

# School of Social Sciences Work Plan Policy 2024<sup>1</sup>

Version 3 Final  
18 December 2023

## 1. Preamble

The School of Social Sciences at Western Sydney University delivers excellence in research and teaching and has a robust level of community engagement. The School provides innovative and relevant undergraduate and postgraduate degrees. Many of the programs that are managed by the School lead to professional recognition in areas such as Social Work, Counselling, Urban Planning, Policing and Humanitarian work.

The School of Social Sciences is committed to build on its reputation through:

- Conducting cutting-edge research that contributes internationally to the generation of new knowledge and which informs our teaching;
- Undertaking engaged research that addresses many of the challenges facing contemporary society;
- Providing high quality undergraduate and postgraduate education for students from Greater Western Sydney and beyond;
- Offering ground-breaking programs that meet accreditation and industry standards and prepare graduates for professional employment and rewarding careers;
- Developing stimulating industry and government collaborations in research.

Aligned with the goals of the School of Social Sciences this policy aims to implement the University Work Plan Policy Framework (Version 1) as a guide to engage academic staff in work planning negotiations. It should be read in conjunction with Clause 23, Workloads, of the Western Sydney University Academic Staff Agreement 2017 –2021.

Workloads for the year will be determined collegially in Academic Group meetings prior to the commencement of Autumn semester before they are reviewed and endorsed by the Work Plan Committee. Individual Work Plan Agreements must be approved annually by the Dean. Individual Work Agreements must be agreed in the SharePoint portal.

All staff will have the opportunity to develop their scholarship as part of their professional development, subject to the approval of a plan and reporting against same (e.g. ADP).

## 2. School of Social Sciences Work Plan Committee

2.1. The School of Social Sciences Work Plan Committee must consist of:

---

<sup>1</sup> This document should be read in conjunction with the University Workplan Policy 2023 and Part F – Workloads and Career Development of the Academic Staff Agreement 2022-2025.

A Chair appointed by the Dean;

At least two employees appointed by the Dean; and

Elected employees equal in number to those appointed by the Dean/Director under clause 2.1(b).

2.2. A quorate meeting requires attendance of four members, including the Chair (or nominee) and at least one elected representative.

2.3. The School Work Plan Committee must:

annually review this Work Plan Policy;

monitor the equitable distribution of workloads in accordance with this Work Plan Policy; and

report to the University Work Plan Committee on an annual basis.

2.4. The School Work Plan Committee may choose to summarise this policy in a table or spreadsheet, which may act as a numeric workload calculator to total up different policy elements.

2.5. Any workload calculator used must be consistent with the requirements of this policy.

2.6. If disparity arises between the numeric workload calculator and the School Work Plan Policy, the policy document will prevail.

## 3. Definitions

3.1. **Academic unit** means a School or Institute.

3.2. **Employee** means an academic staff member of the University employed on an ongoing, fixed term, or casual basis who is covered by the Western Sydney University Academic Staff Agreement 2022-2025.

3.3. **Supervisor** means the person nominated by the University to whom an employee reports, whether directly or indirectly.

### Academic Work Definitions

As set out in clauses 23.22-23.26 of the Academic Staff Agreement, academic work is comprised of teaching; research and development; administration and governance; and approved service to the community.

3.4. **Teaching** includes:

- a. scholarly activities of acquisition, aggregation and synthesis of knowledge in the preparation of teaching materials;

- b. design and/or delivery of face-to-face, online, blended learning, and other subject/program delivery modes;
- c. delivery of lectures, tutorials, laboratory classes, seminars, workshops, practicum, clinical education, and blended learning;
- d. development and/or delivery of non-award short courses and programs including preparatory, supplementary, and Continuing Education programs;
- e. supervision of postgraduate coursework and honours students, research higher degree students and student placements, clinical learning, and practicums;
- f. design and preparation of student assessment;
- g. marking and student feedback;
- h. availability for student consultation relating to an individual's own teaching;
- i. scholarly and professional engagement to maintain currency in a discipline and professional area; and
- j. scholarly activity to develop and maintain teaching skills and understanding of pedagogy.

**3.5. Research and development** includes:

- a. scholarly activities of acquisition, aggregation, and synthesis of knowledge in the preparation of research projects and associated activities;
- b. planning, constructing, undertaking, analysing, and publishing research;
- c. writing articles and other works for publication;
- d. preparing and submitting external research grant proposals;
- e. developing collaborative research networks both nationally and internationally;
- f. presenting and/or publishing scholarly papers, addresses to conferences, and the like;
- g. approved consultancy research and associated work; and
- h. development of intellectual property, patents and commercialisation.

**3.6. Administration and governance** includes:

- a. program and subject coordination, including new and existing program and subject development, development and evaluation of materials, benchmarking curriculum and learning outcomes, and obtaining professional accreditations;
- b. management or coordination of centres, units, and/or academic organisational sub-units or functions;
- c. contributions to committees;
- d. formal Employee supervision;
- e. management, coordination, development, or promotion of University enterprises, programs, or commercial activities;
- f. general administration of policies and work of the Employee's academic unit; and
- g. contribution to institutional leadership and/or governance at the University.

3.7. Where relevance to the work of the University can be demonstrated, **approved service to the community** includes:

- a. contributions to, and involvement with, professional or academic associations, business, unions, and industry;
- b. contributions to, and involvement with, government and community bodies and associations relevant to the University's engagement strategy;
- c. involvement in academic publishing through refereeing articles, editing journals, and participating in editorial boards; and
- d. promotion of the University in the community.

## 4. Principles

This document provides principles and procedures in relation to managing these areas of academic work, including how the unit's policy guides the development of Individual Work Agreements.

Principle 1. This policy aims to positively promote quality educational experiences for students and support the career development aspirations of academic staff.

Principle 2. Academic work should be primarily aimed at excellence.

Principle 3. Workload allocations should be transparent, fair and effective.

Principle 4. Work planning should be based on supporting research aspirations.

Principle 5. Colleagues should have opportunities to develop scholarship as a part of their professional development.

## 5. Individual Work Agreements

5.1. Individual Work Agreements are negotiated on an annual basis between an employee and their supervisor, who should be familiar with the Academic Staff Agreement 2022-2025, the University Work Plan Policy, and this work plan policy.

5.2. Supervisors must then recommend the signed Individual Work Agreement for approval by the Dean as per clause 23.34 of the Academic Staff Agreement 2022-2025.

5.3. Individual Work Agreements are agreed through a process of negotiation. This is distinct from the leadership and support provided during Academic Career Development, Planning and Review.

5.4. Individual Work Agreements must be collegially negotiated and agreed in writing.

5.5. Individual Work Agreements must be approved by the Dean by 31 March each year.

5.6. Individual Work Agreements are subject to renegotiation if circumstances substantially change after the date they are agreed.

5.7. In addition to the content requirements of clause 23.28 of the Academic Staff Agreement 2022-2025, Individual Work Agreements must make allocations as required by clauses 6-8 below.

5.8. Workloads for the year will be determined collegially in Academic Group meetings prior to the commencement of Autumn semester before they are reviewed and endorsed by the Work Plan Committee.

## 6. Teaching

### **Standard Principles**

6.1. Apart from Deans, Deputy Deans, Directors, Deputy Directors, and research-only academics, all staff have a minimum 20 percent teaching allocation, with at least 10 percent allocated to coursework teaching.

6.2. There is a maximum teaching load of 50 EFSL per year or 12 hours per week (unless the teaching has minimal or no preparation).

6.3. There is a possible teaching allocation of 5% a year (to a maximum of 10%) to enable participation in Foundations of University Learning and Teaching (FULT).

6.4. Staff are eligible for marking relief if they are responsible for more than 150 students in a teaching period.

6.5. Travel time of 2 hours is allocated for employees required to teach on more than one campus in a single day. This allocation may be varied if a reason is specified in an Individual Work Agreement.

6.6. Subject to the operational requirements of the School, employees may concentrate their teaching to manage their research.

### **School of Social Sciences Principles**

6.7. Teaching Load - In principle, the normal load is three subjects. Irrespective of mode of delivery, staff will not be expected to teach and assess more than 225 students in any one year, nor to coordinate more than 4 subjects in any one calendar year. Marking and assessment activities are recognized as an essential element of high quality teaching and there is an expectation that each academic will mark a proportion of the students work in the subject they teach. Workload allocations for delivery of Summer subjects can be claimed in either year. In 2025 Summer allocation should be claimed as the last semester of the year.

6.8. Number and Types of Subjects - This policy recognises that teaching can vary in format across face to face and online domains, as well as being spread over different time periods. To that end a notion of a 'standard mode of delivery' is set out in the table below on the understanding that above variations may dictate 'equivalences' to the standard mode of delivery. Examples of non-standard teaching blocks include field based subjects and practicum subjects. In addition, where non-standard teaching arises which is not specifically catered for in this policy, workload allocations will be negotiated in the first instance within Academic groups. Nonstandard subjects, that are not delivered in a traditional way, can attract a supplemental allocation up to a maximum 6% for 10 CP units.

6.9. Third Party Subject Coordination - Recognising that subject coordinators provide quality assurance for subjects delivered by other entities, the School will provide workload based on the hours of work required, as set out in the table below.

6.10. The School encourages the development of blended learning, flipped delivery and fully online modes that may reduce face-to-face hours. The work associated with standard maintaining and updating online resources for blended and flipped delivery of subjects is incorporated in the standard mode of delivery. More significant upgrades of online material can attract workload as 'development'.

6.11. The standard mode of delivery for each taught subject and assumes that one-third of lectures, equivalent online content and related learning activities and materials are refreshed each year on a continuous improvement cycle. Workload for additional curriculum development work will be through submission to the Deputy Dean (via DAPs).

6.12. The standard mode of delivery includes:

- Subject coordination (duties as set out in the SoSS Subject Coordinator Guide and in clause 6.11 of this document)
- Tutorials (or online equivalent)
- Marking

It is recognized that there are different modes of delivery from fully online, to flipped to blended to fully face-to-face.

The flipped approach promotes deep and active learning, utilising student time outside of the classroom as an opportunity for students to engage in online learning activities and online content, preparing them for interactive, active learning in workshops and tutorials. All (lecture) 'content' is online.

The standard teaching block table on page \_ assumes three hours of 'delivery' per week, regardless of how those hours are delivered.

#### Standard Mode of Delivery formula

	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Unit coordination < 75 students: base allocation including refreshing of one-third of recorded lectures or delivery of regular F2F lectures + consultation	80	5
Additional allowance for larger units	As in policy	TBD
First Tutorial/Workshop	((Hours of delivery per week + 1 hour of preparation per hour of delivery) X (Weeks of delivery))/16	TBD
Repeat Tutorial/Workshops	((Amount of tutorials) X (Hours of delivery per week) X (Weeks of delivery))/16	TBD
Marking of all assessment items for Y students	Y x 1	TBD
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>TBD</b>

#### Standard mode of delivery (worked example for 100 students: online lectures (1 hour) and 4 tutorials (2 hours) run by SC for 12 weeks)

	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Unit coordination < 75 students: base allocation + refreshing of one-third of recorded lectures or delivery of regular F2F lectures + consultation	80	5
Additional allowance for larger units (100)		2
First Tutorial/Workshop	(Hours of delivery per week (2) + 1 hour of preparation per hour of delivery (2)) X (Weeks of delivery (12))	2.8

Repeat Tutorial/Workshop	(Amount of tutorials (3)) X (Hours of delivery per week (2)) X (Weeks of delivery (12))	4.2
Marking of all assessment items for 100 students	100	5.9
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>19.9</b>

**Standard mode of delivery (worked example for 150 students: online lectures (1 hour) and 6 tutorials (2 hours) run by SC for 12 weeks)**

	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Unit coordination < 75 students: base allocation + refreshing of one-third of recorded lectures or delivery of regular F2F lectures + consultation	80	5
Additional allowance for larger units (100)		2
First Tutorial/Workshop	(Hours of delivery per week (2) + 1 hour of preparation per hour of delivery (2)) X (Weeks of delivery (12))	2.8
Repeat Tutorial/Workshop	(Amount of tutorials (3)) X (Hours of delivery per week (2)) X (Weeks of delivery (12))	7
Marking of all assessment items for 100 students	100	8.8.
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>25.6</b>

**Standard mode of delivery (worked example for 100 students: online lectures (1 hour) and 4 tutorials (2 hours) run by SC for 18 weeks in 1H or 2H)**

	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Unit coordination < 75 students: base allocation + refreshing of one-third of recorded lectures or delivery of regular F2F lectures + consultation	80	5
Additional allowance for larger units (100)		2
	(Hours of delivery per week (2) + 1 hour of preparation per hour of delivery (2)) X (Weeks of delivery (12))	4.2
Repeat Tutorial/Workshop	(Amount of tutorials (3)) X (Hours of delivery per week (2)) X (Weeks of delivery (12))	6.3



	(2) X (Weeks of delivery (12))	
Marking of all assessment items for 100 students	100	5.9
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>23.4</b>

### Additional Allowances for Subjects

**Subject size** - As the number of students in a subject increases the administrative demands increase for subject coordination. Principle is that larger subjects require extra allowance for coordination duties.

76-150	2%	801-850	16%
151-200	3%	851-900	17%
201-250	4%	901-1000	18%
251-300	5%	1001-1050	19%
301-350	6%	1051-1100	20%
351-400	7%	1101-1150	21%
401-450	8%	1151-1200	22%
451-500	9%	1201-1250	23%
501-550	10%	1251-1300	24%
551-600	11%	1301-1350	25%
601-650	12%	1351-1400	26%
651-700	13%	1401-1450	27%
701-750	14%	1451-1500	28%
751-800	15%	<i>If there are over 800 students in a subject, subject coordinator may opt to employ an assistant coordinator. This will then reduce the additional allowance by 10%.</i>	

<p><b>Additional subject development and third party delivery</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New subjects – up to 10%</li> <li>• Existing subjects (including online versions) – up to 5%</li> <li>• WSU Online – up to 5% (initial build and delivery): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2% for rebuild and delivery; 1% for delivery only</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SCC &amp; WSU College – 1% each</li> </ul>	<p>Development allowances are for designing and building quality content and related learning activities (e.g. active learning plans and materials), designed to maximise student engagement, with reference to best practice and relevant policies and guidelines.</p> <p>Workload for the development and delivery of university agreed micro-credentials will be agreed individually with the Deputy Dean.</p> <p>Development allowances are available for all delivery modes and will be awarded in the year that the development work is done.</p> <p>Additional development hours must be on the pro-forma available in SharePoint, endorsed by the DAP</p>
---	---	---

<b>Field placement units</b>	Allowance for field visits and related tasks are at 1% for a block of five visits (approx. 16 hours), capped at 5% per subject.	Excludes work already recognised in subject coordination allocation. A field visit is allocated three hours of workload of professional visit to a student on placement. Five visits would therefore constitute 15 hours (almost 1% workload).  Where placements are provided by the social work team, workload will be allocated at 1% per for supervising a first placement student and 1.5% for supervising a second placement student. This will be planned and agreed at the start of the year, to a maximum of 5%, considered as part of governance allocation. It is noted that the school is not a service delivery provider, and such placements should be considered exceptional, not routine.  Allocation for International field placements visits will be considered as part of the unit or governance allocation.
<b>Foundations of University Learning and Teaching</b>	5%	Up to a maximum of 10%

### Supervision<sup>2 3</sup>

HDR Supervision (or part time equivalent) <sup>4</sup>	5% per year per full time student (or part time equivalent) for four years.
<i>The total workload allocation for a PhD student from commencement to completion is 20%. This is normally allocated as 5% per year over four years but a different distribution of that 20% can be agreed by the committee subject to the endorsement of the A/D HDR. In exceptional circumstances a total allocation of over 20% can be awarded, subject to the endorsement of the A/D HDR.</i>	
Masters Project (project supervision)	5%
Master of Research (total allocation) <sup>5</sup>	8% per full time student

WSU policy indicates that staff should not be the main supervisor for more than 3 EFTSL (e.g. 5 students at a 0.6 load). In the School of Social Sciences however, many of our staff are also supervisors of Master of Research Students. School of Social Sciences staff on a load of 30% or above (as indicated on the staff workload page), and willing to take on board more students must submit to the HDR committee a one-page explanation that explains:

<sup>2</sup> An allocation will not be awarded for the supervision of non-Western HDR students

<sup>3</sup> Callista supervision data, which reflects an individual's supervision percentage, is to be used to determine HDR supervision allocations (as opposed to a default principal/co-supervisor split)

<sup>4</sup> Research supervision allocations will be distributed among the supervisory panel except where supervision is shared with academics external to the University. In such cases, the full allocation will be awarded to the School of Social Sciences staff member.

<sup>5</sup> 2% for the first year for supervision and 6% for supervision of the research project in the second year

- a. The reason why no other staff in the School of Social Sciences are able to take on that role
- b. The experience of the proposed supervisor in looking after a large cohort of HDR candidates
- c. The strategies proposed by the staff on how to handle a high load of supervision.

## 7. Research

Allocation of research time to staff in the School of Social Sciences aligns to the research profiles and percentage ranges of the University Research Profiles

The research profiles relevant to Schools are as follows:

### 7.1. **Scholarship or Developing Research Profile:** 20 percent research allocation

This profile is characterised by few, if any, recognised high-order publications over the previous three years. Employees in this profile may be early career academics, developing their research profile, or returning to more active research. Supervisors and academic group colleagues should assist research development by encouraging teaching and research synergies, and by allocating workloads accordingly. A workload allocation for a research higher degree (RHD) enrolment may be granted for this profile, subject to satisfactory annual RHD progress.

Publications and research income totalling less than 40% of combined benchmark, as set out in the formula in 7.7

### 7.2. **Substantial Research:** 21–40 percent research allocation

Employees in this profile will have substantial research standing in their discipline and, depending on the character and methods of their research, will generally aspire to achieve national and/or international publication as well as competitive external funding.

Combined output 40-199% of combined benchmark, as set out in the formula in 7.7

### 7.3. **Research Leaders and Mentors:** 41–60 percent research allocation

Academic staff in this profile will have an advanced research output in their discipline area, usually including significant external income and a well above average publication output. They will be required to play a research leadership and/or mentoring role for staff in the other profiles. Leadership and mentoring may include being the head of a recognised research program or unit, and/or guiding and supporting the research efforts of less experienced researchers.

Research Leaders and Mentors will undertake a research leadership role and will have a combined output of at least 200% of combined benchmark, as set out in the formula in 7.7

Refer to Appendix 1: Leadership and Mentoring Indicators

The research profile relevant to Institutes is as follows:

**7.4. Research Intensive Scholars:** 60–70 percent research allocation

- This profile relates to academic staff in University-designated Institutes, where competitively appointed RIF-funded scholars from Levels A to E are expected to have an advanced research standing relative to their colleagues at the same level, and where their primary role is to advance the research standing of the University.

In addition, the following category is recognized:

**7.5. Research-Only Scholars:** 70–100 percent research

- Clause 23.1 of the Enterprise Agreement exempts 'research-only academics' from academic workloads. Research-only academics include those employed on research contracts of five years or less which may include positions funded by external grants or fellowships (such as DECRA and Laureate Fellows). Such scholars can take on administration and teaching, including HDR supervision, at their own discretion.

**7.6. Research Profile Allocation Process**

- a. Allocations to research profiles will be made on a triennial basis, taking into account reasonable breaks in research activity for parental leave, illness, or other valid reasons.
- b. An employee's entire workload may be allocated to activity other than research if:
  - i. the employee has had opportunities to produce research outcomes; and
  - ii. in the preceding 3 years, without good reason, has consistently not produced evidence of reasonably productive engagement in research consistent with the employee's academic level, discipline and personal career plans.
- c. The Academic Career Development, Planning and Review Process is the ongoing reference point for expected research outcomes. If an employee has shown signs of positive research engagement, they will be invited to submit a research plan which may inform their forthcoming research allocation.
- d. Determination of research and scholarship workload is done in two stages:
  - i. Placement in one of the three profiles described in the Western Framework, and
  - ii. Recommendation of an appropriate allocation of workload within the chosen profile.
- e. Academic groups will consult the Researchers Portal for triennium data about recent publications and current projects, as well as Google Scholar for citations. Staff members should be asked for a short statement detailing current research and scholarly engagement, future plans and research leadership activities. Those who claim a research allocation in the 'research leaders and mentors' band will be asked to provide a statement of

their research leadership and mentoring activities in the previous year and their planned leadership and mentoring activities in the coming year. Profile and allocation decisions will be taken collegially by the group paying attention to track record relative to opportunity and staff members will have the opportunity to have decisions reviewed by the School Workload committee.

g. All staff are advised to enter all publications in the publications portal, even if they will not ultimately qualify for HERDS data collection, and also to register a public profile in My Citations on Google Scholar and to provide a ROPE statement where relevant. Periods of leave (e.g. maternity leave, sick leave, extended carers' leave, administration roles of 50%) will be compensated through the use of an alternative appropriate triennium period. This period ought to reflect the performance achieved immediately before the period of leave. School practice is to include the researcher portal triennium and the previous year's outcomes. Those returning from leave ought to be able to count the 'triennium plus one year', as well as any outputs in the period of leave. With each year, after return from leave, the oldest year of return will be included in the 'triennium plus one' (as well as the leave period). Four years after returning from leave the staff member would return to a standard triennium plus one year.

h. Descriptors of the Scholarship and Research Profiles are contained in the Western University Work Plan Policy. The School will provide a set of indicative thresholds to assist Academic Groups to place members in the appropriate profile which relate to Western, School of Social Sciences and disciplinary benchmarks. These will be reviewed at least every two years. The benchmarked thresholds for 2024 are set out below.

### **2024 Benchmarked Thresholds for Research Profiles**

i. For purposes of deciding whether an individual has reached the threshold for 'substantial' scholarship and research, or 'research leader and mentor', the following benchmarks are offered for Academic Groups to work with. These may need to be adjusted for particular disciplinary cultures such as treatment of first vs. subsequent authorship etc. These adjustments affecting particular Academic Groups should be reported to the School of Social Sciences workload committee. Where an individual's research output places them a little below the relevant threshold on publications and income, academic groups may also take into account whether an individual has also achieved in HDR completions and their research performance relative to opportunity.

j. The benchmark is the School of Social Sciences publication and income achievement in the last ERA (The benchmark is the School of Social Sciences publication and income achievement in the last ERA (per EFT, per annum) which is 2.5 publications and \$13,000 in income, and the median citation count over the last five years on the Google Scholar Profile of WSU staff publishing in the FOR codes championed by the school, which is 244 citations . This benchmark will be reviewed in line with the ERA process and the Google Citations benchmark reviewed every year. The weight for publication and income (both 35%) will be higher than citations (30%). The thresholds below are set in relation to this standard. To ensure equity the citation thresholds vary by career stage. For established academics (>15years after PhD), the formula remains as is (that is 3/3 of the median for citations from

last 5 years, that is 244). For mid-career academics (<15years and > 5 years after PhD) the median to reach is 2/3 of overall median (that is 163 instead of 244. For ECR (<5 years) the median to reach is 1/3 of overall median (that is 81 instead of 244).

k. A qualitative peer review process will work in parallel to the metrics based approach, and will include anyone who chooses to opt in. Academic staff will submit a two-page document to their group providing a narrative of their discipline appropriate research performance and trajectory, including aspects not adequately captured in the formula (e.g. non-standard publications, substantial editorial work, knowledge translation/research impact, projects in process). Research Leader claims will need to point to higher levels of such endeavour and esteem such as being an Editor-in-Chief of a journal (involving the management of staff and large budgets) or holding an ARC Future Fellowship or Laureate. The statement will be discussed in the group, supported through advice and mentoring, endorsed by the DAP and submitted to the School Workload Committee. The reasoned documents produced by academics, together with the related recommendation on the individual from the group, can indicate that the appropriate band allocation is different from the one suggested by the research workload calculator.

#### 7.7. 2024 Formula

Combined Output = ((((((last 3 years of publications/3)/2.5)\*100)\*35) + (((last 3 years of income/3)/13,000\*100)\*35)+(((Google Citations/244\*100)\*30))/100)

#### **How to work this out**

Taking into account the broader scope of publications referred to above, and counting all Western register data for the previous triennium plus previous year publications and non-HERDC publications, government reports, textbooks, 'The Conversation' articles, etc divided for multiple authorship (where for example a report would be worth 1.0 weighted publication in total, and a The Conversation article 0.1), as well as current funded projects, then dividing by three to produce a per annum results for publications and income. Divide publications by 2.5 and income by 13,000 to express each of these as a percentage of the appropriate benchmark, then average the percentages. See research band calculator template in the appendix. Note that new staff may only use publications, which will be double-counted, for this calculation, and not research income, for their first two years of IWAs at Western.

#### a. Guidelines for Academic Groups

When considering research allocations within the determined profile, the following should be considered. Particular emphasis should be given to assessment of quality as the other two categories are taken into account in the allocation to band. Those groups relying on a peer review process will be expected to make direct reference to disciplinary quality indicators in regard to most recent publications

i. Publications: refereed journal articles, book chapters, books, monographs, unrefereed articles, policy documents, research report for client, technical notes/manuals, newspaper columns and contributions to new media outlets.

ii. Income including: External grants category 1 (ARC, NHMRC), external grants category 2-4 (e.g., see research bulletin), Partnership grants or contract research,

consultancy and internal grants.

iii. Quality shown by: citations, impact factors, indexation of journals by Scopus and/or Google Scholar or ISI, sales of monographs, discipline standing of publishing houses, effect on policy.

b. Academic groups will make a determination based on current Research and Scholarly engagement and the research trajectory of the individual concerned including:

i. New grants

ii. Current grant applications

iii. Publications plans (e.g., book contracts, submission receipts for papers)

iv. New HDR students.

v. Engaged research leading to possible partnerships

vi. Planned field trips or experiments

vii. Accepted conference presentations

c. Staff making a claim for 40 to 60% research leaders and mentors band should also describe their role in leadership and mentoring both in the preceding year and the year to come.

## 8. Administration and Governance

8.1. In the School of Social Sciences a standard administration and governance allocation of 10% is allocated to academic staff cover administrative duties and collegial responsibilities such as Open Day, careers markets, academic advising (not covering formal academic program advice as provided by appointed Academic Program Advisors) and graduations. **(UWPP cl 67)**

8.2. Academic leadership positions attract the following administration and governance allocations:

Dean and Deputy Dean	80%
Associate Dean HDR	40%
Associate Dean Teaching and Learning	40%
Associate Dean Research	40%
Associate Dean Indigenous Education	40%
Associate Dean Engagement	40%
Associate Dean International	40%
Associate Dean International – China, Hong Kong, Macau & Taiwan	10%
Western Sydney School-based Theme Convener	5%

Country and regional leads will be awarded workload by negotiation

Director of Academic Programs calculated using DAP workload calculator (see [appendix 2](#))

Academic Program Advisors calculated using APA workload calculator (see [appendix 3](#))

8.3 Administration and governance allocations for leadership roles consider the following factors:

a. The nature of the work;

- b. The number of staff-members being supervised; and
- c. The student load in a program. **(UWPP cl 72)**

#### 8.4. University-Agreed Administration and Governance Allocations **(UWPP cll 24.g; 68)**

University-Wide Administrative Activity	Source of Allocation	Time %	Days per Week	Hours per Week
Disability Coordinators	UWPP cl 67.a	5%	0.25	1.75
University Governance Committees	UWPP cl 67.b	5%	0.25	1.75
Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC)	UWPP cl 67.c, also refer to <a href="#">HREC Terms of Reference</a>	5%, 10% or 20%	0.25, 0.5 or 1.0	1.75, 3.5 or 7
Low and Negligible Risk Human Research Ethics Committee (LNR HREC)	UWPP cl 67.d, also refer to <a href="#">LNR HREC Terms of Reference</a>	5%, 10% or 20%	0.25, 0.5 or 1.0	1.75, 3.5 or 7
Academic Unit Work Plan Committees	UWPP cl 67.e	2–5%	0.1–0.25	0.7–1.75
Senate-mandated academic unit committees or sub-committees	UWPP cl 67.f	2–5%	0.1–0.25	0.7–1.75
Health and Safety Representative	UWPP cl 67.g	2–5%	0.1–0.25	0.7–1.75
Health and Safety Deputy	UWPP cl 67.h	1-3%	0.05, 0.1 or 0.14	0.35, 0.7, or 1
Equity and Diversity Working Party Members	UWPP cl 67.i.i	1%	0.05	0.35
Equity and Diversity Working Party Dual SAGE – Self-Assessment Team Members	UWPP cl 67.i.ii	2%	0.1	0.7
Equity and Diversity Working Party Allocations Chairs	UWPP cl 67.i.iii	3%	0.14	1
<p>For further guidance please see Administration and Governance Allocations (UWPP cll. 66-71), that discuss the University-wide allocations for these responsibilities. <b>(UWPP cl 69)</b></p> <p>Workloads for Health and Safety representatives in the School of Social Sciences have been developed in consultation with relevant Health and Safety Committees and Campus Provosts.</p>				

#### 8.5. School-based responsibilities

STARS Coordinator

20%



Master of Research Convener	10%
Academic Group Leaders <sup>6</sup>	10%
Equity and Disability Coordinator – Whole of School	15%
WSU Community Clinic Lead (to be workloaded. Figure to be agreed on provision of rationale)	
Art Therapy Online Clinic Lead (to be workloaded. Figure to be agreed on provision of rationale)	

8.6 Members of the Art Therapy and Counselling group who carry out admissions interviews as mandated by the relevant professional associations may claim up to 5% workload allocation for such activities. This will be available on a pro rata basis for colleagues on fractional appointments.

## 9. Dispute Resolution

9.1. Disputes about Individual Work Agreements must be referred to either the Dean or the School Work Plan Committee for resolution in the first instance.

9.2. The School Work Plan Committee must either attempt to resolve the dispute or escalate the dispute to the Dean.

9.3. The Dean/Director must attempt to resolve any dispute referred to them.

9.4. If the dispute remains unresolved, either person may refer the dispute to the University Work Plan Committee.

9.5. The University Work Plan Committee will determine if the workload allocation process has complied with the Academic Staff Agreement 2022-2025, the University Work Plan Policy, and the Academic Unit Work Plan Policy.

9.6. Decisions of the University Work Plan Committee will be binding and final.

## 10. Consultation

Group Consulted in Policy Development	Date of Consultation
School consulted on first draft	15 November 2023
School consulted on second draft	24 November 2023

---

<sup>6</sup> Up to 10% as agreed with DAP and reviewed by AWG. To be awarded where the leader does not receive a DAP or ACA allocation.

**Appendix 1: Leadership and Mentoring Indicators:**

Academic staff placed within the Research Leaders and Mentors profile are expected to include leadership and mentoring activities within their workload. Leadership roles may be undertaken within the immediate research group, the School, Western or the wider discipline and may vary with the level of appointment and experience. The following table provides a guide.

Level	Research Group	School	University	Discipline
A/B (Research Fellows and RLs)	<p>Publishing with other group members (may be more senior) or HDRs.</p> <p>Submitting grants with other groups members.</p>	<p>As for group, but with school members. Peer mentoring.</p> <p>Organising colloquia/workshops.</p> <p>Participation in Research Committee</p>	<p>Peer review panel participation</p> <p>Media appearances</p>	<p>Organising symposia at conferences. Invited talks.</p> <p>Reviewing papers.</p> <p>Reviewing conference abstracts.</p>
C/D Senior Researchers & Aspros	<p>Publishing with other group members.</p> <p>Leading grant applications with other groups members.</p> <p>Assisting group members with grant writing and publications.</p>	<p>As for group, but with school members.</p>	<p>Representing University research to outside world – media and engagement.</p>	<p>Reviewing theses &amp; grants.</p> <p>Serving on Editorial boards.</p>
E Professors, Directors of Centres & Groups	<p>Publishing with students.</p> <p>Assisting group members with grant writing, publications.</p> <p>Leading a supportive research culture, including for HDR students.</p>	<p>As for group, but with school members.</p> <p>Research cluster leadership</p> <p>Facilitation of Research Activity</p> <p>Organisation of seminars for HDR students</p>	<p>Sitting on relevant Uni wide committees such as Peer Review, Ethics, Research Committees. Representing University research to outside world – media and engagement.</p>	<p>Invited keynotes.</p> <p>Chief editor of journals. Senior activity in relevant Societies</p> <p>Leadership also shown by quality of pubs (e.g., high citations)</p>

## Appendix 2: DAP Workload calculator

<b>Table 1: Accumulated points (indicative) relating to complexity factors</b>				
	<b>Allocated Points (indicative only)</b>			
<b>EFTSL IN COURSE</b>	<200	200-500	500-1000	>1000
<b>Points</b>	2	4	6	8
<b>STAFF SUPERVISED</b>				
	<10	11-20	21-30	
<b>Points</b>	2	4	6	
<b>NO. COURSES</b>				
	2	3	4 or more	
<b>Points</b>	1	2	3	
<b>Table 2: Application of indicative points to annual workload percentages</b>				
<b>Total Points (indicative only)</b>	<b>Workload %</b>			
5 or less	20%			
6	20%			
7	25%			
8	30%			
9	30%			
10	35%			
11	40%			
12	40%			
13	45%			
14	45%			
15	50%			
16	50%			
17	55%			
18	60%			

**Appendix 3: APA Workload calculator**

	<b>Allocated Points (indicative only)</b>				
<b>EFTSL IN COURSE</b>	<50	50-100	100-150	150-200	200-250 etc
<b>Points</b>	1	2	3	4	5 etc
<b>NO. CAMPUSES FOR COURSE</b>					
	one	two	three	Four	
<b>Points</b>	1	2	3	4	
<b>NO. COURSES</b>					
	one	2 to 3	4 or more		
<b>Points</b>	1	2	3		
<b>Total Points (indicative only)</b>					
	Workload %				
4	5%				
5	10%				
6 to 7	15%				
8	20%				
9 to 10	25%				
11+	30%				