

UQ School of Economics Academic Workload Allocation Model



1. Background

The Academic Workload Allocation Model for the School of Economics has been developed in accordance with *The University of Queensland Enterprise Agreement 2021 – 2026 (clause 15)* and UQ's *Workload Allocation for Academic Staff Policy and Procedure* for the purposes of overseeing workloads of academic staff generally within a School, Institute or Centre. It has been developed in consultation with the academic staff of the School of Economics and agreed to by the majority of staff to be covered by the model (see Appendix A).

The model includes an estimate of the time for each type of work or bundle of work to be accounted for, having regard for a staff member's classification, experience and other relevant factors. The estimate is considered a fair and accurate estimate of the average time that a staff member should take to perform this work to a professional standard and at a satisfactory level of performance.

The Academic Workload Allocation Model and workload allocations made under the model can be accessed (in a way that allows the individual to compare their allocation with the allocations of their peers) by academic staff within the School in which the model applies (<https://economics.uq.edu.au/staff-intranet/workload-and-service-roles>).

2. Principles

A set of core principles have been established to guide decision makers in the process of allocating individual workloads.

- Workloads will be allocated fairly and distributed equitably among staff, having regard for a staff member's classification and experience, across all relevant domains of activity, and in alignment with the University's commitment to equity and diversity.
- Individual allocation preferences will be given reasonable consideration and accommodated where aligned with the operational requirements for the academic unit. This includes in relation to family/caring responsibilities and personal responsibilities, professional development needs, and objectives for confirmation, promotion and career progression more generally.
- Allocations will make the best use of staff capability and give consideration to academic categories, optimising for fit between an individual's strengths, commitments and expertise, and operational requirements. Consequently, it is expected that the workload is likely to vary across staff in any particular area.
- Allocations will seek to take advantage of opportunities for efficiency, such as course repeats and stability in allocations over time.
- Methods used to calculate and allocate comparative workloads will be transparent and readily understood.
- Allocations will be sensitive and flexible to the dynamic nature of teaching and service, where needs cannot always be determined a year in advance and may change unexpectedly.

3. Procedure for allocations

With the exception of the senior School service roles, School-allocated service role preferences and individual teaching preferences will be sought from academic staff. The Head of School will be responsible for drafting the service allocation, in liaison with the relevant Director for the Deputy Director roles. The Deputy Head of School, with input as applicable from an academic delegate, will be responsible for the teaching allocation under the oversight and in coordination with the Head of School. The School will aim to begin the process in July of each year for the following year (unless where this is practically unfeasible for operational reasons).

The Deputy Head of School will circulate a draft, or iteratively more than one draft, workload allocation for consultation to the whole of the School when this is available, before it being finalized. The Deputy Head of School will consider cases for review in the first instance. Such cases will then proceed to the Head of School should a suitable resolution not be reached. Standard conflict of interest rules will apply.

Note that, in consultation and (whenever possible) in agreement with affected staff, the workload allocations may continuously change across the year as circumstances change or matters become clearer, for example in terms of allocation of Semester 2 and 3 teaching to casual staff.

In relation to senior School service roles (Head of School, Deputy Head of School, Director of Teaching and Learning, Director of Research, Director of HDR Programs), an application or EOI process will apply. The Head of School application process will be led centrally. The application process for the other roles will be led by the Head of School. Timing will be dependent on the expected vacancies for these roles.

4. Academic categories and weightings

Academic activities are categorised according to the four domains of teaching, research, supervision and researcher development, and citizenship and service. The Academic Categories Procedure outlines the indicative weighting range across the four domains of work for each academic category.

The allocation of work and the weightings attributed to each domain is recorded in the Academic Workload Tool and considered when assessing individual performance.

The Academic Workload Allocation Model is a points-based system, with 1000 points representing the annual workload of a full-time academic staff member. For example, 100 points is equal to 0.1FTE (10%) or approximately 172.5 hours for a full-time staff member.

Indicative Workload Ranges by Academic Category and Domain (points)				
	Teaching	Research	Supervision & Researcher Development	Citizenship & Service
Teaching & Research	300-500	300-500	Up to 200	100-300
Teaching-Focused	600-800	Up to 300	Up to 100	100-300
Research-Focused	Up to 200	600-800	100-300	100-300
Clinical Academic	300-700	200-600	Up to 400	100-500

The School will assign Teaching and Citizenship and Service responsibilities on an annual basis and carryovers are generally not permitted. However, in some circumstances, where it benefits a staff member and the School, special Teaching and Citizenship and Service credit arrangements may be made, subject to approval by the Head of School. With this qualification, if there is an unexpected ex-post excess in directed teaching and service allocations for over 100 points, any excess over 100 points will be considered for carryover to the allocation in the following year, subject to approval by the Head of School.

The directed teaching workloads of TF staff will generally be 50% higher than the directed teaching workloads of T&R staff, subject to the principles of sections 2 and 5.3, and the framework provided by the University TF Guidance slides (or any updated version of this guidance), including recognition of the significance of self-directed teaching impact.

Teaching Associate (TA) positions will engage in undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and teaching related activities including course coordination in Economics, further development of the school's programs, and to perform teaching service activities associated with the school. They will have a teaching intensive focus and will contribute to the delivery of high-quality teaching practice within the school. This will include administrative tasks such as managing a tutor team, training, discipline currency and development activities. Teaching Associates will be assigned (pro rata) 75 points for general citizenship and service as detailed in section 6.1.2, with an expectation that this will be primarily tied to such general administrative tasks; the remaining time (pro rata) will be generally assigned to Teaching.

Indicative Teaching and Citizenship & Service ranges for specific staff under probation are as follows:

Indicative Teaching and Citizenship & Service Ranges for Specific Staff under Probation		
	Teaching	Citizenship & Service
Level B T&R Year 1	160-360	75-125
Level B T&R After Year 1	300-500	75-125
Level B TF Year 1	400-600	75-250
Level B TF After Year 1	600-800	75-250
Level C-D T&R	300-500	75-250

5. Individual workload allocations

5.1 Allowable workloads

The workload allocated to or required of a full-time academic in a calendar year should not exceed that which can be reasonably performed in 1725 hours, or approximately 37.5 hours per week over 46 weeks (52 weeks less annual leave and public holidays). This applies pro-rata for part-time or part-year employees.

5.2 Teaching across semesters

Academic staff may be required to teach only in two out of the three of semester one, semester two and summer semester. Academic staff may, by agreement, teach or convene courses in each of three consecutive semesters where that includes a summer semester. Where academic staff agree to work during summer semester in this context, this will be recognised in the staff member's workload allocation by provision of an equivalent teaching-free or convening-free time during the rest of the year, or other agreed offset (The University of Queensland Enterprise Agreement 2021 – 2026). Whenever possible and requested, T&R academic staff will be given the opportunity to deliver education activities (not including short-notice teaching opportunities and dissertation supervision and marking) within one regular semester.

5.3 Allocation of workload across domains

To allocate workloads to individual staff, the Head must first understand the total (directed) academic work (teaching, service and other required duties) to be undertaken in the organisational unit.

In determining individual workloads, the expectation is that, with due consideration to the indicative boundary ranges in Section 4, a Head will consider operational requirements for workload (including teaching and internal service) and commitments agreed with the member of staff, are prioritised before time provisioned for self-directed workload (research, supervision and researcher development, and external service) is determined, although commitments in the latter areas may to be taken into account to determine appropriate weightings across domains.

For each individual academic staff member, the Head will consider:

1. Any existing individual commitments agreed with the Head;
2. Appropriate workload allocation among staff, having regard for each staff member's academic category, level, capability and experience,
3. Agreed obligations relating to externally funded research.
4. Individual circumstances, noting that these will be given reasonable consideration and accommodated where aligned with operational requirements. This includes in relation to family/caring and personal responsibilities, professional development needs, and objectives for confirmation, promotion and career progression more generally.

It is important to note that this process gives organisational units flexibility in the utilisation of the full indicative ranges within each domain set out in the Academic Categories Procedure and outlined in Section 4 of this document. This is one of the aspects that will be monitored through the faculty level oversight process (Workload Allocation for Academic Staff Policy).

Flexibility in individual weightings across each domain are expected such that the overall work carried out by the combined staff meets the organisational requirements, while giving reasonable consideration to staff commitments in each domain, their circumstances and their career development needs.

The allocation of work and the weightings attributed to each domain are recorded in the Academic Workload Tool (when this is revised to reflect this model) and considered when assessing individual performance.

5.4 Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander cultural duties

The University acknowledges that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff have commitments and obligations to maintaining their relationship to Country, their communities and to the broader community. Where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander academic staff engage (by mutual agreement) in cultural activities on behalf of the University, these activities will be recognised in the workload allocation under the relevant domain (The University of Queensland Enterprise Agreement 2021 – 2026 (clause 19.3)).

5.5 Adjustments for leave

Workload allocations will be adjusted as appropriate for periods of Academic Enrichment Program (AEP) and other types of extended leave (such as parental leave). Adjustments will normally take place pro-rata and be based on what is known *ex ante* at the time of preparation of the workload allocation.

6. Calculating workloads

6.1 Teaching

Teaching can include a range of activities that span both teaching practice and teaching impact. The workload points in this domain are inclusive of these activities, although it is recognised that for teaching impact the activity (and therefore provisioned time) may sometimes be recognised in other domains.

The following formula is used to calculate workload points for teaching per calendar year.

$$\text{Teaching Points} = \text{Course Coordination Points} + \text{Contact Points} + \text{Marking Points} + \text{Coursework Project Supervision Points} + \text{Additional Defined Teaching Activity Points}$$

6.1.1 Course Coordination Points

The responsibilities of the Course Coordinator are described in [UQ PPL 3.30.01 Teaching and Learning Roles and Responsibilities](#). The workload points detailed in the below table are all-inclusive of these responsibilities, excluding teaching into the course. Where these duties are distributed beyond the Course Coordinator, for example where others teaching into the course may contribute to assessment preparation or student consultation, this can be adjusted for using the percentage coordination responsibility.

$$\text{Course Coordination Points} = \text{Course Attribute Weighting} \times \% \text{ Coordination Responsibility} \times (\text{Course Coordination Base Points} + \text{Class Size Points})$$

Case #1 Course Coordination + Lecturer Workload Calculation	
Course Attribute Weighting	2 unit course weighting = 1 4 unit course weighting = 1.5
Course Coordination & Lecturer Base Points	10 points (~17.33 hours) x 1.2 if the lecturer is new x 1.1 if the course coordinator is not the lecturer + (57.2 points (~98.7 hours) if preparing lectures +8.1 points (~14 hours) if preparing tutorials) x 1.2 if this is the first time lecturing this course
*Class Size Points	6.3 points (~10.8 hours) for every 50 students or part thereof if lecturing.
* 91% of the senior tutor support hours to be subtracted, for courses for which senior tutor support is available.	

Example: For a course with 475 students in which the coordinator is also the lecturer and does not prepare tutorials; it is not the first time they lecture this course; assume that 64 hours of senior tutor support are provided, 91% of which is $0.91 * (64/1.725) = 33.8$ points. Overall weight = $1 \times 100\% \times (67.2 + 6.3 \times 10) - 33.8 = 130.2 - 33.8 = 96.4$ points (~166.3 hours).

Case #2(a) Course Coordination only (no Lecturing) Workload Calculation (Fixed)	
Course Attribute Weighting	2 unit course weighting = 1 4 unit course weighting = 1.5
Course Coordination Base Points	10 points (~17.33 hours) x 1.2 if the lecturer is new x 1.2 if this is the first time coordinating this course x 1.1 if the course coordinator is not the lecturer

Example: Individual course coordination of a 2-unit course with 475 students; the course coordinator does not deliver lectures or tutorials, but the lecturer is new. Overall weight = $1 \times 100\% \times 10 \times 1.2 \times 1.1 = 13.2$ points (~22.77 hours).

Case #2 (b) Lecturer only (no Course Coordination) Workload Calculation (Variable)	
Course Attribute Weighting	2 unit course weighting = 1 4 unit course weighting = 1.5
Lecturer Base Points	(57.2 points (~98.7 hours) if preparing lectures + 8.1 points (~14 hours) if preparing tutorials) x 1.2 if this is the first time lecturing this course
*Class Size Points	6.3 points (~10.8 hours) for every 50 students or part thereof if lecturing.
* 91% of the senior tutor support hours to be subtracted, for courses for which senior tutor support is available.	

Example: Only lecturer of a 2-unit course with 475 students; the lecturer is not course coordinator and does not prepare tutorials; it is not the first time they lecture this course; assume that 64 hours of senior tutor support are provided, 91% of which is $0.91 \times (64/1.725) = 33.8$ points. Overall weight = $1 \times 100\% \times (57.2 + 6.3 \times 10) - 33.8 = 120.2 - 33.8 = 86.4$ points (~149 hours).

6.1.2 Contact Points

The workload points detailed in the below table are calculated relative to contact hours and are inclusive of associated work time. Contact points are calculated for each teaching activity per course per semester. Please note the following:

- *First delivery* refers to the first time a lecture, seminar or tutorial is delivered during a course.

- *Repeat delivery* refers to cases where the same staff member delivers a lecture, seminar or tutorial a second, third or further times during a course. In general, the School does not have repeat lectures/seminars.
- *Taught for the first time* means that a staff member has not taught the course before.
- The default expectation is that each course has 2 hours of lectures or seminars per week unless an alternative has been previously approved. Any changes require approval by the Director of Teaching and Learning and the Head of School.

$$\text{Contact Points} = (\text{Contact Hours} \times \text{First Delivery Multiplier}) + (\text{Repeat Contact Hours} \times \text{Repeat Delivery Multiplier})$$

Parameter	First Delivery Multiplier (points per contact hour)	Repeat Delivery Multiplier (points per contact hour)
Lecture / Seminar	2.4 points (~4 hours) per contact hour x 1.2 if taught for the first time (~4 x 1.2 = 4.8 hours).	1.16 points (~2 hours) per contact hour
Tutorial	1.74 points (~3 hours) per contact hour x 1.2 if taught for the first time (~3 x 1.2 = 3.6 hours)	1.16 points (~ 2 hours) per contact hour

Example: Delivery of weekly 1h lecture + 1h tutorial (first delivery) + 1h tutorial (repeat delivery) for 13 weeks (not taught for the first time) = $(2.4 \times 13) + (1.74 \times 13) + (1.16 \times 13) = 68.9$ points (~118.9 hours).

6.1.3 Marking Points

The following formula is used to calculate workload points for marking per course per semester. Each course will be assigned a Course Assessment Load that appropriately recognises the effort associated with marking all assessment items for a single student within that course.

$$\text{Marking Points} = \text{Number of Students} \times \text{Course Assessment Load Points} \times \% \text{ Share}$$

Course Assessment Load	Course Assessment Load Points
~1 hour per student	0.6 points
Hons and PGCW dissertations - ~8 hours/student	4.6 points.

Lecturers in courses with less than 15 enrolments are normally expected to mark all forms of assessment for all students; for quality assurance purposes, lecturers in courses with more than 15 enrolments are normally expected to mark all forms of assessment for 15 students only. When a course is co-taught, marking hours will be split on a pro-rata basis according to the proportion of lectures delivered.

Example: Course with 120 students requiring ~1 hour marking per student and the only lecturer is responsible for assessment for 15 students = 15×0.6 points = 9 points.

6.1.4 Coursework Project Supervision Points

This metric is designed for courses where the primary student deliverable is a project or research thesis. The following formula is used to calculate workload points for supervision calculated per course per semester. Each

course will be assigned a Project Supervision Load that appropriately recognises the effort associated with supervision per student (or group of students).

The formula used to compute supervision points, differs between Honours and Masters student supervision.

Honours Coursework Project Supervision Points = average of Annual Individual Supervision Points in the preceding 3 years, where

Annual Individual Supervision Points = sum of Honours Project Supervision Load \times 3 / max(3, Annual Number of Supervisors).

A cap will apply for total Honours coursework project supervision and HDR supervision as detailed in section 6.4.

Masters Coursework Project Supervision Points = Number of Students \times Masters Project Supervision Load, where

Number of Students = average number of Masters students supervised by the respective academic in the past three years.

Coursework Project Supervision Calculation	
Course Unit Value	Project Supervision Load Points
Honours (#8)	21 points (~ 36 hours per student)
Masters (#4)	16 points (~ 28 hours per student)

Example: An academic co-supervised (a) 1 Honours student in a team of 2 supervisors last year, (b) 1 Honours student in a team of 4 supervisors the previous year, and no Honours students two years ago. They receive $(21 + 21 \times 3/4 + 0)/3 = 12.25$ Honours supervision points in total.

The same academic supervised an average 1.2 Masters students over the past three years. They receive $1.2 \times 16 = 19.2$ Masters supervision points in total.

6.1.5 Additional Defined Teaching Activity Points

Allocated work in the teaching domain can extend beyond the teaching practice captured within the formulas for course coordination, teaching into courses, marking and coursework project supervision. In these circumstances, individual academic staff may be allocated an undifferentiated block of points that appropriately recognises the effort associated with delivering the defined teaching activities as agreed by the Head of School for the upcoming period.

New Curriculum Development

Additional work is typically associated with the development of new curriculum (new course or program). Where appropriate, the Head of School may recognise this as a defined teaching activity that requires additional time (points) to complete in the relevant calendar year. The updating and innovation of existing curriculum is expected and integrated in the time provisioned for allocated teaching activities.

Teaching Impact

Teaching impact is recognised as work that has reach and influence beyond the individual academic themselves and the students they teach, and is a particularly important component for Teaching Focused academics. Where the Head of School agrees that activities and workload extend beyond the parameters measured within teaching practice, this should be recognised as a defined teaching activity that requires additional time (points) to undertake.

6.2 Citizenship and Service

Citizenship and Service includes a range of activities internal to the University, including general activities and service roles expected of staff to contribute to the School and wider University community. It can also include service activities (unremunerated) external to the University, which are more often self-assigned workload.

The following formula is used to calculate workload points for citizenship and service per calendar year.

$$\text{Citizenship and Service Points} = \text{Standard Citizenship and Service Points} + \text{Defined Service Role Points}$$

6.2.1 Standard Citizenship and Service Points

All academic staff are given a fixed allocation of points (75 points) in recognition of general internal activities not recognized by service roles, and external service activities. Where appropriate, this will be applied pro-rata for part-time or part-year employees. The expectation is that internal citizenship and service activities take precedent over self-assigned external service activities.

Substantial UQ-wide and Faculty Service roles will be given a weight within the School's workload. A substantial role would be one that demands more than 75 points within a year and would require Head of School approval. Up to 75 points of time, the role will be recognised as part of the activities within general citizenship.

There is an expectation that, where not connected to service roles, engagement activities naturally tie to teaching and research activities. That said, substantial external engagement roles may be given a weight within the School's workload if they demand more than 75 points within a year, if undertaken in compliance with University policies and procedures and if approved by the Head of School before applying for or accepting the role.

Other examples of general citizenship activities include (where not explicitly recognized as a service role): graduations; School and Faculty meetings; Open days and other future students events and activities; equality and diversity, or RAP events organized by the School, Faculty and University; attendance of 'get together' events with other parts of the University for research, when not directly connected to one's own research; staff supervision and mentoring, whether formal or informal; ad hoc committees and working groups; Community of Practice events for teaching; compulsory training. When in a given year a service role reasonably takes more time than allocated in the service worksheet, the extra time also counts towards general citizenship.

6.2.2 Defined Service Role Points

It is recognised that there are service roles that cannot be reasonably undertaken within the Standard Citizenship and Service Points. Points will be assigned for defined service roles to appropriately recognise the effort associated with fulfilling all associated duties for that role. The associated points will be applied pro rata for part-year or shared appointments.

The weights assigned to formal service roles are reviewed each year and provided in the service worksheet. Weights are reviewed based on available evidence and expectations about the roles. The weights are provided in the service worksheet.

6.3 Research

Individual academic staff will be allocated a block of points for their research and consultancy activity for the upcoming period that is normally within the range indicated for their relevant academic category.

In determining these points, the Head will take into account:

1. agreed obligations relating to externally funded research;

2. the individual academic's teaching and internal service allocation and other agreed commitments for the upcoming year; and
3. other considerations as outlined in Section 5.3 of this document.

6.4 Supervision and Researcher Development

The workload points for HDR supervision are determined using the following formula (for each student), and a cap of 58 points (~100 hours) will apply for total HDR supervision and Honours coursework project supervision (section 6.1.4), in addition to the upper limit for this domain for the relevant academic category. The workload points and the cap recognize that some of the time dedicated to supervision may also have research benefits. Workload points will be ex-ante predictions based on the average supervisory loads over the previous three years. The actual supervisory loads will be calculated ex-post. Only in-load student supervision will contribute to these points.

$$\text{HDR Supervision Points} = \text{Student Attendance Weighting} \times \text{Supervision Type Weighting} \times \text{HDR Student Supervision Points} \times 3 / \max(3, \text{number of supervisors})$$

HDR Supervision Workload Calculation	
Student Attendance Weighting	Full-time weighting = 1 Part-time weighting = 0.5 Out of load weighting = 0
Supervision Type Weighting	Principal Advisor weighting = 0.55 Associate Advisor weighting = 0.45
HDR Student Supervision Points	PhD & MPhil = 35 points (~60 hours)

Example: An Associate Advisor in a team of three for a full-time PhD candidate (in-load) = $(1 \times 0.45 \times 35) = 15.75$ points. An Associate Advisor in a team of four for a full-time PhD candidate (in-load) = $(1 \times 0.45 \times 35) \times 3 / 4 = 11.81$ points.

Appendix A

At the University level, throughout 2023, the Academic Workload Working Group developed the model and undertook several rounds of consultation with Heads of School. On 27 March 2024, it was considered by Joint Consultative Committee. The Deputy Provost presented it for feedback at Academic Board on 7 June 2024. At the School level:

- In the School Meetings of 6 December 2023 and 9 April 2024, there was a discussion of the process by which service roles get allocated. By majority vote, on 9 April 2024 a decision was taken to trial out service preferencing for 2025.
- An online consultation on recommended changes to the workload allocation model was conducted in April 2024. The feedback was discussed at the Workload Allocation Working Group with appropriate responses and follow up action points determined and shared at the School Meeting of 23 May 2024.
- In May 2024, a consultation of all academic staff took place on the general template. Staff could provide feedback online, and this feedback was shared with the Deputy Provost and with the Workload Allocation Working Group. Staff was also given an opportunity to provide feedback in the School Meeting of 23 May 2024.
- In the School Meeting of 23 May 2024, there was a discussion of whether to retain the current stylized service allocation weights method or whether to move to one of two alternatives as determined by the Workload Allocation Working Group and endorsed by the School Executive Committee. By majority vote, a decision was taken to retain the current stylized service allocation weights method.
- In the School Meeting of 20 June 2024, the draft Sections 1-5.4 were discussed. Objections and feedback that were made were taken into account in revising these sections.
- From 24/06/2024 to 01/07/2024, feedback was sought online and also via a special HoS Open House on 27/06/2024, particularly aimed at academic staff who did not attend the 20/06/2024 School meeting; following online feedback, a meeting with three TF staff took place on 4 July 2024. Changes were made following the feedback.
- In the School Meeting of 2 July 2024, the remainder of the document was discussed (focusing particularly on the sections for review). Objections and feedback were taken into account in revising the proposed draft workload model and the document.
- Next steps were described in the HoS Update of 5 July 2024, where it was noted that the HoS would be happy to have special meeting slots with staff either individually or as a group, for anyone who has not followed what has been happening in this space and who wants to catch up. Staff were encouraged to mark the School meeting on August 1 as an important one to attend for collective decision making on the Workload Allocation Model.
- The HoS Update of 12 July 2024 reiterated the above and provided more details on the process in moving forward, including (a) setting up a further online consultation, three special Open House meetings, a special session aimed particularly to staff who have been away and have not followed the process so far, and availability for further engagements; and (b) outlining the voting process when the draft document is deemed ready. Further changes were made to address feedback received in this July round of consultations, including the special session held on 25 July 2024.
- A meeting took place on 17 July 2024 with all Teaching Associate staff, where the paragraph that was added to apply specifically to them was discussed, and more broadly the proposed workload model.
- A School meeting conducted in person and online took place on 1 August 2024. The academic staff present at the meeting approved the proposed workload allocation model (28 votes in favour, 3 against, 3 abstentions; voting was anonymous).
- A 1 week online voting process took place between 2 and 9 August 2024 for any academic staff who could not vote at the School meeting. To assist in the voting, relevant documentation was attached by email and anyone who wished any clarification was invited to attend a special Open House or a standard Open House session taking place during the voting week, or to ask for additional slots if neither timeslot was convenient. Nine votes were cast (7 votes in favour, 1 against, 1 abstentions; voting was anonymous).
- Therefore, the overall outcome of the voting was 35 votes in favour, 4 against and 4 abstentions, with all academic staff having been given the opportunity vote either via the School meeting or via a 1 week online voting process.

Contact details

Head of School

T +61 7 3365 6340

E SOE-HOS@uq.edu.au

W uq.edu.au

CRICOS Provider 00025B • TEQSA PRV12080