





The John Fisher School

Teaching, Learning & Standards Committee Part A Minutes - 20th November 2024

Governors	Category	Attendance
Ms G Grabowski (GG) Chair	Foundation Governor	Present
Ms S Nasser (SN) Vice Chair	LA Governor	Present
Ms J Cole (JC)	Parent Governor	Absent
Mr D Fox (DF)	Foundation Governor	Present
Father Francis Murphy (FFM)	Foundation Governor	Absent
Mr T Richmond (TR)	Co-opted Governor	Absent
Mrs M Ryan (MR)	Foundation Governor	Absent
Mr R Teague (RT)	Headteacher, Ex-Officio	Present
Mr A Theobald (AT)	Foundation Governor	Present
Mr A Tierney (ATi)	Foundation Governor	Present
Mrs N Walsh (NW)	Parent Governor	Present
Ms Anita McGowan (AMc)	Foundation Governor	Present

Attendees

Mr I Jones (IJ) - Assistant Headteacher
Mr N Owen (NO) - Assistant Headteacher

Mrs J Beeson (JB) - Croydon Education Partnership Clerk

MINUTES

1. Apologies for absence & declarations of interest

RT opened the meeting with a prayer.

Apologies for absence were received from TR due to family commitments - these were accepted. No apologies were received from JC or FFM. MR had not been added to the distribution list so was unaware of the meeting.

The meeting was quorate. There were no declarations of interests.

2. Minutes from the meeting on 9th July 2024 (revised) and 9th October 2024

The documents were taken as read. GG clarified that the minutes for 9.7.24 had been revised in light of corrections required. The minutes of 9.10.24 were scrutinised page by page.

Both sets of minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record of the meetings and approved by all governors.

The actions arising were:-

Meeting of 9.10.24 – action 2 – completed.

Meeting of 9.7.24 – action 1 – careers report (NW) – **carried forward.**

Meeting of 14.5.24 – action 6 – completed.

Meeting of 20.2.24 – action 2 – enrichment programme analysis (RT) – **carried forward**.

3. Year 11 PPE data and feedback (presented by NO – report distributed)

3.1 NO commented the reports distributed were based on the latest data for both Y11 and Y13, he felt the







Y11 data was the more secure analysis due to being based on PPE exam paper results. He referenced the Progress 8 (P8) data which is not a headline measure due to the lack of KS2 results for the cohort. However, they have the CATS data from which a formula has been used to convert it into a replacement KS2 score. Whilst this is not 100% accurate and would not justify the jump in the number, it is helpful to demonstrate the difference between the scores of the specific groups.

3.2 They are using this data to monitor attainment and to check consistency across departments. There is an anticipation of an uplift in data as it gets refined over the course of the year.

NO highlighted that the number of grade 4s had gone up but the number of grade 7s had gone down, but they remain optimistic because it is still very early in the school year and the students still need to get more into gear over the year. They are aware that they need to have English and maths at grade 4+ to be able to get into the 6th form; this will mean the school will lose some because they could not come back for this reason.

3.3 On the individual subjects there is a narrative attached for the subjects highlighted on the data table e.g. ancient history results are linked to the fact it is a very able cohort with an average KS2 score of 109 taking this subject. The other subjects highlighted are sciences, DT, Food Tech and Music. For science they start with 3 classes doing separate science which will drop to 2 classes after Christmas and the third moving to double science, which will boost the categories.

A governor asked if this move from separate to double science was done in previous years?

NO responded that they have always done this. They try to keep them going in separate science but after the Y10 PPEs the 'at-risk' students receive a letter advising them of this and then after these Y11 PPEs they receive a further letter. The sciences are initially taught in mixed ability but afterwards move to ability levels.

NO commented that with DT the data is very accurate because of the proportion of coursework involved. In this subject some Y11 students are struggling with the move to a 2 year KS4 which represents 5 periods per fortnight rather than the current Y10 where they are given 6 periods. Food Tech and Music both have subject leader teachers returning from maternity, therefore there is the hope this will solidify the results based on the fact that the results 2 years prior are in line with what they then achieved.

- 3.4 In terms of the various groups, NO highlighted that the higher prior attaining students' progress, who had been one of the school's focus groups are equal to the lower attainers' progress. In terms of the Pupil Premium (PP) students, the subject leaders will need to look at individual students and interrogate the data forensically. They will have to ascertain which boys are receptive to initiatives and can have their grades moved. In some cases this might be as small a factor as providing revision guides for them. Other tweaks in teaching might be to mark those books first and to identify those students requiring specific intervention.
- 3.5 NO referenced the ethnicity breakdown with the Chinese boys as the highest attaining cohort for P8, Black Caribbean the lowest.

Overall, he said there were no specific groups or gaps which the school was concerned about.

- **4. Year 13 professional predictions** (presented by NO)
- **4.1** NO outlined that the first PPEs for Y13 will be in December, therefore the data presented is based on classwork and therefore he has less confidence of its accuracy.







- 4.2 He pointed to the fact that target grades for ALPs are sometimes split. There are only 5 overall grades therefore the predictions have a split grade e.g. A/B For the majority it is B/C, however the outcome is more nuanced because one boy might get a B and another a C, but both would be classed as having achieved their target grade. Generally most are on track at the lower end, but for the A*-C cohort there is work still to be done.
- 4.3 He cautioned about the subjects with 100% A*-C predictions which he felt were very bold but explained that with UCAS coming up the teachers do not want to predict low levels. Once the PPE grades were in place that would be more stable.

He said the predictions meant there were things the SLT would have to look at and report back in due course.

4.4 A governor referred back to the GCSE report specifically relating to RE and asked if there was any worry these were over-optimistic?

NO replied he had run a session on predictions and the RE grades last year were higher than previously, therefore he would not necessarily question them at this point. He added that 3 year trends give more subtlety of indications. RE would normally be aligned with subjects like English Literature and Language due to the similar nature of those subjects, so he would imagine that the grades 5-7 would increase.

4.5 A governor asked if the teachers will be asked to make comparisons with other core subjects?

NO replied there are different staff now.

RT added there is no self-evaluation available from FFT yet, but the initial analysis is that RE is much improved. 83% at grade 4 was above average and 7+ was in line, but they are working hard to get those top grades.

GG thanked NO for the report and analysis presented.

(NO left the meeting)

6. Teaching and Learning Overview (presented by IJ, hard copy report distributed of previously emailed version)

(it was agreed to move this agenda item forward on the agenda to allow IJ to leave afterwards)

- 6.1 IJ outlined that there had been a purposefully narrow focus on specific groups of students including those entitled to free school meals (FSM), Pupil Premium (PP), the more able and SEND. The work was designed based on education research, his NPQH study and masters course. It is a review with a narrow focus on specific subject areas. He and Jonny Evans (JE) have been going to departments and taking one or two students per lesson to look at the perception of the lesson for those students to establish any gap and what is going on to prevent their progress being in line with other students.
- 6.2 Currently it has been done for English and Geography. They have compiled a RAG-rated document based on what they have seen and provided it as feedback to those subject leaders together with recommendations based on John Hattie's research relating to the Size Effect i.e. doing what will have the most impact and what to do. Meta analysis of teaching has identified that teacher efficacy is the factor which has the most impact.
- 6.3 They have also been to History and Maths and seen a similar pattern where really good subject knowledge results in top-end questions for top-end students, together with other teaching strategies.







- 6.4 Likewise in Geography there were some really strong examples of high ability students being stretched. Other quicks wins were achieved by such things as rearranging the seating plans in class with high-end students not all being grouped together. Also through questioning and how the teacher directs the challenge by thinking whether the students is of low or high ability. Likewise, the good use of resources. However, there was some lack of consistency, so they were encouraging teachers how to make things tighter so that all students are getting the same experience.
- 6.5 This is all helping IJ and JE to make tweaks to the curriculum plans and establishing what needs to be done. They are also creating a personalised learning community which allows teachers to opt into whichever CPD they require. They are peer-led sessions by those teachers on NPQSL courses leading the sessions.
- 6.6 IJ and JE will go to all the departments over the year and they are reacting to what they have already found. The current focus is Y11.
- 6.7 IJ also referenced the work done with the EduSolutions consultants recently in school with regard to Book Looks. The aim is to go beyond checking simply for compliance but look at the depth of learning demonstrated. This coming Friday (22.11.24) they will be replicating Sharon Waterman's practice with subject leaders. There will be a combined presentation to staff on 'What does excellence look like?' and 'What is the purpose of the book in this subject?' The aim is to close gaps.

He said that JE is also looking at teaching for the whole school. Through learning walks around the school they have so far produced a 20000 page document.

6.8 A governor asked if it might also be helpful to ask the boys too. As a parent she is aware that they tend to use revision guides rather than their books. She felt it would help them too if they understand the purpose of the book being used.

IJ agreed that this might need clarifying and was also about how they address the boys' individual standards e.g. handwriting deterioration across the year.

6.9 A governor asked why they had decide to have the narrow focus of students?

IJ responded they had carried out departmental reviews in this format 2 years ago and produced a lengthy document at that time involving the subject leaders with the work done then by Jacqueline Jenkins. These were effectively John Fisher deep dives per subject. It was FFT data which highlighted these students not making the progress made by their peers. Therefore they had wanted to narrow down and develop on the work done then.

6.10 A governor asked what was their dream to achieve by the end of the year to see how it was transformed?

IJ replied that it would be highlighted on results day that there was a narrowing of the gap for those students. The staff will then over the summer review the curriculum plans because there is a separate piece of work in the interdisciplinary work. The GCSE content with crossover and links e.g. between Economics and Geography in order that students can make connections across departments, but this will involve curriculum plans being changed.

6.11 A governor asked if there was a difference in pupil expectations and whether there was feedback to teachers for example where a boy was doing well in RE but not in English?

IJ said that the structure which Sharon Waterman had presented helped formulate a method to address that sort of issue. It looked at what measures are in place to identify and train teachers to address this







by looking at books across subjects to establish the interdisciplinary and substantive sections in the knowledge part of their curriculum planning.

GG thanked IJ for his report and presentation for governors.

(IJ left the meeting).

5. Review by EduSolutions and Feedback (*report distributed*)

- 8.1 RT detailed this was the first external review since Ofsted, it had taken place over 2 separate days 7th and 18th October which worked well because they had been able to digest the initial feedback and plan for the second day. Most staff had been involved.
- Day 1 involved visits to lessons, with the majority of the teachers being visited. The consultants also had conversations with groups of pupils. Giles Osborne had requested 3 boys in the school to take him on a tour around the school. They had taken the context from the SEF and Ofsted report. The quality of education in the educational self-evaluation the school had graded itself between good and RI as they wanted to be cautious.

A governor commented that the number of students listed in the 6th form and generally roll was incorrect on the report.

RT replied this number was taken from the Ofsted report and SEF.

- 8.3 RT commented that in terms of quality of education, the curriculum came out well. IJ had met with Sharon to talk it through and found that helpful. She had taken the Fisher Five which reflects the teaching and learning basis promoted in the school. This needed to be simplified and be made more pithy. Giles had commented that you wouldn't have been able to write the Fisher Five backwards after lesson observations because of lack of consistency.
- They had commented that in reading a lot was being done. The second day of the review was with the 3 reviewers, 3 subject leaders and 3 AHTs talking to students about their books. Sharon has developed a way of looking at books which is very helpful. All the staff were struck by how good it was. There were examples of some really good things they saw; there was some good practice and some less impressive in terms of where there was lack of appropriate challenge for all students. They want to focus on the students feeling they have had an intellectual workout. They referenced retrieval practice and noted there should always be some in every lesson, interleaving with different ways of coming back to a subject and testing to facilitate getting knowledge into the long term memory. However, their comment was that sometimes this is happening for too long in some lessons, so the pace needs to be sharpened up. This also runs through their approach to behaviour management.
- 5.5 With regard to behaviour the consultants were fairly positive but said it was a mixed picture. RT had a pre-meet with 2 of the reviewers to discuss things they were concerned about. They picked up on behaviour in PHSE lessons which were poor in KS4 and in cover lessons. One of the other issues was transitions between lessons where there was dawdling and lack of purpose which then has an effect on the lesson itself and undermines the serious purpose of the school. There has been some improvement on this by senior leaders going to particular pinch-point places around the school after break to concentrate on getting things moving along, but it is not yet where they want it to be.
- **5.6** The overall summary was 2 words namely the need to improve sharpness and consistency across the school, to ensure everyone is following the same routines.







- 5.7 The Chair of governors commented that in the reviewers' feedback to him, they had commented that compared with many other schools they go into (also as Ofsted inspectors) JF is not bad but the consistency of application of the Behaviour Policy by all staff including the SLT was not there.
- **5.8** A governor asked how often did the school intend to have the reviewers back to see where progress had been made?

RT said there were no plans at this point, it had a broad focus and they were keen to explain to staff that this was not a mock inspection but a fresh pair of eyes on the school.

5.9 A governor asked how it had been received by staff?

RT said it had been generally positive, there were no complaints other than some emails from the union representatives about the idea of having a review but after the review things were positive.

A governor commented it was good to see things being implemented.

A Vice-Chair of governors outlined that the second day had also been training for the SLT and when she and the Chair had met with the SLT afterwards it was a very positive meeting. They had asked them about the review, and SLT had got something out of it and now it was being cascaded down. It had been effective because it was felt the review had been done with them, rather than to them. She had felt the AHTs were on board about the teaching and learning and what the governors were doing.

A governor also commented the headteacher had inculcated a better ethos and attitude in the school.

The Chair of governors commented that the reviewers had made crystal clear that the school has the right headteacher and they had said this to the staff as well.

5.10 In part B minutes.

TLS committee meeting dates this academic year

- Wednesday 5th February 2025 @ 5.30pm
- Wednesday 26th March 2025 @ 5.30pm
- Wednesday 14th May 2025 @ 5.30pm
- Tuesday 1st July 2025 @ 5.30pm

The meeting closed at 7.15pm

Outstanding Actions list 2023-4

	Action					For	Date	Comments	Status		
Meeting of 20.2.24											
2	Impact	assessment	of	the	enrichment	RT	July 24		Open / cf		
	programme										
Meeting of 9.7.24											
1.	Careers	report				NW	9.10.24		Open / cf		