

Meeting of the University Academy of Engineering School Advisory Board

4.00 pm on Thursday, 9 May 2019
in University Academy of Engineering - Trafalgar Street, London SE17 2TP

Agenda

<i>No.</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
7.	Principal's report <ul style="list-style-type: none">Teaching and Learning update (outcomes of department review)	3 - 16	JT

Date of next meeting
4.00 pm on Thursday, 27 June 2019

Members: Chris Mallaband (Chair), Veronica Allen, Alex Drake, Karen Fowler, Zakir Matin, Lesley Morrison, Tony Roberts and John Taylor

In attendance: Alexander Enibe

This page is intentionally left blank

Business Studies Department Review Report

The Business Studies department review took place on Friday 23rd November 2018 conducted by Jason Philipasz, John Taylor and Annette Moses. The review included observations of the teachers, a review of marking and feedback and a discussion with students.

An overview of the department

The staffing in Business Studies is as follows:

Peter Young – Head of Department

Laura Perez (Trainee teacher)

Leadership and management

The department has a strong lead in Peter. His recent completion of his Masters and current NPQSL course has ensured he has excellent subject knowledge and pedagogy. He is also very experienced in teaching the Btec courses, which differ in emphasis from GCSE and A level and can incorrectly be taught as a series of activities that simply need to be completed. This is not the case in the department, students are taught the knowledge and then use this to complete the necessary assignments with a deep understanding of the business topics covered.

Peter has identified in his SEF that his main area of focus is supporting Laura to improve her teaching. He has then gone on to detail in his DIP the activities and PD planned to support Laura's development as a teacher

Quality of teaching and learning

The teaching and learning observed was excellent.

Laura's lesson was an exploration of the different ways to assess the risk to a business. It was well planned with clear progression and a great atmosphere for learning. All students were focused and on the task set which offered challenge. Laura gave excellent specific feedback and guidance to students.

Peter also taught a well-planned lesson reviewing leadership styles. Peter expertly guided students through a review of different styles then asked students to analyse information on 3 different leaders to determine which style they demonstrated. He also used information from a news article about a known leader to demonstrate how the styles could be blurred but justification of the choice was what mattered in the exam. He went on to explain this in detail by getting students to critique the answers of their peers. Students were able to build on their prior knowledge and analyse and evaluate case studies, an excellent lesson.

Engagement in lessons

The engagement was excellent in both lessons observed.

Marking and feedback

Marking in the department is frequent and of good quality. Detailed templates enable good developmental feedback. Students are also interacting with this feedback. The books are very well organized for learning.

Google classroom is being used to set homework and it is mostly being completed.

Student voice

Students enjoy their lessons in Business studies and feel challenged and supported in their learning.

Design and Engineering Department Review Report

The Engineering department review took place on Thursday 22nd November 2018 conducted by Meirion Lewis, Rob Harding and John Taylor. The schedule for the review is attached to this report. The review included observations of the teachers, a review of marking and feedback and a student panel.

An overview of the department

The staffing in Design and Engineering is as follows:

Lazarus Fiberesima – Head of Department

Saima Ahmed

Renford Sommerville

Ade Bamgbose

Paul Izilein (not observed due to illness)

Leadership and management

The previous Head of Department left at Christmas 2017 and Lazarus took over, having previously been in charge of the 6th Form.

The first set of Level 3 BTEC results were outstanding and the external links developed by Lazarus and his team are very strong and were praised by External moderators.

SoW and Knowledge organisers are in place but lack pace and challenge especially at KS3 and in the Level 2 BTEC. It is also apparent that students are not using the specialized equipment in the department as often as they should and that the curriculum is too theory based.

Quality of teaching and learning

The teaching and learning observed, in general, lacked challenge and was very theory based. No practical work was observed during the course of the review.

All the students in Lazarus' class were on task and there was a good relationship between the teacher and the students. However, the lesson lacked challenge and was repetitious in its nature. The students were working at their own pace but this was fairly slow and they were completing virtual circuits on a computer rather than making circuits themselves. They are approximately 40 lessons into the course and the students had made no circuits yet.

Ade's lesson was very similar to Lazarus' with the students googling work that they could cut and paste into their BTEC portfolio. The students were on task but again the lesson lacked challenge and pace.

The atmosphere in Renford's lesson was calm and focused and the starter showed good use of AfL. However, as the lesson progressed the pace and challenge dropped and opportunities to address misconceptions were missed.

Saima's lesson was the strongest lesson observed with a calm atmosphere and clear cross curricular links highlighted. The pace of the lesson was pleasing and good AfL techniques were demonstrated throughout. Saima needs to make sure that she consistently uses the E4L system to ensure that the small amount of low level disruption is eliminated.

Engagement in lessons

The engagement in lessons was generally good despite the lack of challenge observed but the use of the E4L systems was patchy and needs to become more consistent across the department

Marking and feedback

Marking was very inconsistent within the department and in many lessons there was little or no evidence of light marking. Developmental marking was evident but was limited in nature and there was no marking for literacy seen (and none of the books had literacy stickers on the front of them). This may not be typical, however, as the comments from Student voice was generally positive about marking and feedback.

Student voice

Student feedback was varied with Product Design generally coming out more favourably than Product Design. The level of challenge in lessons was not thought to be high enough in Engineering BTEC (level 2) and students complained that they were not going to do any practical work in Year 10 PD until January.

Engagement feedback was generally good, however, some staff have a tendency to jump straight to S3 too often.

PD was praised for the level and quality of feedback in books but there had been no feedback give to Engineering students in Year 10 yet.

English Department Review Report

The English department was reviewed on Wednesday 14th November 2018 by John Taylor, Rob Harding and Annette Moses. The review included observations of all teachers apart from Elizabeth Blore, a review of marking and feedback and a student panel.

An overview of the department

The staffing in the English department is as follows:

Rebekah Lee – Head of Department

Michelle Edwards – English teacher

Megan Thomas – English teacher

*Elizabeth Blore – English / Drama teacher **not part of the review*

Nasrin Ali – English teacher (trainee)

Leila Douglas – English teacher (trainee)

Leadership and Management

Rebekah displays strong leadership through the dependable use and implementation of systems in her department and consistent excellent teaching. This is a real strength that permeates through the department. She has a clear pedagogical approach and vision, which is shared by all the teachers in her department. Whilst the team has trainees and teachers new to the school, the department is making better than expected progress. Knowledge of the subject is strong amongst the team with teachers carefully linking activities which ensures that the pace of learning is appropriate. The SEF and DIP are well connected and identify correctly areas for development. Actions from the DIP such as developing the team and ensuring consistency will provide a positive impact on student progress.

Quality of teaching and learning

Rebekah's lesson was well planned and had a good pace this ensured this created a purposeful learning atmosphere in the classroom during the tasks. The lesson was challenging and students were comfortable to take risks and contribute frequently. Rebekah used excellent QA techniques to check understanding and challenge the students. There was clear progress because there was differentiated success criteria. Engagement was generally good with excellent use of technical language. This was an excellent lesson.

Michelle taught a lesson to year 10s. Engagement for learning was excellent and students were confident in sharing ideas and views. There was a thought provoking starter which students gave detailed comprehensive answers. The lesson structure and learning objectives were shared in a way which made progression obvious and easy. Rephrasing of some questions

would have helped all students fully understand what was expected. This indicated a very secure learning environment characterised by good relationships. As a result, students were able to progress their thinking rapidly.

Megan taught a year 10 class. It was well planned and structured using a freewriting activity which included creative writing through images. Timing was a slight issue and also oracy opportunities were missed. Clear questioning was evident and students were given time to frame their responses. During the lesson the school's literacy marking policy was not always adhered to. Student answers were encouraged to develop their answers through Megan's excellent motivational style. The main activity contained different levels of challenge. There was a calm learning environment due to good relationships with students and the pace of learning.

Nasrin taught a year 9 mixed ability group. She confidentially described tasks and set expectations. Students enjoyed the task and made progress through the lesson. Some students would have made more progress if Nasrin used questioning to stretch and challenge the most able. Nasrin gave students one to one feedback as she skilfully moved around the room. This personal feedback could have been even better if seating was rearranged or she positioned herself to ensure she could still see the whole class.

Leilia taught a year mixed ability class. Students started promptly and calmly entered the room, ready to learn. Students were reminded of the routinely implemented engagement strategies. The video clip was used to solidify knowledge and challenge understanding. Further stretch and challenge would have helped further develop knowledge. Leilia has a lovely manner with the children.

Engagement in lessons

All teachers were using the engagement for learning expectations and engagement was good in all lessons. Lessons started promptly with high expectations of lining up in silence prior to entering the class. EFL related routines in English are a strength.

Marking and feedback

Feedback and marking is good and there is consistency within the department. Excellent use of stickers with good evidence of pride within their work through; books are tidy with relevant student responses. Marking could be further improved with more developmental and challenging comments.

Student Voice

Student voice was very positive. Most students found lessons challenging but not all. Students felt that their work was valued and that they received excellent feedback from teachers that

helped them to improve. The students were very proud of their learning in English and were keen to show what they had achieved.

Humanities Department Review Report

The Humanities department was reviewed on Tuesday 13th November 2018 by John Taylor, and Annette Moses.

An overview of the department

The staffing in the Humanities department is as follows:

Imogen Fletcher- Blackburn – Head of Department

Tom Plevoets – Humanities teacher

Faiqa Amreen – Humanities teacher

Afsana Begum – Humanities teacher (NQT)

Leadership and Management

Imogen leads one of the strongest departments in the school, in a calm and purposeful manner. The department have a real collegiate ethos and support each other well. Structures and procedures have been put in place that ensure the excellent organisation of the department. The SEF and DIP are well connected and clearly demonstrate the vision and process for development.

Quality of teaching and learning

Imogen's lesson was well planned with a pace and purpose. Imogen was able to expertly probe and tease out answers with questions that challenged students' thinking. The expectation was full participation by all students and this was achieved. Student focus and behaviour was excellent throughout. This was an excellent lesson.

Faiqa taught a year 11 lesson, students were focussed and working in silence constructing an outline for their essay. This was then used to write a full length essay response to an exam style question. Students were practising exam pace and showed lots of progress in the work produced and their verbal exchanges with the teacher. Faiqa has developed excellent relationships with the class and tailored her responses to their questions to meet their individual needs. There was lots of praise and motivational comments from Faiqa and an encouraging, positive learning environment was sustained throughout the lesson.

Tom taught a year 8 lesson to a challenging class. The class was engaged for the most part and enjoyed the discussion activity at the start. Tom followed the behaviour system, rewarding as

well as sanctioning and was able to maintain a good standard of behavior, minimising disruption to the flow of the lesson. The lesson was well planned with good use of a scaffolded worksheet for identified students. Progress was clear in students verbal answers to questions and also evident in their books. Tom has a good relationship with the group and developed a good culture of learning.

Afsana taught a year 9 class. The lesson was clearly planned and linked to the SoW, tasks were timed and contained appropriate challenge. EAL students were considered with a Spanish language worksheet. A good learning atmosphere was maintained throughout the lesson. More AFL opportunities could have been explored in the lesson, but good progress was evident in class books.

Engagement in lessons

All teachers were using the engagement for learning expectations and engagement was good in all lessons. Use of E4L is a strength in Humanities.

Marking and feedback

Teachers are regularly marking books, but there is some inconsistency with the use of the literacy codes. Formative assessments are being implemented and there is some evidence of students responding to the developmental feedback given. Development of student responding to feedback through DIRT time is an area for development as is the consistent use of Google Classroom to set homework.

Student Voice

Student voice was very positive. Students commented that the pace and challenge in lessons was 'just right'. E4L was being used in lessons and independent work was when focus was best. Some teachers in the department had started to use Google Classroom to set work and students in their classes enjoyed the platform and the dialogue they were able to have with their teachers. Students felt that their work was acknowledged and that they received feedback comments that were helpful.

Maths Department Review Report

The Maths department review took place on Thursday 15th November 2018 conducted by Meirion Lewis, Jason Philipsz and John Taylor. The schedule for the review is attached to this report. The review included observations of the teachers, a review of marking and feedback and a student panel.

An overview of the department

The staffing in Maths is as follows:

Nick Moore – Head of Department

Gabor Szabo

Francis Uwaechi

Fatmir Qirezi (not observed due to absence)

Dr Camilla Kerr – NQT

Enas Ahmed – NQT

Jason Philipsz – Vice Principal

Leadership and management

There are three new members of staff in the department this year, two are NQT's (Camilla and Enas) whilst Francis is an experienced, ex Head of Department. In addition, Fatmir has not yet obtained his QTS.

The inexperienced staff are well supported both by their interactions with Nick and the detailed Schemes of Work. Key stage 3 Schemes of Work are planned with Project Based learning in mind and this leads onto a transition year in Year 9 before the SoW become more targeted towards the GCSE exams in Year 10 and 11 (The GCSE course is completed in Year 10 and Year 11 is a Year of Revision). As a result of an earlier, whole school, PD session the Year 7 SoW are currently being revisited with the aim of reducing the amount of revisiting KS2 work and increasing challenge.

The quality of monitoring and intervention at KS5 has been greatly improved this year and Nick has been instrumental in this despite not teaching and A Level maths classes.

Quality of teaching and learning

The teaching and learning observed was generally strong but there are some areas to work upon.

Nick's lesson was well planned and demonstrated a high level of challenge with all students engaged in the activity. Questioning and AfL techniques were a particular strength and good progress was made, both in the lesson and over time. The only area for possible improvement

was the amount of work actually present in their books. Students may benefit from spending more time practicing the techniques repetitively.

Francis also taught a well-planned and challenging lesson that focused on identifying misconceptions via skillful AfL techniques and addressing them. He had a very engaging manner with the students and had developed an excellent relationship with them. It may have been beneficial to have a challenge question prepared to drop on students in the class who understood the topic of the lesson quickly.

The students in Gabor's lesson were focused and engaged in the lesson that was based around reviewing misconceptions and confusion identified in a previous assessment. The students found the lesson very beneficial and the majority made a great deal of progress. The use of student to go through a worked example on the board was very powerful and could be used even more.

Camilla's lesson was well planned and the atmosphere was focused and purposeful. Good progress was evident in the lessons and in books. However, the students do need to be given more time to complete tasks when they are engaged and there were times when misconceptions were not fully identified and corrected. These are things that will develop over time and with greater experience in the classroom

There was a calm start to Enas' lesson and there was a good pace to the lesson. The relationship with the students and most of them made good progress in the lesson. As with Camilla, some misconceptions were missed and, as a result, the opportunity to correct them also passed. Don't be worried about deviating from (or completely abandoning) the lesson plan to correct misunderstandings of key concepts.

Engagement in lessons

The engagement was good in all the lessons observed although some of the new teachers (Camilla and Enas) need to be a little more consistent with their use of the S and P system

Marking and feedback

Marking within the department has improved substantially since it was identified as a concern last year. Light marking was evident in all books apart from Gabor's, although his developmental marking was good as was the majority of the departments. Francis was the only teacher who had little evidence of developmental marking.

Most staff had literacy codes on the front of the books (apart from Nick) but there was very little evidence of them being used during marking.

The whole department is using Google classroom, to varying degrees. Increasing the consistency of its use is an area for development.

Student voice

The student voice was split with a number of students feeling that there was not enough challenge in the lessons (some stated that they were doing work in Year 9 lessons that they had covered at KS2). This was mainly highlighted in Fatmir's, Camila's and Enas' lessons.

The also felt that engagement was also an issue in a number of lessons (the same staff as mentioned above) to the point that their learning was being affected.

They felt that marking was generally fine with the exception of Fatmir but that the comments could be more constructive and consistent.

Science Department Review Report

The Science department review took place on Monday 16th November 2018 conducted by Meirion Lewis, Jason Philipsz and John Taylor. The schedule for the review is attached to this report. The review included observations of the teachers, a review of marking and feedback and an interview with a range of students.

An overview of the department

The staffing in Music is as follows:

Jon Searle – Head of Department

Annette Moses – Teacher of Science AVP*

Meirion Lewis – Teacher of Science AVP*

Philipp Herzberg – Teacher of Science

Manos Karydis – Teacher of Science

Catherine Jones – Teacher of Science NQT

Janelle Prime – Teacher of Science NQT

Jayleigh Mathyi – Teacher of Science

Daniel Garcia – Teacher of Science

*not observed

Leadership and management

Jon has a relatively new and inexperienced department with the bulk of teachers being NQT or RQT equivalents. Despite this it is clear that Jon knows his department very well and each individual's strength and weaknesses. Jon also has a good understanding of where his department is and where it needs to go as evidence by a SEF and DIP, which align well together.

Jon needs to ensure that he puts aside enough time to ensure the actions on the DIP especially when working with individuals to improve their practice. This is essential because Jon is an excellent mentor.

Quality of teaching and learning

All teachers apart from SLT members were observed

Jon's lesson enjoyed a calm smooth start evident from well-established routines. For example, a challenging starter made students think about recalling prior knowledge that would be needed for that lesson. Jon used AfL very well to minimize time spent on the activity by getting class group leaders to respond back to him so that everyone benefitted. He used their answers to identify and correct misconceptions as they emerged. Progress over time was very evident in

the student's books. The work was difficult but enjoyed by the students because of the support and interaction Jon had with the students.

Philipp's lesson started with a very good consolidation activity of the previous lessons learning which established high engagement very quickly. Philipp used skilled exposition to deliver content and supplemented this well with good Q&A technique to develop students answers more fully. He identified a key misconception and spent time ironing it out. Students then embedded this knowledge by a labelling task which then challenged them further as they had to use higher order thinking skills to describe, explain and analyse what was going on. Students were challenged and focused throughout making really good progress as a result.

Manos' lesson was planned well with a clear progression of the learning and well-chosen resources. The pace of activities was good but the pace of learning was less so because the explanations were not clear. This was mitigated by a video clip which explained the content well. There was AfL through questioning but this needs to be developed further, perhaps through diagnostic multiple choice questions. Students were challenged by the content and engaged well with the learning.

Catherine's lesson was well planned although with more experience Catherine would understand which bits of the initial ppt to dwell on more for greater student understanding of how electricity is generated. Catherine adapted the lesson well at the start to thrash out understanding of Renewable and Non-Renewable energy. This approach would have worked well to help student understanding of what a turbine and generator do later on in the lesson.

Janelle's lesson was built around a well thought out practical which had been set up carefully. It was challenging because year 7 students who were not used to practical were having to follow complex instructions and having to record accurate observations. This lesson might have benefitted by splitting the practical over two lessons as it covered a lot of content. Engagement was kept high by Janelle circulating the room and supporting students talking to them about their work.

Jayleigh's lesson was well planned, with appropriate pace and timing suited to all abilities. Misconceptions were teased out and addressed through adept Q&A and there was particularly good teaching of Maths. This was checked carefully by using mini whiteboards. There was clear evidence of progress through student response and their books. Students were challenged by the new learning and engaged throughout the lesson.

Daniels lesson was well planned using a good range of resources. He facilitated the activities in the lesson with real skill maintaining a good pace throughout. Daniel is developing his Scientific knowledge so that he can develop students understanding by responding to their responses with greater confidence. Daniel should be more definite when a student answers incorrectly so that they understand which bit of their thinking needs to be adjusted or developed.

Engagement in lessons

Engagement was high in all lessons observed and the use of EFL strategies was consistent across the department. The best engagement and focus of students occurred when teachers pitched lessons with high levels of challenge and were able to adapt the lesson to student response.

Marking and feedback

Light marking was evident in line with policy in all lessons. However, developmental marking was inconsistent with too much variation in frequency and quality. Where development marking was strong there was a feeling that it was very work intensive and could be more efficient. A department system or template needs to be evolved that ensures consistency, minimizes variation and is time efficient.

Student Voice

A range of year 10, 8 and 7 students were interviewed. Most students wanted a higher level of challenge in lessons 5's and 6's where it was decided that 7 or 8 out of 10 was about right) but cited Merion's lessons always as having the correct level of challenge. Student response about engagement highlighted a lot of difference not only between teachers but the same teacher with different year groups or classes within a year group. This arises because a lot of classes are shared in KS4. Answers ranged from using EFL well to escalating too quickly or without proper reason. The same inconsistency was apparent when students were asked about marking. The same teacher could be very thorough in one class but marked sparsely in another. This may be linked to not using a department template for developmental marking effectively. Again Merion's marking was consistently held in high regard and should be considered as a department exemplar.