

**University of Western Australia, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health
Sciences Research Active Criteria for Academic Staff^a (see notes)**

(Adapted from University of Melbourne Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health
Sciences criteria)

Level E and Level D Academic

**In the past 5 years:
Requirement**

Six publications^b or 3 publications in the top tertile of Impact
Factor in relevant discipline
Named as a Chief Investigator or contractor on one research
grant (any scheme)
Designated supervision to completion of one RHD student^c

**Plus an Additional Requirement
fulfilling two of the categories of:**

Grants/ Income
One external NCG^d **OR**
Other external income of \$50,000^e

OR

Supervision/Publication
Supervision of one or more additional RHD students^c **OR**
A further five publications^f **OR**
Designated supervision of at least two Masters by coursework
(with a minor research component) or two Honours Students

OR

Knowledge Transfer
Demonstrable evidence of a research-based engagement with
the public and private sector^g

Level C Academic

**In the past 5 years:
Requirement**

Five publications^b or 2 publications in the top tertile of Impact
Factor in relevant discipline
Named as a Chief Investigator or contractor on one research
grant (any scheme)

**Plus an Additional Requirement
fulfilling one of the categories of:**

Grants/ Income
One external NCG^d **OR**
Other external income of \$50,000^e

OR

Supervision/Publication
Supervision of at least one RHD student^c **OR**
A further five publications^f **OR**
Designated supervision of at least two Masters by coursework
(with a minor research component) or two Honours Students

OR

Knowledge Transfer

Demonstrable evidence of research-based engagement with the public and private sector^g

Level B Academic

**In the past 5 years:
Requirement**

Five publications^b or 2 publications in the top tertile of Impact Factor in relevant discipline

**Plus an Additional Requirement
fulfilling one of the categories of:**

Grants/ Income
One External NCG^d **OR**
Other external income of \$50,000^e

OR

Supervision/Publication
Supervision of at least one RHD student^c **OR**
A further five publications^f **OR**
Supervision of at least two Masters by coursework (with a minor research component) or two Honours Students

OR

Knowledge Transfer
Demonstrable evidence of research-based engagement with the public and private sector^g

Academic Staff member (levels B to E) with focus on Health Professional Education

**In the past 5 years:
Requirement**

Five publications
Named as a project leader on at least one grant or project (no \$ value as usually locally sourced and \$ value is small)

**Plus an Additional Requirement
fulfilling one of the categories of:**

Additional grant
One additional grant or project funding

OR

Supervision/Publication
Supervision of at least one HD student^c **OR**
A further five publications^f **OR**
Supervision of at least two Masters by coursework (with a minor research component) or two Honours Students

OR

Knowledge Transfer
Demonstrable evidence of education or research-based engagement with the public and private sector

OR

National Award (ie Carrick Institute) or significant role in Leadership in teaching & learning in the School and/or Faculty

Notes

- a. Research Active Criteria for a University of Western Australia Teaching & Research or Research Only staff member with a minimum of 0.5 EFT appointment.
- b. Publications that satisfy the requirement for DEEWR publication classification: Research Book (A1), Chapter in Research Book (B1), Refereed Journal Article (C1), Refereed Conference Paper (F1) and Published Major Reports (G4).
- c. Supervision requirement: in the past five years, staff must have supervised or co-supervised, to completion at least one research higher degree student. This may include supervision of a professional doctorate where clinical knowledge and research skills are combined.
- d. One external national competitive research grant (NCG) from a scheme listed on the Australian Competitive Grants Register in the past 5 years. The list of grants is available as a pdf file at [http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/research_sector/programmes_funding/general_funding/research_infrastructure/competitive_grants_register.htm#2007_ACGR_\(for_funding_received_in_2006\)](http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/research_sector/programmes_funding/general_funding/research_infrastructure/competitive_grants_register.htm#2007_ACGR_(for_funding_received_in_2006))
- e. External research income, other than from NCG, of more than \$50,000 in the past five years.
- f. Further Publications, a further five over the past five years that are in the publication categories at (b.).
- g. Demonstrable evidence includes patents, contracts or consultancies. This may also include work with external partners to provide “in-service” seminars or research-based professional advice on teaching and learning.

DRAFT

Academic Standards

Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics

May 2012

1. Introduction

The Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics' vision is *to empower people to change the world*. To achieve this vision the Faculty must develop and maintain a high performance culture in all staff and students.

This document details the minimum performance standards for academic staff in the Faculty, giving clear and transparent guidance on the expected performance standards across three key areas:

- Research
- Teaching
- Leadership

In the future it is envisaged these standards will be extended by defining levels of expectation, ranging from minimum to above expectation, in Research and Teaching in order to provide a greater degree of clarity on performance expectations for career progression.

2. Principles

It is envisaged that these academic standards are used to:

1. guide and support the career development of individual academic staff in the Faculty;
2. support the Faculty's vision;
3. inform Faculty policies for supporting research and teaching; and
4. contribute towards the financial sustainability of the Faculty.

Additionally, the Academic Standards seek to:

- Provide fair assessment and evaluation, relative to opportunity, taking into account academic level, workload balance and appointment period;
- Encourage teamwork and discourage internal competition and a supportive culture in the Faculty,
- Support the career development of individuals, which recognises their strengths;
- Support the UWA PDR and PAR processes
- Support UWA's academic performance management processes;
- Provide clearly defined expectations for staff applying for promotions, tenure or sabbatical;
- Provide clearly defined and publicly available expectations to prospective staff;
- Be clearly aligned with University and Faculty goals of delivering excellence in research *and* in teaching and learning.

It is vital that all Performance Expectations and Targets be regularly reviewed, including the measures of performance and the criteria themselves, and adapted to the changing needs of the Faculty and the external environment. In addition, all Performance Expectations and Targets are predicated on the assumption of a managed workload allocation process in the Faculty.

3. Research Performance

Research performance targets are based on three categories: publications; research grant income; and HDR supervision. Targets are detailed for each academic staff level and are viewed as minimum requirements. In regard to publications, it is the minimum expectation that at least 60% of all publication are in C1 journals ranked either A or A*.

ECM Research Performance Minimum Targets					
Academic Level	A	B	C	D	E
Publications*	2	2	3	4	6
Research Grant Income (\$ 000)	5 - 50	5 – 50	50 – 500	50 – 500	>500
HDR supervision	0.75	0.75	2.5	4	5

*Publication targets are not measured pro-rata by the number of UWA authors

4. Teaching Performance

The Faculty has identified the *UWA Teaching Criteria Framework (TCF)* as providing a best fit to meet the Faculty's vision and needs in regard to Academic Standards for teaching performance.

The Framework, with the accompanying Core Knowledge and Professional Values, provides strong guidance for staff, particularly in the context of the overarching *Minimum Standards for Academic Levels (MSALs)*.

The Framework consists of six areas of activity, six areas of knowledge and six professional values. The intention is that staff collect evidence of practice in the six areas of activity. However, the evidence presented should demonstrate an understanding of the core knowledge and commitment to the professional values.

The areas of activity are as follows:

- Design and planning of learning activities and/or programmes of study
- Teaching and supporting student learning
- Assessment and giving feedback to learners
- Developing effective environments and student support and guidance
- Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and supporting learning
- Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development

For each area of activity, examples of sources of evidence and types of evidence are provided.

It is proposed that of the various sets of criteria in the areas of activity be further clarified (or augmented) in the context of the Faculty needs for ensuring the quality of its educational programmes. This should also indicate expected levels of achievement (which will need to be reviewed and refined) and the types of evidence expected.

The TCF Standard Descriptors

Lecturer (Level A)

A Lecturer develops an understanding of the student learning experience through contributions to teaching which include implementation of effective teaching practices, a commitment to improvement and innovation in response to feedback, and the provision of support for students in the learning context.

Assistant Professor (Level B)

An Assistant Professor demonstrates an understanding of the student learning experience through a commitment to high quality effective teaching practice, including the ability to incorporate research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities, and a commitment to improvement and innovation in response to feedback.

Associate Professor (Level C)

An Associate Professor demonstrates an understanding of the student learning experience through high quality effective teaching practice, including the incorporation of research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities. An Associate Professor promotes and supports student learning through mentoring and leadership roles (formal or informal), including a commitment to the development of learning and teaching communities, and ongoing improvement and innovation in response to feedback both personally and across the discipline.

Professor (Level D)

A Professor supports and promotes student learning through a significant contribution in a leadership role, including a demonstrated contribution to the development of learning and teaching communities, within both the university and more widely, and a significant role in peer review and mentoring. A Professor demonstrates an original contribution to the advancement of teaching and learning in the discipline and/or university community, including the incorporation of research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities.

Winthrop Professor (Level E) / Professorial Fellow (Teaching and Learning)

A Winthrop Professor or Professorial Fellow (Teaching and Learning) supports and promotes student learning through an outstanding contribution in a leadership role, including a demonstrated contribution to the development of learning and teaching communities, within both the university and more widely, and in peer review and mentoring. A Winthrop Professor or Professorial Fellow (Teaching and Learning) demonstrates distinguished, original and innovative contributions to the advancement of teaching and learning in the discipline and/or university community, including the incorporation of research, scholarship and/or professional practice into teaching activities

5. Leadership Performance

Leadership is a core value of the Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics and central to our ability to be successful and achieve our vision. The UWA Leadership Framework and Code of Conduct define the leadership capabilities required of leaders and provide clarity with regard to behavioural expectations.

There are five Leadership capabilities and behaviors. In some cases there are different expectations dependent on level of appointment.

1. Shaping/supporting strategic thinking

Level A academics are expected to:

- work closely with their supervisors to develop research and teaching plans;
- help in setting directions for HDR student projects, including helping to identify measures that will show success.

Level B academics are expected to:

- work with advice from senior academics, to develop research and teaching plans;
- with advice from senior academics to set directions for HDR student projects, including identifying measures that will show success;
- be actively involved in Faculty and School activities that set strategies, including FASE and appropriate Faculty Research Themes;
- with advice from senior academics, mentor Level A academics and HDR students to manage projects.

Level C academics are expected to:

- independently develop research projects and teaching directions that are compatible within the areas of focus for the School and Faculty;
- actively participate in core School management committees, including Teaching and Learning and Research Committees, to set and review the strategic directions for the School;
- take leadership in specific areas and projects related to operations in a School/Centre/ Research Group, such as in safety, outreach, and publicity;
- mentor Level A and B academics and HDR students to manage projects, develop their career goals and develop their teaching and research.

Level D academics are expected to:

- operate at a level that identifies and fosters synergies in activities between groups within the School/Centre, Faculty and University;
- collaborate with Level A, B and C staff, identify opportunities for these people and expand their interactions in teaching and research outside of their current associations;
- undertake and lead development of staff, including PDR and PAR;
- be involved at senior levels of committees as chairs and deputy chairs of the Research and Teaching and Learning Committees of Schools, including taking on roles as Research Theme Leaders, leadership in FASE and active membership of key University committees;
- be actively involved in leadership to set and review strategic goals within the School/Centre and Faculty;
- lead in the implementation of the strategic goals of the School and Faculty;
- take on the Head of School role when needed.

Level E academics are expected to:

- take on significant leadership roles in both teaching and research, thereby helping to develop strategic directions at a School and Faculty level;
- take on significant mentoring roles for all staff, including staff outside of their immediate research focus;
- undertake and lead development of staff, including PDR and PAR;
- be actively engaged at a University, national and international level in understanding and setting strategies around teaching and research;
- be engaged with and leading core committees within the School, Faculty and University that set and review major policies.

- work with other academics to identify, develop and realise major opportunities for research, teaching and community engagement;
- lead in the implementation of the strategic goals of Schools and Faculty;
- take on the Head of School role when needed.

2. Communicating with influence and respect

All academics are expected to:

- participate and actively contribute in committees and meetings;
- be respectful of other people's views;
- actively consider issues from others' perspectives before responding;
- **appropriately** challenge policies and strategies that are not working;
- actively seek feedback on how their colleagues and students perceive them;

3. Exemplifying personal drive and integrity

All academics are expected to:

- contribute productively to the University, Faculty and School *in a range of areas*;
- operate from an ethical base that demonstrates integrity;
- be transparent, accountable and honest in their actions;
- understand that they work for the University, Faculty and School, and are part of a broad community that is striving to achieve the vision of the University, Faculty and School.

4. Achieving results

All academics are expected to:

- perform to the best of their ability;
- set personal performance goals that stretch and continue to enhance quality in research and teaching;
- meet or exceed all aspects of these guidelines for performance expectations.

5. Cultivates/supports productive working relationships

All academics are expected to:

- understand and work within the University's code of ethics and conduct;
- be respectful of others in all activities.

Mentoring and Professional Development

In addition to the above leadership capabilities, all staff in ECM are expected to participate in mentoring and professional development activities relative to their level:

Level A academics are expected to:

- actively seek mentoring and participate in mentoring activities related to teaching, research and career development.

Level B academics are expected to:

- actively seek mentoring and participate in mentoring activities related to teaching, research and career development;
- participate in activities and professional development that build skills in effective communication and leadership.

Level C academics are expected to:

- actively seek mentoring and participate in mentoring activities related to teaching, research and career development;
- participate in activities and professional development that build skills in effective communication, leadership and team building;
- actively seek opportunities to be part of mentoring teams with Level A and B staff;

Level D and E academics are expected to:

- participate in activities and professional development that build skills in leadership, team building and management;
- actively seek opportunities to be part of mentoring teams with Level A, B and C staff;
- actively seek opportunities to help staff build their networks, both inside and outside the University;
- actively seek opportunities to build relationships with government, industry and leading academic institutions for the benefit of the University.

DRAFT

Faculty of Science: Research Performance

Introduction: The University has identified staff performance as an important management priority and has recently extended the existing Professional Development Review (PDR) and the Commencing PDR (CPDR) process to include a Performance Appraisal Review (PAR). There is also increasing concern over the fact that UWA is struggling to maintain its share of competitive research funding and that significant numbers of staff on teaching and research contracts do not supervise PhD students and have not secured a research grant nor published papers or other recognised research outputs in the last 5 years. If left unaddressed, this will impact negatively on UWA's market position and could jeopardise its status as a research intensive, Go8 University. In response the University has asked Faculties to revise their definitions of research active, to introduce a set of KPIs against which research performance can be monitored and to make these KPIs available to all staff. The purpose is to provide a framework whereby Faculties, and individual staff, can assess performance relative to agreed, Faculty-wide criteria.

Development of this set of KPIs recognises that some staff contribute quite differently to teaching, research and service in the Faculty. This is taken into account here by identifying a **minimum set** of KPIs for academic staff at each of the levels A to E. It is important to recognise that promotion from one level to another, or satisfying the probationary requirements (see below) is unlikely to be supported simply on the basis of meeting these **minimum standards**; notwithstanding the fact that when identifying under-performance other circumstances may need to be taken into account. Research performance of individual staff will be monitored at the end of each calendar year as part of a Faculty wide analysis (the Faculty's review of performance relative to its KPIs, Appendix 3) and the reports passed to HoS and line managers for subsequent action. It is expected that notification of under-performance in research relative to these criteria **constitutes a 'career trigger point'** and that the HoS must instigate an immediate PAR to identify appropriate remedial actions to redress the situation or to recognise issues relevant to equality of opportunity.

Principles: In setting these benchmarks the University recognises that what constitutes 'research active' at a particular grade (A to E) in one Faculty may be quite different from that in another Faculty and as such these KPIs cannot be readily compared across Faculties. It is also recognized that some schools operate their own, discipline specific work-load and performance models. Whilst it is not the intention at this time to replace these models, there is a need to establish a minimum set of standards and procedures at Faculty level that facilitate equitable comparisons across the Faculty. In this context it is expected that all staff:

- have been made aware of their duties and the expectations of them by their Head of School or line manager
- should demonstrate career proficiency and maturity commensurate with their position requirements and their experience
- should be recognized for the contributions they do make and be encouraged and supported to improve their performance

Methodology: Research performance targets for 2012 are established against 4 criteria, research quality, research publications, research income and HDR supervision. All staff are expected to meet these minimum performance criteria in each of these categories. Research performance has been set using the publications database compiled for the Excellence in Research Australia (ERA) 2012 exercise. This database

has been fully audited by the University and, since the objective is to establish a set of benchmark data, is ideally suited to developing KPIs across levels A to E.

Minimum Quality Standards (Table 1)

Although ARC has dispensed with the definition of outputs as category A*, A, B or C the data indicates that staff at UWA are nonetheless aware of the key, high impact journals in their respective fields. As such UWA has continued to collect and report publications against the ERA 2010 categories.

Faculty	Total Outputs	C1 Outputs	A*(%)	A(%)	B(%)	C(%)	A*+A (%)
FECM	2954	2012	29.5	34.8	25.2	10.5	64.3
FLPS	3530	3227	24	37.2	24.2	14.6	61.2
FNAS	3808	3322	17.5	41.5	26.5	14.5	59
MDHS	5062	4751	19	31.3	28.7	21	50.3

Table 1 shows that over the ERA period (2005-2010) the science and engineering faculties published around 60% (mean 58.7) of their C1 outputs in journals regarded as either A* or A. As a minimum quality expectation staff in the Faculty of Science are therefore **expected to publish at least 60% of their outputs in C1 journals ranked either A or A***. This target is considered commensurate with our objective (OPP 2013-2017) of having no FoR 4 figure codes ranked below 4 by the next ERA exercise (date as yet undecided).

Minimum Expected Outputs for Staff in the Faculty of Science (Table 2)

Appointment	Staff Nos.	Distribution ¹		Target ² (per annum)	Total (per annum)
		Range	Median		
LVLA	158	50 – 1	5	2	316
LVLB	154	25 – 1	7	2	308
LVLC	128	92 – 1	13	3	384
LVLD	66	288 – 1	19	4	264
LVLE	73	116 - 0	38	6	438
					1,710

¹. Refers to the number of C1 publications published between 2005 and 2010 (6 years)

². Publication targets are **not** measured pro-rata (where points are divided by the number of UWA co-authors)

Table 2 shows the variability in staff research performance as judged using C1 journal outputs. It is of concern that across all levels there are staff with limited publication outputs (range data). The minimum publication targets of 2 at levels A and B, 3 at level C, 4 at level D and 5 at level E, could still be considered low for science in a research intensive University that aspires to be ranked amongst the world's best. However, the publication profile presents as a long-tail distribution and realistic targets have been set to address the tail and increase the median score. As can be determined from the data in Table 2, the median number of papers published annually was 0.8 for level A, 1.1 for level B, 2.1 for level C, 3.2 for level D and 6.3 for level E. As such the targets for minimum performance (outputs) represent only modest changes in median performance over the period 2005 to 2010 but will, when applied to all staff, raise the median score over the period of the OPP. Applying these minimum expectations across all staff would also increase the total number of C1 publications from 6549 (2005-2010) to 9,822 (2011 to 2016). As indicated, quality would be maintained by expecting that at least 60% of these outputs should be published in the equivalent of A*/A journals.

Research Income (Table 3)

It is no longer feasible that individual research programmes can be funded from recurrent income through the FFM. This means that research needs to be supported using external funding. It is appropriate, therefore, that our minimum standards for research active include an expectation that all research active staff should be able to secure external funding. The numbers below are based on examination of our existing income and again represent fairly modest targets that if applied across all staff could significantly increase our research income; provided that the small numbers of current staff who consistently secure substantial amounts of research income are able to maintain their current high performance.

Appointment	Staff Nos.	Target (\$k) ¹
LVLA	158	5 - 50
LVLB	154	5 - 50
LVLC	128	50 - 500
LVLD	66	50 - 500
LVLE	73	>500

¹ Income targets are measured pro-rata and income is divided by the number of UWA co-applicants and calculated over a 5 year period. Targets corresponds to the Research Input Point bands (1 to 3) used by Socrates.

Research students

Higher degree by research students (HDR) are considered integral to our vision of national and international excellence and are critical for financial sustainability and for maintaining our market position internationally. Given the importance of HDR students to our overall research performance it is expected that all staff should engage in postgraduate research supervision. Thus, targets for the different levels are being introduced as part of the minimum standards of research performance. The OPP sets an overall target over the planning period of 2 PhD students per research active staff member. Recently introduced changes to supervisory practices (April 2012) have made co-supervision mandatory. They have also made it easier for early career researchers to be named PhD supervisors. Both of these measures are likely to impact on the distribution of supervision between levels and the minimum standards for research supervision may need to be adjusted at a later date. For now, the minimum targets for PhD supervision are set against a potential Faculty of Science research active staff load

of 579 and moderated by the University's data on mean HDR load across different levels in both FLPS and FNAS (Tables 5 and 6).

Table 5: Faculty (LPS) Statistics 2005-2010 (from ERA reports)

Level	ROP	Mean ROP	RIP	Mean RIP	Total HDRC	Mean HDRC	Total SI	Mean SI	Count	Mean Student Supervision
LVLA	59.03	4.91	5.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	78.62	6.55	12	0.16
LVLB	352.84	9.53	43.99	1.18	10.53	0.28	504.62	13.63	37	2.56
LVLC	341.06	11.76	24.64	0.84	60.89	2.09	556.52	19.19	29	4.24
LVLD	341.81	11.78	46.65	1.60	120.95	4.17	636.99	21.96	29	7.17
LVLE	454.22	23.90	55.69	2.93	41.68	2.19	706.58	37.18	19	5.47

Table 6: Faculty (NAS) Statistics 2005-2010 (from ERA reports)

Level	ROP	Mean ROP	RIP	Mean RIP	Total HDRC	Mean HDRC	Total SI	Mean SI	Count	Mean Student Supervision
LVLA	355.97	5.47	34.41	0.52	0.00	0.00	435.53	6.70	65	0.33
LVLB	669.91	7.70	142.60	1.63	10.36	0.11	826.67	9.50	87	1.55
LVLC	945.96	16.30	397.91	6.86	90.32	1.55	1292.98	22.29	58	3.96
LVLD	645.90	28.08	263.08	11.43	80.44	3.49	893.35	38.84	23	5.69
LVLE	989.18	47.10	227.55	10.83	87.82	4.18	1315.86	62.66	21	7.66

Table 7: Faculty of Science Minimum Targets for PhD supervision

Appointment	Staff Nos.	HDR Target ¹	Total
LVLA	158	0.75	119
LVLB	154	0.75	116
LVLC	128	2.5	320
LVLD	66	4	264
LVLE	73	5	365
			1, 184

¹ HDR targets are measured pro-rata with supervision divided by the number of UWA co-supervisors. Targets may need to change following introduction of mandatory second supervisors.

Impacts of Minimum Standards on New Appointments and Probation

Introduction of minimum research performance standards for all staff will impact on the recruitment and probationary progress of new appointments. The Science OPP makes clear that the Faculty will enforce the policy of only appointing staff to T&R contracts who have the capacity 'to compete nationally and internationally for research funding'. As such any appointment to a T&R contract **must** satisfy as a minimum, the definition of research active at the advertised grade. Furthermore, since new appointments are a particularly effective means of increasing our overall performance it is expected that all appointments should sit above the median score (5, 7, 13, 19 and 38 C1 outputs for levels A to E respectively) for their grade at the time of their appointment. As an example, we should not be appointing staff to level D positions with fewer than 19 C1 outputs in the 5 years prior to their appointment. Where staff have fewer publications because of the time since their PhD or other extenuating circumstances, data on citations and journal impact should be taken into account when considering whether an individual appointment will shorten or lengthen the tail of the C1 output distribution.

Adopting these minimum standards will mean that staff on probation expecting to move to an on-going appointment should have automatically met the publication requirements of their appointed grade. However, new staff may find it difficult to demonstrate during the probationary period that they can secure external research income or to supervise PhD students. Thus, new appointments unable to match the minimum requirements in research (and teaching) within their probationary period will be judged not to have a '***prima facie case***' for transfer to an on-going contract and will therefore be required to demonstrate that they have the potential to strengthen both the Faculty's research and teaching. Where this is the case staff on probation should be able to demonstrate the following:

1. Research outputs during their probationary period equivalent to two C1 papers per annum
2. Submission of one competitive grant (as Chief Investigator) valued at over \$150k over the 3 year probationary period. To show competitiveness against this indicator it is expected that even where not awarded the application is judged to sit amongst the top 30 % of submissions. Other indicators that may be employed include the number and nature of applications and feedback from the panels.
3. All new appointments should expect to supervise a minimum of 1 PhD student and at the time of their performance review should be supervising a minimum of 2 PhD students. Although advisable, we will not insist that probationary staff agree to supervise an HDR student during the first year of their appointment.
4. As with all other staff, probationary candidates must be able to demonstrate competency in teaching by the time of their review. Competency will be judged from student feedback with probationary appointments achieving at least the Faculty CEQ average score for Q6 (Overall satisfaction)

This 'policy' should be read alongside the UWA policy on academic tenure. For completeness the latter is reproduced below.

POLICY AND PROCEDURES – ACADEMIC TENURE

1. TENURE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Tenure is earned as an outcome of satisfactory job performance. To be eligible for Tenure, as a general rule, the staff member needs to obtain a Tenurable appointment. Tenurable appointments are subject to review annually (i.e. on probationary period). Periods for tenurable appointments are as follows:

- Level A Academics – 5 years. This period may be extended in exceptional circumstances
- Level B Academics – 3 years. This period may be extended by two periods of one year each (or further in exceptional circumstances) or shortened.
- Level C, D, E Academics – up to 3 years. This period may be extended by two periods of one year each (or further in exceptional circumstances) or shortened

If a tenurable staff member is successful in attaining a promotion before the expiry of the review (probationary) period, tenure will automatically be granted from the date of promotion.

Exceptions: If a fixed term staff member is successful in attaining a promotion before the expiry of the review period or before the end of the appointment, the new appointment may be converted to tenured, subject to the recommendation of the Head of School, through the Dean, to the Vice-Chancellor. Regard will need to be had for the reason for a staff member being on a fixed term contract (e.g. external funding) and could result in a position not being eligible for tenure/tenurable track status. This does not affect the academic staff member's application for promotion.

A staff member who has held fixed-term appointments who obtains a tenurable appointment will normally be required to go through the review period for tenurable appointments, even where a period of probation has been completed on a fixed-term contract. On the recommendation of the Head of School and Dean the review period may be shortened.

http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/policy/toc/tenure_of_academic_staff/policy_and_procedures_for_academic_tenure

Graduate School of Education – Research Active Table

For staff members of the Graduate School of Education to be classified as research active the following minimum requirements would need to be met over a five (5) year rolling period: Note: the Dean will use discretion depending on individual circumstances if warranted eg early career academics.

	Publication Points (UWA)			Completions	Grants	
	Minimum points	Quality points		Minimum		Minimum
Level B	≥ 2	-	AND	≥ 1	AND	≥ \$5k
	≥ 2	-	AND	≥ 2	OR	≥ \$20k
Level C	≥ 4	≥ 1	AND	≥ 3	AND	≥ \$20K
	≥ 4	≥ 1	AND	≥ 4	OR	≥ \$40k
Level D	≥ 6	≥ 3	AND	≥ 5	AND	≥ \$40K
	≥ 6	≥ 3	AND	≥ 6	OR	≥ \$60k
Level E	≥ 7	≥ 6	AND	≥ 7	AND	≥ \$60K
	≥ 7	≥ 6	AND	≥ 8	OR	≥ \$80k

Publications = UWA recognised research publications points. Quality publications = A* & A rated journals in ERA or equivalents in other indexes. Level X should produce publications where the individual contributions of the staff member yields X number of UWA points over 5 years.

Completions = supervised to successful completion the equivalent of 'x' HRD student (in the case of two supervisors per student, 1 'completion' would require 2 students completed; 8 'completions' would require 16 students completed over the 5 year period).

Grants = competitive grant scheme or industry.



Faculty Workload Model Guidelines

Document Modification History

Version Number	Primary Author(s) (name and position)	Description of Version	Date Completed	Provided To
1	Deans Advisory Group		24 November	

These guidelines will be trialed in 2011 and will be monitored by the Workload Monitoring Committee.

The formula

The basic version of the formula simplified to:

$$(32 + S_a - S_i)/2 = \text{target EFTSL load per semester}$$

where

S_a is Socrates Index average for *level* of staff member

S_i the Socrates Index for the *individual* staff member

and the range has imposed minimum of 8 and maximum of 21 EFTSL per semester.

In the case of fractional appointments and teaching load reductions (e.g. in the case of Discipline Chair, School Postgraduate Coordinator etc.) the formula operates as follows:

$$\frac{(32 \times x + S_a \times x - S_i)}{2} - y$$

where

x is fractional appointment (1 = full time)

y is actual EFTSL load reduction per semester for administrative task.

The outcome of this process is a list of staff and target workloads, expressed in EFTSL. It is then the task of Discipline Chairs to determine teaching allocations (including supervisions, @1 EFTSL per full time HDR supervision per year) that are aligned to the target loads.

Adjustment mechanisms

New Staff

New staff, employed in their first substantial teaching and research position at UWA, granted 25% reduction of normal target EFTSL load for one year.

Staff yet to have a SI score, awarded the average for their level.

Staff with a SI, but not the full five year span (because of a period of parental or unpaid leave or were recently appointed within six years): the Sa adjusted pro rata.

Staff yet to take Sabbatical, awarded the average SI for their level, or their actual SI (whichever is the greater).

Postgraduate HDR

Postgraduate HDR completions are recognized in the Socratic Index, so the EFTSL component of the workload model will only recognize the supervisory component of the postgraduate workload. This will be allocated a percentage as follows:

A fulltime postgraduate still within the designated four year (PhD) or two year (MA) full-time equivalent completion time: 100% of an EFTSL

*A fulltime postgraduate one year outside the designated completion time: 50% of an EFTSL

to be reviewed in 2012 with the likelihood that this will not continue and only postgraduate student that are still within designated completion time will receive an EFTSL allocation.

Postgraduate coursework

In line with higher EFTSL funding rate, student load weighted at 1.5

Languages

Student load weighted at 1.3

Service Roles

Reduction of target EFTSL load (applied after floor/ceiling filter):

Head of School	16 -24 EFTSL
Deputy Head of School (Research Training)	16 EFTSL
Deputy Head of School (Teaching and Learning)	10 EFTSL

Discipline Chair :

This is calculated using a sliding scale model based on the number of discipline EFTSL. This formula can be determined using a separate spreadsheet which has been developed using the following formula $X\% = \text{LN}(\text{EFTSL}) * 14.427 - 36.439$.

The role of Discipline Chair includes any allocation for language conveners, and assumes postgraduate coordination in the Discipline

Discipline Honours and Postgraduate Coursework Coordinator: Number of FTE students enrolled X 0.1 EFTSL

Other roles that are not listed here will only be allocated by the Head of School as necessary. As a general rule, committee and board work will not be recognized in the workload allocation.

Workloads and “buy-out”

The ability to buy-out teaching time is an important benefit of the generation of grant and other external income.

Buy-out in the Faculty will be managed within the following principles:

1. Buy-out must always be endorsed by the Discipline Chair (and notified as far in advance as practicable).
2. Proportion of teaching load buy-out/appropriate rate:

Buy-out of up to 50% of load	At sessional rates
Buy-out of more than 50% of load	At Level B Step 1

3. Final decisions about the nature of the replacement are the responsibility of the Head of School.

Team taught units

In assigning EFTSL value to contributors to team units, the percentage of each person's contribution will need to be calculated (including sessional staff).

As a starting point, the following models are suggested.

I. Relative value

One hour tutorial set up: 1 x number of weeks x number of cohorts
Two hour tutorial: 1.5 x number of weeks x cohorts
One lecture: 2
Unit coordination: 0.1 x number of students

The total point value of a unit is then aligned to its EFTSL value, giving a point/EFTSL equivalence ratio for the unit. Increasing points (that is, increasing activity) does not vary the EFTSL value of a unit.

II. Standard value

Number of EFTSLs in Unit, minus 10% for coordination (allocated to unit coordinator), divided by number of contact hours = X (to be allocated amongst the team depending on their number of contact hours), giving an hour/EFTSL equivalence ratio for the unit. Increasing hours (that is, increasing activity) does not vary the EFTSL value of a unit.