

Teachers' Working Longer Review – Meeting of the Evidence of the Impact of Working Longer Sub-Group, 9 July 2015

Minutes

Attendees

DfE – Jeff Rogerson, Daniel Metcalfe, Michelle Thompson-Smith, Leila Allsopp and Peter Sellen

Sub-Group members – Dave Wilkinson (NASUWT)(Chair), Nick Kirby (NUT), Anita Jermyn (LGA), Jen Allan (United Learning) and Graham Baird (SFCA).

Apologies

Ian Taylor (DfE), Usman Gbajabiamila (ATL), Suzanne Beckley (ATL), Deborah Simpson (Voice), Dilwyn Roberts-Young (UCAC), Gillian Allcroft (NGA), Janine Brooks (ISC), Joan Binder (FASNA), Jonathan Lloyd (WLGA), Pat Moran (Welsh Government) and David Binnie (ASCL).

Notes from meeting		Action By	Action Deadline
1. Welcome and introductions			
<p>Dave Wilkinson (DW) welcomed the group.</p> <p>DW advised that Helen Kemplay, DfE lead for the employment practices sub group, has moved roles within the Department and will, therefore, be leaving the working longer review project. He thanked her for her support and work on this project He welcomed Michelle Thompson-Smith as Helen's replacement.</p> <p>Jeff Rogerson (JR) explained that the delay in the meetings was due to the change in Government and the need to review work plans/priorities following that. He added that we hope to minimise any delay to the overall project and this would be discussed further under agenda item 3.</p> <p>DW mentioned that researchers have been working on the first part of their task and that our aim today would be to get to a situation where stage 2 of the call for evidence could be launched as soon as possible. He advised that there would be further discussion on these topics under agenda items 3 and 4.</p>	Information		
2. Action points from the meeting of 27 January 2015			
<p>DW gave an update on actions from the previous meeting and updates on developments since:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sub-group agreed the minutes of 27 January 2015 as a true record and DW advised that these would be published on the group's page on gov.uk. • Details of the steering group's discussion of 20 January on priorities was amalgamated with those held by both sub – groups on 27 January and circulated by the DfE on 6 March. 	Information		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group members provided suggestions to the DfE for organisations outside of the steering group who should be included in the stage 1 call for evidence. • DW thanked everyone who responded to the stage 1 call for evidence and advised that the results were used by researchers to help them with the trawl for evidence. • The interim report for the Evidence of Impact REA was received and circulated. • Meetings of the sub and steering groups have not taken place in the meantime. However, we plan to get back to meeting on a regular basis to pick up progress and this will be discussed further under agenda item 8. <p>DW requested that more documents be put on gov.uk, for example the project initiation document. Michelle Thompson-Smith (MTS) advised that she would need to consult gov.uk protocols but would do this if possible.</p>	Action	MTS	17 July
3. Revised Working Longer Review timetable			
<p>JR introduced a discussion on the timeline, which has been revised to take into account the meetings cancelled in May and June and the changes to the REA timelines due to this delay.</p> <p>The group discussed the revised timeline in depth including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group is happy that the design of the stage 2 call for evidence can be completed in time to issue before the end of term, but that the deadline for returns should be for the end of September to take into account school holidays; • The group felt that the overall end date of the project should not be changed and timescales for individual tasks should be shortened, where possible, to facilitate this; • The earliest the REA contractor could submit a draft final report will be early August with final report expected late September/early October; and • It was suggested that work planned for the sub groups for November to look at evidence gaps and identify if additional research/data should be commissioned could be brought forward to August and be based on the REA interim report. This could reduce some pressures on the timeline. <p>DfE agreed to revise the timeline as a result of these discussions and will circulate a revised version ahead of the next meeting.</p>	Information		By next meeting

4. Research update/ Interim Report from REA			
<p>Leila Allsopp (LA) provided an update on the research process and commented on the Interim Report including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The format and content of the report and that it was typical of an REA interim report; • The initial draft was reviewed by DfE in May and amendments were made, these were mainly stylistic but also sought to avoid scope creep into employment practice issues; • ICF have identified gaps in evidence and identified data sets to fill some of these gaps, which they are now starting to analyse; and • The DfE are currently agreeing a contract variation with the REA contractors to take into account the timetable changes. <p>DW led a discussion on the report, examining each section. Points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is some overlap in evidence gaps in both REAs it may be possible to look at commissioning research for both strands together; • Due to the timetable delays the sub group could use the draft final interim report to begin the gap analysis as early as possible; • There are some concerns on how long it will take for the contractor to access identified data, which could impact on the deadline. It was felt that it would be better to be prepared to be flexible on the deadline rather than receive analysis that had not been fully considered. Any data not fully analysed could also be picked up as part of the review's additional research work; • The group need to comment on the initial draft REA as soon as possible as the contractors are unable to progress in the meantime. The group also agreed that comments should focus on content, not stylistic issues in order to expedite responses; • It was considered whether the review should define the term "older teacher" and if so how. Suggestions were on level of service or in age groups not over a set age; and • It was noted that one recommendation might be that the group needs to continue to meet after the final report to the Secretary of State, in line with the way the NHS review is ongoing. 	Information		

<p>Group members agreed to provide comments on the Interim Report by 15 July to enable the contractor to meet revised deadlines. DfE will issue an email to absent group members to invite their comments.</p>	<p>Action</p>	<p>Sub-group members/DfE</p>	<p>15 July/10 July</p>
<p>LA requested that group members advise her by email of any additional data sets the contractor should be made aware of.</p>	<p>Action</p>	<p>Sub-group members</p>	<p>15 July</p>
<p>5. Call for Evidence – Stage 2</p>			
<p>JR talked through the call for evidence paper and opened a discussion on the format for stage 2. As this is an area that effects both sub-groups discussions continued across both meetings. The below is therefore a summary of the discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members discussed the suggested launch and deadline dates of the call for evidence of July and August respectively. It was suggested that this was a very tight timescale and would coincide with school holidays, which could impact on the response rate; • Members discussed the format and questions for the stage two call for evidence and it was concluded that there is a real danger of current proposals looking like and being seen as a survey rather than a request for evidence. It was noted that there is therefore the risk of it being counter-productive, i.e. in resulting in a lot of information that amounts to simply views rather than evidence and which cannot be scientifically analysed. It also could get in the way of holding a robust survey as part of the next stage of research, which is one potential way of plugging some of the gaps in evidence that are emerging; • It was also noted that only asking for details of specific research, evidence or documents could significantly limit responses as the majority of these will have already been identified as part of stage 1 and through the REAs. Additionally it was felt that asking for views concentrated on examples of things being done that could help Teachers to work longer and also giving respondents the opportunity to give views on some very specific questions would be helpful in informing what future research is needed; and • It was questioned whether there is value in individual organisations launching separate surveys or should these be incorporated into the call for evidence. During discussions it was agreed that there was nothing to stop organisations 	<p>Information</p>		

<p>doing that but another option may be to launch a survey which sought to look at all the gaps identified as part of the additional research phase.</p> <p>Following these discussions, it was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the call for evidence could still be launched in July as planned but that the deadline be extended from August to the end of September; and DfE officials would draft a proposed document, based on the discussion held and circulate this for comment in time for it to be sent out before the end of term. <p>Anita Jermyn (AJ) offered to send LA a copy of LGA's proposed survey to assist with question design.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>Action</p>	<p>DfE/Group Members</p> <p>AJ</p>	<p>13 July/17 July</p> <p>By next meeting</p>
6. AOB			
None			
7. Review of meeting including any action points			
DW summarised today's discussion including action points agreed.	Information		
8. Next meeting – TBC – Sanctuary Buildings			
As a lot of sub-group members were unable to attend, and there is a need to review the timeline following today's discussions, it was decided that dates for the next meetings should be determined via email. DfE will issue potential dates.	Action	DfE	w/c 13 July