Teachers Working Longer Review – Amalgamated sub-groups meeting 20 October 2015

Minutes

Attendees

DfE –Jeff Rogerson, Michelle Thompson-Smith and Ian Taylor

Sub group members – Dave Wilkinson (NASUWT)(Chair), Nick Kirby (NUT), David Binnie (ASCL), Valentine Mulholland (NAHT), Deborah Simpson (Voice), Suzanne Beckley (ATL), Anita Jermyn (LGA), Graham Baird (SFCA), Rani Kaur (NGA), Usman Gbajabiamila (ATL), Jackie Wood (LGA), Dilwyn Roberts-Young (UCAC), Donna Saby (GDST) and Mandy Coulter (United Learning).

IES – Emma Pollard, Annette Cox and Sam Swift

PPI – Daniela Silcock

Apologies

Helen Wood (DfE),Pat Moran (Welsh Government), Tricia Howarth (United Learning), Gillian Allcroft (NGA), Joan Binder (FASNA) and Jonathan Lloyd (WLGA).

Notes from meeting		Action By	Action Deadline
1.Welcome and introductions			
Dave Wilkinson (DW) welcomed the group and as research contractors were present, round table introductions were made.	Information		
2. Presentation from IES/PPI on draft final report and Q&A session			
Annette Cox (AC) delivered a presentation on IES's draft final report. A summary of the presentation is as follows: • A brief outline of how the study was undertaken, including project purpose and objectives, key research questions, search and sift processes and how data was analysed; • Key findings 1: Attrition of older teachers; • Key findings 2: Factors affecting attrition and retention of older teachers; • Key findings 3: Career pathways and exit pathways; • Key findings 4: Good employment practices to help teachers work longer; • Key findings 5: Extent, nature and future possibilities for flexible working for teachers; • Key findings 6: Teachers' Pension Scheme (TPS) flexibilities – use and barriers; and • Evidence gaps and recommendations. DW asked the group if they had any questions for IES/PPI. A summary of the discussion is as follows:- • In depth discussion of specific evidence	Information		

in the report such as PWC report; • That no specifics have been uncovered in relation to leadership good practices that support working longer but that it is more about the leadership's engagement with staff than policies; • That a lot of the evidence uncovered is older and probably not representative of the present education and pension landscape; • Group members asked whether any evidence had been found on the impact of funding levels on staff experiences. IES advised that no UK information was found but some was available on US schools (more related to size and rural/urban setting than funding), but that this was not an area that they had looked at specifically. The group suggested that the review should look at experiences of different types of employers; • Most themes seem to be similar in England and Wales; and • The Republic of Ireland's Teachers' Pension Scheme appears to include provision to allow teachers to retire early on an unreduced pension in some cases and the group requested details on this. Following this discussion IES/PPI left the meeting.	Action Information	DfE	Next meeting
3. Discussion on presentation and Q&A			
DW asked the group whether there was anything further that they wished to discuss with regards to the report and presentation or in relation to next steps that the group may wish to consider. The discussion is summarised below: • The evidence/gaps suggest three key areas to look at. Flexible working, Pension information on phased retirements and flexibilities and CPD. • Members agreed that whilst some issues impact the teaching profession as a whole there is a need to concentrate efforts on issues directly related to teaching longer. • DfE agreed to conduct further analysis on the evidence gathered to date and sort this into that related to all workers and that related to older workers only, to support the group's discussions. • DfE will also look into and provide the group with a list of other ongoing work within in the department related to areas identified by the evidence and its timescales to prevent duplication. • When looking at evidence and making recommendations the review group	Information Action Action Information	DfE DfE	Before next meeting Before next meeting

need to mindful about whether the evidence reflects the current/future educational landscape. • Evidence suggests that there is more resentment over changes to SPA/NPA from those 40+ than those just entering the profession. Does this mean we need to address issues in two different ways? • There appears to be no evidence of how supply teachers/TAs are used; and • There are no comparative studies in other professions and a suggestion for filing this gap was that the review could commission its own workplace situational survey (in the teaching profession) and have the same questions duplicated in the Labour Force survey. There is also work ongoing in the US which could assist. At the end of the discussion JR reiterated the next steps process agreed by the Steering Group earlier in the day, which included a steering group workshop on the 17 November which will focus on reviewing all evidence collected to date and recommendations/actions that can be gleaned from that.			
4. Minutes and action points from the meetings of 15 September 2015			
Draft minutes for both of the sub-group meetings held on 15 September meetings were agreed by the group as a true record. DW advised that DfE would arrange for these to be published on the group's page on gov.uk. DW gave an update on each of the action points from both meetings and these are detailed below: EI sub-group meeting • ICF are still drafting a revised version of their draft final report and will advise on any amendments made/ further investigations undertaken at the next amalgamated sub group meeting, when they will be making their final presentation on the report and its findings; • Group members provided comments on ICF's draft final report by 23 September; • Minutes from 9 July meeting were published on the group's page on gov.uk; and • Group members advertised the stage 2 call for evidence through their own organisation's routes. EP sub-group meeting • IES have taken into account discussions at the previous meeting when	Action Information	DfE	30 October

developing their draft final report; • DfE are working with ICF to establish if a copy of their study on older workers in Denmark. A further update will be given at the next meeting; • Minutes from 9 July meeting were published on the group's page on gov.uk; • Group members advertised the stage 2 call for evidence through their own organisation's routes; and • DfE emailed members on the issue of amalgamating the sub groups temporarily, including a proposed date for the first meeting, and members agreed to the proposal.	Action	DfE	By next meeting
5. Call for Evidence – Stage 2			
MTS talked through the paper circulated ahead of the meeting, highlighting themes in the responses received and advised that this had also been discussed at the steering group meeting earlier.	Information		
JR provided a brief summary of the steering group's discussions on the paper and next steps including that DfE would circulate all evidence submitted by group members by the end of the week.	Action	DfE	30 October
The group raised an additional point on whether any evidence was available on leading practioner posts, which had been mentioned by several respondents in the call for evidence. Ian Taylor (IT) advised that statistics were available and will look into whether these could be shared.	Action	DfE	By next meeting
JR stressed that this is a tripartite review and in order for it to be fully effective, group input is essential.	Information		
6. AOB			
None			
7. Review of meeting including any action points			
DW summarised today's discussion including action points agreed.	Information		
8. Next meeting proposed for 24 November between 11am and 1.30pm – Sanctuary Buildings			
The group agreed that the proposed date is suitable.	Information		
DfE will, therefore, make arrangements for this meeting and will also circulate proposed dates for an amalgamated sub-group meeting in December and separate sub-group meetings in January.	Action	DfE	23 October