

Faculty of Science and Engineering Workload Model

2019 revised version - Finalised: 27 November 2019

1. Overview

Requirement under the enterprise agreement

The existence and implementation of a faculty workload model is required under the [Macquarie University Academic Staff Enterprise Agreement 2018](#) (the “EA”). The most relevant portions are sections 17 and 18 in Part 4 of the Agreement which describe the requirements of the model and the process for its development and approval, including a period of review by all Faculty academic staff and the *University’s Academic Staff Implementation Committee* (ASIC).

Consistent with these requirements, this draft Faculty of Science and Engineering workload model is a revision of the previous model developed in 2015 under the previous 2014 Enterprise Agreement. Details on this process are provided in section 7 below.

Purpose and scope

The Faculty of Science and Engineering workload model is designed to broadly capture workload in teaching, research and service. The intended purpose of the model is to achieve:

- alignment of staff activities and Department resources with the University and Faculty’s strategic goals,
- appropriate and efficient use of staff time resources,
- an equitable and appropriate distribution of workload between staff.

The model is not designed to measure performance, which is addressed by other tools including PDR and the [faculty’s research productivity definition](#).

The model applies to all academic staff within the Faculty employed on full-time or part-time contracts. It does not apply to sessional/casual staff.¹

Principles

The development of the model has been directed by the following principles. The model should be:

- **Fair:** Workload allocation should be fair, transparent and as equitable as possible.
- **Holistic:** Teaching, research and service should be considered together in the context of each academic’s approximate *pattern* when adjusting the workload allocation. For traditional research and teaching academics this pattern is normally 40:40:20, but this

¹ Note that the EA is quite specific about the combination of duties associated with particular casual activities. For example, the pay rate for one casual lecture or one casual full tutorial anticipates time spent in preparation and marking associated with the class, as well as the face to face time. As some of these components are separated in this model, there is not necessarily a one-to-one correspondence between this model and casual academic descriptions in the EA.

model is intended to accommodate staff in all three job families specified in the EA (see section 17). *This is not only a teaching workload model.*

- **Practicable:** The model should be as simple to implement and maintain as is practical.
- **Reasonable:** In particular, recognising that this tool is a *model*, workload measures should be no more precise than they are accurate.
- **Strategic:** The workload model should support staff behaviour aligned to the strategic goals of the Faculty and University.
- **Informative and Indicative:** Measures should indicate what workload is reasonable to ensure the delivery of the University's core business.

Job families

Under the 2018 EA, academic staff may be employed under one of three academic job families. The three families place different emphasis on various aspects of academic activity, which is reflected in differing default workload patterns as follows:

Job Family	Duties	Default Workload Pattern from EA
Teaching and Research Academic	Teaching, Research and Discovery, Leadership and Service	40% Teaching 40% Research 20% Service A Staff Member may be allocated up to 50% teaching by the Supervisor following consultation and consideration of the factors listed in subclause 18.14. A Staff Member may also agree to a teaching allocation of more than 50%, provided that it is for a fixed period and there is genuine agreement. Service: Service allocation may be increased above 20% for staff with significant service or administrative roles.
Teaching and Leadership Academic	Teaching, Teaching Leadership, Leadership and Service	70% Teaching 30% Leadership Teaching allocation may be increased up to 80% or reduced below 70% by agreement.
Technical/Industry/Commercial Academic	Teaching, Research and Discovery, Leadership and Service, Non-traditional academic activity	No default allocation but must have at least 40% dedicated to either teaching or research duties.

Note that the Teaching and Leadership Academic family supersedes the previous role of Scholarly Teaching Fellow which will be phased out over the coming year.

As specified by the EA, the Workload Model Committee has sought to develop a model that is sufficiently flexible to apply for all three families. As the Technical/Industry/Commercial Academic family is the least familiar (there are no current appointments within FSE) and potentially supports the most diverse activity, it may be necessary to make additions to the model once the role is

better understood. We recommend that this be considered as part of a review of the model in late 2020.

2. Approach

Hours and points

This model measures workload in points rather than in hours. The reason for this decision is to avoid the perception that the model is an accurate hour-by-hour measure of the time taken for any given task. Any workload model is inevitably inaccurate and can only give an approximate measure of the relative time taken for different tasks. Having said this, points can be converted to hours and the value of each activity in points is intended to reflect the expected time spent on that activity in hours. Assuming 35 hours work per week over 45 weeks, there are a nominal 1,575 hours over a year for a full-time academic staff member. One point in the model corresponds to one percent of the overall workload, or around 15 $\frac{3}{4}$ hours.

The model allocates points for different tasks under the categories of Research, Teaching and Service. It can be useful to distinguish between a staff member's nominal workload *pattern* – the expected *percentage of time* spent in research/teaching/service, from their workload *allocation* – the expected *points* in each category in a given year, taking into account full-time/part-time status, OSP leave, long service leave etc.

For a Teaching and Research Academic, the normal expected pattern is 40% teaching/40% research/20% service, corresponding to an expected 40:40:20 points for a full-time staff member. For a full-time Teaching and Leadership Academic, approximately 70 points would be expected under teaching, while the Leadership and Service role might draw from both teaching and service tasks. There is no default workload pattern for Technical/Industry/Commercial Academics, though a minimum of 40% of research and/or teaching is required. Different patterns will also be appropriate for staff supported by internal or external fellowships held in their own name. Note that workload for postdoctoral research staff supported by other academics' grants will generally be managed by the postdoc's immediate supervisor.

Where appropriate, deviations from these patterns can be set by the Head of Department in consultation with the staff member. The workload model is intended to provide objective information to help inform such discussions. For example, when total points deviate significantly from those expected for any of the activities (research, teaching, service) it is an opportunity for staff to discuss their workload balance with their Head of Department. The University expects more experienced staff at higher levels to perform their tasks more effectively and efficiently than their junior colleagues. For instance, it will not be uncommon that a senior academic exceeds their nominal target points in research, possibly quite significantly. This fact is not necessarily an argument that the staff member's expected teaching points should be reduced. Successful researchers on teaching and research appointments are by default still expected to spend approximately 40% of their time on teaching.

A workload model can never measure workload precisely or accurately. It is unlikely that any staff member on a 40:40:20 workload pattern will record exactly 40 points under teaching, exactly 40 points under research and exactly 20 points under service.

Part time roles and other variations

Staff in part-time roles have expected points reduced pro-rata. Similar adjustments are made for staff taking OSP or other periods of leave other than annual leave. Similarly, health or family circumstances may also warrant moderated workloads.

Unanticipated activity

Where the model does not anticipate a class of activity, the Head of Department may approve an allocation of points to the activity, in discussion with the staff member. It is expected that this should be infrequently required.

Alignment with university promotion criteria

As described above, tasks in the workload model are collected into the three traditional categories of Teaching, Research, and Service. The model does not identify separate categories of tasks corresponding to the University's Promotion Criteria of *Integration, Application, or Leadership and Citizenship*. This is because these criteria fit naturally into the different aspects of the core activities of Teaching, Research, and Service. For example, the work involved in *Integration* of research discoveries and practice into an undergraduate unit can be captured through curriculum development/innovation points; activities undertaken in the category "Substantial curriculum design" provide the opportunity for a staff member to demonstrate *Leadership*, as does serving as a committee chair or program director; points allocated to developing a strategic industrial research partnership reflect *Application*. The accompanying spreadsheet makes explicit a large number of such mappings.

Accommodating early career academics and staff returning to work

The 2015 iteration of the workload model included suggested adjustments for staff beginning their academic roles, or returning from a career absence such as extended parental leave, to acknowledge that teaching efficiency comes with experience, and that research productivity is tied to research momentum. For example, it suggested a starting academic in their first year might have a target of 20:20:10 points. However, since what is actually being anticipated is lower *efficiency* and fewer *outputs* relative to other staff, rather than a reduced amount of time on work, some staff have found this approach unsatisfactory.

The new model addresses these issues in a different fashion, by formalising the ideas of *research establishment* points and *new-to-teaching* points. These and other categories should allow Heads of Department (HoDs) to support staff through these periods.

3. Notes on model - Teaching

The detailed table of activities, allocations and notes can be found at the end of this document. This and the following sections provide context for each of the broad areas of work.

The teaching model seeks to cover all aspects of teaching preparation, delivery, administration, moderation, development and innovation. The model also provides mechanisms to accommodate staff being new to teaching or new to a particular unit, where an accommodation is appropriate. Some elements of the model provide points for face-to-face interactions such as lectures and practicals based on hours of delivery. Others acknowledge tasks such as preparation and

moderation of assessment tasks, marking, student consultation, development of new material and convening. Compared to the 2014 model, a number of these tasks have been separated into finer categories to enable more flexibility in supporting different kinds of delivery, such as online versus face-to-face lectures. In *implementing* the model, it may be convenient in some departments to treat several tasks as a group in assigning work. For example, a department might have a standard pattern for the expected marking time associated with a practical class, and the points associated with the preparation (if any), delivery and marking of the practical could then move together. A department may also choose to make a strategic decision to apply greater points to certain activities, for instance to permit more intensive supervision of undergraduate projects.

It is important to note that several categories model points associated with delivery of a *unit*, rather than associated with a particular *person* contributing to the unit. A good example is *convening*. For some units, the entire burden of convening may indeed be performed by a single *convenor* who would receive all the convening points given by the model. In many units however, while the convenor may carry the major workload of convening, a portion of these tasks might be provided by a co-lecturer (eg. sharing student inquiries), or by technical, professional or sessional staff supporting the unit. In such cases, an appropriate fraction of the convening points would be directed to these other staff, even where such staff (professional or sessional) are not specifically covered by the workload model.

Points allocated for teaching a unit should also be considered as a resources budget for teaching the unit. For example, the approach to assessment within a unit needs to be designed to conform to the University assessment policy as well as to be manageable within budgeted academic and sessional staff workloads.

Teaching Caps

In addition to requiring a workload model, the EA calls for certain maximum caps on teaching tasks assigned to a staff member.

The EA specifies that academic staff must not be required to:

- teach in more than 2 out of 3 sessions or 3 out of 4 sessions
- teach face to face over a span of more than 9 hours on any day
- teach morning classes within 12 hours of the conclusion of their previous day's teaching.

The EA requires that the Faculty specify limits for a range of tasks. These limits represent the maxima that may occasionally occur and are not norms. The values below are for a 40:40:20 academic. Values for a Teaching and Leadership academic, where different, are shown in parentheses

- Face-to-face contact per week: 21 hours (25 hours)
- Number of original lectures per week: 6 hours (10 hours)
- Number of equivalent lectures delivered in a previous offering per week: 6 hours (10 hours)
- Number of repeats of a given lecture in the same offering per week: 6 hours (10 hours)
- Online interactions per week: 10 hours (15 hours)
- Marking load/student: 90 minutes
- Units coordinated per session: 4 (7)

4. Notes on model - Research

Accounting for research workload is inherently difficult. The approach taken in this model is to use a number of observable measures as a proxy for research workload. While this is necessarily imperfect, it does go some way to recognising the work involved in activities that are seen to contribute to the University and Faculty's strategic priorities. The model accounts for writing and holding grants and writing papers and books. HDR supervision is included as a research activity.

A major change in this revision of the workload model is the introduction of *research establishment points*. This category acknowledges that staff at lower level academic levels and on fellowships tend to perform more "coal-face" research needing to spend more time per publication to perform and write-up research, and have had less opportunity to develop networks to establish collaborations, attract HDR students etc, that lead to higher productivity.

For HDR students, the allocation is shared between the principal and co-supervisor with a default 75%/25% weighting. The supervision team may recommend a different split to the HOD as appropriate.

Publications and grant writing are both assessed looking backwards. Publication data from the last 3 years are based on HERDC reported data, as generated by the research office. HERDC reported outputs (A1-E1) are counted in full without moderation by the number or position of authors (A1 counts as 5 HERDC points). For new staff and ECRs HERDC data may not be available and publication data are likely to be based on self-reporting. Similarly, this approach may need to be adjusted for staff returning from prolonged absences, for example parental leave. For definitions of HERDC publications please see: https://staff.mq.edu.au/research/project-management/docs/All_Publications_Categories_Information.pdf. Formal reports, policy documents and patents are treated as papers. The model also allows for major releases of significant public software tools to be treated as a publication.

Grant writing is based on grants written in the previous 12 months as reported by PURE. The workload associated with writing publications and grants is given to all authors equally. This is because of a lack of consistent data in reporting, and to encourage collaborations. However, the formula for outputs acknowledges that highly productive individuals will generate more papers through students and collaborations, by weighting additional papers less generously.

Interpretation of research points

There is significant inter- and intra-discipline variation in how academic staff conduct research, teaching and service. The workload model has the flexibility to incorporate some of this variation.

The total workload points recorded for each staff member under research are intended to provide one objective measure of how effectively staff have used their total time for research to undertake the tasks expected, including: writing papers, supervising students, seeking funding, and running funded research programs. Obviously, the points recorded will vary from one discipline to another, and senior staff are expected to perform their tasks more effectively and efficiently than their junior colleagues, so the total research points for each staff member *should only be seen as a broad indicator of research activity* (including data that represents an average over the previous three years).

Staff and HODs are expected to reflect on the total points for research determined by the model. The total is a broad measure and is not expected to match the nominal pattern value for all staff. Further, the average may vary for different disciplines, reflecting different discipline norms. If the research total for a staff member is anomalously greater than the expected pattern value (eg. say by a factor of two or more), then it may be appropriate for their HOD to consider an adjustment to their teaching workload allocation (but their teaching workload should not be less than half the normal teaching workload) in the context of Department norms. If the research workload points total is significantly less than the expected value, then the staff member should consider if they are using their allocated research time effectively. How can they be mentored to use their research time to write more papers, seek and obtain grants and attract and supervise HDR students? Alternatively, would they be more comfortable with a more teaching-focused pattern?

5. Notes on model - Service

The workload model points under internal and external service are intended to be used as an aid to the fair and equitable allocation of internal service responsibilities to staff in Departments.

Internal service includes service to the Department, Faculty and University. It includes formal service roles such as service on committees, outreach, an allocation for professional development activities, mentoring and an automatic allocation for standard department activities that are expected of all staff. External service is service external to the university including activities associated with professional societies, journals, thesis examination. Except in exceptional circumstances (to be negotiated with HoDs), external service is capped at 10 points. This is to ensure that all staff are able to contribute to the necessary service work within the Department, Faculty and University.

6. Implementation

The Faculty workload model is formally specified by this document. The Faculty workload model and any significant Departmental variations will be published on the Faculty staff intranet.

Accompanying this document is a revised version of the spreadsheet for recording information and calculating points for each staff member. Where there are inconsistencies, this document shall take precedence. If inconsistencies with the EA arise, the EA shall take precedence. The HoD, together with Directors of Research and Teaching and department administrative staff, should ensure that the spreadsheet is properly populated for each staff member. It is also expected that the workloads are discussed where necessary with academic staff. While the spreadsheet is useful for recording and collecting information for individual staff, Departments will typically develop tools for collating and presenting information for all staff in a more compact and accessible fashion.

In accordance with Section 18.15 of the EA, each staff member will be shown their workload allocation and that of all other staff members in the Department for that academic year. The full schedule of workload allocations for each Department is to be published within the Department.

To facilitate transparency and equity in workload allocation, HoDs are encouraged to communicate regularly with staff about the principles and process of workload allocation.

It is also important that the model is applied in a consistent and open fashion within and between departments. The workload committee recommends that the Exec. Dean and HoDs speak regularly as a group about mechanisms to ensure this.

7. Model development and review

This model was developed in the period April – November 2019 by a committee initially chaired by Prof. Bernard Mans (Deputy Exec. Dean), and then by Prof. Michael Steel (Head, Physics and Astronomy) from July 2019, when Prof. Mans was appointed Interim Exec. Dean.

The starting point was the previous model developed in 2015 under the 2014 enterprise agreement. That model was developed by a similar representative working party chaired initially by Prof Mariella Herberstein (Deputy Dean) and then Associate Dean (Research), Prof. David Coutts.

Timeline

July 2018 – Finalisation of new Enterprise Agreement

April 2019 – Formation of Faculty Workload committee with representation from each department

May 2019 – Call for input from Faculty on existing model

May-October 2019 – Series of weekly meetings for revision of draft model

17 October 2019 – Release of draft model to Faculty staff and Academic Staff Implementation Committee (ASIC)

2 November 2019 – Close of feedback period

4-15 November 2019 – Consideration of staff and ASIC feedback and revisions by workload committee

27 November 2019 – Endorsement and publication by FSE Interim Exec. Dean Professor Bernard Mans

Committee

Consistent with EA requirements, the committee was composed of 13 core members including representatives from each Department. Six members held leadership roles in the Faculty or Departments, and seven did not. Some substitute members also contributed to discussions.

Member	Representative for	Level	Other
Michael Steel	Chair	E	HoD (Physics & Astronomy)
Linda Beaumont	Biological Sciences	D	
Sophie Calabretto	Mathematics and Statistics	C	ECR
David Coutts	FSE exec	E	Associate Dean (Research)
Gayandhi De Silva	AAO	C	
Sammy Diasinos	Engineering	B	
Simon George	Earth and Planetary Sciences; Earth and Environmental Sciences	E	Deputy HoD (EPS) until creation of EES.

Rosemary Giuriato	Chiropractic	C	HoD
Michael Hitchens	FSE exec	D	Associate Dean (Quality and Standards)
Matt Owers	Physics and Astronomy	C	
Matt Roberts	Computing	C	Scholarly Teaching Fellow
Alison Rodger	Molecular Sciences	E	HoD
Kerrie Tomkins	Environmental Sciences; Earth and Environmental Sciences	B	Scholarly Teaching Fellow

Additional contributors: Bruce Schaefer (EPS), Candace Lang (Eng.), Georgy Sofronov (M&S)

Future review

The workload committee recommends that a review of the new model take place in late 2020 to assess the effectiveness and implementation of the model in its first year. This review should be performed by a staff committee with a similar composition including a mix of members of the 2019 workload committee and new members and a new Chair. This committee should provide a short report to the Exec. Dean on changes recommended for the 2021 academic year.

8. Model definition

Teaching activities

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
T.1	New to teaching allowance	Up to 20 points in a year as agreed in advance with HoD.	<p>For staff taking up a teaching role for the first time (anywhere, not just Macquarie). This is a multiplier recognising that teaching tasks take longer for staff who are new to teaching. Plausible values are up to a 2x multiplier on teaching points in year 1, and up to a 1.5x multiplier in year 2, or a 4-session staging: S1-2x, S2-1.75x, S3-1.5x, S4-1.25x.</p> <p>The degree to which this weighting is applied in any instance may depend on Department resources and teaching requirements at the time, the nature of the appointment, and/or any commitments agreed during hiring negotiations. There is no guaranteed allocation. It would be expected that where some teaching experience had occurred during a research-intensive period (for instance a prior fellowship before moving to a regular 40:40:20 role), then this multiplier would not apply.</p> <p>This allocation must be agreed in advance with the HoD. Points cannot be claimed retrospectively. This would not normally apply for staff appointed to a Teaching and Leadership role, where a prior history of teaching would be expected.</p>
T.2	New to unit allowance	Up to 10 points in a year, and at most 50% of the base allocation in any given unit, as agreed in advance with HoD.	<p>For staff picking up teaching on an existing unit with existing resources to gain familiarity with the material. The degree to which an allocation is appropriate will depend on the difficulty of the material, the quality of existing resources, and whether the content is regarded as standard expected knowledge or not. Where substantial change to the unit or resources associated with a change in staffing is required, this should be addressed under T.3 in discussion with HoD. This allocation must be agreed in advance with the HoD and the weighting should be applied with a consistent policy in a department (eg same weighting for all units, or same weighting for all units at a given level). Points cannot be</p>

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
			claimed retrospectively. This weighting will not apply if the new-to-teaching allowance in T.1 is being granted.
T.3	Substantial curriculum design, redesign or course development	Up to 10 points per year, as agreed in advance with HoD, or up to 20 points for those in Teaching and Leadership roles with HoD approval.	Curriculum and/or content development activities related to substantial change to a unit or course as part of a Department's planned strategy for development and renewal of offerings. May include design or development of a new unit or course, substantial unit and curriculum redesign such as developing a suite of new lectures/practicals/tutorials from scratch, moving a unit to on-line delivery, or trialling new tools and approaches. Does not apply to routine year-to-year adjustment or refinement of content which is captured in T.7. This allocation must be agreed in advance with the HoD on the basis of the anticipated work required, consistent with Department practice. Points cannot be claimed retrospectively.
T.4	Convening one unit	$0.8 + 0.09 \times (\text{enrolment} - 1)^{0.70}$	Convening refers to the duties of overall administration and academic leadership of a unit. This includes most administrative work associated with operation of a unit including preparing and maintaining the structure and administrative content of the iLearn page, interacting with the CMS, generating unit guides, collating, cross-checking, and presenting marks. This includes student consultation as part of convening duties strictly restricted to administrative matters (e.g. special considerations, organising supplementary quizzes and exams), but not related to teaching content, which may be captured elsewhere. Convening excludes uploading of content related to teaching materials (e.g. lecture slides, teaching videos, quiz solutions), and content-related student consultation which should be captured in categories T.5, T.7-16. Some units may also require moderation of assessment tasks in parallel MUIC units. Convening also includes academic leadership and carriage of a unit in terms of leading discussions about changes to delivery, modes of assessment and learning outcomes, and leading unit reviews in years they are required, in concert with the relevant program director(s) and other relevant staff. This workload formula refers to the total load of convening for a unit, rather than the workload allocated to the convenor, per se. There is generally a

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
			designated convenor with primary responsibility for the unit who will receive the largest convening allocation, but in team-taught units, it may be appropriate for this workload to be split amongst multiple staff, possibly including technical, administrative and or sessional staff.
T.5	Student academic consultation (including on-line, office hours etc.)	$\min(0.02 * \text{number of students}, 2)$	Non-convening duties for all units including the need for extended consultation hours, weekly meetings with tutors for marking moderation etc. This is a maximum number of points associated with a unit that should be allocated across the teaching team to the appropriate people. This may include the convenor, other lecturers, technical, sessional or administrative staff.
T.6	PACE unit coordinator	Typically up to 5 points	To be determined on a unit-by-unit basis, acknowledging the wide variety of workloads associated with different PACE units. PACE units also attract standard convening points which should be captured separately with the convening model at T.4. This allocation reflects the additional administrative duties associated with coordinating a PACE unit including arranging placements, visits, risk assessments etc. This workload may be split amongst more than one staff member engaged with a PACE unit. Lead project supervision of PACE students is to be captured at T.17. The allocation available for a given unit must be determined in advance by HoD.
T.7	1 hour face to face or equivalent online lecture	0.25 points per face to face hour	Includes read through of material prior to lecture, delivery of material (without change), and iLearn activities associated with the lecture: posting lecture notes, videos and other resources, discussion forums. Also accounts for replacement or refreshment of a fraction of existing lectures within the whole unit. Student follow up and advising is captured at T.5. Where there are no pre-existing notes and/or lecturer is new to the material some allocation at T.2-new to unit may be appropriate.
T.8	1 hour original tutorial or 1 hour high-preparation face to face practical/laboratory/workshop	0.2 points per hour of face to face coordination	Tutorial involves significant academic involvement in class design and preparation (creation or reflection on problems, discussion prompts etc). Includes preparation of teaching material, delivery, and one hour of marking time for contemporaneous assessment (e.g. in-class quizzes), consistent with the EA allocation for casual academic staff. Most active-learning classes in the

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
	coordination or equivalent online delivery		<p>faculty will be more naturally described as workshops or practicals rather than tutorials. A typical use of the tutorial designation might be for one hour a week out of four taught by the lecturer but with a focus on worked problems or discussion of content presented in previous lectures.</p> <p>High preparation practical/laboratory/workshop: Supervision of students in a laboratory/practical session requiring significant preparation by academic (lab setup & pack-up, sample-prep etc). May involve some preparation of laboratory notes. Marking of log books/reports/quizzes is to be captured under marking.</p>
T.9	1 hour face to face low preparation practical/laboratory/workshop supervision	0.1 points per hour of face to face supervision	Supervision of students in a laboratory/practical/workshop session with no academic contribution to preparing class notes/quizzes/materials or lab setup/pack-up. It is assumed that laboratory notes exist. Marking of log books/reports/quizzes is to be captured under marking. This describes a range of workshop and active-learning style classes where instructors are provided with existing problem sets or other active learning prompts. Requires only minimal prior preparation (approx 30 mins). This category corresponds to the EA category of Other Academic Activity.
T.10	1 hour face to face or online repeat lecture, tutorial, practical or workshop	0.08 points per face to face hour	For repeat delivery of a class in the same session.
T.11	Field trip leader (duplicate line for additional field trips; half organisation component points for co-field trip leader)	$0.2 * (n \text{ hours}^{0.5})$, in addition to the fieldtrip participant points captured in T.14	Fieldtrip participation points to account for field trip preparation and organisation. This covers meetings with technical staff on field trip logistics and equipment, preparation of field trip manual, assistance with packing/unpacking gear, collation of teaching material, meetings with tutors, student follow up and advising, and preparation of assessments/exams based on the field trip content. Assumes a high initial workload to organise any field trip, including a single day, then flattens out with the number of days in the field. Also assumes technical staff assistance with Field Friendly, packing of gear, field trip bookings, and student payments. In the absence of technical staff assistance, allocation of more points is warranted and can be reflected by adding additional hours. Number of hours refers to all teaching and transport hours (e.g. after dinner

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
			review of day's activities) but not sleep/meals etc. Recreation and rest hours are not counted. Co-leadership of field trips should be split across the field trip leader and participant workload allocations accordingly. Discipline specific variations may be approved by HoD.
T.12	Field trip participation (all participants, including leader)	0.08 points per hour. Maximum 10 points as agreed with HoD.	Fieldtrip participant: 0.08 points per hour, including time for travel to and from the site, time spent teaching and supervising, and minor tweaking of teaching material. If assistance with field trip preparation and organisation is provided, additional hours may be included. Number of hours refers to all teaching and transport hours (e.g. after dinner review of day's activities) but not sleep/meals etc. Recreation and rest hours are not counted.
T.13	Assessment and exam development and moderation	Max of 1.75 points for unit shared appropriately	For preparation and moderation of all assessment material in a unit. Includes modification of assessment outline; modification of marking rubrics on iLearn; examples of poor and strong assessments; development of exam(s). Maximum of 1.75 points to be shared across unit staff as appropriate. Note that if multiple supplementary exams are likely to be required (for very large units), points allocated here may need to be slightly increased in consultation with HoD.
T.14	Assessment and exam marking & feedback	0.063 points per hour marking	Includes marking, marking moderation where required, and reporting of grades whether directly to iLearn or to convenor. This allocation is unit dependent as required. Recommendations per unit: 4 assessment tasks and capped marking time of 60-75 mins/student for total marking & feedback. Appropriate allocation per student will vary according to the nature of assessment tasks and feedback required, degree of computer marking etc. In a fully computer marked unit this could be zero. Allocated points to be shared across unit staff, including sessional staff, as appropriate.
T.15	Supervision of undergraduate/coursework master research project or PACE student project	Up to 1 point per student with HoD agreed allocation at unit level.	For direct supervision of undergraduate research students, coursework master students, interns, PACE student projects, vacation scholarship students. Assumes ~ 16 hours total for interaction with student and feedback on project reports. Note that PACE allocation is specifically for direct lead academic supervision of a project. Activity as a student's 'mentor' or placement visitor should be captured under PACE coordination at T.6.

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
T.16	Other teaching related activities	0.063 points per agreed hour. Maximum 10 points	Includes a range of potential department-specific activities not captured elsewhere: e.g. maintenance and oversight of teaching lab equipment where not provided by tech staff, risk assessments for outdoor practicals, etc. Also includes sessional staff coordination in large units, activities aimed at improving student outcomes (such as student experience, engagement, support and employability), and meetings with students in small groups or individually that are scheduled as part of a unit but are in place of, or in addition to lectures or tutorials/workshops. Must be agreed in advance with HoD. Cannot be claimed retrospectively. Must be agreed in advance with HoD. Can not be claimed retrospectively.

Research activities

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
R.1	Research program establishment and development	Teaching and Research academics: level A - 20 points, level B - 18 points, level C - 15 points, level D/E - 0 points Research fellows (DECRA, Future, NHMRC etc): level A - 50 points, level B - 40 points, level C - 35 points, level D - 25 points, level E - 20 points Staff on OSP may claim 50% of	This level-dependent category acknowledges two facts - 1) that research productivity, HDR students and funding increase as an academic develops their reputation and academic and collaborative networks which makes it easier to earn research points as a career develops, and 2) that research fellows on high (say 80%) research loads are very rarely able to attain a corresponding number of research points. It is not realistic to expect that a doubling of research time will lead to a doubling of research outputs, students and funding. In addition, research fellows often use the scale of their research time to tackle more ambitious or longer-timeline projects that require more time, and may deliver high impact outputs, but do not deliver twice the research points. Staff on fellowships can claim the points as indicated in the adjacent column. Staff on OSP in one session may claim half the research fellowship points for their academic level.

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
		research fellow points for their academic level.	For staff in teaching and research roles at level A/B/C, the indicated number of points can be claimed in full in the first 3 years at Macquarie. In subsequent years, staff may claim as many points as they generate in the remaining research categories up to the limits shown in the adjacent column. For example, a level A staff member who accrues 20 points in rows R.2 to R.11 may claim the full 15 points; a level B staff member who accrues 7 points in rows R.2 to R.11 may claim only an additional 7 points.
R.2	Primary supervisor of full time and PhD or Mres (2nd year) student	For <= 6 students: 5 points/student; For > 6 students: 2.5 points/student	Reduced points for > 6 students is designed to ensure quality supervision for each student. Also, supervision of more than six students is usually done in a team environment with shared workload.
R.3	Engaged co-supervisor of full time and PhD or Mres (2nd year) student	2.5 points per student. 1.25 points for a part time student.	Engaged co-supervisor indicates a co-supervisor who is meeting and advising student on a regular basis, typically once per month.
R.4	3-year average HERDC reported published A1, B1, C1, E1, or K1 publication, published patents, software or report; 3-year average HERDC reported published A1 book (an A1 book counts as 5 outputs).	$10 * (\text{number of allowed outputs})^{.35}$	<p>Data is to be determined from a 3-year rolling average from HERDC data generated by the research office based on data in PURE. Points allocation captures underlying research. We consider all HERDC reported products as full without moderation by the number or position of authors. Software publication includes a major release of a software package that has demonstrated widespread use or impact. Points scale non-linearly with the number of outputs to reflect that staff who produce large numbers of papers likely do so as part of an extended team.</p> <p>Consistent with the FSE Research Productivity statement, it is recognised that publication rates in some branches of mathematics are demonstrably lower than other disciplines. In particular, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics will develop a suitable formula to address this and submit it to the Exec. Dean for approval.</p>

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
R.5	Writing external funding application <= \$60,000/year or internal funding applications	1 point per submitted application, up to 6 grants in a year	Points are allocated based on grants submitted in the previous 12 months as recorded in PURE. Includes applications for external funding & applications to internal funding such as: MQRIS, new, restart, seeding grants; internal L&T research funding; LIEF grants where MQ is not lead institution. The workload associated with writing grants is given to all authors equally.
R.6	Writing external funding application > \$60,000/year or external in-kind funding bodies	5 points per submitted application, up to 4 grants in a year	Points are allocated based on grants submitted in the previous 12 months as recorded in PURE. Includes applications for external cash and in-kind funding (e.g. ANSTO, Antarctic division) > \$60,000/year; includes MQ led LIEF & external L&T research funding (e.g. OLT). The workload associated with writing grants is given to all authors equally.
R.7	Holding grant/discrete funding <= \$60,000/year; includes internal grants, LIEF grants of any size and PI role on overseas grants >\$60,000/year; does not include MQRIS	1.5 points per grant or discrete funding source	The points capture grant administration and some research activities, but these are also captured in the publications. Consultancy and research contract funding can be considered here if money comes through MQ. Includes internal new staff or return-to-work staff grants, research development grants; LIEF grants >\$60,000/year; PI on large external grants. There is no allocation for holding MQ infrastructure (MQRIS) grants.
R.8	Holding grant/discrete funding > \$60,000/year or external in-kind funding or external L&T research funding; does not include MQRIS	4 points per grant or discrete funding source	This refers to external funding with money coming to MQ. The points capture grant administration and some research activities, but these are also captured in the publications. Consultancy funding can be considered here if money comes through MQ. There is no allocation for holding MQ infrastructure (MQRIS) grants.
R.9	Research development training, skills enhancement or	0.45 points per day of agreed activity, normally no more than 10 days	Includes small-scale research development activities (e.g. training courses) and conference/workshop attendance. (Presentation at conferences/workshops is required to claim points).

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
	conference/ workshop presentation		
R.10	Other major research development activities (not encapsulated above) as agreed with the HoD	Typically up to 10 points	<p>This refers to significant focused research activities or research facility development (e.g. establishment or major upgrade of a new laboratory or major new equipment), where work will take many weeks or months and expected research outcomes are medium to long term. It may include very large-scale grant development work, for example a months to years-long coordination of a CoE or CRC bid in a senior leadership role. Activities are to be defined in advance with clearly stated expectations and outcomes. This allocation must be agreed in advance with the HoD. Points cannot be claimed retrospectively. The agreed activity must be time-limited with a specific project or goal.</p>
R.11	Targeted external industrial/non-academic partner and end-user development	0.45 points per day of agreed activity.	<p>In-depth activities to develop a <i>specific</i> end-user partnership or end-user impact opportunity (including commercialisation). Intended to capture substantial focused development of specific partner/commercialisation relationships towards an income or research translation opportunity (eg. Development of MOU, licensing arrangement, partner attraction in CRC preparation). Activities to be agreed with HoD might include attending a strategic program of multiple industry-focused trade shows (not academic conference attendance), discussions and visits with partners, potentially consultation and commercialisation (subject to outside work policies). This does not include incidental conference/workshop discussions or patent preparation which are captured elsewhere. This allocation must be agreed in advance with the HoD. Points cannot be claimed retrospectively.</p>

Internal service activities

Code	Category	Allocation	Description
IS.1	Head of Department	60 points	Standard allocation for Head of Department. Pro rataed when role occupant changes during the year or an Acting HoD is appointed.
IS.2	Deputy HOD & Department leads such as (Directors of Teaching, Research, HDR, WHS chair and other discipline specific roles)	Points as established in a role description document based on the demands of the role in each department, typically between 5 and 15 points but may be larger	Points allocation will vary with portfolio, Department size and level of support from others. L&T, Research and HDR directors are likely to have a higher workload than other portfolios and should be guided by the Faculty Role Descriptions. Other Director roles should be guided by faculty or department statements. Depending on the expectations of these roles, possible values are: Large role or large departments: 7-10 points, up to a maximum of 20 points; medium role/department: 3-6 points; small role/department: up to 3 points, to be agreed in advance by the HoD. This allocation includes attendance of directors at Faculty committee meetings and membership of a Department executive team. Points for Co-Directors or Deputy Directors may be pro-rated according to role expectations.
IS.3	Leadership at course/major/specialisation level	Points as agreed based on the demands of the role and scale of the course/major/specialisation. Normally ≤ 3 points per role.	Includes the administration, meetings and leadership associated with coordination of courses/majors/specialisations, including student program advising, approvals (e.g. RPL, cross-institutional study), curriculum reviews and accreditation. Appropriate allocation will depend on the scale of the program and accreditation duties within any particular year to be agreed to in advance by the HoD. It would not necessarily be the case that each course (degree, grad. dip. etc) receives an additional allocation where one person looks after several closely related courses (eg BSc and BAdvSci).
IS.4	Department Committee or Working group role	Points as established for each role according to regularity of meetings and between-meeting duties. Normally 1 to 2 points per role.	For service on department committees or temporary working groups (not to be double counted for Director roles). 2 points is a nominal allocation only, that could be adjusted up or down by the HoD, depending on the expected work and responsibilities of the committee - frequency of meetings and expected amount of between-meeting work. This allocation does not apply for Directors/Chairs of relevant committees where captured at IS.1.
IS.5	Faculty and University	Typically up to 2 points per committee	For service on University committees or temporary working groups. The 2/4 points are nominal suggestions only, that could be adjusted up or down by HoD depending on the

	committee or working group chairs and members	member, up to 4 points per committee chair	expected work and responsibilities of the committee - frequency of meetings and expected amount of between-meeting work. Some specific faculty or university roles may be anomalously large and should be acknowledged appropriately. Allocation should account for part-year service for temporary working groups, for example workload committee or senate working groups. Appropriate pro rata weighting should apply when a role changes hands during the year.
IS.6	Standard Department service activities	5 points allocated to all staff for basic required service	Academic membership of a department and University involves a number of expected core service engagement activities. This includes activities that engage the individual with the Department, e.g., staff meetings, attending seminars and colloquia, presenting seminars, peer review of teaching, contribution to unit and program reviews, graduations, PDR, strategic retreats, student advising events (eg OpenDay) etc.
IS.7	Outreach activities	Up to 3 points for Outreach beyond routine expectations (eg Info Day advising). May be increased for outreach-intensive staff as agreed with HoD.	Examples include school visits, Open Nights, media engagement, writing and/or reporting for external media outlets (e.g. The Conversation), maintaining an influential blog and/or online video series, delivery of workshops, engagement with amateur societies, commercialisation activities and engagement with industry not elsewhere captured. Exceptional cases may be granted additional load as approved in advance by the HOD.
IS.8	University Research Centre executive role	Up to a maximum of 5 points according to intensity of role as agreed with HOD.	Captures administration associated with centre chair or deputy chair roles, such as strategic planning, meeting with and engaging with existing and potential external stakeholders, preparing centre budget, publicity (web, social media etc), preparing for and chairing relevant meetings and personnel management. Maximum 5 points for Director, 2.5 for deputy role.
IS.9	External Research Centre - Director, Node Director or other leadership role	Determined on a case-by-case basis in consultation with HoD	Captures administration associated with external centre chair or deputy chair roles, such as engaging with existing and potential external stakeholders, managing centre budgets, preparing for and chairing relevant meetings, determining centre strategy and personnel management. Large role variation means points to be agreed with HoD, normally expected to be below 5 points.
IS.10	Professional development and training	0.45 points per day up to 3 points over the year	Participation in formal organised professional development training: could include safety training, HR training, HDR supervision qualifications, leadership training, L&T training including HEA fellowships, etc.

IS.11	Discipline specific administration	up to 5 points	Discipline-specific service work not captured elsewhere. Examples include biosafety administration, animal/human ethics administration (not preparation of ethics applications for own work), field work risk management, dive safety, etc.
IS.12	Mentor of a staff member as part of a formal mentoring program	0.5 points per staff member over a full year, up to a maximum of 3 points	This is for mentorship of staff members as part of a formal program. It should not be claimed for natural support and informal mentoring of members of an academic's own research team.
IS.13	Mentoring or academic support of U/G or P/G students as part of a formal program	0.5 points per student over a full year, up to a maximum of 3 points	This is for mentorship of UG or PG coursework students as part of a formal program. It should not be claimed for natural support and informal mentoring of students performing a project under your supervision.
IS.14	Internal service not captured elsewhere	Up to 5 points as agreed with HOD	Other forms of internal service not captured elsewhere as agreed with HoD, eg Faculty international recruitment trips, or Faculty activities, workshops and development of material that enhance the knowledge and capabilities of others in L&T and/or research practices.

External service activities

Code	Category	Allocation	
ES.1	Journal editor-in-chief/associate editor, or active member of editorial board	Up to 5 points per editorship depending on level and load	Appropriate allocation will be discipline and journal specific. As a guide: Carriage of <10 manuscripts/year: 1-2 points; 11-25 manuscripts/year: 2-4 points; > 25 manuscripts/year: 4-5 points
ES.2	Maintenance of database or other technical contribution to discipline	Up to 5 points per role	Activities could include maintenance, updating, quality control of research databases, development of code in relation to maintaining database, answering queries about databases, extraction of data for other researchers; maintenance of website associated with the database. Initial development of database is likely to be captured in research. Note that

			databases and activities included here should generally be for the benefit of the research community external to the university.
ES.3	External committee member/executive of a professional society	Up to 2 points per role	For executive/committee role on a professional society, including meetings; policy development, consultation and implementation; promotion of society etc. Typically 2 points for approximately 4 days work per year. Larger allocation for a senior executive role in a large society may be appropriate.
ES.4	Reviewing manuscripts for journals, grants, theses, presenting seminars	up to 4 points	For < 10 paper reviews/year: 1-2 points; 10-20 reviews 3-4 points. Examination of a PhD or Masters thesis counts as 4 papers.
ES.5	Conference organisation	0.45 points per day, typically up to 4 points	Includes service on technical committees, local organising committees. A senior role (Chair, co-chair etc) for a major meeting may warrant additional points.
ES.6	Other discipline or academic service.	0.45 points per day, typically up to 10 points	This category accommodates many types of other discipline service such as allocation committees for major infrastructure (telescopes, beamlines, HPC), ARC/NHMRC expert panels, government panels or advisory groups, and contributing to L&T practices and policies within the discipline.