

Teachers' Working Longer Review – Initial Meeting of the Evidence of the Impact of Working Longer Sub-Group, 2 December 2014

Minutes

Attendees

DfE – Jeff Rogerson (Chair), Helen Kemplay, Ian Taylor and Leila Allsopp.

Sub-Group members - Graham Baird (SFCA), Jackie Wood (LGA), Nick Kirby (NUT), David Binnie (ASCL), Suzanne Beckley (ATL), Kathryn James (NAHT), Jen Allen (United Learning), Dave Wilkinson (NASUWT), Deborah Simpson (Voice), Dilwyn Roberts-Young (UCAC), Zenny Saunders (Welsh Government)

Apologies

Angela Culley (ISC), Gillian Allcroft (NGA), Jane Morris (Governors Wales), Joan Binder (FASNA), Jonathan Lloyd (WLGA).

Notes from meeting		Action By	Action Deadline
1. Welcome and introductions			
Jeff Rogerson (JR) welcomed the group	Information		
2. Project overview			
JR gave a brief overview of the Working Longer Review project and its objectives. Points were raised by members about the objectives, in relation to how far the Review would look at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific groups of teachers with protected characteristics; and • all teachers, not just older teachers (ie in terms of long term health and supply/recruitment/retention). JR advised that these points should be discussed at the steering group meeting in the afternoon.	Information		
3. Update from the steering group meeting of 23 October			
JR provided a brief update from the previous steering group meeting.	Information		
4. Terms of reference from this sub-group			
This was covered under item 2 (project overview).	Information		

5. Election of chair and role of DfE and secretariat			
<p>Dave Wilkinson (DW) was elected as chair of the sub-group.</p> <p>JR advised on the role of the DfE, as discussed at the steering group on 23 October and set out in the minutes of that meeting.</p>	Information		
6. Data Update			
<p>JR talked through the evidence gathering paper which had previously been discussed at the steering group on 23 October. He also introduced a paper on initial mapping of data against the objectives of the Review and invited discussion.</p> <p>Points discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data mapping was a starting point and there would be other data sources we could use. • Ideally all objectives would go ‘green’ through the addition of other sources of evidence but in reality the Review would need to prioritise what it could look at in the available timeframe. • The School Workforce Census doesn’t include sixth form colleges or Welsh schools so SFCA and the Welsh Government would need to feed in data. 	Information		
7. Proposed approach on commissioning research			
<p>JR advised of a deviation from the evidence gathering paper presented to the steering group. DfE were now proposing a 2-stage approach to making a research bid: stage 1 would be to commission a literature review of current evidence, to begin asap; stage 2 would be to commission new primary research to fill the highest priority evidence gaps identified by the review of current evidence. Ian Taylor (IT) explained that this is a typical approach and would be more likely to lead to the bid being successful.</p> <p>JR advised that the NHS evidence, our own call for evidence, and previous DfE reviews eg of ill health would all feed in to the researchers’ review of current evidence.</p> <p>JR/IT also advised that we would need to move more quickly than in the timetable circulated as we had now been informed that, due to purdah beginning in March, the research contract would need to be signed by the end of February.</p> <p>IT and Leila Allsopp (LA) set out the two options</p>	Information		

<p>for stage 1 of the research bid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rapid evidence assessment (REA); or • A full systematic review. <p>The DfE recommended an REA because: it would fit better within the two year timeframe for the Review; we already have evidence from the NHS Review and our own call for evidence to feed in; it is unlikely that there is a lot of evidence out there which will be relevant to many of the Review's objectives.</p> <p>There was a full discussion of the pros and cons of each of these options. The following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to ensure the Review has credibility. • The time and cost pressures. • The possibility of a 'half way house' between the two options – eg an REA could take between 2-6 months so a 6 month REA would be close to being a short systematic review. • The need to allow enough time for the primary research (stage 2). • The need to consider international evidence. <p>Following discussion, the majority of the sub-group voted for the REA while recognising that the systematic review would be the ideal option if there were no time or cost pressures. Three members voted against. It was agreed that the REA should be as comprehensive as possible within the available timeframe.</p> <p>There was a further discussion about the tight timetable and the need to maximise the likelihood of receiving quality bids.</p> <p>DfE agreed to circulate the draft research bid to sub-group members asap for comment, with a three day deadline.</p> <p>DfE agreed to circulate a revised timetable for the evidence gathering process, keeping as far as possible to a full three weeks for invitations to tender (ITTs) to be submitted.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>DfE</p> <p>DfE</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Completed</p>
<p>8. Next steps</p>			
<p>JR briefly reviewed today's discussion and action points.</p>	<p>Information</p>		
<p>9. Next / future meetings</p>			
<p>Proposed dates for future meetings had been circulated with the papers. The next meeting of the sub-group is on 27 January 2015 at Sanctuary Buildings.</p>	<p>Information</p>		