

MARCS Institute for Brain, Behaviour and Development

Work Plan Policy

2025¹

Version 2 – 18th October 2024

1. Preamble

The Work Plan Policy for the MARCS Institute for Brain, Behaviour and Development (MARCS) is based on the general requirements and policies of the University, the *Western Sydney University Academic Staff Agreement 2022-2025*, and the *University Work Plan Policy 2023*. This document specifies the principles and procedures used to guide individual work agreements, and details dispute settlement, should it be required.

The MARCS Institute for Brain, Behaviour and Development is one of several institutes within Western Sydney University. The Institute provides a stimulating and safe research environment in which researchers can focus on major research questions of our time. Our academic staff build on existing national and international reputations with an interdisciplinary research emphasis on interaction, communication and advanced sensing, including electronic sensing, using scientific methods through language, gesture, across the lifespan, between humans, between humans and machines, within and across cultures, and from neural networks to behaviour.

The vision for the Institute is to optimise human interaction and wellbeing across the lifespan. We strive to solve the problems that matter most through the themes: sensing and perceiving, interacting with each other and technologies for humans. Researchers in MARCS come from many disciplines including cognitive science, developmental psychology, language science, music science, cognitive neuroscience, and biomedical, electrical, electronic and software engineering.

Our staff embodies the shared vision to provide a stimulating and collegial research environment in which researchers and Higher Degree Research students deliver outstanding research outcomes with impact.

Our strategic objectives are to:

- conduct high-quality research;
- increase the number and concentration of national and international research collaborations and ensure MARCS research has impact;
- increase the number of high quality HDR students aligned to MARCS areas of research strength;
- increase the depth and breadth of linkages with other academic units within Western;
- contribute to the number of fields of research at Western operating above or well above world standard;

¹ 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*.

- achieve and sustain a high level and diversity of MARCS external research income.

All academic staff can contribute to these objectives through activity and recognition of their:

- learning and teaching (section 6);
- research and development (section 7);
- administration and governance incorporating approved service to the communities (section 8).

The MARCS Work Plan Policy has been written to define the scope and nature of these activities, which will assist in the development of individual work agreements.

The Western Sydney University guidelines on Academic Work Plans seek to establish an environment in which the shared goals and responsibilities for academic work are distributed in an equitable, transparent and collegial manner. At the same time, the Institute requires flexibility in its approach to work plans and practices to meet changing circumstances affecting its research, contributions to teaching and administrative arrangements. Individual Work Agreements will be drafted in collaboration with members of the relevant Institute academic groups (which in MARCS are research programs), prior to review and approval by the Institute Director (see section 5).

2. MARCS Work Plan Committee

2.1. The MARCS Work Plan Committee must consist of:

- a. A Chair – Institute Director or nominee;
- b. At least two employees appointed by the Institute Director; and
- c. Elected employees equal in number to those appointed by the Institute 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 MARCS Work Plan Committee must:

- a. annually review this Work Plan Policy;
- b. monitor the equitable distribution of workloads in accordance with this Work Plan Policy; and
- c. report to the University Work Plan Committee on an annual basis.

2.4. The MARCS 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 MARCS Work Plan Policy, the policy document will prevail.

2.7 Pro rata calculations for part-time staff are to be used to create an equitable assessment and allocation for full-time and part-time staff.

Allocations calculated based on past performance (eg research allocation) will be calculated pro-rata based on the actual fraction FTE which was worked during the assessment period.

Allocation for the current period will be calculated pro-rata to the actual fraction FTE in the current period.

Generally, where work plan models allocate load for specific tasks based on a proportion of a full-time load, the equivalent allocation for a part-time staff member will be divided by the annual fraction FTE of the part-time staff member.

3. Definitions

General 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.

In addition, the Institute recognises that teaching may also typically include:

- k. development of new skills and learning required for successful online delivery of teaching materials;
- l. providing guidance to, and supervision of, Higher Degree Research students.

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, preparing/formatting data for storage on open-access portals, preparing/formatting code for storage on open-access portals, 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.

In addition, the Institute recognises that research and development may also typically include:

- i. developing new collaborative opportunities with colleagues across the University;
- j. research management and administration (including monitoring expenditure from research grants against budget, preparation of financial reports, etc.);
- k. liaising with industry funding partners to disseminate research findings
- l. refereeing or reviewing grant proposals, journal articles and theses, and other research outputs;
- m. research training (techniques, facilities and instrumentation, internal workshops, transdisciplinary networking, etc.);
- n. mentoring colleagues.

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.

In addition, the Institute recognises that administration and governance may also typically include:

- h. scholarly contributions to curriculum design and review;
- i. management of research facilities;
- j. preparation and commissioning of new equipment/facilities;
- k. reviewing job applications and serving on staff recruiting interview panels;
- l. participation in meetings, forums and workshops.

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.

In addition, the Institute recognises that approved service to the community may also typically include:

- e. conference organisation and participation;
- f. responding to requests from national and international media for comment on events/developments;
- g. Schools outreach;
- h. Activities related to patent searching, lodgement of patent applications and other research commercialisation/knowledge-transfer activities.

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, not at increasing numbers and meeting targets. Where possible research practice (e.g., data collection, analytical processes) should be open and transparent.
- Principle 3. Workload allocations should be transparent, fair and effective. All researchers should be able to check that their outputs have been correctly identified.

Principle 4. Work planning should be based on supporting aspirations. Specified thresholds for research productively although important should be considered to be guiding expectations and assessed on a three-year rolling average.

Principle 5. Staff 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 Institute Director, 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 Institute Director 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.

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 MARCS, employees may concentrate their teaching to manage their research.

MARCS Principles

It is the Institute's expectation that all academic staff will complete some teaching of undergraduate and/or postgraduate coursework students, and/or postgraduate research students undertaking coursework as an approved component of their higher degrees (equal to 10%). Postdoctoral Fellows are encouraged to participate in the Institute's contribution to teaching. Our contribution supports the University's commitment to the nexus between teaching and research.

The Institute adheres to the Principles for Teaching Allocations as described in clauses 23.5 and 23.6 of the *Western Sydney University Academic Staff Agreement 2022-2025*.

All teaching arrangements will be negotiated between the staff member, supervisor and MARCS Director. The Institute has established the following principles:

- a. DECRA, Future Fellows, and Laureate Fellows are not required to teach in classrooms, unless it is written into their research agreement, although any contribution to teaching is welcome;
- b. postdoctoral fellows wholly employed on an external grant (i.e. on research grant money) are not required to teach, however they would usually supervise HDR students. As part of their training and development, they may elect to teach into subjects as guest lecturers, running practical sessions and fieldtrips, where their hands- on experience is valuable;
- c. all other academic staff undertake a 20% teaching load in accordance with the availability of a relevant subject and need with 10% face to face with the exception of those identified in clause 6.1. While the Institute is set up primarily with a research focus, it recognises that teaching is an important practice for researchers, expressly through communicating their discipline-based knowledge and methodological understanding in the classroom and through HDR supervision;
- d. the expectation is that academic staff will fit within the profile shown in Table 1 below and that negotiation in terms of the discipline focus is managed collegially with oversight by the MARCS Director;
- e. learning and teaching effort is recognised in the end of year Annual Performance & Planning Review (APPR) process along with research and development; administration and governance; and approved service to community;
- f. loading is comparable with that of other academic staff holding substantial research

commitments.

6.7. Teaching load allocation is consistent with the teaching profile for academic staff within an Institute (i.e., 20%, where 10% is face-to-face teaching). Upper limits are shown in Table 1.

6.8. The teaching commitment of Institute staff will be in the staff member's broad area of expertise. Given the interdisciplinary nature of the Institute and its staff, some staff might teach across a number of areas or subjects. Upper limits are shown in Table 1.

6.9. Subject coordination calculations are between 2% and 16%. A core 2% for all subject coordination. In addition, supervising staff attracts between 1% (one member of staff) to 8% (equal to or greater than 7 staff); and subject enrolment between 2% (equal to or greater than 100 students) to 6% (equal to or greater than 400 students). Upper limits are shown in Table 1.

6.10 Supervision of research students (including Honours, MRes and PhD students) is calculated as shown in Table 1. As a research-intensive unit of the University, the Institute highly values student supervision as a core element of the Institute's strategic plan.

Table 1 – Guideline to Allocation of Teaching Time and Upper Limits

	Activities	Time Percentage	Average hours per week (35hr week)	Upper Limits expressed as hours per week
Overall, comprising the following:		20 percent		
HDR Supervision (full-time student)	As Principal Supervisor		2.5	
	As Co-Supervisor (a) allocation includes face to face and reading/edits (b) multiply by number of students		1.0	
MRes Supervision – second year (full-time student)	As Principal Supervisor		1.0	
	As Co-Supervisor (a) allocation includes face to face and reading/edits (b) multiply by number of students		0.75	
Honours Supervision – (full-time student)	As Principal Supervisor		1.0	
	As Co-Supervisor (a) allocation includes face to face and reading/edits (b) multiply by number of students		0.75	
Other approved supervision contributions	Mentoring of High School students in		0.01	
	Extension courses such as Senior Science Extension;		0.1	
	Summer / Winter scholars;		0.1	
	Capstone projects; Other student project supervision		0.05	
			During Term	During Term

Subject Coordination (viz 6.9)	Subject Coordination		3.0	7.5
Classroom Teaching (viz 6.8)	Preparation		2.5	6.25
	Lectures		2.0	4.5
	Practicals		3.0	7.5
	Tutorials		2.0	5
	Marking		1.0	2.5
	(a) multiply by number of subjects/activities/students			
Learning and Teaching Development	All staff will have opportunities, should they seek it, for learning and teaching scholarship as part of their professional development	A standard allocation of 5 to a maximum of 10 percent is available for staff to undertake FULT.		

Academic staff will be given opportunities for learning and teaching scholarship as a part of their professional development including researcher development training. The Epigeum program offers professional development courses for researchers in addition to in-house opportunities including:

- early career researcher or executive speed mentoring;
- e-research training and support including data management;
- research professional;
- pitching a research proposal;
- shut up and write;
- workshops and events facilitated by the Research Office;
- and research seminar series in the Institute and more broadly.

More targeted opportunities such as the HDR Supervision Skills and the Foundations of University Learning and Teaching (FULT) program. A 5% to a maximum of 10% load will be allocated to any academic member of staff undertaking (FULT) in any calendar year.

The Institute will work with individual members of staff to identify and prepare individual work agreements following the annual APPR process. A template will be provided by the Institute Director and Institute Manager which gives ample opportunity for staff to identify their teaching commitment for the coming year (in addition to research, engagement and governance activities). The MARCS Work Plan Committee will play a key role in monitoring the various work plans and processes to ensure equity and transparency across the Institute.

7. Research

Allocation of research time to staff in MARCS aligns to the research profiles and percentage ranges of the University Research Profiles.

Research leadership and research mentoring definitions: Research Leaders and Mentors would be expected to have significant international profile and standing, and comparable high quality research publications and funded research (as primary or principal researcher). The researcher must be actively involved in mentoring junior research staff. A research mentor should be assisting group members with grant writing and publications. A research leader is expected to be a member of relevant university-wide research committees or a leader of a research centre or a research group and should normally be reviewing research grants and journal articles. A research leader is also expected to involve organising international conferences and workshops.

The Institute broadly determines each individual's research work plan profile according to their academic level. However, MARCS acknowledges that academic level is not a restrictive factor in determining the profile and that individual staff may be performing above, or well above, what is expected from their substantive position.

Non-conventional research across all University Research Profiles, such as consultancies not considered "research consultancy" by the Research Office, are submitted to the Institute Director on an External Work Approval EWA1 or External Private Work Approval EWA2 form. If the Institute Director approves the activity, they will determine if the activity is within load or above load in consultation with the academic. If within load, it will also be determined how the activity will contribute to the academic's teaching, research, or governance workload.

The following principles will be an essential part of evaluating research performance:

Given the diverse nature of the research carried out at MARCS, where possible a suite of quality metrics and indicators will be made available to researchers from different fields. Research quality targets at the Institute-level have been set annually, with the goal of driving behaviour towards quality publishing. Research measures include: percentage of Journal articles in Scopus Scimago Journal Rank (SJR) Quartile 1; HERDC Income; QS World University Subject Rankings; HDR Student Load; Field Weighted Citation Index (FWCI). Flawed assessment metrics, such as Journal Impact Factor, H-index, or i10-index will not be used for research assessment.

Where practical, assessment of individual researchers will include a qualitative judgement of their portfolio. In general, a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice will be considered. That is, an approach that considers more information about an individual's expertise, experience, activities and influence will be preferred over single metrics.

As a general principle, the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets and software) in addition to research publications will be taken into account when

evaluating research performance.

The Institute values good scientific practice, such as research that is pre-registered, published completely and transparently, and this will be considered in evaluation of a research portfolio. Likewise, the value of research practice that follows the principles outlined by FAIR (Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability) data management practices will be acknowledged. Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., ... & Bouwman, J. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific data*, 3(1), 1-9.

The research profile relevant to Institutes is as follows:

7.1. **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.

The Institute operationalises workload in different ways according to the stage of career for each academic as specified below:

The Institute recognises first and second year Postdoctoral Researchers who are not employed on grants, roughly equivalent to Academic Level A. Wherever possible, staff will be given HDR student co-supervision responsibility, access to research seminars, conference organising, and funding for presenting at national and international conferences.

Academic staff will receive an academic mentor to assist in the development of their academic career, which may include exposure to teaching and demonstrating.

A typical expectation for a Level A position would be:

- Submitting grants for funding from internal sources and contributing to the development of grants for external funding by becoming familiar with its funding rules, and gathering relevant information to assist with the completion of the application. Small grants and travel bursaries form the external income for these staff.
- Assist with the preparation and submission of high-quality research papers.
- Attain measures of academic esteem such as awards, recognition by peers or co-authorship on a scientific paper.

The Institute recognises Early Career Researchers and high performing or third year Postdoctoral Researchers, roughly equivalent to Academic Level B. Staff will be expected to be named on large-scale and other grants as co-investigators. Principal supervision of

HDR students and additional responsibilities for the academic life of the Institute including participation in committees and providing leadership in the academic and cultural activities of the Institute are essential.

A typical expectation for a Level B position would be:

- Prepare and submit high-quality research papers for publication
- Attain measures of academic esteem such as awards, recognition by peers, co-authorship on a scientific paper, or membership of a committee
- Submit grants for funding from ARC Discovery and Linkage programs, DECRA Fellowships, LIEF applications, ITTC, Research Hub, and mid-scale industry R&D corporations, and seed funding from various sources including Councils and Professional Societies to reach an income target of \$80,000 - \$100,000 per annum (other than those employed fully on research grant money).

The Institute recognises Mid-Career Researchers, roughly equivalent to Academic Level C. Staff will be expected to be named chief investigator on large-scale grants and hold a significant number of other grants as co-investigators or as chief investigators. Principal supervision of HDR students and additional responsibilities for the academic life of the Institute including participation in committees and providing leadership in the academic and cultural activities of the Institute are essential across more than one discipline area (e.g., a theme leadership role).

A typical expectation for a Level C position would be:

- Prepare and submit high-quality research papers for publication
- Attain measures of academic esteem such as recognised awards or membership of national or international committees
- Submit grants for funding from ARC Discovery and Linkage programs, DECRA Fellowships, LIEF applications, NHMRC, ITTC, Research Hub, and mid-scale industry R&D corporations to reach an income target of \$100,000 - \$125,000 per annum.

The Institute recognises experienced researchers, roughly equivalent to Academic Levels D and E. Staff will be expected to lead large-scale grants as chief investigators across a diverse range of funding bodies, competitive and collaborative/industry, resulting in significant external income generation. Principal supervision of a significant cohort of HDR students and primary responsibility for Institute sub-committees. These researchers provide significant leadership for academic and cultural activities of the Institute including mentorship.

A typical expectation for a Level D position would be:

- Prepare and submit high-quality research papers for publication
- Attain measures of academic esteem such as recognised international awards, membership of national or international committees, or editorial panels of journals
- Submit grants for funding from ARC Discovery and Linkage programs, Future Fellowships, LIEF applications, NHMRC, ITTC, Research Hub, large-scale industry R&D corporations, other federal and state government competitive grants, and

other sources to reach an income target of \$125,000 to \$160,000 per annum. Research will demonstrate both quality and impact.

A typical expectation for a Level E position would be:

- Prepare and submit high-quality research papers for publication
- Attain measures of academic esteem such as prestigious international awards, memberships of academies, expert panels or editorial boards of journals.
- Submit grants for funding from ARC Discovery and Linkage programs, Laureate Fellowships, LIEF applications, NHMRC, ITTC, Research Hub, large-scale industry R&D corporations, other federal and state government competitive grants, and other sources to reach an income target of \$160,000 to \$250,000 per annum. Research will demonstrate both quality and impact.

In addition, the following category is recognized:

7.2. **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.

The Institute assigns Postdoctoral Researchers employed on grants to this profile, roughly equivalent to Academic Level A. Wherever possible, staff will be given HDR student co-supervision responsibility, access to research seminars, conference organising, and funding for presenting at national and international conferences.

Academic staff employed on research grant money would receive a minimum 90% research allocation to further develop their academic profile, plus appropriate time for administration and broad participation in the fabric of the Institute. They will also receive an academic mentor to assist in the development of their academic career, which may include exposure to teaching and demonstrating.

Academic staff appointed as ‘research only’ would also fit within this University Research Profile.

7.3. **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. Academic Staff are either Research Intensive Scholars (60-70 per cent research) or Research Only Scholars (70+ per cent research). Scholars are allocated to the

Research-Only profile based on an analysis of eligible Institute contracts, remaining Scholars are allocated to the Research Intensive profile.

- c. Typical allocation is specified by Academic Level shown in clauses 7.1-7.2 above, however the intensity of research expected of all academic staff in research Institutes is captured in our APPR process which takes into account:
- stage of career including prior experience and reputation;
 - previous research grant success;
 - significant administration and governance responsibilities: e.g. as Director, Chief Scientist, HDR/Research/Engagement Directors, Deputy Director, standing committee representation, etc;
 - significant learning and teaching responsibilities: e.g. as Subject Coordinator, sizeable HDR student supervision load;
 - employment wholly on external research grant income.
- d. 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.
- e. 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.

8. Administration and Governance

8.1. In MARCS 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.

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

- Institute Director – 80% allocation

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.

8.4. University-Agreed Administration and Governance Allocations

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 HREC Terms of Reference	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 LNR HREC Terms of Reference	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%	0.1–0.25	0.7–1.75
Senate-mandated academic unit committees or sub-committees	UWPP cl 67.f	5%	0.1–0.25	0.7–1.75
Health and Safety Representative	UWPP cl 67.g	5%	0.1–0.25	0.7–1.75
Health and Safety Deputy	UWPP cl 67.h	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

For further guidance please see Administration and Governance Allocations (UWPP cll. 66-71), that discuss the University-wide allocations for these responsibilities.

Workloads for Health and Safety representatives in MARCS have been developed in consultation with relevant Health and Safety Committees and Campus Provosts.

8.5. Institute-based responsibilities

- Director of Research – 30% allocation.
- Director of Impact and Engagement – 20% allocation.
- Director, Higher Degree Research – 25% allocation.
- Deputy Director –20% allocation
- Chief Scientist – 50% allocation
- Committee representative – up to 5 % allocation.

9. Dispute Resolution

In resolving disputes, staff members are encouraged to discuss the issue with an impartial colleague or in academic groups first for collegial resolution. If the dispute is not resolved, then the procedures in this clause are to be followed.

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

9.2. The MARCS Work Plan Committee must either attempt to resolve the dispute or escalate the dispute to the Institute Director.

9.3. The Institute 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
MARCS Work Plan Committee – version 1	30 th August 2024
MARCS Academics – version 2	17 th October 2024
MARCS Institute Director – version 2	18 th October 2024
MARCS Institute Manager – version 2	18 th October 2024