

<p>previous meeting:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering group members have provided suggestions on the REAs search terms; • DfE circulated the original proposed stage 2 call for evidence questions in March and these have been discussed in more details at the sub-group meetings on 9 July. This was covered further in agenda item 5; • Priorities and issues discussions will be revisited at a later steering group meeting; • DfE issued proposed post purdah meeting dates in March; and • DfE also circulated a revised consolidated timetable. This, however, had to be revised further and was discussed under item 6. 			
3. Update from sub-group meetings held on 9 July			
<p>Michelle Thompson-Smith (MTS) briefly updated the group on discussions at the two sub-group meetings on 9 July. The main points were:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helen Kemplay, DfE lead for Employment Practices, has left the working longer project and MTS will be her replacement. The group extends its thanks to her for all her hard work and wishes her well in her new role; • Both meetings followed very similar agendas to today's meeting; • Both included very useful discussions on the content of their REA interim report and sub-group members have provided additional comments by email which have been passed to the contractors; • Both included discussions on the stage 2 call for evidence and timeline, which have been used to produce the updated documents sent to the steering group for this meeting; and • The sub-group members decided, as there were a low number of attendees due to the tube strike, to agree future dates for all meetings via email/ steering group. The proposed dates were circulated with the papers for this meeting. 	Information		
4. Update on research contracts and			

progress			
<p>Leila Allsopp (LA) provided an update on progress. The main point were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft interim reports have been received from both contractors and comments made by sub-groups and DfE; • Both reports were typical for an REA and contained everything researchers expected to see; • The EP REA has identified significantly more literature than the EI REA; • Fourteen of the items submitted through the stage 1 call for evidence were included in the REA shortlists; • Due to the delays post-election both REAs have extended their timelines and these have been incorporated into the overall revised timeline. As a result, contract re-negotiations are underway; and • Initial findings suggest that it is likely to be useful to undertake case study work as part of the primary research phase. <p>Group members advised that several of the teaching unions had undertaken a joint survey of members. This has resulted in approximately 12,000 responses and they are currently analysing these. This survey also includes retired members so will provide a useful perspective from those over 65. Employer organisations are also looking to undertake a survey of their members, mainly looking to identify good employment practices.</p>	Information		
5. Stage 2 call for evidence			
<p>Jeff Rogerson (JR) introduced the topic and talked through the call for evidence paper circulated for this meeting.</p> <p>JR explained that following discussion at the sub-group meetings a “request for evidence” had been drafted and circulated to group members, however, due to the volume and content of feedback received it was felt that the steering group should discuss this further before issue and that was the aim of this agenda item.</p> <p>JR summarised the feedback received so far. The main points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the introduction was too long; 	Information		

- That it should include a statement to clarify that participation in this review does not imply agreement with changes to normal pension age for teachers or wider pension reforms;
- That it was too focussed on teachers and should cater for employers as well, possibly by creating two separate versions of the request; and
- That questions should be reworded/ number of questions increased to enable teachers to provide detailed views.

The group then held a detailed and productive discussion on the request for information. A summary of the main points raised, in addition to those above, is below:

- School leaders who are also teachers may want to answer from both a personal and managerial perspective;
- As the WLR is a joint project both teachers and employers views need to be represented;
- Asking questions that illicit views at this stage will not be scientifically quantifiable and so will not in themselves be useful evidence for the review, however, it will be useful to sign post to areas to explore as part of primary research;
- As drafted Q1 is likely to illicit responses to this question only, need to reword as an open question on barriers/issues with free text response field. This will then provide a temperature check of views but also allows respondents to explain more fully and provide details.
- Should seek to minimise duplication of work already undertaken by organisations and ensure that teachers are not overburdened with requests;
- Need to ensure questions are not leading;
- If this is not a survey then the questions need to be changed to reflect this;
- A full survey could be considered later as part of the primary research phase; and
- Need to ensure that this request covers both strands of the review in the questions.

<p>DfE will draft a revised version of the request based on today's discussion and earlier comments received by email. This document will then be presented for discussion at the Steering group meeting on 18 August, with a view for the document to be finalised and agreed at that meeting.</p> <p>Group members agreed to update the rest of the group with any ongoing research/ survey activity as they become aware. Union members also agreed to share the results of their joint survey with DfE and expect these to be ready by 31 July.</p> <p>The group agreed that due to the further discussion required the request for information should not be launched until the first week of September (start of new term) and the deadline for responses should be moved to the first week of October to allow respondents sufficient time to reply. DfE to update the timeline to reflect this.</p> <p>The group discussed the format that the request would be published in on the TP website and suggested that a web based format should be explored. DfE to investigate this further with TP.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>DfE</p> <p>Group members</p> <p>DfE</p> <p>DfE</p>	<p>Before next meeting</p> <p>Ongoing/31 July</p> <p>Before next meeting.</p> <p>Before next meeting</p>
<p>6. Revised timeline</p>			
<p>MTS talked the group through the revised timeline. The key points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to delays following the general election, not least to the REA contracts, it has become necessary to revise the timeline; • This was discussed in detail at the sub-group meetings and the timeline further revised to reflect these discussions; • Although some milestones have moved significantly, the review is still due to conclude to the same timescales; and • Within that, the contractors will be asked to frontload as far as possible their consideration of the gaps identified, which in turn will allow members to stick to the original timetable for looking at what further research might be needed. <p>Some concerns were raised by the group on the final report and response sections in that there may be insufficient time. SB advised of other activities, like sharing the early findings with Ministers in advance of the final report, that DfE can undertake to ensure that these</p>	<p>Information</p>		

<p>deadlines are met.</p> <p>The timeline will be further revised to take into account the changes agreed in the call for evidence dates and recirculated to the group.</p>	Action	DfE	Before next meeting
7. Future meetings			
<p>SB discussed the proposed future meeting dates circulated with the papers for this meeting. He explained some sub-group meeting dates had been suggested to allow REA contractors to attend to report their findings.</p> <p>SB discussed the importance of attendance at meetings to ensure work could be completed to the revised timetable. With this in mind, the group agreed that deputies could attend if necessary to enable meetings to go ahead.</p> <p>The group highlighted that the Steering Group meeting proposed for 27 October would clash with half term and may prove problematic. DfE will look at an alternative date for this meeting.</p>	Information		
	Action	DfE	Before next meeting
8. AOB			
None	Information		
9. Review and close			
SB summarised discussions, highlighting that the key area of this meeting was the call for evidence and thanked everyone for attending.	Information		