Appendix F – Workload Model Allocations

The University recognises the importance of high quality and facilitative ethical review in ensuring that we meet our stated aim of achieving the highest standards of rigour, scientific, scholarly and professional integrity (see sections 1 and 2 of the Research Ethics Framework).

The roles of those involved in the ethical review process are critical to the University's research process and should be recognised appropriately in workload allocations. This applies to Research Ethics Committee and Animal Welfare & Ethical Review Board Chairs, members, reviewers and Departmental Ethics Officers.

Allocations should be based on the previous year's records of meetings and numbers of applications, with some account taken of longer-term patterns in order to predict growth.

It is recommended that the following aspects should be taken into account when allocating workload:

- Meetings: for each hour of ethics committee (including REC, AWERB and University Ethics Committee as relevant) meetings held in a year, one additional hour should be allowed for all members for review and preparation.

- REC Chairs and administration: depending on the available level of administrative support, REC Chairs should receive adequate time to communicate with their College/Department to ensure that the requirements and process for review are understood, schedule the REC's business, provide support and training to REC members, undertake some audit activity (in conjunction with RE&G team), take Chair's Action where relevant and to respond to queries. At a minimum, one hour should be allowed per working week.

- Numbers of applications:

  - Low and medium risk (*proportionate/expedited review*) – it would be reasonable to allocate one hour per four projects to be reviewed
  - High risk ethics applications (*full review*) or Home Office Project Licence reviews *(AWERB review)* – if applications are not reviewed in a meeting (when the suggested allocation of one hour's preparation for every hour of meeting can be used), it would be reasonable to allocate one hour for every two projects to be reviewed
  - The review methods for taught student research (i.e. whether individual review or module/group level review) should be taken into account when considering workload.
  - Additional time should be allocated for the first year of the term of REC membership.

- Induction and training: at a minimum, an additional 8 hours must be allowed per year for ongoing training and development

- Advisory role: adequate time should be given to allow those involved in the REC process to give proactive advice and support to colleagues, such as responding to requests for advice on ethics applications or at grant application stage, discussing issues arising during the course of a research project, or discussing ethical implications of research and the review process at departmental or research group meetings. At a minimum, 30 minutes should be allowed per working week.