for Line Managers and direct reports
The allocation process	The process by which Line Managers (or nominees) and Academics plan, discuss, and agree work plans

In brief, the framework provides the common structure Line Managers or nominees can use to plan for the delivery of essential University activities by academic staff in the year ahead. The framework has been built into the AWP tool (the software platform) to promote consistency and to make workload data more visible to support engagement between Line Managers and direct reports.

This document provides further information about the University's approach to workload allocation and management processes.

Guides relating to how to use the AWP tool as a Line Manager, Designated Allocator or Academic staff member are available via the AWP Portal.

1.2 AWP Core Principles

The approach to workload planning is underpinned by the 'core principles' below. The AWP framework, tool and processes will:

1. Enable the **allocation of fair academic workloads** so that academics are able to deliver the Strategy and its commitments to **high quality and personalised teaching and learning for our students and impactful research and knowledge exchange.**
2. Be **fair, setting out clear expectations** and ensuring that staff recognise the time intended to be devoted to various duties. Facilitate the allocation and management of fair academic workloads **to promote positive staff mental health and well-being.**
3. Be **transparent and equitable** – everyone should know their own allocation and be able to regularly see how it compares to others.

4. Embrace **consultation and collaboration** in the continuous improvement of the approach to workload management by incorporating pathways for feedback into the governance process.
5. Be **as simple as is practically possible –** its purpose is to incentivise and capture valued activity to inform academic workload planning. It should therefore avoid the temptation of trying to capture all activity at a high level of detail.
6. **Align with the University's values** (inclusive, collaborative, impactful), its strategic priorities and any specific objectives set out in supporting plans.
7. Strive for **consistency across faculties and schools** whilst recognising the need for limited authorised customisation where specific circumstances require it.
8. **Adopt an 'all hours' allocation** that is more practically grounded in how staff use their time.
9. Support **agility, flexibility and dynamism** in terms of the active management of workloads, by, for example, allowing for rapid changes when responding to unplanned events.
10. Enable university-wide **workforce planning and support financial sustainability** through the provision of reliable data to inform academic staffing decisions and module and course costing.
11. Provide workload data to **add value to other institutional processes** such as the TRAC (TRansparent Approach to Costing) return, Access and Participation Plan activity, timetabling process, and equality and diversity accreditations (e.g., Stonewall, Athena Swan, Race Equality Charter).
12. Be overseen and managed through **robust and accepted governance mechanisms** complemented by **clear and effective management processes** that address issues such as under and over-allocation of workload.
13. Incorporate **ongoing training for all staff involved in the process** and be regularly reviewed to ensure it remains fit-for-purpose.

2 Academic Workload Framework

2.1 Who is included?

The AWP Framework applies to all salaried academic staff and the expectation is that all Academics will receive a published workload during the planning cycle (see section 4) which is to be agreed through the allocation process (see section 3).

Line Managers (LM) and Designated Allocators (DA) will also be able to utilise the AWP tool to capture the contributions of other staff (e.g. hourly-paid lecturers) where this contributes to the delivery of essential academic activities, but such staff will not be expected to use the AWP tool to view their workload.

The aim of the above is to enable the building of a holistic picture of the resources allocated to modules (and so programmes) within the AWP tool.

Alternative engagement will take place with the Natural Resources Institute (NRI) which has its own distinct allocation arrangement.

2.2 Categories of Work

The academic workload framework (“the Framework”) conceptualises the essential components of academic activity organised across the following categories of work:

- A – Teaching and Learning (see section 6)
- B – Research and Knowledge Exchange (see section 7)
- C – Leadership and Management (see section 8)
- D – Administration and Academic Citizenship (see section 9)

For example, lectures or seminar delivery would be an activity within the category “A - Teaching and Learning”. Academic staff will be able to see the high-level distribution of allocated hours against these categories of work as individual allocations are made against specific activities, which in turn belong to one category.

2.3 Work Unit Types (WUTs)

The staff-time allocated against activities will also fall under at least one ‘Work Unit Type’ (or WUT) which is a method for differentiating types of effort in the delivery of a single activity. The WUTs being used in the framework are:

- FST – Formal Scheduled Teaching time
- TRA – Teaching-Related Activity
- RKE – Research and Knowledge Exchange (KE) time
- L&M – Leadership and Management-related time
- OTH – Other activity

For example, lecture or seminar delivery may involve contact time (FST hours) and an amount of time for preparation which would then fall under Teaching-Related Activity (TRA). An academic may receive a total allocation of 20 hours for the delivery of lectures on a given module but the WUTs enable visibility of the breakdown of this as 10 FST hours and 10 TRA hours.

2.4 Total Available Working Hours

Academic workload allocations will be based on there being 1505 allocatable hours available for a 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) member of staff or pro-rata as appropriate.

The allocatable hours value is based on the following:

- 35 hours per week
- 7 weeks leave entitlement plus 2 weeks university closure days = 9 weeks
- 52 weeks less 9 weeks = 43 weeks
- 43 weeks x 35 hours = 1505 hours per annum

2.5 Scope of the framework

Staff do not work in identical patterns and, as such, the framework is not a direct representation of the experience of working as an Academic and it does not attempt to capture every working hour. Rather, the framework concentrates on the broad distribution of different types of work and includes simplified assumptions expressed through tariffs for specific activities.

The framework is intended to work at a 'macro' level as a mechanism to help manage the demand that the essential academic activities place onto available Academic staff resources. Moreover, it is designed to help facilitate dialogue by providing a common language to discuss workload, in terms of hours, at the individual level and to review resource allocation at a macro (e.g. school or faculty) level.

At the same time, the framework is not intended to be used for the micro-management of individuals or to inhibit professional autonomy when delivering expected activities.

In short, the aim is for the framework to help all staff strike a balance between institutional and individual needs, in a way that is detailed enough to be effective but avoids the pitfall of 'bean-counting'.

2.6 Framework Development

The Framework is expected to develop over time to reflect changes in the nature of the key activities that the University and Academics need to deliver. This may include more specific guidance in the application of existing tariffs, reconfiguration the AWP tool, or the inclusion of new or updated tariffs.

Framework development will take place within the context of the AWP governance processes (see Section 5) in which feedback from Line Managers and Academics will be considered.

Any changes to the framework will be reflected within updated versions of this document.

2022/23, the 'transition year' has been a key period of engagement with staff to test the new processes and tariffs and refine where necessary ahead of the planning cycle for 2023/24.

For 2023/24 we have used the following data:

a. Student Number Planning (SNP) numbers have been used for all core modules uploaded into the system.
b. For optional modules we have used the actual numbers from 2022/23.
c. For new optional modules we have made nominal allocations based on the numbers predicted at programme level in SNP.

3 Allocation Process

3.1 Overview

The figure below shows a simplified view of the allocation process (left-to-right):

Allocate	**Publish**	**Approve**	**Discuss**	**Allocate**	**Publish**	**Approve**	**Report**
Initial allocations to serve as basis for discussion	Line Managers make work plans available to Academics	Academics review work plan and agree or query it	Back-and-forth between Line Manager and Academic	Refine allocations based on discussions	Line Managers make work plans available to Academics	Academics review work plan and agree or query it	Data can feed into refinements or other university processes

The allocation process is intended to be iterative, with Line Managers (or nominees) with responsibility for workload allocations and Academics making use of the AWP tool and its visualisation of workload data to facilitate meaningful discussion within the context of regular line management.

3.2 Allocating

Line Managers or Designated Allocators will be provided with full training in the use of the AWP tool in order to facilitate the allocation process. This will include knowing how to allocate staff hours to activities (or vice versa) but also how to access reports to give a view of activity at the school level to help inform their decision-making.

All Line Managers or Designated Allocators will be expected to undertake core training on using the tool with completion being monitored by the AWP Support Team. Refresher training will be offered on an annual basis and after any substantive changes to the tool. Training for Line Managers and Designated Allocators will also be incorporated into the staff induction process.

Line Managers will have the ability to model the distribution of activities between staff under their supervision and to publish that data out to Academics (i.e. making individual workload plans visible). They will also be able to track whether Academic staff have agreed to those work plans or whether they have queried it – prompting edits/refinements. Designated Allocators can plan and allocate within the system, but they cannot publish workloads.

Line Managers will also be encouraged to participate in local user groups to share best practice not only in using the AWP tool but in managing staff workloads more generally.

3.3 Publishing

To make changes to the workload visible to Academic staff, Line Managers will need to ‘publish’ it within the AWP tool. This will trigger an email inviting Academic staff to review their workload and take part in the approval workflow outlined below (see section 3.4). There will be key publish points throughout the workload planning cycle, but publication may happen at any point where circumstances require (e.g. some institutions decided to review allocations to reprioritise during the COVID pandemic and associated lockdowns).

3.4 Approval workflow

3.4.1 Agreeing to workplans

A key part of the process is to seek the agreement of staff to the work plans that are published so that Line Managers - and those being managed - are clear about what needs to be delivered and that appropriate time is available to deliver it. The AWP tool will present Academics with the following question alongside their work plan on their ‘Me Page’:

Your workload allocation has changed. Do you agree with the workload allocated to you? Yes or No.

If an Academic agrees that the work plan available on their ‘Me Page’ is a reasonable plan at that point in the planning cycle (see section 4) then they can confirm this by clicking ‘Yes’ with the option of leaving a comment back to the Line Manager(s).

Name	FST	TRA	RKE	L&M	OTH	Total
A - Teaching and Learning	145	229.5	0	112.04	0	486.54
B - Research and Knowledge Exchange	0	0	0	50	72	122
C - Leadership and Management	0	0	0	387.5	0	387.5
D - Administration and Academic Citizenship	0	0	0	0	285	285
Totals	**145**	**229.5**	**0**	**549.54**	**357**	**1281.04**

View allocation history View comments

Your workload allocation has changed. Do you agree with the workload allocated to you? Yes No

This completes the agreement process for a given publication point. Please note, there will be multiple publish points throughout the planning cycle and academic year.

3.4.2 Replacement of TAS

Additionally, the University wants to achieve efficiencies by replacing the need for Academics to complete the Time Allocation Survey (TAS) which is related to TRAC, or the TRansparent Approach to Costing – a government costing exercise which all universities are required to undertake annually.

If the University can demonstrate that a significant proportion of Academic staff ‘agree’ (this is the terminology required by TRAC) to their work plans before the start of the academic year - and retrospectively at the end of the year - then the data contained within AWP about how staff are spending their time can be used instead of the TAS.

This is an additional benefit to the active engagement of Academic staff and Line Managers in the use of the AWP tool.

3.4.3 Querying workload

If an Academic believes that a work plan requires editing (e.g. they have local knowledge about how many hours are to be delivered on a given module that differs to the plan) or is otherwise inappropriate, then they can respond ‘No’ when asked if they agree with the plan.

The Academic will be expected to comment about why they are querying the work plan or what, if any, specific changes they would expect before clicking on ‘Submit and query’ to feed this back to the Line Manager(s).

Academic staff should note that their comments are viewable to all allocators in their school. They are therefore asked to provide constructive feedback in this response, especially where it would be helpful for a Line Manager to correct an allocation where there has been an omission. This kind of exchange would allow the Line Manager to see that the work plan has not been agreed to, and to make quick changes to get the plan re-published and back out to the Academic.

However, as a reminder, the AWP tool is not meant as a replacement for existing line management and methods of communication. The allocations can be discussed in more depth in a 1-to-1 meeting with a Line Manager or over email to fully explore the situation better than via the comments functionality in AWP. A simpler message in the tool can still record the response of querying the workload.

3.5 Link to Annual Appraisals

Whilst academic workload planning is a separate process, there is a relationship given that the annual Appraisals will likely include discussion of workload. Academic staff will be able to see their latest published workload, allocation history, and a view of high-level allocations across the School. An important reason for this level of transparency is to enable Line Managers (or other Appraisers) and Academics to be able to discuss workload openly, based on hours, with a common frame of reference as provided by the Framework and the AWP tool.

We recommend that allocations are published by 31 July to allow for a discussion of workload for the coming year as part of appraisal discussions and acceptance of the allocation shortly thereafter. Where it is not possible to publish prior to the appraisal discussion, we recommend that a discussion is held at appraisal, and the allocation published shortly afterwards.

3.6 Significant concerns about workload

Where an Academic or Line Manager has significant concerns about an individual’s work allocations that cannot be addressed via the existing line management and allocation process, they should contact their Head of School in the first instance for assistance in resolving the issue.

If this does not result in the issue being resolved, or if the Line Manager is also the Head of School, then the issue should be escalated to the Deputy Dean for the faculty.

If the issue relates to the technical functioning of the framework or AWP tool, then the central AWP Support Team can be contacted to assist. However, in cases where the issue relates to workload and resource allocation then the emphasis will be on School and Faculty staff to resolve the issue.

In cases where a member of staff feels the issue amounts to an individual grievance, they should follow the University’s ‘Grievance Policy and Procedure’ and its associated informal, formal and appeal stages. The ‘Grievance Policy and Procedure’ is available here:

https://docs.gre.ac.uk/rep/human-resources/grievance-policy-and-procedure

In cases where a member of staff feels they have been bullied or harassed as part of the workload allocation process, they should follow the University’s ‘Bullying and Harassment Policy’ and its associated informal and formal resolution mechanisms. The ‘Bullying and Harassment Policy’ is available here:

https://docs.gre.ac.uk/rep/human-resources/bullying-and-harassment-policy

4 Planning Cycle

4.1 Planning Cycle Overview

The academic workload ‘planning cycle’ takes into account the months preceding and during an academic year and is comprised of three phases:

1. **Plan** – forward planning/allocating ahead of the start of the next academic year
2. **React** – ad hoc changes to allocations because of material changes or events
3. **Confirm** – a retrospective confirmation that existing allocations reflect what was done

The phases are illustrated in the figure below using the example of the 2024-25 planning cycle.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="20">Planning Cycle</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="8">Plan</td><td colspan="9">React</td><td colspan="3">Confirm</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="8">2024-25 planning cycle begins</td><td colspan="10">2024-25 academic year begins</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Jan</td><td>Feb</td><td>Mar</td><td>Apr</td><td>May</td><td>Jun</td><td>Jul</td><td>Aug</td><td>Sep</td><td>Oct</td><td>Nov</td><td>Dec</td><td>Jan</td><td>Feb</td><td>Mar</td><td>Apr</td><td>May</td><td>Jun</td><td>Jul</td><td>Aug</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="12">2024</td><td colspan="8">2025…</td></tr>
</table>

4.2 Plan phase

In a typical year the plan phase (green – see figure in 4.1) will begin in the Spring before the academic year. During this time the allocation process (see Section 3) will run at least once to ensure Academics and Line Managers are confident that resources are available to deliver the planned activities based on the best information at that time. The aim is to get a ‘good picture’ together based on available data by the end of July.

To enable allocations, student number planning (SNP) data will populate AWP for core modules and use 2022/23 data for optional modules. This will be observed using existing mechanisms which track student application numbers.

4.3 React phase

During the react phase (yellow – see figure in 4.1) Academic colleagues will be performing the activities within the work plans agreed in the plan phase. However, there may be the need for ad hoc changes to allocations where there is a material change to circumstances. This may be due to changes in variables relating to allocations (e.g. student numbers on modules starting in January shifting significantly) or individual circumstances such as going on long-term sick leave.

4.4 Confirm phase

The University’s approach also includes the confirm phase (blue – see figure in 4.1) during which there will be a final republishing of workload and a retrospective ‘agreement’ from Academics that the work plan reflects what happened (past tense) during the year. The purpose of this is to maintain a record of Academic staff agreement at the start and end of the year so that accurate workload data can be used in place of Academics completing the Time Allocation Survey (TAS).

4.5 Concurrent Planning Cycles

Academics and Line Managers will have access to multiple planning cycles or 'years' within the AWP tool at different times of the year. This will include the cycle for the current academic year (which will be in the react phase) and the planning cycle for the next academic year (in its forward planning phase).

5 Governance

The 2023/24 academic year will be overseen by the AWP Management Group.

The AWP Management Group will oversee the maintenance of the framework, tariffs and processes, monitor both the university-level uptake of the system and workload allocation levels, and consider feedback on its effectiveness. The Management Group will make recommendations on any changes to the AWP approach ahead of the following years planning cycle.

Over the course of each year, more localised governance structures at faculty-level will be explored, with the AWP Support Team reaching out to Academic staff, Line Managers and Designated Allocators within the Schools to determine the best ways for feeding back and sharing best practice both locally and at the university-level.

6 A - Teaching and Learning

6.1 Modular

6.1.1 Delivery

Allocation

Allocation will be based on hours of first-time and repeat 'Formal Scheduled Teaching' (FST) delivery time.

For every hour of first-time FST delivery there will be an additional hour of preparation time allocated. Where repeat hours are allocated these will not generate preparation time.

Example 1: An Academic is to deliver four unique one-hour lectures, once each. The Line Manager will allocate four hours of first-time delivery each generating an hour of preparation time (and no repeat hours). The total allocation would be: 4 hours first time delivery + (1 hours prep x 4 hours of first-time delivery) = 4 + 4 = 8 hours.

Example 2: An Academic is to deliver the same one-hour lecture on three occasions. The Line Manager will allocate one hour as first-time delivery (generating one hour of preparation) and two repeat delivery hours (that do not). The total allocation would be: (1 hour first time delivery + 2 hours repeat delivery) + (1 hour prep x 1 hour of first time delivery) = 3 + 1 = 4 hours.

A Line Manager or Designated Allocator can either allocate the marking and feedback of a specific No. of students to a member of staff (e.g., 25 students) or a proportion of the cohort (e.g. 50% of the cohort).

FST should not exceed 550 hours of delivery.

Guidance

'Delivery' covers a range of activities that an Academic may undertake such as the following:

- Lectures
- Delivering a presentation or talk
- Seminar
- Tutorial
- Demonstration
- Laboratory work
- Task-based student activity
- Practical
- Studio time
- Workshop

Please note: the rest of Section 6.1 includes modular teaching-related activities that may use different calculations.

6.1.2 Assessment and Feedback

Allocation

The allocation will be on a per student basis and scales by the credit value of the module and includes a generalised contribution for the marking of resits – which will be unpredictable in terms of forward planning activity. The per student allocations are as follows:

- 15 credits or less: 30 minutes per student
- 30 credits: 1 hour per student
- 45 credits: 1.5 hours per student
- 60 credits: 2 hours per student

Guidance

The allocation is a standardised one across all disciplines, but it is acknowledged that time demands for assessment and feedback will vary to some extent across academic disciplines.

To enable this feedback, the tool will incorporate both a % input and a number input, enabling the sharing of roles and for the system to reflect a role being taken on 'in-year'. The 'manual override' function has been removed as the two main methods of allocating effectively allow for a change in student numbers.

6.1.3 Internal Moderation

Allocation

Internal moderation is based on 10 minutes per script.

Guidance

Internal moderation has been added as a separate activity to acknowledge the sometimes substantial additional work entailed and that this is not always undertaken by those doing the main assessment and feedback. There is however limited data available to pre-populate the specific number of scripts expected on relevant modules. Line Managers and Designated

Allocators are encouraged to liaise with Academics and refer to the guidance in appendix 2 of the Assessment and Feedback policy to establish roughly how many scripts they will be expecting to moderate in total (for context) as well as the number they would individually be responsible for. This value should then be entered into the AWP tool to complete the allocation.

6.1.4 Dissertations

Allocation

Dissertation (or final project, etc) time will be on a per student basis and scale by the credit value and level of the module.

The table below shows the allocation outcome in hours based on the credit value and level. Please note: the figures in brackets represent the relative scalar in effect, e.g. a 60 credit module (2) has double the allocation of a 30 credit module (1).

(Per student)	**<15 Credits (x0.5)**	**30 Credits (x1)**	**45 Credits (x1.5)**	**60 Credits (x2)**
Undergraduate	5	10	15	20
Postgraduate	5	10	15	20

Example: An Academic is responsible for 3 students on a 30-credit undergraduate dissertation resulting in an allocation of 30 hours (3 * 10 = 30).

Guidance

The time allocation is expected to cover all the usual duties associated with supporting, supervising, and assessing a student undertaking a dissertation (or equivalent project) over the course of an academic year.

6.1.5 External Moderation

Allocation

External moderation (or moderation of modules delivered at partner institutions) is based on 10 minutes per script.

Guidance

External moderation is a separate activity to acknowledge the sometimes substantial additional work entailed. There is however limited data available to pre-populate the specific number of scripts expected on relevant modules. Line Managers and Designated Allocators are encouraged to liaise with Academics to establish roughly how many scripts they will be expecting to moderate in total (for context) as well as the number they would individually be responsible for. This value should then be entered into the AWP tool to complete the allocation.

6.1.6 Field Trip

Allocation

Field trip time will be allocated based on a number of actual days (or fraction, e.g. 0.5 days for 3.5 hours) to be agreed with the line manager.

Guidance

The AWP tool is designed to record travel time separately so the allocation for field trip should only record the time spent at the field trip site. Travel to and from the destination should be recorded separately under the ‘travel time’ activity (see 6.2.7).

6.1.7 Module Leadership

Allocation

Each module is allowed a base allocation of 35 hours, plus a per-student allocation driven by the student number and module credit as shown:

35 base module hours plus

- ≤15 credit: 10 mins per student
- 20 credits 15 mins per student
- 30 credits: 15 mins per student
- 40 credits 20 mins per student
- 45 credits: 20 mins per student
- 60 credits: 25 mins per student

Where there is more than one module leader, the allocation will be shared between the module leaders.

Guidance

Module leadership consists of student numbers, credit level and an amount of fixed or base work regardless of size or credit level of the module. The activities within the base allocation can include the following:

Moodle pages and handbooks, a variety of timetabling aspects, the deployment of teaching teams, a selection of monitoring reports, marking and moderation reports.

This list is not exhaustive. Where the module is delivered across campuses and the required module preparation is adjusted due to different practical or lab space, this may generate additional preparation time.

The override function can also be used to overcome this and make allocations for the range of additional work (e.g. running practicals).

Please do not include inter campus travel time in this assessment. Travel time can be included separately under the dedicated Travel Time activity (see 6.2.7).

6.2 Non-modular activities

6.2.1 Personal Tutoring

Allocation

Personal Tutoring will be based on a per student allocation which scales according to the level or type of student, as follows:

- New students (L3 and L4) – 5 hours per student
- Continuing students (L5 and L6) – 3 hours per student
- Masters students (L7) – 5 hours per student

Example: An Academic is tutoring 2 new students, 2 masters students and 1 continuing student. This results in the allocation calculation: (2x5) + (2x5) + (1x3) = 10 + 10 + 3 = 23 hours.

Guidance

Personal tutoring includes activities such as regular tutorial meetings, advising and supporting students as named tutor/academic advisor for a given student. This allocation is separated from other roles where academic advice is provided under another allocation, e.g. dissertation supervisor.

6.2.2 Placement Support

Allocation

This allocation is based on a variable per student rate as determined by the characteristics of the placement (or placement type). There is significant variation in placement support activity across the University and Line Managers are advised to use their judgement on the per student allocation using the logic and characteristics of the placement types in the able below:

Placement Type	Typical characteristics of placement type	Hours per student
Type A – Extra Small (XS)	Usually ‘micro’ placements of 2-4 weeks with minimal or light-touch supervision. An example would be a 30 min online check-in with a student on a short-term work placement	0.5
Type B – Small (S)	Could be a short placement (2-4 weeks) with pre-placement support and some supervision. Or could be a one-term placement with 1-2 supervision check-ins possibly including an on-site meeting.	2
Type C – Medium (M)	Most likely to be a 1-2 term placement with regular supervision and some on-site placement visit(s). May be some additional placement support activity as well.	5

Type D – Large (L)	Typically 2-3 terms in length with significant supervision including some visits and/or other support activity (e.g. sourcing placements, pre-placement tutorials, assessment).	8
Type E – Extra Large (XL)	Likely to be 2-3 terms in length with regular and/or significant placement meetings. These could include longer observation sessions for example. Also potential for pre-placement tutorials, the writing of placement references and assessment activity.	15

There is also a component specific to apprenticeship students whereby an additional 4.5 hours per student is added to the above to account for the additional workload associated with the required tripartite meetings. The 4.5 hours is broadly reflective of the expected 3 x 1.5 hour tripartite meetings that take place over the academic year.

Note: Travel time relating to placement support is to be allocated separately under the Travel Time activity (see 6.2.7).

Guidance

Placement visits are likely to account for a significant part of the overall placement support. To determine an initial assessment of the per student time/type involved, Line Managers should answer the following two questions:

i) What is the average length of a placement visit meeting per student? Ranges are typical between 30-60 minutes but some cases may be shorter or longer.

ii) How many visits to each student are undertaken in each academic year? This will be influenced by the length of the placement (e.g. one, two or three terms) and the frequency of visits in that time (e.g. once or twice per term).

The average length of a placement visit meeting and the number of meeting per year can then be summed to provide an overall per student time allocation for the academic year.

In some cases, the frequency and duration of placement visits will be pre-determined as part of PSRB requirements.

Please do not include travel time in this assessment. Travel time can be included separately under the dedicated Travel Time activity (see 6.2.7).

It is recognised that additional placement support is also undertaken in specific cases. This can include the academic's involvement in sourcing the placements, assessment of student work or projects during the placement period, undertaking placement risk assessments and ongoing communications with students. The Line Manager should take such activities into account when devising the overall per student allocation (placement type) and may wish to discuss the details with the relevant academics.

The system includes five default per student allocations linked to a Placement Type and the Line Manager should choose the one that most closely aligns with the characteristics and per student allocation based on the logic above.

6.2.3 Module Development and Review

Allocation

This will be determined by the type of activity (new module development or review of existing module) and will scale by the credit value of the existing/expected module. The allocation will also vary based on the proportion of the overall activity the Academic is responsible for.

	<15 Credits (x0.5)	30 Credits (x1)	45 Credits (x1.5)	60 Credits (x2)
Module Review	25	40	55	70
New Module Development	50	75	100	125

Example: Two Academics are equally responsible for the review of an existing 30 credit module and each receive a 20 hour allocation (i.e. 50% of the 40 hours available).

Guidance

New module development relates to the work involved in creating novel content for a new module, ensuring that it is constructively aligned and fits into the overall programme design. Allocation of time for review should only be given for a major review of a module (expected roughly once every five years) and relates to the assessment and development of content for an existing module.

6.2.4 New Programme Development / Major Accreditation

Allocation

The allocation differs based on the type of activity (new programme or review of existing programme) and the proportion of the overall activity the Academic is responsible for.

New development relates to the work involved in creating the learning outcomes for a new programme, its overall structure, liaising with module leaders to ensure that modules align and contribute to the overall programme aims and taking the programme through the approval process. For this work there will be 150 hours available to allocate.

The review of an existing programme's content has an allocation of 100 hours for distribution to Academic staff.

Example: Two Academics are to take part equally in the review of an existing programme and each receive an allocation of 50 hours (i.e. 50% of the 100 hours available).

Guidance

For the creation of a new programme or where there is work to a major programme re-accreditation which is similar to new programme development.

6.2.5 Research Student Supervision

Allocation

Post-graduate research (PGR) or research student supervision will be on the basis of 100 hours available per full-time student per year and 0.6 for part-time (60 hours). The Line Manager will be able to enter a percentage for each member of the team that is supervising the student.

Example: A full-time research student (100 hours available) is being supervised by three Academics, of which one supervisor receives 60% (60 hours) with the remaining 40% of the hours being split equally between the two remaining supervisors (20 hours each).

Guidance

As noted above, the percentage function allows for flexibility in capturing shifts in intensity of time/effort that members of the supervision team may experience over the course of the PGR student's degree. This means one Academic may receive a greater share in year 1, which then is relatively smaller in year 2 reflecting a change in focus of the student's research. Service Request functionality can be used to select supervision team members who are outside of the School that 'owns' the research student activity in AWP. Any allocation in 'Other' should not be used.

6.2.6 Other Teaching and Learning

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with Line Manager.

Guidance

To be used in extenuating circumstances to provide flexibility where Academic staff time is required in the delivery of an activity not presently held within the system. The use of this allocation will be monitored by the AWP Steering Group and the Line Manager will be required to provide a rationale for its use.

The system is designed to record all other activity in one allocation (under one activity on-screen). This means, when making the allocation, the Line Manager will need to total these up and make a combined allocation. However, a mandatory text box will allow for any relevant breakdown to be included.

6.2.7 Travel Time

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with line manager.

Guidance

This relates purely to travel time associated with Teaching and Learning activities. It is not intended that every journey will be included here and, as a principle, the practice of 'bean counting' is discouraged. What should be recorded is any material time, over the course of an academic year, that is spent travelling for the purposes of Teaching and Learning. This could include the broad total of numerous trips spent in relation to a specific activity.

Examples of what to include and not include are shown below.

What to include?

- Multiple and/or frequent visits to partners such employers or PSRBs (Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies) as part of developing a new programme or module.
- Any significant and/or recurring travel associated the external moderation of assessments at partner institutions.
- Individual instances of travel where the overall travel time is material (e.g. am overseas module fieldtrip where travel time is more likely to be measured in working days rather than hours).

What not to include?

- Inter-campus travel. The only exception would be where it is material and in support of the activities within Teaching and Learning (e.g. multiple trips to Medway campus from Avery Hill or Greenwich to deliver Teaching and Learning).
- Travel to or from work as part of what could be considered the daily commute.
- Infrequent or ‘one-off’ journeys of short duration.

The system is designed to record all travel for Teaching and Learning in one allocation (under one activity on-screen). This means, when making the allocation, the Line Manager will need to total these up and make a combined allocation. However, a mandatory text box will allow for any relevant breakdown to be included.

For example, an Academic spends 70 hours over a year travelling for international and domestic fieldtrips. They then also spend 25 hours per year travelling to meet with partners in relation to external moderation. In this case, the Line Manager would make an allocation of 95 hours for 'travel time’ and in the text box would say “70 hours for Fieldtrips and 25 hours for external moderation”.

Colleagues are also expected to use their judgement as to whether it is most appropriate and/or possible to travel for sessions/meetings or hold them online, balancing the added value of such time against the delivery of essential activities included elsewhere in the Framework.

7 B - Research and Knowledge Exchange

7.1 RSA Allowance

Allocation

175 hours (pro-rata for part-time staff).

This uses the logic of 5 weeks at 35 hours per week for a full-time member of staff (5 x 35 = 175 hours)

Guidance

RSA time will be principally self-managed and it is expected that associated activities to be undertaken will be discussed with Line Managers. These activities (and their relationship with other duties) will be considered as part of the PDR process under which objectives for the year (or another appropriate period) can be set and assessed.

The activity within the AWP tool also contains open input boxes available for the Academic and Line Manager to record a specific split in the hours relating to the individual elements of RSA: bid preparation, CPD activity, Enterprise and Knowledge Exchange, Research, and Scholarship. The values entered in the input boxes will not adjust the allocation.

The use of the boxes is optional and intended to provide the Academic and Line Manager with a useful breakdown of the RSA time allocation and give the University insight into academic practices surrounding RSA. Whilst this functionality can be used to plan for the year ahead, it would also be of benefit to update these values following the PDR process and/or towards the end of the academic year in order to provide an accurate retrospective view of how the time was actually spent in the year.

The table below sets out the kinds of activities that typically falls within RSA by career pathway.

Areas of activity within "Research and Scholarly Activity" (RSA) time allocation by pathway		
Research Pathway	**Teaching and Learning Pathway**	**Knowledge Exchange and Enterprise Career Pathway**
Unfunded research activities that provide foundation for development, as agreed by line manager	Unfunded pedagogical and practice activities that provide foundation for development, as agreed by line manager	Unfunded Enterprise/KE that provide foundation for development, as agreed by line manager
Bidding for funding for research projects	Bidding for pedagogical project funding	Bidding for KE or enterprise project funding
Preparation of research publications	Preparation of publications/materials reports/ on innovative pedagogical approaches or practice	Preparation of publications/publicity materials/reports
Standard "Esteem" activities external to the university relating to research or teaching - editorial/reviewing/talks/ etc.	Standard "Esteem" activities with external bodies relating to teaching and learning or practice such as editorial activities, curriculum development, practice innovation, presentations etc.	Standard "Esteem" activities with external bodies relating to enterprise teaching and learning or practice such as curriculum/CPD

		development, practice innovation, presentations etc.
Engagement with external bodies PSRBs/ industry/third sector/government/civil society to support pedagogy, practice, research or impact	Engagement with external bodies PSRBs/ industry/third sector/government/civil society to support pedagogy, practice, research or impact	Engagement with external bodies PSRBs/ industry/third sector/government/civil society to support enterprise, pedagogy, practice, research or impact
Integration of research into teaching/training materials/programmes	Introduction of Innovation in teaching/training materials/programmes	Integration of enterprise or KE into teaching/training materials/programmes.
Supporting the delivery of impact or outcomes with demonstrable benefits to businesses, the public sector or society in general	Supporting the delivery of impact/outcomes with demonstrable benefits to businesses, the public sector or society in general	Supporting the delivery of impact/outcomes with demonstrable benefits to businesses, the public sector or society in general
Developing leadership in research including mentorship	Developing leadership in Teaching and learning including mentorship	Developing leadership in enterprise including mentorship
Contribution to assessment of research quality e.g. GREAT exercises	Contribution to assessment of research quality e.g. pedagogical outputs in GREAT exercises	Contribution to assessment of research quality e.g. impact case studies in GREAT exercises
Participation in the academic discipline	Participation in the academic discipline	participation in the academic discipline

To note that additional time can be allocated to areas of activity using the AWP, if agreed by the line manager to be a priority for the University. For example, additional time can be allocated for developing and submitting research bids which sits outside of RSA.

7.2 Bid Preparation

<u>Allocation</u>

Actual hours as agreed with the Line Manager taking into account the expected value of the bid in relation to financial size and impact. This category should only be used for new bidding opportunities that arise during the year – planned bidding activity should be included within the Research and Knowledge Exchange Internal category.

<u>Guidance</u>

Line Managers will be able to capture an Academic's individual bids by providing a name/description for the activity as well as the number of allocated hours. The number of hours is to be informed by the expected value of the bid in relation to financial size and impact. The Line Manager may also consider the experiential benefits for the Academic in terms of their professional development. Greenwich Research and Enterprise (GRE) and Institutes, Centres and Groups may wish to provide advice in support of specific allocations.

The allocations under this activity are considered separate to other principally self-managed bidding activity that is considered as part of Research and Scholarly Activity (RSA) – see 9.1 for more detail.

7.3 Research – External

Allocation

Planned actual hours as agreed with line manager in relation to the scope of the funded research.

Guidance

Line Managers should capture an Academic's individual external research projects by providing a name/description for the activity as well as the number of allocated hours and the source of funding. Allocations can be discussed with the Academic and Greenwich Research and Enterprise (GRE) as part of their formulation. It is expected that the number of hours for allocation to an Academic should be in the approved research grant as part of the full costing of the research bid.

When QR and HEIF funding are used to fund planned time then it should be treated as externally funded research. For staff outside NRI, employment costs (Salary plus National Insurance plus Employer Contributions to Pension) should be used as a cost rate. Within NRI then the NRI cost rate with indirect costs should be used. GRE will support costing of activities.

No allocations should be made in cases where an Academic may be receiving additional renumeration for the work.

Any allocation made under this activity should be considered as separate from allocations made under RSA.

7.4 Research – Internal

Allocation

The level of time allocated for "Research and Knowledge Exchange Internal (RKE) will be agreed through the process described below and includes time planned for bidding activity at the start of the year.

Guidance

The amount of planned time available for "RKE-Internal" will be agreed at School level and this will be determined by the School/Faculty budget.

Academics wishing to access "RKE-Internal" time allocation should apply through the school process by completing the "RKE Internal Funding Application" spreadsheet. The deadline for submitting a completed application will be agreed at School level. Requests for time allocations will be agreed through a process chaired by the Associate Dean (R&KE) which must involve the relevant Heads of Schools and Centre Leaders.

When QR and HEIF funding are used to fund planned time then it should be treated as externally funded research (see above).

Before completing the RKE Internal Funding Application spreadsheet, it is important to work out planned time allocations to other categories of Research and Knowledge Exchange because this will be required on the spreadsheet. To avoid duplication of effort only the total time per category will be required in the spreadsheet.

Academic staff allocated “R&KE Internal” time for research must have participated in the GREAT process (Research Career Pathway) and have completed TRAC submissions.

Academic staff allocated R&KE Internal time should normally be on a Research or Knowledge Exchange Career pathway.

An allocation of “RKE-Internal” time is in addition to an allocation of **Research and Scholarly Activity (RSA)** time. An indication of how RSA time is planned to be spent must be included in the “R&KE Funding Application” spreadsheet. If this is not provided, then “RKE internal” time will not be allocated.

There are no automatic allocations of time for specific career pathways or for Significant Responsibility for Research (SRR). Requests for time should be against planned activities and planned outputs only.

Proposed activities for the allocation of “RKE Internal" time should be in alignment with both School and “Centres/Institutes” strategies and plans. Indicative potential activities include:

- Development of R&KE bids for external funding/preliminary work for external bids (indicate value and funder)
- Preparation of outputs with a focus on those that could be submitted to REF.
- Activities to increase the number of externally funded PGR students.
- Internally funded time contributions to approved externally funded R&KE activities. Time contributions must be clear when the project was approved through RADAR.

All activities in the “RKE Funding Application” spreadsheet must have associated outputs and how they contribute to R&KE sub-strategy KPIs (including for example revenue targets, REF, KEF, growth in number of MPhil/PhD students). Academics will be asked to report briefly against these outputs when they apply in the following year, and they should also inform staff appraisals.

R&KE-Internal time is valuable. At mid-point on each scale, the value of 9% internally funded R&KE time is as follows:

Grade/Mid-point Salary	Indicative cost of 9% R&KE internal time allocation (employment costs only)	Indicative cost of 9% R&KE internal time allocation (with non-lab indirect and estates cost)
AC5/£70,953	£8,988	£14,289
AC4/£65,689	£7,312	£12,613
AC3/£53,539	£5,960	£11,260
AC2/£43,783	£4,874	£10,174

Note: costs calculated using rates in May 2023.

“RKE internal" time will be allocated according to one of four levels that take into account, past performance, proposed activities, contribution of activities to R&KE sub-strategy and the balance of other activities in which the academic is engaged. Note the time resource available will be capped at school level and these allocations are in addition to RSA.

Level	Time allocation
1	4% (75 hours)
2	9% (135 hours)
3	19% (285 hours)
4	24% (360 hours)

When assessing applications disciplinary norms will be taken account in terms of availability of external funding etc.

Should an Academic secure external funding for a proportion of their time then the allocation for “RKE Internal" time allocation should be revised in association with the Line Manager and the Head of School.

Allocations can be discussed with Greenwich Research and Enterprise (GRE) as part of their formulation.

No allocations should be made in cases where an Academic may be receiving additional renumeration for the work.

Any allocation made under this activity should be considered as separate from allocations made under RSA. The proposed use of RSA must be detailed in the RKE internal application form.

7.5 Enterprise and Knowledge Exchange (KE)

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with line manager in relation to the scope of the funded activities.

Guidance

The Line Manager should make an allocation of hours following discussion with the Academic and as advised by Greenwich Research and Enterprise (GRE) where appropriate.

No allocations should be made in cases where an Academic may be receiving additional renumeration for the work.

Any allocation made under this activity should be considered as separate from allocations made under RSA.

7.6 RKE Leadership Roles

Allocation

The number of hours allocated will vary according to the scope of the leadership as follows:

- Institute Director – 500 hours
- Centre Leader – 300 hours
- Group Leader – 50 hours

Guidance

The Line Manager will be expected to provide the name of the institute/centre/group for subsequent analysis.

The total time allocation for Leadership roles should not normally exceed 50% FTE.

7.6.1 Undertaking a PhD

Allocation

An allocation of 100 hours (additional hours on top of the 175 hours for RSA)

Guidance

An Academic staff member studying for a PhD can get a time allocation of up 275 hours per annum as approved by their Line Manager. It is not necessarily a university requirement for all academic staff to have a PhD, so this allocation is not an automatic entitlement but one to be agreed between the Academic and Line Manager.

The allocation is to be made for each year the Academic is studying for a PhD. It will be the responsibility of the Line Manager and PhD Supervisor (or supervisory team) to manage progress towards completion and ensure that time allocations are used effectively.

7.7 Short Course and CPD Delivery

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with line manager in relation to the scope of the funded activity.

Guidance

The Line Manager will be expected to discuss the nature of the activity with the Academic and provide the name of the activity, the number of delivery hours, and the number of preparation hours that the individual should receive for the nature of the activity. No allocations should be made in cases where an Academic may be receiving additional renumeration for the work.

7.8 Other RKE activity

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with line manager.

Guidance

To be used in extenuating circumstances to provide flexibility where Academic staff time is required in the delivery of an activity not presently held within the system. The use of this allocation will be monitored by the AWP Steering Group and the Line Manager will be required to provide a rationale for its use.

Where not otherwise considered as a duty within a role, activities that may be included here are: Chair of Faculty Research Degrees Committee, Chair of Faculty Research Ethics Committee, REF Unit of Assessment Leader.

The system is designed to record all other activity in one allocation (under one activity on-screen). This means, when making the allocation, the Line Manager will need to total these up and make a combined allocation. However, a mandatory text box will allow for any relevant breakdown to be included.

7.9 Travel time

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with line manager.

Guidance

This relates purely to travel time associated with Research and Knowledge Exchange activities that is not already included as part of externally or internally funded RKE projects. It is expected that part of the full-costing of externally funded research (and internally funded research where applicable) will include an allocation of time to facilitate travel to undertake any required research. Therefore, to avoid double-counting, this should be included under externally and internally funded research and knowledge exchange in the first instance.

Any other material time not counted as part of the RKE activities above (sections 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4) should be recorded here. It is not intended that every journey will be included here and, as a principle, the practice of ‘bean counting’ is discouraged. However, the broad total of numerous trips spent in relation to a specific RKE activity should be recorded.

Examples of what to include and not include are shown below.

What to include?

- Multiple and/or frequent visits to off-campus locations to deliver short courses or CPD (Continuous Professional Development) sessions.
- Any significant and/or recurring travel associated with being a Director of an Institute, Centre or Group.
- Any significant travel associated with a research or knowledge exchange project (externally or internally funded) that is not already accounted for under the relevant RKE activity.
- Individual instances of travel where the overall travel time is material (e.g., to deliver a series of short courses overseas or a significant overseas trip as part of representing an Institute or Centre).

What not to include?

- Inter-campus travel. The only exception would be where it is material and in support of the activities within Research and Knowledge Exchange (e.g., multiple trips to Medway campus from Avery Hill or Greenwich to as part of leading an Institute, Centre or Group).
- Travel to or from work as part of what could be considered the daily commute.
- Infrequent or 'one-off' journeys of short duration.

The system is designed to record all travel for Research and Knowledge Exchange in one allocation (under one activity on-screen) with the exception of that already counted under RKE projects. This means, when making the allocation, the Line Manager will need to total these up and make a combined allocation. However, a mandatory text box will allow for any relevant breakdown to be included.

For example, an Academic spends 30 hours over a year travelling internationally as part of their Director role promoting an Institute. They then also spend 30 hours per year travelling to deliver CPD sessions. In this case, the Line Manager would make an allocation of 60 hours for 'travel time' and in the text box would say "30 hours for Institute Director travel and 30 hours for CPD delivery".

Colleagues are also expected to use their judgement as to whether it is most appropriate and/or possible to travel for sessions/meetings or hold them online, balancing the added value of such time against the delivery of essential activities included elsewhere in the Framework.

8 C - Leadership and Management

8.1 Programme Leadership

Allocation

Programme Leadership allocations are comprised of a fixed element of 40 hours plus a variable element of 40 mins per student involved on the programme. The percentage of the programme leadership the Academic is responsible for is also taken into account (e.g., two staff sharing the responsibility, equally).

For example, on a programme with 500 students an Academic is undertaking 100% of the leadership role: 40 + (500 * 0.6) * 100% = 40 + 300 * 100% = 340 hours.

Guidance

Line Managers and/or Heads of School will have a good understanding of the programmes requiring leadership and the Academics that lead them.

Given the variability in programme naming structure (e.g., different titles relating to pathways such as Foundation Year) the Line Manager is enabled to allocate to clusters of programmes where desired and focus on the allocation to individuals.

There are cases where certain programmes require additional support, for example where they invovle industrial placements or run across campuses . To recognise this, there is an optional tick box, whereby an additional 20 hours can be added if it is appropriate to account for such complexities in programme leadership.

8.2 Link Tutors

Allocation

Link Tutor allocations will vary according to the following factors:

- Base hours relating to the number of programmes involved
- International or Domestic
- Franchise or Validation
- The percentage of the activity the Academic is responsible for

The allocation will take the Base Hours based on the number of programmes involved and multiply this against the International/Domestic and Franchise/Validation scalers. The table below shows the allocation outcome in hours based on the above elements. Please note: the figures in brackets represent the relative scalar in effect:

Number of Programmes	Base Hours		Validation (1)	Franchise (1.5)
1-3	15	**Domestic (1)**	15	22.5
		International (1.5)	22.5	33.75
4-5	30	**Domestic (1)**	30	45
		International (1.5)	45	67.5
6 or more	45	**Domestic (1)**	45	67.5
		International (1.5)	67.5	101.25

Example: An Academic participates in a Link Tutor relationship involving 5 programmes which is international and franchised, and they are sharing this responsibility equally with one colleague. This takes the base hours (30) against the scaler for international (30 x 1.5 = 45) and then franchise (45 x 1.5 = 67.5). The Academic is responsible for 50% resulting in an allocation of 33.75 hours.

Guidance

Despite some variation across the University, the AWP framework considers the Link Tutor to be the main contact for a specific partner with responsibility for facilitating regular two-way communication between programme-level staff teams within the collaborative partner and key staff in the University/Faculty/School (e.g. Module Leaders, Heads of School).

It is expected that the Line Manager and/or Academic will be close enough to these relationships to appropriately identify them as international/domestic and validated/franchised. Cases where these statuses are unknown should be flagged to the AWP Support Team.

In terms of the number of programmes, it is expected that the total will reflect the number of individually delivered programmes. For example, if a programme is different in title only (e.g., to reflect a different pathway such as Foundation Year) and is actually delivered together with a cluster of other programmes then we would respect this to only the recorded as one programme for the purpose of the Link Tutor role.

It is recognised that the number of sites a partner delivers at drives some work particularly associated with conducting visits for quality accreditation and graduations.

The allocation does not include travel time. Visiting domestic and international partners is likely to entail a material amount of travel time. This should be recorded separately under 'Travel Time' in this category.

8.3 Defined Leadership and Management Roles

8.3.1 Associate Heads of School

Allocation

The allocation for this role is 750 hours and where applicable can be shared between Academic staff.

Guidance

The allocation represents approximately 50% of an Academic's workload for a full-time member of staff. An Associate Head of School is a designated member of staff that is tasked to undertake responsibility for a set area within the School. There are a range of Associate titles with additional responsibilities, local school arrangements will dictate the exact responsibilities of the role. The allocation can be divided using % share if the role is held by multiple staff.

This allocation only covers Academics in the role of Associate Head of School.

8.3.2 Academic Conduct Officer

Allocation

The allocation for this role is 50 hours and where applicable can be shared between Academic staff.

Guidance

An Academic Conduct Officer is a designated member of staff that manages allegations of student assessment misconduct. There is some variation across faculties with regards to how much of this activity is undertaken by Academics and/or administrative support staff. This allocation only covers Academics in the role of Academic Conduct Officer.

8.3.3 Deputy Head of Section

Allocation

The allocation for this role is 750 hours and where applicable can be shared between Academic staff.

Guidance

The allocation represents approximately 50% of an Academic's workload for a full-time member of staff. There is some variation across schools in terms of the existence of this role. Local school arrangements will dictate the exact responsibilities of the role.

8.3.4 Extenuating Circumstances Officer

Allocation

The allocation for this role is 75 hours and where applicable can be shared between Academic staff.

Guidance

This allocation applies to any Academics undertaking the role of Extenuating Circumstances (EC) Officer which entails dealing with students' EC cases. There is some variation across faculties with regards to how much of this activity is undertaken by Academics and/or administrative support staff. This allocation only covers Academics in the role of Extenuating Circumstances Officer.

8.3.5 Timetabling Lead

Allocation

The allocation for this role is 70 hours and where applicable can be shared between Academic staff.

Guidance

The allocation is for those Academics who are undertaking timetabling coordination activity on behalf of their academic discipline or school/faculty. There is some variation across faculties with regards to how much of this activity is undertaken by Academics and/or administrative support staff. This allocation only covers Academics in the role of Timetabling Lead.

8.3.6 Academic Portfolio Leads

Allocation

The allocation for this role involves a fixed element of 300 hours (FTE 0.2). The allocation can be split using % share where the role is undertaken by multiple staff, or the staff member is not full-time.

Guidance

Line Managers are asked to provide a brief description of the portfolio the Academic is responsible for. This information will be analysed by the AWP Steering Group.

8.3.7 Year/Level/Cohort Tutor or Co-ordinator

Allocation

The allocation for this role has a fixed allocation of 150 hours (FTE 0.1). The allocation can be split using % share where the role is undertaken by multiple staff, or the staff member is not full-time.

Guidance

A range of similar roles exist across the faculties with responsibility for tutoring or co-ordinating a specific cohort, year or level of students. The role fits between and has some overlap in some areas with that of personal tutors, programme leaders and module leaders. The tariff represents a standardised allocation. This role is seen as extra support in cases of large cohorts.

8.4 Other Leadership and Management

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with line manager.

Guidance

To be used in extenuating circumstances to provide flexibility where Academic staff time is required in the delivery of an activity not presently held within the system. The use of this allocation will be monitored by the AWP Steering Group and the Line Manager will be required to provide a rationale for its use.

The system is designed to record all other activity in one allocation (under one activity on-screen). This means, when making the allocation, the Line Manager will need to total these up and make a combined allocation. However, a mandatory text box will allow for any relevant breakdown to be included.

8.5 Travel Time

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with line manager.

Guidance

This relates purely to travel time associated with Leadership and Management activities. It is not intended that every journey will be included here and, as a principle, the practice of 'bean counting' is discouraged. What should be recorded is any material time, over the course of an academic year, that is spent travelling for the purposes of Leadership and Management. This could include the broad total of numerous trips spent in relation to a specific activity.

Examples of what to include and not include are shown below.

What to include?

- Multiple and/or frequent visits to partners as part of the Link Tutor role
- Any significant and/or recurring travel associated with meeting Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) requirements as part of being a Programme Leader.
- Repeated or significant travel representing the School in visits to PSRBs or employers (or others) as part of being a Deputy Head of School.
- Individual instances of travel where the overall travel time is material (e.g., an overseas trip to visit an international partner in the Link Tutor role where travel time is more likely to be measured in working days rather than hours).

What not to include?

- Inter-campus travel. The only exception would be where it is material and in support of the activities within Leadership and Management (e.g., multiple trips to Medway campus from Avery Hill or Greenwich to provide Programme Leadership).
- Travel to or from work as part of what could be considered the daily commute.
- Infrequent or 'one-off' journeys of short duration.

The system is designed to record all travel for Leadership and Management in one allocation (under one activity on-screen). This means, when making the allocation, the Line Manager will need to total these up and make a combined allocation. However, a mandatory text box will allow for any relevant breakdown to be included.

For example, an Academic spends 50 hours over a year travelling internationally to visit partners where they are the designated Link Tutor. They then also spend 20 hours per year travelling to meet with local employers as part of their Programme Leader role. In this case, the Line Manager would make an allocation of 70 hours for 'travel time' and in the text box would say "50 hours for Link Tutor travel and 20 hours for Programme Leadership".

Colleagues are also expected to use their judgement as to whether it is most appropriate and/or possible to travel for sessions/meetings or hold them online, balancing the added value of such time against the delivery of essential activities included elsewhere in the Framework.

9 D - Administration and Academic Citizenship

9.1 Administration (contracted TRA)

Allocation

This allocation relates to a contractual commitment for two weeks' time, or 70 hours (35 hours x 2 weeks = 70 hours), for a full-time member of staff (or pro-rata).

Example for part-time Academic staff: An Academic with a 0.7 FTE will be allocated 49 hours for Administration (contracted TRA), based on 0.7 x 70 = 49.

9.2 Career Development

9.2.1 Early Career Development Allowance

Allocation

The allocation is 100 hours per year for the first two years of contract in Higher Education (HE) which will scale for part-time staff.

Guidance

The allocation is intended for those new to HE rather than new to the University of Greenwich. For example, if a new Academic member of staff has worked at another post in a university for one year before joining the University of Greenwich, the Academic would be eligible for the allowance for one year only, i.e., their second year in HE.

The activity has been specifically designed to grant the career development allocation to Academic staff, irrespective of their career pathway. The Line Manager will be asked to allocate the Academic to the correct career pathway option (Practice, Research, Teaching, Teaching and Research) and expected to monitor whether the continued allocation of the allowance is appropriate. This allocation can only be received once for one career pathway.

The AWP support team and/or HR will be able to confirm an employee's employment history (e.g., the number of years they have already been employed in HE) in cases where a Line Manager requires clarification.

9.2.2 HEA Fellowship Submission

Allocation

The allocation is 25 hours.

Guidance

This is a standardised per year allocation to be allocated to Academic staff completing Higher Education Academy (HEA) fellowship submissions as certified by Advance HE. This covers those applying for Fellow (FHEA), Associate Fellow (AFHEA), Senior Fellow (SFHEA) and Principal Fellow (PFHEA). The allocation can be made in addition to any other career development allocations.

9.2.3 Level 7 Apprenticeship in Higher Education

Allocation

The allocation is 0.2 FTE in Year 1 (300 hours) and 0.1 FTE (150 hours) in Year 2.

Guidance

This allocation is based on an expected duration of 18 months/1.5 years and is the officially recognised study commitments of the course. It is a new tariff allocation given the Level 7 Apprenticeship is a new activity. It is not to be allocated in addition to the 'Early Career Development Allowance' (see 9.3.1).

The Line Manager will be expected to monitor whether the continued allocation of the allowance is appropriate (e.g., that the Academic staff member is still enrolled and/or has completed).

9.2.4 Undertaking a PG Cert in Education

Allocation

The allocation is 120 hours per annum.

Guidance

An Academic cannot receive an allocation for this activity and also receive an 'early career development allowance' (see 9.3.1) in any given year.

However, they can undertake a PG Cert in Education at any point in their academic employment – unlike the 'early career development allowance' which is only applicable to those in their first two years in employment in HE.

9.3 Accreditation Relationship Management

Allocation

The allocation will vary based on a determination of the relative significance of the accreditation to the academic discipline and associated complexity in managing the accreditation relationship. The system has three default allocations built in to reflect this as follows:

- Small – 10 hours. Applies to simple relationships and/or those which are easy to manage with small or infrequent requirements in terms relationship management. May also include cases where Academic member of staff is playing a smaller support role to a more complex relationship.
- Medium – 30 hours. Applies to more complex accreditation relationships. This may include more onerous engagement/relationship activity and/or requirements for (re)accreditation. Could also include some internal coordination of other staff and activity to manage the relationship. Academic staff member also likely to either be the institutional lead or senior representative.
- Large – 50 hours. Applies to the most significant and/or complex accreditation relationships with associated more intensive time commitment. Likely to include internal coordination of other staff and activity to manage the relationship.

Guidance

Line Managers will need to consider whether the allocation to this activity is appropriate in the context of other roles the Academic may have where such activity may form part of expected duties, (e.g. Deputy Head of School, Programme Leader, Academic Portfolio Leader, Module Leadership).The Line Manager should also consider whether the Academic is leading on managing the relationship or playing a support role or managing a distinct smaller relationship within a larger accreditation agreement.

The Line Manager will be expected to provide a name/description of the accreditation activity for this data to be monitored by the AWP Support Team and Steering Group. The system includes a mandatory input box for this information to be recorded.

9.4 Recruitment and Outreach

9.4.1 Interviewing Student Applicants

Allocation

The allocation is based on 15 minutes/0.25 hours per applicant to be interviewed/interviewed.

Guidance

The Line Manager will be expected to plan using the previous year's number of applicants and/or to discuss with the Academic about the anticipated numbers. This can be updated in the system, in-year should there be a material change in either direction.

The 15 mins per student tariff is designed to capture the widely used quick interviews of student applicants as part of the recruitment process. However, it is recognised that there are cases of different types of assessment which may not fit with this tariff and may require more time. In such cases the 'Other' category should be used to allocate the total time for the activity and include detail on the type of interview practice, number of students and time per student. Known examples where the 'Other' category may be used include reviewing portfolios of potential students' work (such as design portfolios, videos, performance/monologue), mock scenarios such as for teaching, and delivery of health sector information.

It is appreciated that this is an area where exact numbers can be difficult to establish so Line Managers and Designated Allocators are encouraged to use their most-informed judgement when allocating.

9.4.2 Recruitment and Outreach Sessions

Allocation

The allocation will vary based on the method of allocation selected by the Line Manager, as follows:

- By number of days where 1 day = 7 hours
- By number of sessions where 1 session = 2 hours

Guidance

The Line Manager can use either method for the allocation. The Line Manager will be expected to plan using the previous year's number of applicants and/or to discuss with the Academic about the anticipated numbers. This can be updated in the system in-year should there be a material change in either direction.

If there are any local cases where an Academic may be receiving additional financial compensation for the delivery of recruitment and outreach activity, this should not be granted a workload allocation in the AWP system.

9.5 Mentoring of Staff

Allocation

The allocation is based on 5 hours per staff member to be mentored (or 'mentee').

Guidance

The starting rationale in the AWP Framework is that a significant amount of mentoring activity is expected to take place as part of the responsibilities of agreed leadership and management roles. This standalone activity is designed to capture that mentoring activity which may take place in addition to those roles and responsibilities. For example, it may cover more informal arrangements for mentoring that occur outside of any line management or matrix management relationships.

9.6 Long-term Absence

Allocation

The allocation is based on a given number of weeks, where 1 week = 35 hours as required.

Example: A Line Manager needs to adjust allocations mid-year owing to the Academic going on long-term sick leave for 2 months. The Line Manager enters in 8 weeks resulting in an allocation of 280 hours (8 x 35 = 280).

Guidance

Please note that information about the specific nature of the absence is not required in the AWP system. It is expected that the reasons for any absence will be known by the Academic, Line Manager and HR and, apart from the overall time allocation to inform resource planning, will be managed through our HR processes outside of the AWP system.

It is expected that some cases of long-term absence will be known in advance (e.g., planned clinical procedures, maternity, paternity and adoption leave). The system allows for these to be included in advance. However, where there are unexpected cases of long-term absence, the system can be adapted in real-time to assist Line Managers in undertaking necessary resource planning to cover such absences.

9.7 Union Responsibilities

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed by the University and the Union.

Guidance

The Line Manager should discuss any related time requirements with the Academic given their role within the union.

9.8 Other Admin and Academic Citizenship

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with line manager.

Guidance

To be used in extenuating circumstances to provide flexibility where Academic staff time is required in the delivery of an activity not presently held within the system. The use of this allocation will be monitored by the AWP Steering Group and the Line Manager will be required to provide a rationale for its use.

The system is designed to record all other activity in one allocation (under one activity on-screen). This means, when making the allocation, the Line Manager will need to total these up and make a combined allocation. However, a mandatory text box will allow for any relevant breakdown to be included.

9.9 Travel Time

Allocation

Actual hours as agreed with line manager.

Guidance

This relates purely to travel time associated with Administration and Academic Citizenship activities. It is not intended that every journey will be included here and, as a principle, the practice of 'bean counting' is discouraged. What should be recorded is any material time, over the course of an academic year, that is spent travelling for the purposes of Administration and Academic Citizenship. This could include the broad total of numerous trips spent in relation to a specific activity.

Examples of what to include and not include are shown below.

What to include?

- Multiple and/or frequent visits to schools or other locations to deliver Recruitment and Outreach Activities
- Any significant and/or recurring travel associated with Research and Scholarly Activity, or research associated with undertaking a PhD.
- Repeated travel to visit partners related to Accreditation Relationship Management.
- Individual instances of travel where the overall travel time is material (e.g., an overseas trip where travel time is more likely to be measured in working days rather than hours).

What not to include?

- Inter-campus travel. The only exception would be where it is material and in support of the activities within Administration and Academic Citizenship (e.g., multiple trips to Medway campus from Avery Hill or Greenwich to provide outreach activity).
- Travel to or from work as part of what could be considered the daily commute.
- Infrequent or 'one-off' journeys of short duration.

The system is designed to record all travel for Administration and Academic Citizenship in one allocation (under one activity on-screen). This means, when making the allocation, the Line Manager will need to total these up and make a combined allocation. However, a mandatory text box will allow for any relevant breakdown to be included.

For example, an Academic spends 40 hours over a year travelling across south-east England to deliver Recruitment and Outreach Activities. They then also spend 20 hours per year travelling to meet with institutional partners as part of their role in Accreditation Relationship Management. In this case, the Line Manager would make an allocation of 60 hours for 'travel time' and in the text box would say "40 for recruitment and outreach and 20 hours for Accreditation Relationship Management".

Colleagues are also expected to use their judgement as to whether it is most appropriate and/or possible to travel for sessions/meetings or hold them online, balancing the added value of such time against the delivery of essential activities included elsewhere in the Framework.