

Meeting of the University Academy of Engineering Learning & Teaching Committee

2.30 - 5.00 pm on Monday, 5 March 2018
in University Academy of Engineering - Trafalgar Street, London SE17 2TP

Agenda

<i>No.</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
7.	Quality of Teaching	3 - 10	JT

Date of next meeting
3.30 pm on Wednesday, 18 April 2018

Members: Lesley Morrison (Chair), Rao Bhamidimarri, Karen Fowler, Steve French, Tony Roberts and John Taylor

In attendance: Alexander Enibe

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

Review of quality of teaching

Agenda item 7

Teaching and learning committee meeting

We are currently working through the intensive department review process. The outcome of these reviews is a summary report synthesised from the extensive evidence gathered during each day. The schedule for the reviews is as follows:

- Tuesday 20th February - **English – Annette and John**
- Wednesday 21 February - **Maths – Jason and John**
- Thursday 22nd February – **Science – Meirion and John**
- Friday 23rd February- **Spanish- Jason and Annette**
- Monday 26th February – **Design and Engineering – Rob and John**
- Tuesday 27th February –**Humanities- Jason and Rob and Annette**
- Wednesday 28th February- **Computer Science – Jason and Meirion**
- Thursday 29th February – **PE- Rob and Annette**
- Friday 30th February - **Business Studies- Jason and Rob**
- Monday 5th March - **Music, Art, Dance- John and Annette**
- Tuesday 6th March – **Drama- Annette and Jason**

The lead member on the review is coloured in red, they will also be responsible for writing the report.

At the time of writing we have completed the English and Maths reviews. The reports are below. In the committee meeting I will be able to circulate the reports for the Spanish, Design and Engineering, Humanities and possibly Computer science as well.

English Department Review Report

The English department was reviewed on Tuesday 20th February 2018 by Annette Moses and John Taylor. The schedule for the review is attached to this report. The review included observations of all teachers, a review of marking and feedback and a student panel.

An overview of the department

The staffing in the English team is as follows:

Rebekah Lee – Leader of Learning for English and Literacy

Michelle Edwards- English teacher

Celeste Bucknall- English teacher

Leila Douglas- Trainee English teacher

Nasrin Ali- Trainee English teacher

Leadership and management

The English department has strong leadership. Rebekah has a clear vision of what she wants for the department in terms of teaching and learning. She has begun to implement some of the action points on her DIP to develop written literacy and progress the year 10 students. She meets regularly with the team, conducts learning walks and monitors marking. Rebekah observes Leila and Nasrin weekly as part of the TiQ training programme.

Areas for development include make the DIP more clearly focused on identified teaching and learning weaknesses in the English department. Also clarify expectations for developmental and light marking and ensure they are implemented consistently.

Quality of teaching and learning

All teachers in the department were observed.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned with good structure and students made clear progress in their learning. There was lots of praise and encouragement, level of challenge was very good and support for students who struggled with the tasks set was evident. Engagement for learning was excellent.

■■■■'s lesson was also well planned but it was obvious that the lesson was not planned by her, this hindered the flow of teaching and her ability to adapt based on student response. There was very little progress made by students in the lesson and opportunities for AFL were not taken. Engagement expectations were met, but despite this students' were not clear about what they were expected to do or learn from the lesson. Focus was on process rather than student learning.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned and structured, but there were many missed opportunities to identify and then address the gaps in students' knowledge. Consequently, little progress was made, apart from students practicing their descriptive writing. When ■■■■ worked one to one with students this was effective.

■■■■■■'s lesson was well planned and structured with a good pace of learning. Engagement for learning expectations were met but not consistently applied. Progress was evident and students were clear about what they were learning to do. There was evidence of passive disengagement which could have been reduced with skillful adaptation of the lesson plan. The lesson was challenging with good use of high level language.

■■■■■■'s lesson was well planned and structured with a clear fun element to the learning which ensured active engagement from all students. Engagement for learning expectations were consistently applied. Questioning technique was skillful and effective. Clear progress was made by students. An opportunity for students to access their paragraphs against their peers would have improved the progress made by many.

Engagement in lessons

Generally, the majority of teachers used the engagement for learning expectations consistently. Two out of five teachers need to improve this.

Marking and feedback

Marking in the department meets the marking policy expectations. Consistency and frequency of light marking needs to be improved as does use of the marking for literacy codes. Teachers are clearly spending a lot of time marking and giving feedback. The HoD should now ensure common processes for developmental feedback are followed consistently.

Student voice

Students find their work challenging but doable, but not always for the higher ability students. Students feel the teachers are effective in helping them to learn and they give feedback that helps them to improve their work. Some teachers need to ensure that students are given more work when they finish the task set. Teachers are not setting homework regularly enough.

Maths Department Review Report

The Maths department was reviewed on Wednesday 21st February 2018 by Jason Philipsz and John Taylor. The schedule for the review is attached to this report. The review included observations of all teachers, a review of marking and feedback and a student panel.

An overview of the department

The staffing in the Maths team is as follows:

Nick Moore – Head of Department for Maths

Jason Philipsz – Vice Principal and Maths teacher

Gabor Szabo – Maths teacher

Brian Forde – Maths teacher

Nathan Cyrus – Maths teacher

Fatmir Qirezi – Maths teacher

Leadership and management

Nick has a clear leadership style and communicates his expectations to teachers regularly and with clarity. The systems and templates he expects to be followed and completed are done so consistently across the department. This is a strength. The SEF is detailed and comprehensive identifying areas to be improved. These are reflected in the DIP, but this is an incomplete document. It needs to be redrafted following consultation with Jason P. The DIP needs to include detail of programmes to support improvements in classroom practice. Nick could also identify areas where he can develop his own management style to support teachers becoming the best versions of themselves.

Feedback from the November marking review has not been acted upon. This will need to be resolved immediately.

From the review it is clear that teachers are delivering the project based learning but there are issues where the knowledge is not mastered before being applied. This needs to be looked at with clear guidance given to resolve this.

Quality of teaching and learning

All teachers in the department were observed.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned utilizing individual QLA for each student then analyzing questions from the test they had just done. Students made good progress in this lesson as Brian skillful and nuanced use of questioning and engagement meant that constant opportunities for AfL were taken and used to address misconceptions throughout. His relationships and compassionate manner helped to ensure the students remained 'thinking hard' for many minutes. Some more able students

would not have made as much progress as others due to the nature of the planned lesson. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented to the observers.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned utilizing individual QLA for each student then analyzing questions from the test they had just done using examples of student responses through a visualizer. This was a high ability set. The pace was good and the use of high level language and detail of exam technique was very good. Routines are well established and the behaviour for learning expectations were followed and students were focused on the task throughout. The planned lesson meant that the higher ability students made little or no progress. There could have been more questioning and development of students' verbal responses. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented to the observers.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned. The starter activity was good with most students engaging in group talk. Nathan managed the classroom well with a confident presence and clearly has good relationships with the students. For the main activity the introduction on scale supported the learning. There was no differentiation and no opportunities for AfL taken, so that some students did not have the ability to do the work and this was not identified in the lesson, except when Nathan visited individuals whilst they were working. The learning assistant (Ana) used her initiative well to identify struggling students and teaching them the Maths that was need to complete the task. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented to the observers.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned. He clearly identified how the assessment criteria related to the task giving specific examples and guidance to the whole class. His manner with the students is calmly assertive resulting in good levels of focus in a purposeful working atmosphere. The main task was challenging with opportunities for higher ability students to access higher level learning. Many students did make progress but not all. Gabor did not use any whole class Q and A or other AfL strategies to establish which students did not have the knowledge to complete the task effectively. Gabor did work well with individuals as he circulated the room, as did Emmanuel, who was assisting in the lesson. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented to the observers.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned. There was a lot of focus on the success criteria at the start of the lesson, but this did not relate to the Maths knowledge clearly enough. The pace could have been quicker. Fatmir modelled how to draw a line from its equation but some students were confused as to how to achieve the objective. Fatmir successfully circulated the room and working with individual students. There was a small amount of low level disruption, this was acted upon using the engagement for learning expectations and it then stopped. The use of technology to support the explanation of how to plot a line was very good. Most students made progress, but Fatmir did not use an AfL technique to establish what the students already knew, and didn't know. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented to the observers.

Engagement in lessons

All teachers were using the engagement for learning expectations and engagement was generally good in all lessons.

Marking and feedback

Marking in the department does not meet the marking policy expectations. Developmental feedback is generally good, used effectively at the end of each topic in KS3 or each module in KS4. Templates are consistently used in these instances. Students are using green pen to respond to the comments made. In key stage 3 and 4 there is little or no light marking of classwork or homework in between these events and no evidence was seen of teachers using the marking for literacy codes, or of teachers marking for presentation. In key stage 5 the marking is good with classwork, homework and assessments marked effectively and according to the school policy.

Student voice

Students have differing responses to the level of challenge, some say it is easy, some that it is too hard. They like it when teachers help them with their work but feel this depends on the teacher responding to their hand being raised. Students consistently say that they do not get homework.

Science Department Review Report

The Science department was reviewed on Thursday 22nd February 2018 by Meirion Lewis and John Taylor. The schedule for the review is attached to this report. The review included observations of all teachers, a review of marking and feedback and a student panel.

An overview of the department

The staffing in the Maths team is as follows:

Jon Searle – Head of Department for Science

Annette Moses – Assistant Vice Principal and Science teacher

Meirion Lewis – Assistant Vice Principal and Science teacher

Manos Karydis – Science teacher

Jayliegh Mathi – Science teacher

Danny Garcia – Science teacher

Philip Herzberg – Science teacher

Leadership and management

Jon is a strong Head of Department who has built effective and supportive relationships with all of his teachers. The SEF is detailed and comprehensive identifying areas to be improved. These were not always focused on in the DIP. He should now spend time with Meirion redrafting the DIP. Jon has real strength in his ability to develop the quality of teaching in others. The quality of teaching across the department was all good or better and there was an impressive level of focus from the students in every lesson that was observed. Jon now needs to build on this strong base and further develop the teaching practice of his colleagues. In particular, there is a great opportunity for many students in many classes to be challenged further in their deep understanding of complex ideas and models which will build a coherent picture of how the universe and everything in it works.

The areas of development from the last marking review have not been addressed fully. Jon needs to lead the department in developing consistent practice aligned with the school marking policy and then take steps to assure it is being followed by all teachers. Jon also needs to ensure that homework is set, and marked, consistently by all teachers in the department.

Quality of teaching and learning

All teachers in the department were observed.

■■■■■■'s lesson was planned with a good range of engaging activities for the students to do. The main task – each student becoming an expert and then teaching the others in their group – worked well and they made good progress through this. Jayliegh's manner and presence is very good and the students enjoy her teaching them. She should work on her AfL techniques to identify where there are misconceptions and address as the lesson flows. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented.

■■■■ is clearly an excellent teacher with a wealth of successful experience and a developed capacity to learn thorough self-reflection. His lesson was thoughtful and thought provoking, it engaged students and even gripped them through his performance style. He showed skill in identifying the level of prior learning and misconceptions and then took them through the process of addressing their cognitive dissonance such that the students all made very good progress. Jon's challenge is now to develop other teachers in his department to become better. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned and used media effectively. The level of challenge was high, with students teasing out key points in the narrative of the development of the Earth's atmosphere and constructing a paragraph. All the students made good progress with this difficult task. The plenary question was very interesting. Although there was very little low level disruption Philip needs to employ the engagement for learning policy consistently to ensure the level of focus continues in all his lessons. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned with an excellent demonstration of how the digestive system works, followed by a series of questioning and text based activities to consolidate the acquired knowledge. She has a great presence and charisma in the classroom and the students are all engaged and on task throughout, hence making good progress. The level of challenge was adapted based on the ability of the students. Annette should think about how she could expose students to really high level concepts and mechanisms occasionally in every lesson.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned and he used the engagement for learning expectations effectively to ensure that all the students were quiet and focused for most of the lesson. He used a lot of questioning to identify whether the learning was successful. He built on the student responses but did not always correct their misconceptions clearly. Manos needs to work with others to develop a delivery style which is naturally engaging and charismatic. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned and the pace was good. He built on students' responses throughout the lesson to develop their understanding both as a whole class and as he spoke to each one individually about their work as they completed practice questions coming up with the

systematic names for complex organic molecules. Good progress was made by all students as a result and they enjoy his personable and attentive teaching persona. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented.

■■■■'s lesson was well planned with a nice selection of engaging and challenging activities for the students. There was good, repeated use of high level technical language and the pace was good throughout. He managed their engagement for learning really well, they were focused for the whole of the lesson and every student made good progress. There was lots of use of questioning to establish what they had learnt and what they knew prior to the lesson. His relationship with students are very good, they like having him as their teacher. Danny needs to continue to work on his subject knowledge and he should work with other teachers to develop his questioning technique so that he is able to identify and address misconceptions as they arise in the flow of the lesson. No lesson plan or tracking sheet was presented.

Engagement in lessons

Most teachers were using the engagement for learning expectations effectively and this supported the level of focus in lesson which was universally good and sometimes very good.

Marking and feedback

Marking in the department does not meet the marking policy expectations, with the notable exceptions of the 2 AVP's. Many books from different teachers did not have the expected level of light marking throughout. There was little or no evidence of marking for literacy using the codes. There was very little marking for presentation (■■■■ being a notable exception). The use of developmental feedback is under developed, as was student feedback to comments. The department should spend time immediately producing agreed processes and templates which are used consistently by every teacher. This needs to happen immediately.

Student voice

Students generally thought that the level of challenge was 'challenging, but do-able'. This is a strength. Most stated that there was very little homework set and marked in Science. They were positive about the way teachers responded when they needed help in lessons, and also positive about the pedagogic techniques that were employed generally, they thought these helped them to make progress.