

Gazette Supplement



Task Force on Academic Employment

Council of the University

In 2005, Council set up a task force to undertake a wide-ranging review of a range of key academic staffing issues. The task force has now made its final report to Council and the full text of that report is set out below. Council has endorsed the recommendations in this report, which will now be taken forward through the permanent committee structures of the collegiate University. Individual academics are invited to direct any comments they may have at this stage on those recommendations to jeremy.whiteley@admin.ox.ac.uk by **12 March**. The task force has now been discharged.

Full details of the work of the task force since 2005 may be found at www.admin.ox.ac.uk/personnel/staffinfo/academic/taskforceonacademicemployment.

Duties of academics, and other issues: final communication from the Task Force on Academic Employment

(a) Summary

This paper presents final proposals from the Task Force on Academic Employment about the duties of academics and about the range of other issues that the task force has reviewed (beyond those relating to merit pay and titles of distinction, on which final decisions were taken by Council and Congregation in 2010).

These final proposals arise from the terms of reference of the task force (annexed at A), from discussions in the task force itself and from the five extensive consultative exercises which it undertook in 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009.

A list of the membership of the task force is included at the end of this report.

(b) Action required of Council

Council is asked to **consider** the following recommendations, which are explained in more detail in the next section of this paper:

(i) that the Personnel Committee, in liaison with the Education Committee, the divisional boards and the colleges, oversee the introduction of new arrangements for the duties of lecturers holding joint appointments, of a new framework for the variation of the duties of lecturers holding joint appointments, and of new contractual terms for lecturers;

(ii) that at the beginning of each budget cycle relevant university bodies all be routinely reminded to consider the scope for additional focused investment in improving academic terms and conditions (alongside other top priorities);

(iii) that no further consideration be given to any proposal (mooted in earlier discussions) to relax the entitlement statute at the margin until time has been taken to assess the impact of the improvements suggested by the Conference of Colleges' Working Party on College Associations;

(iv) that eligibility to apply to the University's professorial housing scheme be extended, in acute recruitment and retention cases, to lecturers/readers without tutorial fellowships and those in the University's most senior research support grade (RSIV);

(v) that outline proposals from the task force in relation to research staff, which are set out at Annex E, be referred to the Personnel Committee for substantive consideration;

(vi) that colleges, departments/faculties, and divisions work positively to keep administrative burdens on academics under review, reducing them wherever possible;

(vii) that the University Administration and Services consider appropriate actions to minimise, as appropriate, the administrative requirements made of academics;

(viii) that the question of developmental appraisal for academics be referred to the Personnel Committee for consideration in the medium term; and

(ix) that, subject to Council's views on the recommendations above, the task force be disbanded.

(c) Key issues

(i) Academic duties

1. When the task force presented to Council and then to Congregation in April 2010 its proposals on career progression for academics, in the shape of a combined system for titles and merit pay, it also reported on its progress on questions relating to academic duties.

2. Congregation was informed (www.ox.ac.uk/gazette/2009-10/supps/1_4915.pdf) that the task force was consulting divisional and college representatives on a draft revised framework for academic duties; and the draft framework, which had been developed by the task force in the light of successive broad consultation exercises across the collegiate University and in particular in response to specific consultation on this in 2009, was included as an annexe to the documentation received by Congregation. While that material covered issues like the embedding of graduate supervision in contractual duties, and the wording of such duties, a particular focus was the flexibility and variability, over time, of the duties of individual academics holding joint appointments - this in response to the issue which emerged from the task force's general consultation in 2006 as the one which most preoccupied individual academics as well as university and college appointing bodies.

3. Since then, discussions of the task force's emerging framework for academic duties have, as agreed, been pursued through a 'plenary group' of representatives of the task force, the colleges and the divisions. The group comprised Dr Goss, Dr Mapstone, Dr Davies, Professor England, Dr Heal and Professor Softley from the task force; the President of Magdalen, Dr Dinshaw, Dr Durning and Dr Pobjoy from the colleges;

and Professor Goodman/Dr Shaikh, Professor Paterson, Professor Shuttleworth/Dr Achinstein and Professor Woodhouse from the divisions.

4. That group produced a revised version of the framework, with ancillary material, and this was then discussed in divisionally based meetings, each with college representation, and also separately and subsequently by a meeting of college representatives. The written responses to the revised draft framework which emerged from those meetings were then considered by the plenary group.

5. In the light of those discussions revised draft documentation has now been carefully considered by the task force, which now **commends to Council** the material annexed at B, C and D: the task force **recommends** that the Personnel Committee, in liaison with the Education Committee, the divisional boards and the colleges, oversee the introduction of new arrangements for academic duties on the basis of these documents.

6. The first document (Annexe B) is a **draft overall framework for the duties of lecturers holding joint academic appointments at Oxford**.

7. The second document (Annexe C) sets out **draft arrangements for the variation of the duties of lecturers holding joint academic appointments at Oxford**.

8. In discussion the task force has acknowledged that some scope for flexibility of duties already exists in practice, even across the University/college divide, but it continues to believe that a formal set of arrangements for enabling this should be agreed and should be referred to in contractual documentation; this would be an important element to underpin recruitment to and retention in joint appointments and in the career development of academics.

9. In redrafting Annexe C, the task force has tried to safeguard the interests of all parties, and also to manage the expectations that the document might generate among individual academics. In response to views expressed not only by the divisions but also by the college representatives, it has withdrawn the idea that requests for variation should be invited and considered in annual gathered fields (though it would still be possible for departments/faculties, divisions or colleges to delay a decision on a particular case until details of other relevant cases were available). The task force has noted that heads of department/chairmen of faculty boards and senior tutors will in the

natural course of events develop informal knowledge about proposals that lecturers are likely to wish to make.

10. The task force continues to believe that it might be appropriate to monitor the general operation of these arrangements via annual reports from the divisions. The task force suggests that Council might wish to ask the Personnel Committee, the Education Committee and the Conference of Colleges to consider what would be appropriate in terms of monitoring.

11. The task force believes that agreement on and availability of formal arrangements for variation of duties is more important than the detail of their operation; but one important detail will be the agreed rate at which colleges may be compensated for the true costs that they incur in replacing the teaching lost as a result of an agreed reduction of a fellow's college duties. The Conference of Colleges is currently surveying colleges about the actual costs to them which have resulted from individual temporary reductions in college stint agreed at the request of the University since 2008. It is likely that this survey will lead the colleges to wish to renegotiate the buy-out rates agreed between the colleges and the University in 2000. Although it may be expected on the college side that particularly the long-term adjustments to college stints that the new arrangements are designed to cover may justify a higher buy-out rate, the plenary group has noted that divisions may not immediately share this view, and will be concerned if any higher rate unreasonably constrains the number of variations that can be afforded (especially perhaps in the Humanities).

12. The third document (Annexe D) consists of revised **draft headline contractual terms for future appointments of lecturers**.

13. This document continues to reflect the wish of the task force to move, for future appointments, to a single type of general University duty for lecturers (albeit with variation between appointments as a function of the level of the college stint), permitting variation of the lecturers' duties over time (after the tenure point).

14. It would be open to the divisions to gloss these University duties as they wished. In particular, the task force sees considerable advantage in divisions overseeing the development, by subject and in liaison with college representatives, of ancillary documents describing how teaching in the subject is delivered, bearing in mind the requirements of the curriculum, modes of delivery, and the availability

of individuals to contribute; how duties are fairly and transparently allocated and equalised, in order to promote the best use of teaching capacity without overburdening individuals; and what standard expected loads for lecturers are in relation to undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, examining, and administration (either separately or agglomerated on a unitised basis). In setting out the university load, divisions would need to take due account of the particular level of college stint attaching to the post, and could give a broad indication of the normal proportion of time that lecturers could expect to spend on research, teaching and administration respectively.

15. The task force has considered whether to propose (a) that these new terms be imposed on existing lecturers; (b) that they be offered to them; or simply (c) that the new arrangements for variation be available to existing staff, without change in contract. The task force is firmly in favour of the last of these options.

16. The discussions noted the existence of a general template for the duties of tutorial fellows, developed by the Conference of Colleges in 2002; the task force was pleased to note that the revision of this material is likely to be discussed in the Conference of Colleges.

(ii) Other key issues considered by the task force

17. The task force, and many of the bodies and individuals making submissions to it, attach considerable importance to the existence of a **mechanism for regular, highest-level consideration, in the annual discussions of budget/resource allocation, of the scope for additional, focused investment in improving academic terms and conditions** (alongside other top priorities). The task force understands that in January 2010 Council agreed that any proposals from the Personnel Committee for increased investment in academic salaries, in the shape of merit pay for lecturers, readers or professors, should in future be considered, alongside other top priorities, by the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee, Council and a subset of the Finance Committee. To ensure that this is embedded in the work of the range of relevant university bodies the task force **recommends** that at the beginning of each budget cycle Council, the Finance Committee, the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee, the Personnel Committee and other appropriate bodies are all routinely reminded of this general issue of additional investment in academic terms

and conditions. The task force has noted that the Personnel Committee (having considered in Michaelmas term 2010 and in Trinity term 2011 whether to recommend that funding be made available for merit pay for lecturers, and declining to do so) has determined that it will revisit this issue each Trinity term.

18. On **joint appointments**, the task force would wish to emphasise its strong support for the principle that senior academic appointments at Oxford should be made on a joint basis between the University and the colleges. The main focus of the task force's work has been on arrangements for the duties of academics and in particular how these might vary over time at the level of the individual, as discussed above. More generally, the task force has during the course of its existence repeatedly discussed whether the basic pattern of academic employment at Oxford should continue to be a joint one between the University and the colleges. The task force has also noted the report of the Working Party on College Associations, chaired by the President of Magdalen. The task force believes that its own consultations, and those of that working party, showed that there was no appetite for a wholesale discontinuation of the joint appointments system at Oxford, but much support for improving the current arrangements around the entitlement statute. The task force supports the practical suggestions made by the Working Party on College Associations, and now **recommends** that it would be appropriate to give those proposed reforms a chance to work before any further consideration is given, presumably in the first instance by the Personnel Committee and the Conference of Colleges, to any proposal to relax the entitlement statute at the margin (eg by not guaranteeing that a college fellowship would be available for a university lecturer in a small number of cases, as had been mooted in earlier discussions).

19. On **allowances for college fellows**, the task force has in the past confirmed that it would favour the upward harmonisation of college housing allowances and of college housing support/joint equity schemes for tutorial fellows, and very much welcomes the provisions that have been put in place, with significant financial support from the University and from many individual colleges, to foster such harmonisation under the aegis of the College Contributions Scheme and the College Contributions Committee. It notes, too, that the College Contributions Committee was broadly sympathetic to proposals made by the former Principal of Linacre, on behalf

of certain graduate colleges, for the introduction of modest allowances for the fellows of those graduate colleges in recognition of the work they undertake with graduate students in their colleges; and understands that the introduction of some such allowances has now been approved in the case of at least one college. The task force encourages the College Contributions Committee to continue in this way to build on the work of the University over recent years to improve the salary arrangements for University lecturers without tutorial fellowships. For its part, the task force **recommends** that eligibility to apply to the University's professorial housing scheme should be extended, in acute recruitment and retention cases, to lecturers/readers without tutorial fellowships and to those in the University's most senior research support grade (RSIV). This would be in line with the approach taken to the availability of medium-term transit accommodation, following the report of the Property Working Party.

20. On the position of **research staff**, the task force has noted that the work of the Personnel Committee's Research Staff Working Group has recently been gaining momentum, not least in terms of the development and implementation of a new code of practice on the employment and career development of this important group of staff. For its part, the task force has taken the view that its own concentration should be on the position of research staff on an academic trajectory, and this has been reflected in its proposals in relation to titles and the duties of academics. It accepts, however, that it is appropriate for the range of issues affecting research staff to be considered in the round, and therefore **recommends** that its own outline proposals in this area, which are set out at Annexe E, should now be referred to the Personnel Committee for substantive consideration.

21. Responses to the task force's 2007 'direction of travel' consultation showed a widespread wish for the **bureaucratic burdens** on individual academics to be reduced. This was the third most popular area identified as a priority for reform, with the proposal that unnecessary bureaucratic burdens be eliminated receiving the highest percentage of positive responses among all of the task force's propositions. The task force itself does not believe that many, or indeed any, of the administrative requirements currently made of academics are in themselves unnecessary; it is in complete agreement with the view that the prime function of the administration is to support teaching and research, and that

collegiate and University administration should be funded, and trusted, to fulfill that function, consistent with the demands made on us by external authorities.

22. In many areas, the potential remedy to the perceived problems around bureaucracy is, in the task force's view, in the hands of academics themselves, and the task force **recommends** that colleges, departments/faculties and divisions work positively to keep administrative demands on academics under review, reducing them wherever possible by transferring them to other staff, with academics locally deciding what is a burden from which they can be relieved, what is a duty of self-governance which they must retain, and what administrative support would best help the situation. Recognising, however, that not all administration is under such local academic control, the task force **recommends** that the Registrar and relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellors be asked to consider any appropriate actions to ensure that the University Administration and Services works to minimise, as appropriate, the administrative requirements made of academics.

23. For its part, the task force believes that the measures that it might be appropriate to consider might include the enhancement of information systems, so that requests for information from or requiring the involvement of academics are made only where necessary, and only once; better systems for feedback from academics on the ground as to the impact of the administrative practices of the various central functions; and the possible creation of a small troubleshooting group with central, divisional and collegiate representation, with a specific remit to ensure that unnecessary administrative burdens on academics are not increased, and, where possible, are reduced.

24. The role of **developmental appraisal for academics** features in the task force's terms of reference. The task force **recommends** that this question should be referred to the Personnel Committee, for it to consider the practicalities of trying to build on that committee's new arrangements for personal development review for support staff and for academic-related staff by scoping their possible extension to academics (strictly against the background of Congregation's rejection of any system of mandatory performance review linked to sanction or reward). The Personnel Committee might wish to consider these issues in the medium term, once revised arrangements in relation to academic duties have bedded in, in liaison with the Senior Tutors' Committee as far

as joint appointments are concerned, and particularly in the light of the experience of introducing personal development review for academic-related research staff.

25. Successive chairmen of the task force, as Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Personnel and Equality), have worked actively with colleagues in Personnel Services and the Equality and Diversity Unit, and in consultation with the academic divisions, on a range of **equality and diversity** matters in relation to academic staffing issues. Ongoing work will include reviews, from a gender profile perspective, of recruitment issues at various levels and of training and personal development. This work can continue independently of the task force, though it very much responds to comments and insights that have come out of the task force's consultations.

26. The task force believes that all major elements of its terms of reference are adequately covered in the points above, or by the continuing work of other University and/or intercollegiate bodies. Subject to Council's views on the recommendations above, the task force *recommends* that it be **disbanded**.

Membership of the Task Force on Academic Employment

Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Personnel and Equality), Principal of Lady Margaret Hall, Professor Caplan, Dr Davies, Professor England, Dr Heal, Mr Knowles, Dr Mapstone, Professor McKendrick, Ms Perkins/Mr Taylor, Professor Softley, Dr Whiteley.

Annexe A

Task Force on Academic Employment: terms of reference, as approved by Council on 5 December 2005

1. To undertake a comprehensive review of arrangements for academic employment in the collegiate University, specifically:

- a) the principles relating to all academic appointments made by the University alone or jointly with colleges, including the joint appointment system, and the effect of current and possible alternative arrangements on individual workload (in respect of teaching, research and other duties) and on the achievement of academic objectives;
- b) career structure and career development, including the implications for titles, remuneration, duties and other general terms of employment, and the role of developmental appraisal;
- c) academic salary structures, taking into account suitable comparator organisations, including the number and structure of pay grades, promotion, arrangements for recruitment and retention payments, for merit pay and market pay and for allowances and other additional payments and benefits;
- d) the implications of inequalities in remuneration between the colleges;
- e) the promotion of the principles of equality and diversity, including gender, ethnicity, disability and age;
- f) arrangements for tenure, ie appointment to the retiring age after a probationary review.

2. To make proposals for future structures for academic employment, bearing in mind:

- a) the University's values and objectives and its commitment to the tutorial system, as expressed in the Corporate Plan;
- b) the key importance of arrangements to recruit, retain and reward academic staff of the highest international calibre;
- c) resource issues such as the financial position of the collegiate University, the proportion of its expenditure which should be devoted to academic salaries, and the desirable balance between general and discretionary levels of academic salaries;
- d) the implications of the National Framework Agreement on salary 'modernisation' in higher education.

Annexe B

Task Force on Academic Employment: draft framework for the duties of lecturers holding joint academic appointments at Oxford

This is designed to be an acceptable broad enabling framework for local implementation. It is intended primarily to meet the needs of academics as optimally as possible, while also maintaining proper teaching provision, safeguarding institutional (including college) interests and being capable of providing any relevant external bodies with confidence as to the arrangements for academic duties at Oxford. It consists of the following points, and should be read in conjunction with the more detailed arrangements for the variation of individual academic duties [see Annexe C below]:

1. a commitment to maintaining and improving the principles and processes of the joint appointments system at Oxford;
2. reassertion of the current Education Committee principle about the preponderance of teaching being delivered by senior academics (as defined), noting that not all teaching is done in tutorials; that other academics have a role to play; and that it will be in the interests of all parties to try to meet reasonable requests for flexibility at the level of the individual academic, in order to recruit, retain, motivate and develop high-calibre academics who will be committed to the collegiate University;
3. contractual duties for lecturers remaining generally as at present, save for the clearer integration of graduate supervision and for the replacement of any requirement to give no fewer than a set number of lectures by a general duty to engage in research, undergraduate and graduate teaching, examining and administration;
4. therefore a single form of lecturership on the University side, in the sense of a standard general University duty, but with levels of college and University teaching which may vary (i) between posts; and (ii) within the individual post, over time¹;
5. so the continued existence of posts with different levels of college teaching would reflect the current distinctions in that respect between University and CUF lecturerships; and the level of college teaching agreed when a vacancy is advertised would continue to determine whether the college or the University was the 'major' employer in terms of the joint selection process²;

6. arrangements for the possible variability of duties to be available to all those holding joint appointments;
7. variation within the individual post may be proposed at any time after the successful completion of the initial period of office;
8. but variation is strictly subject to tripartite agreement between the individual, the University and the college: the guarantee of quality substitute provision is recognised as being crucial. The onus would be on those suggesting a change or supporting a suggested change that would increase the duties owed to one employer to explain why this change could not be accommodated by that employer without requiring any reduction of duties owed to the other employer; to propose a detailed solution; and to demonstrate how the full range of the individual's current duties would be discharged effectively in the future;
9. the normal lead-time between the suggestion of a change and its eventual implementation, if agreed, would be one year;
10. the arrangements for the balance of an individual's duties following any subsequent variation would normally be expected to last for at least three years;
11. variation of the duties of an individual postholder will normally have no implications for the nature of the underlying joint appointment, for example when it becomes vacant for refilling;
12. divisions to develop, with colleges, effective and sensitive ways of implementing the arrangements for the variation of individual duties;
13. appropriate use should be made of the ability of trained academics below the lecturer level to contribute to academic work in the subject in the collegiate University, including quality-assured tutorial teaching;
14. divisions/departments may, if they wish and subject in appropriate cases to the rules of the external body funding the appointment, introduce for new research appointments and for new academic appointments below the University lecturer level a requirement to undertake, if asked, a certain amount of teaching within the collegiate University (ie for the University and/or for individual colleges) for no additional remuneration; if divisions/departments choose not to introduce such a requirement, such teaching would need to be separately remunerated;
15. the University and the colleges to develop effective and sensitive ways of monitoring

the operation of the arrangements for variability;

16. different arrangements will cover situations in which academics successfully apply for prestigious external research *awards* which may involve funding to 'buy out' teaching duties (although many of the principles reflected in the above points will apply to those situations too);

17. there is no expectation that successful application for research *grants* will lead to any formal variation in duties.

¹Thought would need to be given to nomenclature for future lecturership appointments: in the view of the task force this should be as simple as possible, for example university lecturership (CUF); university lecturership (TF); university lecturership (NTF)

Annexe C

Task Force on Academic Employment: draft arrangements for the variation of the duties of lecturers holding joint academic appointments at Oxford

Preamble

Teaching is as important a part of the work of the collegiate University as research; the personal and career development of individual academics at Oxford is not to be equated with a steady and irreversible reduction in teaching duties or in the level of overall commitment to the joint appointment.

It is recognised, however, that academic and personal needs and abilities change over the course of a career and that for various reasons it may be desirable for the pattern of duties that applies during the initial period of office to be varied for a long-term period at some later stage.

The purpose of these arrangements is to support the University, the colleges and lecturers in reaching agreement on the variation of duties, whenever possible. The arrangements set out how such variation may occur. They are designed to preserve fair opportunities for all academics and to produce variations which are acceptable to all sides, are sustainable and affordable and do not produce unfair workloads for others.

This document should be read in the context of the collegiate University's general framework for the duties of academics [see Annexe B above]. It is designed to give a clear view of (a) the process for discussing the potential variation of your duties and (b) the factors that will need to be taken into account in such cases, and to encourage early discussion between you, the college and the University so that the reasonable expectations of each party can be understood and fostered.

This document is not designed to cover situations in which academics successfully apply for prestigious external research *awards* which may involve funding to 'buy out' teaching duties (although the principles underlying point 6 below in particular will apply to those situations too).

It should be noted that there is no expectation that successful application for research *grants* will lead to any formal variation in duties.

Key points

1. The initial arrangements for your duties will be expected to continue until at least the successful completion of the initial

period of your university appointment and may remain in place for the full duration of that appointment. However, after successful completion of the initial period of appointment, you may propose a variation in your duties and, with your consent, the college and the University may also propose such changes.

2. The University will in the first instance seek to accommodate a proposed increase in one of your university duties by adjusting your other university duties.

3. The college will in the first instance seek to accommodate a proposed increase in one of your college duties by adjusting your other college duties.

4. Should any change be proposed at your initiative or with your agreement that would require an increase in one of your university duties through a reduction in one of your college ones, or vice versa, this will be discussed between the department/faculty/division and the college, and will be subject to agreement between them and with you.

5. Such changes will include (but will not be limited to) proposals to reduce college teaching in order to spend more time on research or vice versa; cases in which colleges wish their fellow to take on demanding college offices; and cases in which it is proposed to increase the teaching done either for the college or for the University while reducing the teaching done for the other employer.

6. If such a variation in duties is proposed by you and the University, the expectation will be that the University will explain to the college why the change is desirable and why it cannot be accommodated by an adjustment in your other university duties; and will suggest to the college in detail ways in which the proposed shortfall in college duties might be met, demonstrating how the full range of your current duties would be discharged effectively in the future. This might be through the supply of a suitably qualified replacement teacher, whom the department/faculty would if necessary remunerate; or through direct payment to the college at the general buy-out rate approved by the University and the colleges.

7. If such a variation in duties is proposed by you and the college, the expectation will be that the college will explain to the University why the change is desirable and why it cannot be accommodated by an adjustment in your other college duties; and, noting the need to ensure that the full range of your current duties can be discharged effectively in the future, will offer appropriate funding to cover the agreed costs of such substitute provision as the department/faculty might require.

8. The normal lead-time between the proposal of a change and its eventual implementation, if agreed, will be one year.

9. New arrangements for the balance of your duties will normally be expected to last for at least three years.

10. It is recognised that in some cases it will be necessary to consider requests for variation at short notice, eg in response to sudden opportunities or to acute retention issues.

Annexe D

Task Force on Academic Employment: draft contractual formulations

GENERAL UNIVERSITY CONTRACTUAL DUTY FOR LECTURERS, FOR FUTURE APPOINTMENTS

You will be expected to perform the following duties to the satisfaction of the divisional board:

a) to engage in and publish original research in the general area of []; and

b) to engage in undergraduate and graduate teaching, including graduate supervision, in the general area of [] under the direction of the head of department/the chairman of the faculty board; and

c) to undertake an equitable share of other activities in the collegiate University as required, including administration and examining, under the direction of the head of department/chairman of the faculty board.

If you are a Principal Investigator on a research grant, your responsibilities will include managing any researchers who report to you and supporting them in their career development.

The full duties of the [fellowship at X College] which you hold in association with this university appointment will be set out separately to you by the college; it is noted that your [college teaching stint/equivalent for ULNTFs] will be [], and this will be taken into account in the allocation of your university duties.

The balance of your duties may be reconsidered as set out in [Annexe C above], in discussion with your division and department/faculty, and your college, as necessary. The agreement of all parties (you, your division, your department/faculty and your college) is required for any changes.

Annexe E

Outline proposals on research staff

a) Suitably qualified research staff who are on (or who wish to be on) an academic trajectory should in general be encouraged/required to take a fuller part in the academic work (research, teaching, and administration) of the collegiate University (University and colleges), rather than concentrating solely on the particular research project on which they are engaged;

b) this should be fostered by a contractual duty that goes beyond their narrow research focus and envisages/requires such a wider contribution;

c) that wider contribution should not attract any additional remuneration;

d) the wider contribution to colleges should be recognised by forms of college attachment;

e) those who successfully pursue the Oxford academic trajectory, and are of the requisite calibre and proven contribution, could be considered for translation into substantive lecturerships (if the division did not think that an open advertisement of a new post was preferable);

f) that process would include an assessment of whether the research contribution was equivalent to the current requirement for a lecturer to be reappointed to the retiring age (or perhaps the title of professor); of their willingness and ability to take on the full range of a lecturer's teaching and administrative load; and of the likelihood that, if they were not already a fellow, the extent and level of their contribution to college teaching and administration meaning that appointment to a fellowship could be achieved;

g) in such cases the normal expectation would be that an open-ended terminable contract would already be in place (rather than a fixed-term one);

h) such translated lecturers would then become eligible to apply for the merit pay arrangements which have been approved by Congregation;

i) similar provision for translation into single-tenure professorships would be possible but is perhaps less likely;

j) others in the research support grades, and eg departmental lecturers, would continue to be eligible for discretionary super-scale payments and regradings; this would apply equally to those on an academic trajectory who do not succeed in translation into a lecturership, as well as to those researchers not on an academic trajectory.