<u>Teachers' Working Longer Review – Initial Meeting of the Steering Group on 23 October</u> 2014

Minutes

Attendees

DfE – Stephen Baker (Chair), Jeff Rogerson, Helen Kemplay, Ian Taylor, Michelle Thompson-Smith and Leila Allsopp.

Steering Group members

Andrew Morris (NUT), Angela Culley (ISC), Anita Jermyn (LGA),
Dave Wilkinson (NASUWT), David Binnie (ASCL), Deborah Simpson (Voice),
Dilwyn Roberts-Young (UCAC), Joan Binder (FASNA),
Mandy Coalter (United Learning), Suzanne Beckley (ATL),
Valentine Mulholland (NAHT), Zenny Saunders (Welsh Government)

Apologies

Gillian Allcroft (NGA), Graham Baird (SFCA), Jane Morris (Governors Wales), Jonathan Lloyd (WLGA), Judith Telford (Northern Education Trust)

Notes from meeting		Action By	Action Deadline
1.Welcome and introductions			
Stephen Baker (SB) welcomed the group	Information		
2. Project overview and documentation			
SB gave a brief overview of the project and its objectives, highlighting the importance of the group's work in addressing those.	Information		
Jeff Rogerson (JR) presented the project documentation and invited discussion on these with particular emphasis on the proposed project principles.			
Principle 2 attracted a lot of discussion, particularly the definition of "agreed". Key points made by the group were: • full agreement may be difficult; • people should not be forced to sign up to a recommendation; and • recommendations made by consensus will carry much more weight than those made by separate groups. The group agreed that WLR meetings should not be a forum for any other business.			
The group also agreed that it was responsible for monitoring and reporting on progress, though suitable updates would be provided to, for example, the programme of talks.			
Members agreed to provide comments on the documents to the Working Longer Review mailbox within two weeks to enable revised versions, showing the changes, to be circulated for agreement.	Action	Steering Group members	7 November

3. Terms of reference			
SB, JR and Helen Kemplay (HK) introduced the terms of reference (TOR) documents for the steering and sub-groups, and invited discussion on these. Although it was agreed these captured most of what was needed the following specific points were raised:	Information		
 there will be a need to consider the impact on younger teachers of older teachers working longer; should consider older teachers' experiences and any assumptions/bias they have faced; the first meeting of the employment practice group should be moved forward to November; Objective c in the evidence group TOR should include "quality" and it should be clear that d could include a recommendation to remodel the arrangements; and should look at impact from a number of aspects, i.e. should look at the impact by subjects taught as well as by different sectors and school types. Members agreed to provide comments on the	Action	Steering	7 November
documents to the Working Longer Review mailbox within two weeks to enable revised versions, showing the changes, to be circulated for agreement.	7 totion	Group members	
4. Membership of sub groups JR invited discussion on the membership of the sub groups. He advised that in order to keep group sizes manageable organisations would be restricted to one member per group.	Information		
The majority of members of the group indicated that their organisation would want to have a representative on each group but that it would not necessarily be the same person either on each group or the steering group.			
Members agreed to provide names of sub group members to the Working Longer Review mailbox within two weeks. They will indicate if a nominee is prepared to chair the sub group and this will be discussed and agreed in initial meetings.	Action	Steering group members	7 November

5. Role of DfE and secretariat		
JR advised that the DfE viewed its role as being mainly an advisory one, using their experience of the issues and working with Ministers to assist discussions and help the group shape recommendations.	Information	
JR also advised on the DfE Secretariat role, including publishing information on a dedicated GOV.UK webpage.		
The group discussed the drafting of any reports and agreed that the secretariat would provide the main drafting support but that ultimately it was for the group to determine the content.		
6. Data Update		
JR introduced the data paper and invited discussion on this.	Information	
JR stated that data gathering would be very challenging and one of the major challenges would be to model what may happen in the future.		
lan Taylor (IT) gave further detail on the analytical team's proposed approach including that they would work directly with appointed researchers but would be led by the evidence sub group.		
Some of the other points discussed were:		
 NHS review – There is potentially some data that is not NHS specific and will read across; scope for recommendations for certain data to be collected as routine in future; as the Department is not the employer of teachers we will need to engage at local and regional level; any data collections should not put an additional burden on schools if possible; the short time scale of the "call for evidence"; and conducting "Big conversations" like the NHS could be an imposition on schools. 		
availability of data in relation to Wales. They stated that they needed to be reassured that Wales would be fully catered for in the review and that they would be given the opportunity to share information.		
7. Next steps		
JR briefly reviewed today's discussion and action points.	Information	

8. Future meetings			
It was agreed that meetings for all groups would be monthly but that this would be kept under review.	Information		
It was suggested that the first evidence sub group meeting should be booked to coincide with the next steering group meeting, with sub group in the morning and steering group in the afternoon. Michelle Thompson-Smith (MTS) agreed to circulate potential dates.	Action	MTS	24 October
It was agreed that wherever possible meetings should be planned three months ahead.	Information		