

Precarious education: how much university teaching is being delivered by hourly-paid academics?



**A report from the University and College Union
February 2018**

Executive summary

Key points:

- University employers' organisations have claimed that only 3% of the work being done in universities is done by casual staff.
- UCU conducted a Freedom of Information request to try to shed light on the issue of how much teaching was being delivered in an academic year in our universities and how much was being delivered by people who are paid by the hour.
- 36 universities ignored the request and 60 universities refused to disclose all or some of the information requested using an exemption clause in the Freedom of Information Act either because they said they did not hold the information or it would take too long to collate it.
- 38 universities did eventually return useable data, though many did so with caveats about its accuracy.
- It is not possible to use the data to provide precise calculations of the percentage of teaching that is being delivered by hourly paid staff in the sector.
- However, using the data we now have allows us to get a sense of approximate scale. **This suggests that somewhere between 15 and 40% of undergraduate teaching is being delivered by hourly paid staff, with the average being 27%.**
- **On this basis, UCU estimates that most universities probably rely on hourly paid staff to deliver around 25% of their undergraduate teaching, with some pre-92 universities likely to use hourly paid staff for up to 50% of their undergraduate teaching.**

Recommendations:

UCU recommends that government should instruct the Office for Students to make it a requirement on universities to collect and publish data on their total annual teaching and the number of hours of teaching delivered by staff on insecure contracts.

UCU also urges more university employers to:

1. Mandate their national negotiators at UCEA to negotiate a national framework for positive action on the issue of casualisation, or,
2. Engage with UCU in negotiations with the aim of improving the employment conditions of their staff on casual contracts.

Introduction

Universities' employment practices have attracted substantial and growing media attention in recent years. This reflects in part the growing public interest in precarious work in the economy and the notorious zero hours contracts that pervade so many sectors of the labour market. It also reflects a sense that something has gone wrong with a profession like academia when so many people, particularly those at the early stages of their careers, are stuck on insecure contracts leading lives blighted by anxiety, stress and material hardship.

UCU has been at the forefront of the campaign to persuade universities to take this issue seriously. In 2013, the union published a report showing that around half our universities used zero hours contracts to deliver their teaching. In 2016, we published a further report that showed that more than 50% of the teaching workforce was employed on some form of insecure contract.¹

Who are the precariously employed staff?

There are three broad categories of casualised or precarious workers in higher education.

1. The first is PhD students who teach during their studies as part of their attempts to begin an academic career. In pre-92 research intensive universities in particular, this can be a very large category.
2. The second category is comprised of professionals substantively employed elsewhere but who do teaching in their field on the side to boost their incomes or because they enjoy it. Some universities with strong vocational or professional pathway subjects do employ large numbers of these staff, often termed 'Visiting Lecturers'. This is the category that the employers and their representatives like to talk about because it takes the debate away from people struggling to make a career and towards people who are not necessarily dependent on them for a living. However, even here many lecturers in creative arts subjects use hourly paid lecturing to supplement precarious art practices.
3. The third category is those who are substantively employed on limited term or precarious contracts and dependent on these for their living. This encompasses contract research staff – including those on so-called open-ended contracts whose employment is dependent on short-term funding - and teaching staff on fixed-term or hourly-paid contracts.

¹ The Use of Zero Hours Contracts in Higher Education (UCU September 2013); https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/5967/The-use-of-zero-hours-contracts-report-Sep-13/pdf/Use_of_Zero_Hours_Contracts_Report_0913.pdf *Precarious work in higher education: a snapshot of insecure contracts and institutional attitudes* (UCU, April 2016); *Precarious work in higher education: November 2016 Update* (UCU, November 2016), both available from <https://www.ucu.org.uk/stampout>

Employers like to emphasise the degree of choice and agency available to workers on casual or as they like to call them 'flexible' contracts, but it is obvious that your enjoyment of choice and flexibility will be shaped by which category you are in. A typical academic career trajectory, for example, involves moving from hourly-paid teaching as part of a PhD to hourly-paid teaching as substantive employment, often with another university, with possible fixed-term contracts afterwards. For many academics, this is where the road ends. They have to accept a lifetime of precariousness as they piece together short-term contracts, or look for employment elsewhere.

The struggle to make ends meet

Hourly rates of pay in higher education vary considerably for casualised teaching staff. For PhD students who teach, an NUS survey from 2012 showed that the average hourly rate was just under £20 but rates can be as low as £13 per hour. For experienced lecturers trying to make a living after their PhDs, rates can be between £30 and £40 per hour. But these hourly rates are misleading. Within each 'hour' is contained one teaching hour and frequently another 1.5 hours preparation and marking time.

Most hourly paid lecturers work longer hours than they are paid for. The NUS survey from 2012 claimed that on average, postgraduates are working almost twice as many hours per week on teaching than they are actually being paid for.² Surveys of hourly paid staff almost invariably show that staff report working longer hours than they are paid for.

In addition to donating significant amounts of unpaid labour to their employers, hourly paid lecturing staff can exist on very low incomes and precarious livelihoods. UCU conducted a survey of members in insecure contracts in 2015 and results in higher education revealed significant numbers of them struggling to get by.

- 40% said that they earned under £1000 per month.
- One in seven (14%) earned less than £500 per month, which places them below the Lower Earnings Limit for National Insurance Contributions.
- 17% said that they struggled to pay for food.
- One third (34%) said that they struggle to pay rent or mortgage repayments
- 36% said that they struggled to pay household bills like fuel, electricity, water and repairs.³

The single biggest thing that unites the experience of all staff on insecure contracts though is the anxiety and the inability either to build careers or plan lives that flow from insecure employment.

² https://www.nus.org.uk/Global/1654-NUS_PostgradTeachingSurvey_v3.pdf

³ https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/7279/Making-ends-meet---the-human-cost-of-casualisation-in-post-secondary-education-May-15/pdf/ucu_makingendsmeet_may15.pdf

'It's taking a huge toll on my personal life and my health. My career is in tatters at the moment, with the huge number of hours needed to make ends meet impacting on my ability to research and publish. It's vicious circle.'

'I especially dread the summer and Easter periods as I have no idea how I will pay the rent. I plan to leave the area as soon as my son has completed his GCSEs in the hope I can find a proper job either abroad or in another part of the UK.'

Higher education lecturers quoted in *Making Ends Meet The human cost of casualisation in post-secondary education*, (UCU, May 2015)

https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/7279/Making-ends-meet---the-human-cost-of-casualisation-in-post-secondary-education-May-15/pdf/ucu_makingendsmeet_may15.pdf

The impact of casualisation on provision

Staff on insecure contracts face a daily struggle to deliver a high level professional service. Staff on hourly-paid teaching contracts regularly report that their hourly rates do not pay them for the amount of preparation and marking or assessment work they have to do. There is a constant pressure to cut corners because so much of the work is effectively unpaid. In other words, just to do a proper professional job these staff are already going over and above what should be required of anyone.

They do this in spite of the impediments put in their way. Hourly paid staff frequently don't have access to basic teaching facilities such as rooms in which to meet with students. They are effectively treated as 'teaching delivery' staff and often kept out of course and curriculum review and design processes, meaning that courses don't develop as they could. These staff also suffer disproportionately from stress and poor morale with high levels of turnover as many leave the sector, finding their career progression and their access to time to build up a research profile blocked.

Sector failure

Overall, the UK higher education sector has failed to address these issues. UCU has pursued a twin track approach of trying to persuade individual employers to take positive action on casualisation and trying to use the national collective bargaining machinery to pursue national action from the employers' body UCEA (The Universities and Colleges Employers' Association).

Some universities, to their credit, have recognised that insecure employment is a problem and have begun to work with UCU to address it. UCU has engaged in successful negotiations with several employers that have delivered real improvements for precariously employed staff, including the **Universities of Glasgow, Sussex, Essex, Bournemouth, University of the Arts** and **Anglia Ruskin**.

But the vast majority have not engaged and appear to be keeping their heads down and hoping the issue will blow over. They have also mandated their national negotiators at UCEA to offer nothing that might be binding on them or require action from them through the national bargaining machinery. UCU has raised issues of casualisation nationally in 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 and all that has been offered has been 'working parties' to produce 'reports' highlighting different 'practices in the sector'.

In September 2017, all the higher education unions withdrew from the latest working group with the employers, stating that in their view the group was 'unlikely to produce outcomes with sufficient credibility or value, nor will it bring any significant benefit to our members.'

At the same time, UCEA appears to have been tasked with a separate propaganda mission to make the issue disappear in the public eye.

UCEA – Obfuscation as advocacy

Faced with press interest in precarious employment in their sector, and presumably keen to keep their subscribers happy, UCEA have attempted to cloud the issue by publishing a calculation that they claim shows there is no real issue in higher education.

In November 2016, they published a calculation of the amount of 'Full-Time Equivalence' represented by 'Atypical academics' in higher education. Atypical academics are described by the Higher Education Statistics Agency as 'those members of staff whose contracts involve working arrangements that are not permanent, involve complex employment relationships and/or involve work away from the supervision of the normal work provider'. UCEA's claimed that "the data (2014-15) for these 'atypical' academic staff show 75,560 contracts but only 3.2% of the full-time equivalent academic workforce, down from 3.7% in 2011-12."

Recently, UCEA have repeated this figure and even claimed that a fall in the number of atypical academics visible in the HESA records represents a fall in the 'hours worked' by casualised staff: "Contrary to claims that the sector is increasing its use of casual staff, the use of academic atypical staff has fallen by 12% in headcount terms and 8% by hours worked."

This claim lacks any credibility, for several reasons.

1. Firstly, many hourly paid staff are not within the figures for atypical academic staff but reside unseen within the figures for fixed-term teaching staff. HESA have not required universities to mark any of these staff as hourly paid, so hitherto they have remained obscure. Revisions to the way HESA collects its data should help make this clearer.
2. Secondly, claiming that either atypical FTE or headcount are falling is deeply problematic because HEIs do not have to submit this data to HESA and may choose not to. In 2016, for example, around 30 universities failed to report whether they use

atypical academic staff or not. At City University, Sheffield Hallam and Nottingham Trent, for example, UCU knew from its FOI on zero hours contracts that these universities all used hundreds of zero hours contracts for their academic staff, yet these were simply 'disappeared' in the HESA record for atypical staff by the universities concerned choosing not to report any data. While this is allowed to continue it's impossible to make any claims about changes in either headcount or FTE of 'atypical academic staff'.

3. Thirdly, it is fundamentally flawed to use FTE to calculate the amount of work being done by casualised staff as it's impossible to make a 'like for like' comparison of the two staff groups. We can illustrate this as follows: A standard academic is contracted to do teaching, research and administration and might reasonably be expected to do 30% of their FTE on each of these activities. Someone paid by the hour will have a very small FTE as they will be contracted for a few classes per week. Yet 100% of that FTE will be spent in preparing, teaching and marking classes. To put it another way, 1 FTE made up of, say, five hourly paid staff might contain five times as much teaching as 1 FTE made up out of a single standard academic. Universities who employ a lot of hourly paid staff get a lot more FTE teaching for their buck. It is perfectly possible, for example, that within UCEA's '3.2%' FTE of work being done by the atypical academics might be concealed a large amount of the teaching going on in universities.

UCU has raised and published these objections, yet still UCEA continues to use its statistic, apparently in the belief that it can be recycled ad nauseam to government ministers, civil servants, politicians and journalists alike to persuade them that there is no issue in UK HE.

So how much teaching really is being done by casualised staff? No one knows. No agency has been tasked with finding out and the only universities who have ever published any statistic on it have recycled UCEA's calculation.

UCU believes that this is unacceptable and it is for this reason that we undertook a Freedom of Information request to attempt to shed a little light on the issue.

UCU's Freedom of Information Request (FOI)

On 13 July 2017, UCU sent a Freedom of Information request to UK higher education institutions which asked them to:

1. Please disclose the number of hours of scheduled learning and teaching activities that were delivered at your institution during the academic year 2015/16. Scheduled teaching and learning activities should be understood to be as defined by HESA here: https://www.hesa.ac.uk/collection/c16061/calculations_methods
2. Please disclose the number of hours of scheduled learning and teaching activities that were delivered by hourly paid lecturing staff during the academic year 2015/16.

Our aim was to try to get a better picture of how many hours of 'classroom' teaching were delivered as a whole at your university in the last full academic year and how many hours of teaching over the same period were delivered by staff classified as hourly paid. As we explained to many HEIs, the intention of this FOI was to get a sense of the relative scales of the volume of teaching being delivered in an institution and the volume of teaching being delivered by hourly paid staff.

University responses to the FOI

Universities have a patchy record on responding to their statutory duty to disclose information under Freedom of Information legislation. As UCU has shown recently, some universities are serial offenders, routinely ignoring requests for disclosure of the minutes of Vice Chancellors and Principals remuneration committees. However the response to this Freedom of Information request was worse than usual.

Universities who ignored the request

A total of 36 higher education institutions simply ignored the request, including serial offenders like the universities of Coventry and Bolton.

Table 1: HEI responses to Freedom of Information request

HEI responses to FOI	Number
Full submission of data	38
Partial or full refusal on grounds of Section 12 exemption	60
Ignored request	36

Universities who refused data:

60 universities refused to disclose data either fully or in part. This was most commonly justified using Section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act which allows an exemption to public authorities if the information is not held or it would take more than 18 hours and cost more than £450 to compile. Around 30 universities applied this exemption in full and refused to disclose any data. More than 20 other universities only made a partial disclosure, claiming exemption under Section 12 on the grounds of the estimated time needed to fulfil the request.

UCU challenged many of these universities, including simplifying and clarifying the request in some cases. In a number of cases the universities subsequently agreed to disclose some data. Others however, have continued to insist that they do not hold or cannot collate any data in the time allowed within the Act.

Universities who disclosed information

UCU received useable information from 38 higher education institutions, though three of these only did so following a request for an internal review of their initial refusal. In general, new universities found it easier to comply with the request, with 24 post-92 universities returning data and four atypical specialist institutions doing so. Only eight pre-92 universities returned data. Of these, only three were from the so-called 'elite' Russell Group universities. The rest of the Russell Group failed or refused to disclose their data.

Limitations of the data

UCU wants to be transparent about what this data can and cannot tell us and there are certainly serious limitations with it. Because of the different provenance, functions and collection methods of the data, it is impossible to make any strict comparison that would allow us to see how much of the teaching being done in these universities is being delivered by hourly paid staff. Many of the universities who reported data to us provided substantial caveats about the accuracy of their information and were keen to impress on us that exact comparison was not possible on the basis of what they disclosed.

In answering the first question, which related to the total amount of teaching that they delivered in the academic year 2015/16, some universities argued that data on scheduled teaching hours reflected only what was timetabled, not what was actually delivered. Some data only covered undergraduate courses, some included everyone. Several universities were at pains to explain that more teaching happened than was reflected in their timetables.

In answering the second question, which related the amount of teaching hours delivered by hourly paid staff in the same period, a number of universities said that it was not possible to disclose data which showed how many hours of teaching were being delivered by their hourly paid staff. However, they were able to disclose payroll data that showed

the hours used to calculate pay for hourly paid staff. Hourly paid staff are, in theory, paid an amount of preparation, marking and related activities and this is often bundled up in the amounts paid. In some cases an agreed number of hours are paid for all these activities. In other cases an 'enhanced rate' is paid against a classroom teaching hour to encompass this work. Accordingly, in some cases the amount of hours reflected in payroll data needs to be 'deflated' by a factor of around 2 to 2.5 to allow for the fact that payment was multiplied. In other cases, however, the number disclosed is likely to reflect exactly the number of classroom hours being delivered.

The University of Durham and Imperial College both disclosed data showing larger figures for the hours being taught by hourly paid staff and PhD students than the number they reported as representing their total teaching load. They explained that this was partly because they are only required to report total teaching hours for undergraduate courses to HESA and so the total amount of teaching appears less than it was. They also explained that some classes, particularly in lab-based subjects were effectively 'team taught' by groups of PhD students, resulting in some double counting of hourly paid teaching hours.

All the caveats provided by universities to the data are excerpted and included in Table 3 in the Appendix below.

What we *can* say from this data

With all these caveats, however, the data gives us a fascinating snapshot and allow us to see for the first time the approximate volume of teaching being undertaken by hourly paid staff, judged against an approximation of the total undergraduate teaching being delivered. The full data is reproduced in Table 3 in the Appendix. We have also reproduced excerpts from the institutions' own caveats.

If we calculate the total teaching hours reportedly delivered by hourly paid teaching staff as a percentage of overall reported teaching hours, it produces the data in Table 2, below.

On the basis of this, the indicative average would be 35%. If we exclude Imperial and Durham's data, which will clearly skew the average, it produces a more conservative figure of 27%.

Clearly, it is not possible to push this analysis too far. The inaccuracy and poor quality of much of the data supplied to us makes it difficult to use it for anything other than approximate indications of scale.

However, it's worth noting that a number of the universities appeared to find it relatively unproblematic to generate and return data and their results suggest that the figure of 27% may not be unreasonable.

The University of Derby, for example, did not send us any caveats to the data. Calculating the total teaching hours delivered by all hourly paid teaching staff as a percentage of

overall reported teaching hours generates a figure of 26%. Similarly, the Universities of Liverpool and Middlesex sent data that was not subjected to extensive explanation, but which generated indicative proportions of 56% and 41% using the same approach. Wolverhampton, Worcester and Sussex universities similarly sent in data without extensively arguing for its inaccuracy, generating proportions of 26%, 21% and 26% respectively.

To reiterate, we cannot say that this data allows us to see exactly what the real proportion of teaching being undertaken by hourly paid staff is. However, it does indicate that the UCEA '3%' figure has even less credibility than we have hitherto argued.

Extrapolating from the indications in the data we have to the situation concealed by universities who refused to disclose data, **it would seem likely that across the sector, around 25% of undergraduate teaching is undertaken by hourly paid staff. In some pre-92 universities, it would seem likely that this figure may rise above 50%.**

What the data we have been able to extract indicates is that, contrary to the spin emanating from the universities' national representatives and being recycled by some Russell Group universities, a large amount, often a very large amount, of the teaching in our universities is being performed by people who are paid by the hour.

Table 2: Indicative proportions of hourly paid teaching, generated by FOI returns

Institution	Indicative proportion of hourly paid teaching*
Durham, University of	227%
Imperial College London	132%
East Anglia, University of	81%
Central School of Speech and Drama	80%
Writtle College	76%
City University	58%
Liverpool, University of	56%
Bishop Grosseteste University	47%
Middlesex, University of	41%
Chichester, University of	37%
Norwich University of the Arts	35%
Oxford Brookes University	34%
SOAS	28%
Edinburgh Napier University	27%
Derby, University of	26%

Institution	Indicative proportion of hourly paid teaching*
Sussex, University of	26%
University College Birmingham	26%
Wolverhampton, University of	26%
Greenwich, University of	23%
Leeds Trinity University	23%
Winchester, University of	21%
Worcester, University of	21%
University of St Mark or St John	18%
Rose Bruford College	16%
West of England, University of	16%
Bournemouth, University of	15%
Roehampton University	15%
Abertay University	12%
Anglia Ruskin University	12%
Essex, University of	12%
Robert Gordon University	12%
Nottingham, University of	10%
Royal Veterinary College	10%
Liverpool Hope University	7%
Teesside University	6%
Chester, University of	5%
Northumbria, University of	2%
Newman University	1%
Indicative average	35%
Average excluding Imperial and Durham	27%

Conclusions

The debate over casualisation in higher education has hitherto been conducted using HESA workforce data and has led to sharp exchanges over different ways of calculating the degree of casualization in UK universities.

Universities have permitted their national representatives to run an argument that goes something like this: looking at the HESA data and adding up the tens of thousands of small hourly paid contracts in the sector, we can see that this adds up to a very small amount of

the Full-Time Equivalent work going on in universities. Ergo there is no casualization problem, despite the huge headcount of people on insecure contracts and the abundant evidence from academic staff themselves indicating that there is. Methodological sleight of hand can conjure away the issue and Vice Chancellors can sleep more easily again. As we saw above, UCU has responded by pointing out that this is a flawed and deeply misleading argument.

It was partly to move this debate on that UCU conducted this Freedom of Information request. Ours was the first attempt to try to look systematically at what was going on in classrooms and seminar rooms. We wanted to ask the question: how much of the teaching that students are paying for was being done by people who were paid by the hour, often underpaid, often struggling to build a career and living in acute and chronic insecurity?

The problems thrown up by this exercise were formidable and are an issue in themselves for the sector. How can it be right that it is impossible for a student or parent to know how much of the teaching that goes on in universities is delivered by hourly paid lecturers? This issue is particularly acute when some universities are selling degrees at £9000 a year and marketing themselves using their research stars. The University of Birmingham, for example, is currently recruiting students using adverts that talk about its 'Heroes', academics who are unquestionably delivering world class research outcomes. Yet its response to the FOI on how much of its teaching was done by casualised staff was to refuse to disclose data on the grounds that it would take too long to collate. How can it be acceptable that universities can simply escape any accountability by saying, in effect, 'we can't tell you that because we don't know, or it would take us too long to find out'?

In spite of the problems we faced, we have been able to shed some light on the issue and what we have seen should change the debate. We have seen that tens of thousands of teaching hours in universities are being delivered by hourly paid staff. In most universities, this probably represents somewhere between 15% and 40% of the total teaching being delivered. In some universities that figure could be in the region of 50%.

Using this data and combining it with estimates from frontline staff, an estimate of around 25% for the proportion of undergraduate teaching being undertaken by hourly paid staff would certainly seem reasonable.

What is certain is that universities can no longer hide behind the ridiculous figure of 3.2% being peddled by the Universities and Colleges Employers Association. Whatever the real situation on the ground, such claims are wholly lacking in credibility and do the sector no credit.

Recommendations

The government and much of the press have, understandably, been exercised recently by the issue of Vice Chancellors' and Principals remuneration packages. Yet the exploitation of

staff on insecure contracts is a greater scandal, affecting as it does the lives of struggling higher education staff and their students alike.

Students deserve to know what the employment conditions of their lecturers will be. It cannot be right that universities that rely on taxpayer funding and subsidy and that are subject to Freedom of information requirements are able to simply hide their reliance on hard-pressed casualised staff behind the claim that it's too difficult to collate reliable data. While this information vacuum exists, organisations like UCEA will continue to circulate publicly figures that lack any credibility within the sector.

UCU recommends that government should instruct the Office for Students to make it a requirement on universities to collect and publish data on their total annual teaching and the number of hours of teaching delivered by staff on insecure contracts.

UCU also urges more university employers to:

- 1. Mandate their national negotiators at UCEA to negotiate a national framework for positive action on the issue of casualisation, or,**
- 2. Engage with UCU in negotiations with the aim of improving the employment conditions of their staff on casual contracts.**

Appendix 1 – Data tables

Table 1 – Completed data returns

(*Indicative proportion generated by calculating total teaching hours delivered by all hourly paid teaching staff as a percentage of overall reported teaching hours)

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
1	Post-92 Abertay University	25,148	2,925			12%	This [hourly paid data] represents all the hours worked by hourly paid academic and teaching support staff on any work so may include activities not related to teaching, or covered by the HESA definition. The hours are 2925.25
2	Post-92 Anglia Ruskin University	275,169	31,774			12%	The total number of hours of scheduled learning and teaching activities delivered during the academic year 2015/16 was 275,169 hours. We do not hold data relating separately to PhD students but we have only a small numbers of FT PhD students who teach The total number of scheduled learning and teaching activities delivered by

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							Associate Lecturers (hourly paid lecturing staff) in 2015/16 was 31,774 hours
3	Post-92 Bishop Grosseteste University	27,379	12,767			47%	The visiting tutor contracted hours of 12,767 is correct. However, this reflects a practice which sees a number of contracted hours raised during the planning period process which is reviewed as more accurate planning information becomes available. It is therefore not what is ultimately required or delivered throughout the year. The actual delivered teaching hours by visiting tutors during 15/16 were 5,190 and this would therefore better reflect the actual provision provided from this source. In addition the 27,379 provided is based on our KIS submission and the technical criteria that this submission requires. It therefore reflects the programmes we deliver over a period of two or three years and the accumulation of hours that a single

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							student would receive on each programme. You will be aware that this method ignores situations where the same lecture or taught session is delivered more than once and we, like other institutions, have a number of courses where this may happen due to group sizes. By excluding this the figure the total teaching hours delivered could be significantly understated both at BGU and other institutions.
4	Post-92 Bournemouth, University of	139,370	20,165	14,080	6,085	15%	Please note that the above figure does not include the following two activities: project supervision time; and Individual tutorials 5(although shared tutorials are included in the data).
5	Specialist Central School of Speech and Drama	19,775	15,847			80%	Central is a highly specialist institution offering a broad and diverse range of training which draws heavily on professional practitioners actively working in the (mainly freelance) theatre arts

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							industry. This is an essential component of the curriculum.
6	Post-92 Chester, University of	425,663	19,761			5%	This includes all scheduled contact with students by all staff.
7	Post-92 Chichester, University of	99,123	36,810			37%	We do have a record of the number of hours our associate lecturers (i.e., our hourly-paid lecturing staff) spent in activities that were not meetings. This figure stands at 36,810 hours for the time period requested. However, note that this figure makes no distinction between, e.g., lecturing, preparation time, marking etc.; the figure is drawn from our financial records, and we have the figure because our associate lecturers are paid a lower rate for time spent attending meetings.
8	Pre-92 City University	95,858	55,815			58%	95858 hours of teaching activities were booked in centrally managed rooms last academic year. We use a system called VT2000 to manage

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							our hourly paid visiting lectures. We took an extract to give the total amount of 'classroom' hours. Visiting staff were scheduled to work 55,815 'classroom' hours.
9	Post-92 Derby, University of	170,171	44,360			26%	No comments on the data
10	Pre-92 Durham, University of	46,500	105,701			227%	The number of hours for the 2015/16 academic year is in the region of 46,500 classroom hours. This is based on registered student modules and the associated module outlines data. This figure includes lectures, seminars, tutorials, workshops, labs and practicals, but excludes fieldtrips, placements and independent study. The data has been taken from the module outlines as the timetabling system does not hold information about all the teaching across the institution, i.e. there may be some tutorials and seminars which are taught in individual staff offices and which

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							<p>are not centrally controlled.</p> <p>There are a number of caveats to the [hourly paid] data. The analysis sourced the data from the fees claims database for the period June 2015 – May 2016. The claim date is based on the date on which the claim was approved, which does not necessarily tie up with when the work was done. Unfortunately we cannot give the split between hourly paid teachers and PhD staff for that period as ICT do not maintain historical data of student/staff status. If it helps, for June 2016-May 2017, there is an annual hours split of hourly paid teachers (57.2%), Postgraduate (39.3%) and Undergraduate (3.5%). As I explained, the data that we were able to provide for point 1 in no way corresponds to that which we have provided above for point 2; the datasets are very</p>

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							much separate.
11	Pre-92 East Anglia, University of	192,633	156,899		37,744	81%	Total hours: Please note that there are a number of learning events where more than one member of staff attend a session which effectively doubles the hours of staffing to teaching so the total taught by all classes of teachers will exceed the total hours that the students receive. This figure (HPL teaching) represents the total teaching hours delivered to students, regardless of the number of teachers delivering the content.
12	Post-92 Edinburgh Napier University	117,422	32,218			27%	Number of Hours of Paid Work Undertaken by Hourly Paid Academic Staff in 2015/16 for activities including teaching, preparation, class contact, assessment, administration and staff development: .
13	Pre-92 Essex, University of	84,100	9,684	9,684		12%	Refused to disclose data in relation to postgraduates who teach as

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							"such a move would still allow the data to be represented in a way that distorts the nature of our teaching to out UG and PG students, as the payroll hours could still be presented in a way that would suggest each hour would be a separate teaching event, whereas, as we have already noted, most many teaching events involving GTAs include several GTAs alongside a permanent member of staff."
14	Post-92 Greenwich, University of	147,394	34,364			23%	This includes HPLs as we are not able to distinguish between these and the permanent teaching staff. It also includes all the First week activities which are offered to all new and continuing students.
15	Pre-92 Imperial College London	150,443	199,557	405	199,152	132%	'The HESA data referred to in your request applies only to KIS (Key Information Set) data. KIS data is only relevant to undergraduate courses recruited through UCAS.

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							From the College's KIS data, the number of hours of scheduled learning and teaching for UCAS courses is 150,443'. HPL data: 'Please note that this figure includes cases where there may be several PhD demonstrators present in any given scheduled session.'
16	Post-92 Leeds Trinity University	17,116	3,921			23%	The figure above is for planned hours not taught hours. We do not keep records of taught hours... total no of hours for Hourly Paid Visiting Lecturers was 3,921* HPL - This figure is for hourly paid lecturing staff for both UG and PG provision
17	Post-92 Liverpool Hope University	74,310	5,462			7.3%	'The number of hours of scheduled learning and teaching activities that were delivered at the University during the academic year 2015/16 was 74,310 hours. The number taught by hourly paid lecturers (not otherwise engaged in study) was

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							5462'.
18	Pre-92 Liverpool, University of	164,135	91,710			56%	This is an estimate based on the number of casual academics employed on teaching and research or teaching only
19	Post-92 Middlesex, University of	93,573	38,624			41%	The scheduled number of hours of learning and teaching activity for 2015/16, as returned to HESA, was 93,573. The figure [for hourly paid staff hours worked] is 38,624.48 hours.
20	Post-92 Newman University	486,340	2,962			0.6%	No comments on data
21	Post-92 Northumbria, University of	825,111	18,402			2.2%	As explained in the response to your previous request (FOI/RFI-1809) you should note this figure reflects the number of hours. Hours worked may include teaching or other activities and should not be assumed to be entirely made up of

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							'teaching'.
22	Post-92 Norwich University of the Arts	39,377	13,664			35%	The number of hours of scheduled learning and teaching activities that were delivered at our institution during the academic year 2015/16 was 39,377. The number of hours of scheduled learning and teaching activities that were delivered by Hourly Paid Lecturers (substantive) during the academic year 2015/16 was 13,664.50.
23	Pre-92 Nottingham, University of	1,120,037	116,964			10%	The following is based on hours allocated in the University's Workload Planning system..Staff: Permanent members of academic staff (including fixed-term appointments). Academic staff are defined as any staff member on a Research and/or Teaching contract, level 4 or higher (from Research Associates and Teaching Associates to Professors. Non-contract staff: Includes teaching allocated to guest

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments	
							lecturers, hourly paid staff, any contributions to teaching by PhD students and non-academic staff, including technicians.	
24	Post-92	Oxford Brookes	61,627	21,200			34%	<p>The total figure for 2015-16 is 53,130. However, in providing this figure, I wish to make clear that this figure solely relates to the number of hours claimed and does not accurately reflect the number of hours actually spent teaching.</p> <p>UCU Comment: We have deflated this by a factor of 2.5 to more closely reflect the teaching time within the hours claimed and disclosed by Oxford Brookes.</p>
25	Post-92	Robert Gordon University	81,652	10,872	7,550	3,322	12%	Some schools and departments do not record record some or all of the information (Marked as nil return) therefore I have attached the above table laid out by school. Where the

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							information was not recorded I give notice that this is information not held under section 17 of the freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002
26	Post-92 Roehampton University	56,998	8,758			15%	We can give you information related to workload planning for the year 2015/16: This gives a reasonably accurate picture of the scheduled teaching that was planned for the academic year. However, it does not take account of changes that might have occurred because of unexpected staff absences- e.g. The additional appointment of hourly paid staff to take account of illness or resignation; or where new staff appointed within year have filled gaps that might otherwise have been picked up by VL staff. It might also overestimate the amount of hourly paid staff – because it would not take account of a member of

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							<p>staff that was being paid on an hourly rate was subsequently converted to a salaried position. It also does not take account of situations where academics ask PhD students to join them in the classroom to build up their professional experience. Based on these caveats, there were 56,998 hours of teaching scheduled. 6385 (11.2%) hours were undertaken on an hourly paid basis by skilled practitioners with expertise relating to the discipline e.g. Teachers, psychologists, dancers. 2373 (4.2%) hours were undertaken by Visiting lecturers. This would include PhD students. However, we do not break the data down to show whether the hours taught in this category are PhD students or not, and the workload modes does not name VL staff so we cannot assess their study status. We only employ VILs to reduce staff workloads and</p>

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							to fill in subject gaps when substantive staff are not available; and we do not routinely use PhD students to support teaching.
27	Post-92 Rose Bruford College	22,740	3,649			16%	No comments on the data
28	Specialist Royal Veterinary College	10,265	990			10%	
29	Pre-92 SOAS	87,850	24,564	16,911	7,653	28%	Overall 87850 hours of scheduled learning and teaching activity were delivered in 2015/16. Please note that this figure may include instances where two or more staff shared a learning or teaching activity. In these instances the time allocation for each member of staff is included, multiplying the time expended on the activity. Therefore the total should not be viewed as how much teaching happened at SOAS but rather an expression of how many hours each tutor was

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							teaching
30	Pre-92 Sussex, University of	121,005	31,005	19,161	11,844	26%	The information we have provided below only includes the scheduled teaching time. This is because other activities are not captured in the University's timetabling system and therefore not easily reportable in terms of the requested information.
31	Post-92 Teesside University	159,973	8,907	8,552.5	354.5	6%	Please note that the information provided is for four of the five previously-existing schools. It does not include the data for the School of Design, Culture and the Arts (SDCA). This is because with effect from 1 August 2017, SDCA no longer operates as a separate school and its subject groups have been redistributed across three of the other schools. Given the timing of your request, the data relating to the redistributed subject groups is not readily available and has therefore been omitted from this response.

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
32	Post-92 University College Birmingham	29,428	7,668	7,668		26%	No comments on data
32	Post-92 University of St Mark or St John	29,791	5,409	5,409	0	18%	No comments on data
34	Post-92 West of England, University of	205,982	32,115			16%	The University holds a total of 205,982 hours of scheduled learning and teaching activities that were recorded in our timetabling database for the academic year 2015/16, and this figure includes a whole range of activities, as defined by HESA, including lectures, seminars, workshops, supervised studio time, fieldwork tutorials and demonstrations. This figure is the best approximation it is possible for us to get, based on the information timetabled centrally, but there are a number of caveats that accompany this information...The University system does not distinguish PhD students who are paid as 'Hourly Paid lecturers' for teaching work.

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							The data cannot be split or extracted in the way requested. There is no shared unique identifier between data on PhD students and HR records so separation of the data would not be accurate. The use of 'Hourly Paid lecturers' for teaching has declined over the last four academic years.
35	Post-92 Winchester, University of	60,616	12,693			21%	We are concerned about the accuracy of the figures provided, and have therefore listed some of the caveats and assumptions below. This is not a complete list. 15/16 is the first year of using the timetabling system for timetabling rather than room bookings, so a lot of the data is incomplete/inaccurate. The figures given are only as accurate as the information provided to timetabling. Data is incomplete with respect to tutorials, but also field trips, external visits, project supervision, supervised time in studio. The total

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							<p>number of hours scheduled include teaching activities listed as whole class activities (eg lectures), as well as each separate activity such as seminars where students are split into groups. Where multiple staff and rooms are timetabled for one time slot, the total hours scheduled = number of rooms or staff (whichever lowest) x number of hours. Some classes have more than 1 tutor listed, with no breakdown of which tutor in which weeks. So where an HPL is listed alongside a contracted staff member, the HPL may be listed with more hours than actually teaching. Some classes may have the contracted staff member listed, but may be using HPLs who are not listed at all in the timetabling system. So the figures are incomplete. Some HPLS may have been engaged after the timetable was published, and timetabling may</p>

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
							not have been informed of the change in staff. So the figures are incomplete. The timetabling system does not link directly with the HR system for staff contract information. Staff information is provided directly to timetabling for manual tagging in the system, and as such is not complete or 100% accurate.
36	Post-92 Wolverhampton, University of	97,350	25,421		1,738	26%	The total number of scheduled teaching and learning hours recorded for the academic year 2015/16 is 97,349.6 for modules at levels 3-6 only. Please note that the same information for postgraduate courses is not routinely recorded and has not been provided as a result. Please note, the figure provided includes all individuals subject to a Visiting Lecturer contract, including those who are PhD students.
37	Post-92 Worcester,	77,945	16,518	16,370	148	21%	No comments on data

HEI type	Institution	Teaching hours delivered 2015/16	Teaching delivered by hourly paid staff	Hourly paid staff not engaged in study	PhD students who teach	Indicative proportion*	HEI Comments
	University of						
38	Post-92 Writtle College	14,650	11,083			76%	No comments on data

Table 2: Other university responses

Universities who ignored the FOI	Universities who refused to disclose information on at least one question, claiming a Section 12 exemption under FOI legislation
Aberystwyth University	The University of Aberdeen
Bath Spa University	Bangor University
University of Bedfordshire	The University of Bath
The Queen's University of Belfast	Birkbeck, University of London
Birmingham City University	The University of Birmingham
The University of Bolton	University of Bradford
The University of Brighton	University of Bristol
Buckinghamshire New University	Brunel University London
The University of Buckingham	The University of Cambridge
University of Central Lancashire	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Coventry University	Cardiff University
De Montfort University	University of Creative Arts
King's College London	The University of Dundee
Kingston University	University of East London
Liverpool Institute of Performing Arts	Edge Hill University
Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	The University of Edinburgh
London School of Economics and Political Science	Edinburgh Napier University
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine	University of Essex
Loughborough University	The University of Exeter
University of Manchester	Glasgow Caledonian University

Universities who ignored the FOI	Universities who refused to disclose information on at least one question, claiming a Section 12 exemption under FOI legislation
<p>The University of Northampton</p> <p>Ravensbourne College</p> <p>Royal Agricultural University</p> <p>Ruskin College</p> <p>Sheffield Hallam University</p> <p>The University of Sheffield</p> <p>St George's University of London</p> <p>St Mary's University</p> <p>University of Suffolk</p> <p>The University of Sunderland</p> <p>The University of Surrey</p> <p>University of West London</p> <p>University of Wales Trinity St David's</p> <p>University of the Arts, London</p> <p>The University of Westminster</p>	<p>The University of Glasgow</p> <p>University of Gloucestershire</p> <p>Glyndwr University</p> <p>Goldsmiths University, London</p> <p>Heriot Watt University</p> <p>University of Hertfordshire</p> <p>The University of Huddersfield</p> <p>The University of Hull</p> <p>Keele University</p> <p>University of Kent</p> <p>University of Lancaster</p> <p>The University of Leeds</p> <p>Leeds Beckett University</p> <p>The University of Leicester</p> <p>Lincoln University</p> <p>London Metropolitan University</p> <p>London South Bank University</p> <p>Newcastle University</p> <p>The Nottingham Trent University</p> <p>The Open University</p> <p>University of Oxford</p>

Universities who ignored the FOI

Universities who refused to disclose information on at least one question, claiming a Section 12 exemption under FOI legislation

- Portsmouth University
- The University of Plymouth
- Queen Margaret University
- Queen Mary University of London
- The University of Reading
- Royal Holloway, University of London
- The University of Salford
- The University of Southampton
- Southampton Solent University
- The University of St Andrews
- Staffordshire University
- University of Stirling
- The University of Strathclyde
- Swansea University
- Falmouth University
- University College London
- University of South Wales
- The University of Warwick
- University of York