

Birmingham City University

Birmingham City University Seacole BLD, Westbourne Rd, Edgbaston, Birmingham, West Midlands B15 3TN

Inspection dates

16 to 19 May 2022

Inspection judgements

	Primary age-phase	Secondary age-phase	Further education age-phase
Overall effectiveness	Requires improvement	Requires improvement	Inadequate
The quality of education and training	Requires improvement	Requires improvement	Inadequate
Leadership and management	Requires improvement	Requires improvement	Inadequate
Overall effectiveness at previous inspection	Good	Good	Good

What is it like to be a trainee at this ITE provider?

Leaders have a strong vision to enact a high-quality ITE curriculum in the primary and secondary age-phases for trainees on all programmes. However, leaders are on a journey of improvement and this vision is still in the process of being realised. In further education and skills (FES), leaders do not have a credible ITE curriculum in place for trainees.

Trainees across the primary and secondary age-phases do not benefit from a curriculum that is understood equally well by all the partners who take a role in training them. This is because, while the main themes in the centre-based training have been established, not all the detail that underpins those themes has been finalised. This hinders some trainees' chances to practise and deepen their understanding of how to deliver the national curriculum. In the primary phase, some trainees do not have enough opportunity to practise what they have learned for some foundation subjects. Leaders have plans in place to rectify this to improve trainees' experiences.

In the primary and secondary age-phases, trainees do not benefit from consistently strong mentoring. Some mentors are unclear about what trainees are expected to know, remember and apply from the ITE curriculum. Therefore, some trainees do not have mentors that can fully reinforce the core learning from the centre-based programme.

In FES, the curriculum lacks ambition and fails to develop the subject-specific knowledge that trainees require for the breadth of the FES sector. Trainees have mentors in this phase who typically have no understanding of what is being taught in the centre-based training because of a lack of communication from leaders in the partnership.

In the primary and secondary age-phases, the ongoing feedback that trainees receive is uneven in quality. This is because leaders have not ensured that all mentors understand the systems to assess trainees. As a result, some mentors and trainees set targets that are too broad and unhelpful. In the FES phase, trainees experience no purposeful subject-specific curriculum on which an assessment system can be used effectively.

Trainees are exposed to research across the primary and secondary ITE programmes. In FES, trainees do not access pertinent subject-specific research.

In the primary age-phase trainees receive a secure grounding in systematic synthetic phonics. Experts in the wider partnership support trainees to learn to teach early reading.

Trainees across the primary and secondary age-phases develop a broad understanding of how to support pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities (SEND) and those who speak English as an additional language. In FES, trainees do not learn enough about how to adapt the delivery of their specialist subject for learners with SEND and high needs.

Leaders across the partnership ensure that most trainees receive strong pastoral support and are cognisant of how to manage their workload and well-being.

Despite the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, leaders in the primary and secondary age-phases have worked very effectively to ensure that nearly all trainees complete their courses on time. In FES, however, leaders at Birmingham City University have failed to ensure that the centre-based curriculum enables trainees to gain the appropriate knowledge and skills that they require to practise in their placement settings.

Trainees receive a secure understanding of how to manage the behaviour of pupils and learners in their classrooms. Primary and secondary trainees gain a very comprehensive understanding of a teacher's critical role in spotting potential safeguarding concerns and protecting pupils' welfare and well-being. However, in FES the centre-based safeguarding training is underdeveloped.

Partners and employers value the trainees, many of whom progress into employment with them. Candidates who are accepted onto the assessment-only route in primary and secondary age-phases benefit from a very strong offer.

Information about this ITE provider

- In the 2021/22 academic year, the partnership had 1,401 trainees over three phases: primary, secondary and FES.
- In 2021/22, the partnership trained a total of 866 trainees in the primary age-phase. This figure included 610 undergraduate trainees on the Bachelor of Arts with Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) route, in primary and early years education, covering either the three to seven or five to 11 age ranges. There were 189 full-time and 17 part-time trainees studying towards a Post-graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) on either the core or School Direct routes. PGCE trainees trained on either the three to seven or five to 11 age ranges. There were also 50 trainees on specialist full-time PGCE primary age-phase routes in either mathematics, physical education or SEND.
- In the secondary age-phase, there were 343 trainees in 2021/22. This included 78 undergraduate trainees on the following programmes: a Bachelor of Arts with QTS in physical education, a Bachelor of Science with QTS in computing and a Bachelor of Science with QTS in secondary science (biology). There were also 265 trainees following the core PGCE programmes and the PGCE School Direct routes. The PGCE subjects offered in 2021/22 were: art and design, biology, business studies, chemistry, computing, design and technology, drama, English, geography, health and social care, history, mathematics, modern foreign languages, music, psychology, physical education, physics and religious education.
- In 2021/22, there were 152 trainees in the FES age-phase studying towards either a Post-graduate Certificate in Education and Training (PCET) or a Diploma in Education and Training (DET). The 152 trainees included 57 pre-service full-time trainees, 39 pre-service part-time trainees and 56 in-service part-time trainees. At Birmingham City University, FES trainees studied in one of the following specialisms: arts, media and performance; English, literacy and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL); humanities and social sciences; mathematics and numeracy and science and technology. At Birmingham City University's partner colleges in 2021/22, FES trainees were on a generic subject programme.
- In 2021/22, there were 13 primary age-phase and 38 secondary age-phase assessment-only candidates.
- The provider works with a wide range of schools, colleges and other settings. The majority of these partners are inspected by Ofsted. In 2021/22, those settings that had been graded by Ofsted spanned the full range of judgements, including outstanding, good, requires improvement and inadequate.
- Overall, the partnership works with 17 School Direct partners across the primary and secondary age-phases. These partners span nine local authorities.
- In the primary phase, the partnership works with 184 schools, covering 19 local authorities.
- In the secondary phase, the partnership works with 131 schools, spanning 16 local authorities.
- In the FES phase, the partnership works with 16 colleges and other settings, covering six local authorities.

Information about this inspection

- This inspection was carried out by 12 of Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) and four Ofsted Inspectors (OIs).
- During the inspection, inspectors met with senior leaders, heads of department, course coordinators, course tutors, link tutors, quality assurance leaders, university admissions staff, assessment-only route leaders and members of the strategic partnership committees across all phases. Inspectors also met with School Direct and FES partner colleges and settings. Inspectors spoke with professional mentors, subject mentors, headteachers and senior leaders in partner schools and FES provider-based programme leaders and mentors.
- Inspectors reviewed a wide range of information, including: documentation relating to the ITE curriculums across all phases; documentation in relation to safeguarding arrangements; audits of the provider's compliance with Department for Education's (DfE) ITT criteria and supporting information; training materials from across all phases; assessment materials; and course handbooks.
- In the primary phase, inspectors spoke with 66 trainees, 10 early career teachers (ECTs) and 27 mentors. Inspectors made 20 on-site or virtual visits to schools.
- In the secondary phase, inspectors spoke with 40 trainees, seven ECTs and 39 mentors. They made eight on-site or virtual visits to schools.
- In the FES phase, inspectors spoke with 66 trainees and five ECTs. They also spoke with 19 mentors. Inspectors made nine on-site or virtual visits to settings.
- In the primary phase, inspectors completed focused reviews in: art and design, computing, design and technology, early reading, English, geography, history, mathematics, modern foreign languages, physical education and science.
- In the secondary phase, inspectors carried out focused reviews in: art and design, biology, chemistry, design and technology, English, mathematics, music and physical education.
- In the FES phase, inspectors carried out focused reviews in: arts, media and performance; social sciences; SEND; English with ESOL; and business, accountancy and law.
- Inspectors considered the responses to the Ofsted surveys for staff and trainees that were completed during the inspection.

Primary phase report

What works well in the primary phase and what needs to be done better?

Leaders have a strong vision for their primary ITE curriculum. They have established a centre-based undergraduate and post-graduate ITE curriculum that develops trainees' broad understanding of how to teach in the primary age-phase. Leaders have carefully considered the Department for Education's Core Content Framework (CCF) to ensure that all key aspects are included in their ITE curriculum. The overarching primary ITE curriculum is organised in a logical order. It is mostly taught by subject experts who have an up-to-date knowledge of their phase and subject specialisms.

Leaders are ambitious for trainees and have a secure understanding of what they want trainees to learn. However, leaders do not identify with sufficient clarity all of the essential subject knowledge that trainees should be taught within each area of the primary national curriculum. Consequently, some trainees do not learn all the subject knowledge that they should to enable them to design a series of lessons for pupils in each national curriculum subject area. In particular, some trainees have limited experience of planning, delivering and evaluating a sequence of lessons in the foundation subjects, such as music and art and design.

Leaders have ensured that tutors, mentors and trainees know and understand how the primary-phase ITE curriculum is shaped around broad educational themes. However, leaders have not fully aligned centre-based learning with trainees' school-based experiences. As a result, some mentors do not understand exactly what is being taught at the centre. This means that mentors do not reinforce trainees' centre-based learning while they are out on placement. Often, mentors do what they think is right instead of planning their mentoring to reinforce the essential subject knowledge that trainees must know and practise on their placement experiences.

The partnership successfully trains mentors for the generic aspects of their roles. Most partnership tutors keep in regular contact with mentors and trainees. That said, the partnership does not train mentors to ensure that trainees pay sufficient attention to how to plan, deliver and assess the primary national curriculum subjects as effectively as they should. For example, trainees often discuss how to manage pupils' behaviour. However, they do not discuss in enough depth how to plan activities in the different national curriculum subjects to support pupils' learning. The resulting quality of targets set for some trainees' ongoing development are too variable in quality and subject specificity. For instance, some targets do not ensure that trainees' subject knowledge is sufficiently well developed, alongside their other wider professional knowledge of how to teach.

Undergraduate and post-graduate trainees develop a secure knowledge of systematic synthetic phonics to help them to learn how to teach pupils to read. They understand that the foundations for early reading begin in the early years. Trainees appreciate the need for all pupils to experience success as readers in order for pupils to access the wider curriculum.

Leaders' systems to assess how well trainees are progressing through the ITE curriculum are in development. Leaders have introduced a generic assessment tracker which assesses the pedagogical skills that trainees are developing. However, not all partners understand how to use this tracker to assess trainees' learning and development against the ITE curriculum. For example, trainees do not get enough ongoing feedback about how effectively they deliver the primary national curriculum at an individual subject level.

Leaders help trainees to understand the range of schools that they may work in as ECTs. For example, trainees are supported to understand how social disadvantage can affect pupils' learning and the pivotal role that teachers must play in helping to address child poverty. Trainees are well informed about how to support pupils with SEND as well as those who speak English as additional language.

The partnership gives primary trainees a first-rate understanding of safeguarding. Partnership leaders have considered very carefully the many national and local safeguarding issues that they wish trainees to understand. Leaders have reflected carefully on how trainees will be taught this information. Equally, trainees develop a confident grasp of managing pupils' behaviour and how to apply this knowledge to their roles in schools in different contexts.

The quality assurance systems that leaders use to assess the effectiveness of the primary ITE curriculum are underdeveloped. This means that leaders' own evaluation of their ITE curriculum lacks focus and some priorities for improvement lack clarity. For example, leaders do not pay sufficient attention to assessing how well the ITE curriculum aids trainees' learning and development at individual national curriculum subject level. The strategic partnership committee overseeing the development of the ITE curriculum primary phase is also at an early stage of development. Strategic partnership committee members bring valuable skills and knowledge to their roles. Nevertheless, the board does not focus well enough on the quality of the ITE curriculum and the quality of trainees' learning experiences.

What does the ITE provider need to do to improve the primary phase?

(Information for the provider and appropriate authority)

- Leaders do not identify clearly the essential knowledge that trainees should learn in the ITE curriculum about all of the foundation subjects. As a result of the lack of detail in the primary ITE curriculum, some trainees do not learn in sufficient depth how to plan, deliver and evaluate a series of lessons in some of the foundation subjects. Leaders should make certain that the core knowledge that trainees will be taught is clearly identified in the ITE curriculum. This is so that all trainees receive a rich grounding in all elements of the primary national curriculum.
- The partnership does not use the ITE curriculum effectively enough as the vehicle for assessing trainees' learning and progress throughout their training. Although leaders have introduced a new assessment tracker, it is not used by all partners, including mentors, in the way leaders intend. As a result, leaders cannot be certain that trainees are learning all that they should. Leaders should ensure that their systems to assess

trainees' ongoing learning and development focus on the content and knowledge contained within each area of the planned ITE curriculum. Leaders should also ensure that all partners, including mentors, know how to use the assessment system to assess trainees' ongoing development.

- The centre-based and school-based elements of the ITE curriculum are not integrated as effectively as they should be. This means that mentors are not sufficiently informed or trained about the subject-specific aspects of the centre-based ITE curriculum. This leads to some superficial discussions between mentors and trainees about how well trainees are developing their knowledge and skills of how to teach the primary national curriculum. It also results in target setting that sometimes lacks focus and clarity. Leaders should share with schools the full primary ITE curriculum, including the essential subject knowledge that trainees must be taught. This is so mentors can build effectively on these aspects of trainees' centre-based learning through well-focused mentor meetings and high-quality target setting.
- Leaders' systems to quality assure the ITE curriculum are underdeveloped. This means that leaders, including the strategic partnership committee, lack clarity on how well different aspects of the ITE curriculum are being learned by trainees. Leaders also do not have a sufficient oversight of the quality of mentoring. Leaders should establish a deeper understanding of the impact of the primary ITE curriculum, including mentoring arrangements, on trainees' learning and development.

Does the ITE provider's primary phase comply with the ITE compliance criteria?

- The provider meets the DfE statutory compliance criteria.

Secondary phase report

What works well in the secondary phase and what needs to be done better?

Leaders and staff across the partnership work positively together. They have a shared vision of what they want trainees to learn on the secondary ITE programmes. However, leaders are on a journey to improve their ITE curriculum in the secondary phase. While they have made some headway in redesigning the centre-based training programme, the centre- and school-based training elements are not aligned as effectively as they should be. As a result, not all partners fully understand how the different parts of the ITE curriculum work together to enable trainees to learn about the distinctiveness of the subjects that they are training to teach.

Leaders have worked effectively and collaboratively to establish the overarching aims for their secondary ITE curriculum. These aims are suitably ambitious for both undergraduate and post-graduate trainees. Leaders also ensure that trainees receive their full entitlement to the core content framework through the centre-based curriculum. Course tutors know the topics that they want trainees to learn. Relevant phase and subject-specific content is introduced to trainees during centre-based training sessions. Trainees' initial learning is well informed by relevant literature and research. Consequently, trainees acquire secure knowledge in some important areas such as generic pedagogy, inclusion and safeguarding.

While there are strengths in the overarching aims of the secondary ITE programmes, and course tutors know what topics they should teach, leaders' curriculum thinking lacks specificity about the essential knowledge that trainees should learn about their chosen subjects. This includes important knowledge such as how to adapt the delivery of the curriculum for pupils with SEND, or pupils who speak English as an additional language, in the trainees' specialist subject.

Course tutors broadly know what trainees need to learn. However, trainers and mentors in the wider partnership do not know exactly what they are expected to deliver. This is because the essential knowledge that trainees must learn in each subject has not been outlined or communicated to all partners. Consequently, trainees following different ITE training routes in the same subject do not always cover the same depth of content in their professional or subject-specific studies. Furthermore, some trainees' school-based experiences do not build on the content that they have been introduced to elsewhere in the ITE curriculum.

The partnership engages well with schools that have varied contexts. Most trainees benefit from diverse placements. On those placements, some mentors use their curriculum expertise to support trainees to great effect. However, this is not typically the case. For example, some mentors do not fully understand their role in reinforcing the centre-based learning with the trainees. Furthermore, mentors are not guided sufficiently well to undertake important aspects of their role, such as how to provide feedback and how to set appropriate targets which focus on the uniqueness of teaching a secondary age-phase subject. Often, trainees do not benefit from an appropriate balance of general and subject-specific advice and guidance.

The lack of curriculum specificity impedes some mentors' ongoing assessment of trainees. Added to this, leaders have introduced an assessment tracker that is not well understood by some mentors. The assessment tracker enables mentors and trainees to establish how well they are developing generic pedagogical skills. However, in some instances, this impedes mentors and trainees from reflecting meaningfully about how to adapt the generic principles of teaching to the subject that the trainee is learning to teach.

Leaders do not have a sufficiently well-informed understanding of the quality of education and training across the partnership. While the centre-based training is beginning to be scrutinised much more effectively, other components of the ITE curriculum are not quality assured as rigorously as they should be. For example, leaders do not establish how well the taught content of the centre-based ITE curriculum impacts on trainees' learning and development across the range of subjects on offer. In addition, the quality assurance of trainees' school-based experiences is equally less well developed. Leaders do not check carefully enough what content trainees cover in their school-based experiences. Consequently, leaders do not have the information that they need to support and challenge mentors effectively. Nor do leaders have sufficient information to inform their own evaluation of what is working well and what needs to improve in the ITE curriculum.

Weaknesses in quality assurance hinder the effectiveness of the secondary-phase strategic partnership committee. This group does not have a sufficiently comprehensive and accurate picture of how well the ITE curriculum is delivered or the impact that it has on trainees' progress towards QTS.

Tutors and mentors across the partnership support trainees' needs well. The majority of trainees speak highly of the professional and pastoral support that they receive. They are equally positive about how the partnership prepares them to manage their workload and well-being. They are also well prepared to manage pupils' behaviour.

What does the ITE provider need to do to improve the secondary phase?

(Information for the provider and appropriate authority)

- Across all routes, leaders' curriculum thinking does not outline in sufficient depth the essential knowledge that trainees are expected to learn about the uniqueness of the subjects that they are training to teach. This means that there are inconsistencies in how effectively different partners deliver aspects of the secondary-phase ITE curriculum. Consequently, some trainees learning to teach the same subjects do not access the same content as their peers. Leaders should ensure that they define exactly what knowledge trainees should learn. They should ensure that all partners know and understand their roles in delivering the ITE curriculum so that all trainees have equal access to the same high-quality training.
- Some mentors who support school-based experiences do not receive enough training to know exactly what is expected of them in their roles. They do not have access to a comprehensive programme of subject-specific training. Nor do they know what is contained in the centre-based ITE curriculum. This leads to trainees receiving uneven experiences of the ITE curriculum in their placements. It also leads to target setting that lacks precision. Leaders should ensure that they train mentors effectively so that

they know how to reinforce the centre-based training. Leaders should also outline exactly what is expected of mentors in schools.

- The systems for the ongoing assessment of trainees, including the assessment tracker, are too focused on broad approaches to teaching. Across all routes, mentors do not routinely identify what pedagogical and subject-specific knowledge trainees know and remember of the taught ITE curriculum. This means that often, trainees do not understand the reasons for strengths or weaknesses in their teaching practice. They do not know how to improve their subject-specific knowledge. Leaders should ensure that assessment systems support mentors and trainees to identify the important knowledge that trainees know and can apply.
- Quality assurance of the ITE curriculum is not sufficiently focused on the impact of the provider's curriculum on trainees' learning and development. This means that leaders do not have a detailed enough picture of the quality with which the trainee curriculum is delivered and assessed. They do not have some of the information that they need to continually and systematically improve the ITE curriculum. This impedes the work of the strategic partnership committee in holding leaders to account for the quality of the ITE curriculum in the secondary phase. Leaders should ensure that the quality assurance of all aspects of the secondary ITE curriculum is focused on the impact of the partnership's curriculum on trainees.

Does the ITE provider's secondary phase comply with the ITE compliance criteria?

- The provider meets the DfE statutory compliance criteria.

Further education and skills phase report

What works well in the further education and skills phase and what needs to be done better?

Leaders have not designed a suitably ambitious FES ITE curriculum. The initial stages of the training support trainees to prepare for placements. However, the lack of any meaningful centre-based curriculum hinders trainees from developing the specific knowledge and teaching skills that they require to teach their specialist subject areas. This puts additional pressure on mentors, who strive to make up for this shortfall.

Leaders do not ensure that trainees are developing the range of knowledge that they need to flourish in a diverse post-16 sector. For example, pre-service trainees are expected to attend some subject-specific sessions with secondary age-phase trainees. Course tutors in the secondary age-phase are unable to relate their centre-based subject sessions to the post-16 sector sufficiently well.

As a result of an inadequate ITE curriculum, trainees gain a narrow and outdated understanding of the post-16 sector. In-service trainees who have not previously gained subject-specialist qualifications do not receive any training to fill the gaps in their knowledge. As such, they have to teach themselves how to deliver their subject to the range of learners on their placements.

Trainees are not signposted to the most appropriate research to support their learning. All too often research is generic and lacks any subject specificity. Some research is also outdated. Trainees sometimes draw on this inappropriate, outdated research to inform their teaching. Leaders and course tutors do not support trainees to develop their subject-specific knowledge and teaching strategies by enabling them to reflect on pertinent research.

Most trainees do not have a sound enough understanding of how to support learners with SEND and/or high needs, or learners who speak English as an additional language. Although they are able to identify the need for alternative teaching strategies, they do not have all the knowledge that they need to adapt the delivery of their subject for these groups of learners.

There is no purposeful assessment system in place to check how well trainees are learning to teach their subject specialism. This is because leaders have not decided what knowledge trainees must learn about their subject specialisms. Therefore, partners cannot assess whether trainees are progressing towards becoming an effective teacher in their subject. Too much is left to chance.

Trainees do not gain a sufficiently broad understanding of the range of sectors in FES. Leaders do not ensure that there are sufficient opportunities in trainees' placements to experience teaching across the full range of provision, such as adult education and apprenticeships. Trainees are not prepared well enough to work in the broader FES sector.

Placement mentors have extensive experience and knowledge of their subjects. Mentors often teach alongside trainees to share their expertise. Mentors use the knowledge of their subject to provide support and feedback. This helps some trainees to improve their knowledge and skills. However, insufficient guidance, support and training from Birmingham City University for mentors means that, overall, trainees get a disjointed training experience. Leaders do not communicate sufficiently well with mentors to enable them to know how well trainees are progressing through their centre-based training. This leads to mentors setting inappropriate targets for improvement which are sometimes unhelpful for trainees.

The quality assurance of the FES ITE training programme is not fit for purpose. Although leaders adopt the wider university process to assure the quality of trainees' assignments, there is no meaningful quality assurance of the ITE curriculum. There is also no oversight of the quality and consistency of mentoring and target setting. The strategic partnership committee has no overview of the quality of the training provided. Added to this, leaders do not monitor the quality of training in partner colleges with sufficient rigour.

In-service trainees' understanding of harmful sexual behaviours in the workplace is wholly derived from their workplace continual professional development. Centre-based training sessions do not cover this aspect of safeguarding sufficiently well. Leaders do not ensure that recent updates relating to sexual abuse in further education are communicated to trainees.

What does the ITE partnership need to do to improve the FES phase?

(Information for the provider and appropriate authority)

- Leaders do not have a credible centre-based curriculum in place to teach the subject-specific knowledge that trainees need to learn within the FES sector. Consequently, too much of what trainees must learn is left to the provider-based mentor or it is shoehorned into the secondary age-phase ITE curriculum. A lack of a purposefully designed centre-based FES ITE curriculum hinders trainees' learning experience. Leaders must urgently design and implement a specific FES ITE curriculum that fully meets the needs of trainees entering the wider post-16 sector, and that focuses on the subject that they are training to teach.
- In-service trainees who have not previously gained subject-specialist qualifications do not receive any training to fill the gaps in their knowledge. This slows their learning and development. Leaders must ensure that in-service trainees have the appropriate training that they require to address any missing subject-specific knowledge that they have.
- Leaders have not established an effective assessment system that links to the ITE curriculum. Consequently, trainees do not know how well they are progressing in their ITE curriculum. Leaders must design an assessment system that links to a well-planned FES ITE curriculum.
- Trainees are not exposed to the most current research in pedagogy and in their subject specialisms within the FES sector. As a result, trainees rely on outdated concepts and techniques when planning learning in their placements. Leaders need

to ensure that the curriculum is underpinned by recent and relevant research in both generic pedagogy and in the subject specialism that the trainee is preparing to teach.

- Trainees do not benefit from a variety of placement experiences that enable them to learn about how to teach their subjects across the diversity of the FES sector. This prevents trainees from having a sufficiently rich and deep training experience. Leaders must work with their partner organisations to ensure that trainees have opportunities to broaden their understanding of the sector through a wider range of placement experiences.
- Leaders do not support and train placement mentors effectively enough. As a result, the quality of mentoring is uneven and too much of the provider-based training is left to chance. Leaders need to implement as a matter of urgency a training programme for mentors. They also need to ensure through their partnership arrangements that workplace mentors understand their critical role in training their trainees.
- Quality assurance processes are not fit for purpose. Consequently, leaders, including the strategic partnership committee, do not know about the effectiveness of provider-based mentoring or how effectively the ITE programme is being delivered. This means that FES trainees get an inadequate experience. Leaders at Birmingham City University need to make certain that quality assurance processes are fit for purpose for the FES ITE phase, that they implemented consistently and that they are understood by all partners.
- Leaders' monitoring of the quality of education and training in partnership colleges is equally ineffective. As a result, leaders have an inaccurate view of the quality of training that trainees are receiving in partner colleges. Leaders must ensure that they set high expectations for partner colleges to deliver high-quality, purposely integrated training.
- In-service trainees' understanding of harmful sexual behaviours in the workplace is wholly derived from their workplace continual professional development. Leaders must put in place an appropriate safeguarding curriculum, to ensure trainees have a sufficiently detailed understanding of these subjects, including more-recent updates relating to sexual abuse, in the FES sector.

ITE provider details

Unique reference number 70075

Inspection number 10217248

This inspection was carried out in accordance with the 'Initial teacher education inspection framework and handbook'.

This framework and handbook sets out the statutory basis and framework for initial teacher education (ITE) inspections in England from September 2020.

Type of ITE provider Higher education institution

Phases provided Primary
Secondary
Further education and skills

Date of previous inspection 31 March to 3 April 2014

Inspection team

Jonathan Smart, Overall lead inspector	Her Majesty's Inspector
Sharon Dowling, Phase lead inspector (further education and skills)	Her Majesty's Inspector
Tim Vaughan, Phase lead inspector (primary)	Her Majesty's Inspector
Michael Pennington, Phase lead inspector (secondary)	Her Majesty's Inspector
Andrea Dill-Russell	Her Majesty's Inspector
Elizabeth Stevens	Her Majesty's Inspector
Gillian Martin	Ofsted Inspector
Jacqueline Ecoeur	Ofsted Inspector
Janette Walker	Her Majesty's Inspector
Jo Olsson	Her Majesty's Inspector
John Nixon	Her Majesty's Inspector
Rachel Goodwin	Her Majesty's Inspector
Sally Kenyon	Ofsted Inspector
Sheila Iwaskow	Her Majesty's Inspector
Simon Hunter	Her Majesty's Inspector
William Baidoe-Ansah	Ofsted Inspector

Annex: Placement schools and colleges

Inspectors visited the following schools and colleges (either virtually or face-to-face) as part of this inspection:

Name	URN	ITE phase(s)
Access to Music	50313	FES
Birmingham Metropolitan College	130466	FES
Birmingham City Council	50213	FES
Cadbury College	130468	FES
Joseph Chamberlain Sixth Form College	130468	FES
Heart of Birmingham Vocational College	141435	FES
Sandwell College	130479	FES
South and City College	130461	FES
Walsall College	130483	FES
The Pines Special School	103622	Primary
Rounds Green Primary School	103980	Primary
Grace Mary Primary School	103945	Primary
Causeway Green Primary School	103983	Primary
Castle Vale Nursery School	103144	Primary
Abbey Catholic Primary School	147669	Primary
Yew Tree Primary School	103974	Primary
Boldmere Junior School	103341	Primary
Pens Meadow School	103883	Primary
Chandos Primary School	143908	Primary
Rookery School	137168	Primary
Lozells Junior and Infant and Nursery School	103227	Primary
Charford First School	116659	Primary
Twickenham Primary School	140518	Primary
Thornton Primary	103268	Primary
St Chad's Catholic Primary School	148440	Primary
Paget Primary School	103240	Primary
Wyndcliffe Primary School	141319	Primary
Town Junior School	141206	Primary
Saltley Academy	141668	Secondary
Holyhead School: Teach Central Academies	137034	Secondary
St Bede's Catholic Middle School	141064	Secondary
Holte School	103509	Secondary
Swanshurst School	103514	Secondary
Kings Heaths Boys School	103486	Secondary
St George's School	103564	Secondary
Archbishop Ilsley Catholic School	146124	Secondary

Any complaints about the inspection or the report should be made following the procedures set out in the guidance 'Raising concerns and making a complaint about Ofsted', which is available from Ofsted's website: www.gov.uk/government/publications/complaints-about-ofsted. If you would like Ofsted to send you a copy of the guidance, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, further education and skills, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for children looked after, safeguarding and child protection.

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 0300 123 1231, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may reuse this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is available at www.reports.ofsted.gov.uk.

Interested in our work? You can subscribe to our monthly newsletter for more information and updates: <http://eepurl.com/iTrDn>.

Piccadilly Gate
Store Street
Manchester
M1 2WD

T: 0300 123 1231
Textphone: 0161 618 8524
E: enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk
W: www.gov.uk/ofsted

© Crown copyright 2022