## <u>Teachers Working Longer Review – Meeting of the Steering Group</u> 18 August 2015

## Minutes

## <u>Attendees</u>

**DfE** – Jeff Rogerson (Chair), Michelle Thompson-Smith, Leila Allsopp and Helen Wood

**Steering Group members –** Andrew Morris (NUT), David Binnie (ASCL), Valentine Mulholland (NAHT), Dave Wilkinson (NASUWT), Deborah Simpson (Voice), Adrian Prandle (ATL), Anita Jermyn (LGA), Gillian Allcroft (NGA), Janine Brooks (ISC), Pat Moran (Welsh Government) and Mererid Lewis-Davies (UCAC)

## **Apologies**

Stephen Baker (DfE), Mandy Coalter (United Learning), Dilwyn Roberts-Young (UCAC), Joan Binder (FASNA), Jonathan Lloyd (WLGA) and Graham Baird (SFCA)

		A 4*	A 11
Notes from meeting		Action By	Action Deadline
1.Welcome and introductions			
Jeff Rogerson (JR) welcomed the group.	Information		
He advised that Leila Allsopp will be starting maternity leave in October and introduced Helen Wood who will be providing analytical support to the review in Leila's absence. Helen will be attending meetings from now on.			
2. Minutes of the meeting of 21 July and			
update on action points			
JR asked if the Steering Group were happy to agree the minutes as a true record. Group members suggested a few amendments which DfE will make and then publish the minutes on the group's page on gov.uk.	Action	DfE	28 August
JR gave an update on the actions from the previous meeting:-	Information		
<ul> <li>DfE have put together a draft proposal for including HR expertise in the steering group and this will be discussed further under agenda item 3;</li> <li>DfE have drafted a revised version of the request for information document, which was circulated with the papers for this meeting. This will be covered further in agenda item 5;</li> <li>Union members of the steering group have shared the results of their joint survey with all group members. Although NASUWT was not involved with this survey, they have submitted details from their "big question" survey via the stage 1 call for evidence;</li> </ul>			

DIE have revised the timeline to reflect the change to the stage 2 call for evidence dates, as agreed by the group at the last meeting. A revised timeline was circulated with the papers for this meeting and this will be discussed further under agenda item 6; DIE have investigated if a web based format for the stage 2 call for evidence could be supported by the TP website and this will be discussed further under agenda item 5; and DIE have circulated revised proposed meeting dates.  Inclusion of HR expert on the steering group  Bichelle Thompson-Smith (MTS) briefly talked through the Department's proposed approach. The main points were:  DIE HR have suggested approaching ACAS as they have experience of many different areas of employment; DIE have contacted ACAS on a speculative basis, explained about the review including that this would be on a voluntary basis and that steering group approval would be required for any new members; and ACAS have not committed to whether they would definitely be able to field a member for the group as they need to discuss this further internally, however, they seem very interested in the idea as one of the main roles of their organisation is to champion good employment practices.  In the main the group were supportive of the idea but suggested that the HR expert would need to ensure that they balance their knowledge of what can go wrong with the ability to look forward.  Group members also cautioned that HR expertise should not be procured at the detriment of any actuarial advice that may be needed later in the review.  DIE will discuss this further with ACAS and, on advice of the group, will also approach CIPD to see if they can offer an alternative source of input on HR practices from other sectors.  4. Update on research contracts and progress  Leila Allsopp (LA) provided an update on Information				
Michelle Thompson-Smith (MTS) briefly talked through the Department's proposed approach. The main points were:  DfE HR have suggested approaching ACAS as they have experience of many different areas of employment; DfE have contacted ACAS on a speculative basis, explained about the review including that this would be on a voluntary basis and that steering group approval would be required for any new members; and ACAS have not committed to whether they would definitely be able to field a member for the group as they need to discuss this further internally, however, they seem very interested in the idea as one of the main roles of their organisation is to champion good employment practices.  In the main the group were supportive of the idea but suggested that the HR expert would need to ensure that they balance their knowledge of what can go wrong with the ability to look forward.  Group members also cautioned that HR expertise should not be procured at the detriment of any actuarial advice that may be needed later in the review.  DfE will discuss this further with ACAS and, on advice of the group, will also approach CIPD to see if they can offer an alternative source of input on HR practices from other sectors.	<ul> <li>the change to the stage 2 call for evidence dates, as agreed by the group at the last meeting. A revised timeline was circulated with the papers for this meeting and this will be discussed further under agenda item 6;</li> <li>DfE have investigated if a web based format for the stage 2 call for evidence could be supported by the TP website and this will be discussed further under agenda item 5; and</li> <li>DfE have circulated revised proposed meeting dates.</li> </ul>			
Michelle Thompson-Smith (MTS) briefly talked through the Department's proposed approach. The main points were:  • DfE HR have suggested approaching ACAS as they have experience of many different areas of employment;  • DfE have contacted ACAS on a speculative basis, explained about the review including that this would be on a voluntary basis and that steering group approval would be required for any new members; and  • ACAS have not committed to whether they would definitely be able to field a member for the group as they need to discuss this further internally, however, they seem very interested in the idea as one of the main roles of their organisation is to champion good employment practices.  In the main the group were supportive of the idea but suggested that the HR expert would need to ensure that they balance their knowledge of what can go wrong with the ability to look forward.  Group members also cautioned that HR expertise should not be procured at the detriment of any actuarial advice that may be needed later in the review.  DfE will discuss this further with ACAS and, on advice of the group, will also approach CIPD to see if they can offer an alternative source of input on HR practices from other sectors.  4 Update on research contracts and progress				
idea but suggested that the HR expert would need to ensure that they balance their knowledge of what can go wrong with the ability to look forward.  Group members also cautioned that HR expertise should not be procured at the detriment of any actuarial advice that may be needed later in the review.  DfE will discuss this further with ACAS and, on advice of the group, will also approach CIPD to see if they can offer an alternative source of input on HR practices from other sectors.  4. Update on research contracts and progress	<ul> <li>through the Department's proposed approach. The main points were:-</li> <li>DfE HR have suggested approaching ACAS as they have experience of many different areas of employment;</li> <li>DfE have contacted ACAS on a speculative basis, explained about the review including that this would be on a voluntary basis and that steering group approval would be required for any new members; and</li> <li>ACAS have not committed to whether they would definitely be able to field a member for the group as they need to discuss this further internally, however, they seem very interested in the idea as one of the main roles of their organisation is to champion good</li> </ul>	Information		
expertise should not be procured at the detriment of any actuarial advice that may be needed later in the review.  DfE will discuss this further with ACAS and, on advice of the group, will also approach CIPD to see if they can offer an alternative source of input on HR practices from other sectors.  4. Update on research contracts and progress	idea but suggested that the HR expert would need to ensure that they balance their knowledge of what can go wrong with the			
advice of the group, will also approach CIPD to see if they can offer an alternative source of input on HR practices from other sectors.  4. Update on research contracts and progress	expertise should not be procured at the detriment of any actuarial advice that may be			
progress	advice of the group, will also approach CIPD to see if they can offer an alternative source of	Action	DfE	•
	•			
		Information		

progress. The main points were:			
<ul> <li>It has taken longer for ICF, the EI</li> </ul>			
contractor, to obtain data sets than			
expected, in fact at this point they still			
have not received the data. As a result			
they will have to submit a revised			
timeline which they will be able to			
provide once all data is received;			
<ul> <li>DfE are taking steps to expedite the data;</li> </ul>			
An El sub-group meeting was			
scheduled to be held after this meeting			
at which ICF were to attend to give a			
presentation of their progress so far,			
however, due to the change in			
timelines this presentation has been			
rescheduled to take place at the next			
El sub group meeting on 15			
September; and			
IES, the EP contractor, are			
progressing to the new timelines			
advised at the last steering group meeting.			
•			
5. Stage 2 call for evidence	Information		
MTS gave an update on progress and advised that it was hoped that agreement could be	IIIIOIIIIalioii		
reached on content and method of publication			
by the end of this meeting. The main points			
were:-			
The document has been updated to			
reflect the discussion at the last			
steering group meeting and the revised			
version was circulated to steering			
group members a week and a half			
ahead of this meeting.			
The call for evidence is expected to be			
launched early September and			
conclude the first week of October.			
DfE have investigated the possibility of			
a web based format hosted on the TP			
website and although this is possible it			
will have to be done using an external provider. Due to some questions			
asking for potentially sensitive data,			
there were some concerns, however,			
HW has further advised that she has			
access to Smart Survey, which is a			
secure web based product.			
We suggest that this is publicised			
through the TP website, WLR group			
page and via group members.			
The group then held a detailed and productive		I	
The group them held a detailed and productive			

discussion. A summary of the main points raised, in addition to those above, is below:  • Group members are not in a position to fully agree the content at this meeting and have asked for a revised version to be circulated by 20 August, they will provide comments by 25 August and a final draft to be circulated by 26	Action	DfE/Group Members	Various dates in main text
<ul> <li>August. Group members will provide final clearance by email.</li> <li>Group members are happy with the proposed publication method and dates and DfE will circulate a "mock up" of how it will look on Smart survey by 20 August.</li> <li>SPA and NPA need to be explained in paragraph 2 of the background text and this point should be expanded to cover the review of SPA.</li> <li>Questions need to be expanded or possibly split to ensure both negative and positive responses are collected.</li> <li>Q4 needs to be broaden to include other professions.</li> <li>A confidentiality statement needs to be included.</li> <li>As both good and practice can be identified the request for the name of the school where it takes place should be removed.</li> </ul>	Action	DfE	20 August
DfE will draft a revised version of the request based on today's discussion and recirculate to the timetable set out in the first bullet point above.			
6. Revised timeline			
<ul> <li>MTS talked the group through the revised timeline. The key points were:         <ul> <li>stage 2 call for evidence design phase, launch and deadline for submissions moved to July – August, September and October, respectively;</li> <li>a further iteration will be circulated via email once ICF provide their revised timeline; and</li> <li>the key deadlines for the project remain unchanged.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Information		
7. Future meetings			
JR advised that the next steering group meeting is due to take place on 1 October between 11am and 1.30pm.	Information		
8. AOB	1.6		
None	Information		

9. Review and close		
JR summarised discussions and thanked	Information	
everyone for attending.		