



Workload Committee Meeting
Thursday, 9 January 2020, Room SW00, William Gates Building

Minutes

Present:

Dr Andy Rice (ACR, Chair)
Celia Burns (CB, Secretary)
Dr Alice Hutchings (AH)
Prof Larry Paulson (LP)
Malcolm Scott (MS)
Caroline Stewart (CS)

1. Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies. ACR advised that he would be on paternity leave from 10 January 2020 for four weeks and again for the Easter 2020 term.

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting

The minutes of the last meeting held on 5 December 2019 were approved as a correct record.

3. Update on Pending Actions

i. Template Document

ACR to create a template document for the Committee's data, for CB to populate.

ACR reported that a template document was now available in the committee's Google drive, showing the minimum amount of data required by decision-makers. CB had not yet spoken to Graduate Education for feedback but would do so after the meeting.

Committee members were asked to review the document and advise if they have anything to add.

Action: CB, Committee members

ii. Administrative Databases

MS to talk to Stewart Carswell and request a short summary of his plans and timescales.

MS to convey to Stewart Carswell that it is still unclear how much data will be shared with UTOs (and, consequently, how much data should be posted on the webpages).

MS's understanding was that Stewart is not making any fundamental changes; rather he is modernising current data. MS thought that it would be possible to write scripts from Markus Kuhn's database, although little historical data would be included as it goes back to 2017 only.

iii. Markus Kuhn's Collection of Data

ACR to follow up with Markus Kuhn about his data. On receipt of Markus' report, he will forward it on to Committee members for their information/comment. He will also talk to Markus if further information is required.

ACR had received a report from Markus Kuhn shortly before this meeting (subsequently circulated to Committee members). ACR noted that Markus had also offered to be available for a member of the Committee to speak to if further information was required. LP agreed to speak to Markus in ACR's absence if required.

Action: LP

iv. Graduate Education Data

CS to talk to Graduate Education about the ACS and PhD reviews data.

CS had not yet discussed this with Graduate Education. ACR felt that CB could combine this with the discussion about the template document (action 3(i) above). CB agreed to talk to Graduate Education about these issues.

Action: CB

v. Undergraduate Data

MS to talk to Graham Titmus with regard to his admissions data collection.

MS reported that there is a lot of admissions data but in most cases, there is a current snapshot only and therefore historical data may be an issue.

CS to talk to Undergraduate Admin with regard to how they collect Part II supervisions data.

Post-meeting note: MS has reported that CamCORS holds the data about supervisions and he will investigate whether we can use any of the data, although he thought that would be unlikely. Overseer information is held in an Excel spreadsheet.

Action: MS

4. Next Steps

The Committee discussed the provision of Workload Reports for UTOs and Workload Summaries for decision makers. Workload Reports would be a one-page document showing the data noted in the 'Data Needed' column of the Workload Data document, stating what the UTO has done and is currently doing. Workload Summaries would show the same data but in a different format.

The Committee discussed the issue of providing other UTOs' data to individual UTOs but it was felt that this should not be done as it might cause resentment towards a fellow UTO with a different workload, and even if the data were anonymised, it might still be possible to identify people. However, since it was felt that contextual data would be very useful—particularly for new UTOs—an alternative might be to provide a couple of fictional comparison workload reports, showing *average* teaching and *average* committee loads, etc. It would be important, though, to report only quantitative data in order to avoid interpretation of data.

With regard to reporting on MPhil modules where they are taught by more than one person, it was agreed that the number of hours would normally be divided by the number of people teaching, noting the allocation as, for example, "[x] hours, part of a team of [y]." However, there may be occasions where the number of people teaching a module is not an accurate representation of who is doing the teaching. Individuals would need to make that judgement.

Interpretation of the Workload Summaries, for example interpreting the workload relating to different committees (which can differ considerably in terms of required workload) would be a next-stage problem. A possible approach could be to ask each committee how much work is involved and/or require all committee terms of reference to state the hours expected of its members.

The following next steps were agreed:

(i) ***Completion of Workload Data Document:***

CB to talk to Lise Gough, Graduate Education (see 3(i) and 3(iv) above), and finalise the document.

Action: CB

(ii) ***Template UTO Workload Reports:***

CS to lead on manually creating three example Workload Reports for ACR, AH and LP, for circulation to the Committee for review.

Action: CS, ACR, AH, LP

(iii) ***Review of UTO Workload Reports***

Committee members to look at the three example Workload Reports at the next meeting with a view to circulating them to UTOs for their feedback.

(iv) ***Code for UTO Workload Reports***

Once the template Workload Report is agreed, MS to write some SQL to produce the Workload Reports from the data currently available.

5. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

6. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will take place at 2.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 11 March 2020. If ACR has not returned from paternity leave by that date, LP will chair the meeting.