

JOINT CONSULTATIVE FORUM: RECORD OF WORKLOAD DISCUSSION 2015 to 2018

DATE	DISCUSSION	ACTION
March 2015	<p>The workload in its current form is not realistic and not attainable The workload affects the performance of staff; Never consulted at JCF - clarified that the consultation in schools, reported at Senate was in respect to the design of workload norms and not its impact on staff. Management - not linked to PM - mechanism for transparent assignment of duties through the line management system. UKSU incorrect as Framework for Teaching Workloads SE/01/1008/11 Clause 5.7: A link to performance management and evaluation is enabled by agreeing on what constitutes a full teaching load, also referred to in clauses 5.9 and 7.4</p>	<p>Unions to establish if there are areas where there was not proper consultation and where these are; Separate the challenges in respect of the design of the workload norms from its impact on staff. Identify the impact on staff and make a submission. HR should request colleges to engage with schools to put processes in place to equalise workloads for academics and where necessary across colleges. Documentation required on how to deal with equalisation of workloads based on information from teaching workload data.</p>
April 2015	<p>Submission identifier to Senate did not reflect that the School Boards were consulted. HR requested to provide documentation showing consultation undertaken – refused by management said unions must provide information of where consultation did not take place. Concerns raised: The handbook indicates notional hours but the data utilises number of lectures, whereby notional hours has to be converted to number of lectures manually and then captured. So too, the calculation of shared work has to be done manually. How data of student numbers is calculated for shared courses Reduction in the number of hours for supervision of honours research projects, initially 23 hours reduced to 15 hours??? Rationale for the 15 hours especially for 32 credit modules.</p>	<p>Management undertook to convey the above input to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Teaching and Learning for consideration to enhance the online system or when reviewing the system. JCF noted that the teaching workload norms are linked to performance management.</p>
August 2015	<p>Evidence submitted to Human Resources. What is the plan to address the problem? HR had discussed the issues with the DVC College of Humanities. Allocations effected by Dean and Academic Leader within each School.</p>	<p>Management undertook to verify whether the union concerns had been conveyed to the DVC Teaching and Learning for consideration to enhance the online system or when reviewing the system.</p>

	<p>Management is concerned about the inequitable workloads. The report on the 2014 teaching workload data will serve before the next Senate meeting. Management undertook to review the data at the institutional level.</p> <p>Confirmed the problem is not only with workload but also with finding a systematic way of dealing with the challenges that have been revealed.</p>	
September 2015	Confirmation the concerns had been shared with the DVC Teaching and Learning.	Chair to write to DVC to obtain progress on attending to the concerns and to seek clarity on the presentation
December 2015	<p>DVC offered the have the teaching work load system demonstrated to JCF</p> <p>Two aspects to the issue: 1) implementation of the system and 2) whether staff in the Schools were working properly with the system.</p> <p>Mrs Williamson informed JCF that NTEU raised the issue at various structures - confusion about what they were trying to table. The issues were regarding the Conditions of Service in relation to the number of hours worked and it was somehow linked to the issue of overtime. The issue of overtime was addressed with them at a meeting. The problem is how the teaching workload is segregated from the academic workload as a responsibility of an academic. The response that she received from Teaching and Learning was that teaching workload cannot be separated from the academic workload. The matter served before EMC and their response was that the teaching workload had to be managed more efficiently. It is the responsibility of Academic Leaders to resolve the issue of the teaching workload. Also referred to the Executive and Deans Forum.</p> <p>Mrs Williamson informed JCF that Nteu had indicated that they intended to raise a dispute on the matter.</p>	Nteu to provide a response regarding the dispute they had raised.
February 2016	<p>Schools alone cannot solve the problem – need more staff. Additional staff can only be appointed if a need is indicated after all current modules reviewed.</p>	Nteu to meet with the EDHR in an attempt to find a resolution before declaring a dispute.

	<p>The teaching workload norms is a mechanism for transparent assignment of duties. The framework provides a mechanism for making assignment of duties transparent and recognises the duties that staff have to undertake. The challenge is that if staff are doing too much then the framework provides an opportunity for engagement between staff members and line managers in terms of balancing the workload to a reasonable level.</p>	<p>Deans and Executive Forum should have a mechanism in place for Schools to share their practice of how they dealt with the allocation of teaching workload and to have some moderation of the practice to ensure consistency in the allocation of teaching workload across the Schools.</p>
March 2016	<p>College Management Committees must follow up on the queries raised by the unions and respond to JCF. Line Managers required to investigate the imbalances in teaching workload and research productivity and report on achievements to CMCs. Unions to send individual concerns or speak to Line Management.</p>	<p>EMC to set a time-frame.</p>
April 2016	<p>The Vice-Chancellor had intervened and requested the Deans and Head of Schools to report to him in respect of the assessment and clarification of teaching workload and research productivity. A report was being prepared which would serve before the EMC and EDF on Thursday, 7 April 2016. The input of EMC and EDF will be incorporated into the report prior to it serving before JCF on 3 May 2016.</p>	<p>Creation of a framework for the assessment of teaching duties, teaching could be evaluated via an evidence-based Teaching Portfolio or Teaching File.</p>
May 2016	<p>Submission on TWL made to EMC and referred to EDF. The Vice-Chancellor requested the data to be consolidated and a report to Deans of Teaching and Learning, to analyse the report. Deans and Head of Schools had been requested to assess the situation in their Schools, consider their processes for the finalisation of allocation of duties, consider actions taken to ensure equitable workloads and consider actions taken to ensure that time is available for research. The academic workload analysis was done for 2015 and was being used as a framework. The report will serve before all the structures including JCF.</p>	<p>JCF requested that the extract of the EDF minutes of 7 April 2016 pertaining to TWL should be included in the agenda of the next JCF meeting.</p>
June 2016	<p>The Teaching Workload System should be presented to the JCF;</p>	

	Thereafter, a workshop should be held to consider all the issues that JCF have identified, which Professor Vithal should attend.	
July 2016	TWL system presentation done and union concerns regarding the assessment values and how they were calculated, the linkage of the Teaching Work Load System to the Performance Management System, the transparency of the Teaching Work Load System and excessive teaching workloads were noted. The dispute settlement regarding performance management had addresses some concerns (introduction of flexibility and engagement and consultation plan on Senate norms)	Await the 2015 Teaching Work Load System report because it would provide statistical information which will either confirm or dismiss the concerns of the unions.
August 2016	Consultation on TWL in performance management. The concerns of the unions: - many academics teaching above the norm; - number of hours to create a Teaching File; - the KPA allocation for creation of a Teaching File – time consuming and will increase the administrative load.	
May 2017	To be discussed at the Performance Management Workshop	
September 2017	Management reminded members that it was agreed that individual cases of unequal workload should be brought to the attention of the Line Manager. Unions - Line Managers are endorsing the unequal workload so it would be futile approaching them. A workshop was held to consider issues that were raised by the unions in relation to unequal workload. Progress was made at the workshop and there was to be a follow-up.	Workshop to be held after 1 October 2017 to discuss issues related to unequal workload and another workshop should be held to discuss Senate norms.
October 2017	To be included in workshop to consider benchmarking of qualifications for different levels.	
March 2018	The presentation had been done but no response to the additional information request had been received.	Human Resources and the unions had been dealing with the Conditions of Service and had not been able to workshop this matter.
May 2018	JCF noted that there are 955 academic staff that have above 810 hours of workload, which was more than 50% of the academic staff.	HR and UKSU to meet

June 2018	Deferred as the meeting had not taken place	
August 2018	Uksu requested timeframes from Human Resources	