Q6 Please use the space below to make any other comments, positive or negative, about the impact of the 80% contact teaching requirement

Answered: 46 Skipped: 15

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	This was already a requirement for us.	5/27/2025 9:14 AM
2	It will negatively impact those student teachers who, for whatever reason, have had difficulties earlier on in the training year e.g. sickness, difficult placements etc.	5/23/2025 7:17 PM
3	They need to be able to sustain the 80% at the end of the programme as they will be going into doing this 6 weeks later.	5/23/2025 2:28 PM
4	This is more of an issue for Secondary than Primary. The biggest issue is that it lasts for 6 weeks and is hard to timetable in Secondary	5/23/2025 1:31 PM
5	It is very complex for schools to facilitate this once KS4 and KS5 exam groups leave. It could impact on our ability to offer PGCE places as schools and colleges may be less inclined to offer placements. This is becoming a significant issue with the pressures on schools currently.	5/23/2025 10:31 AM
6	I can see the reasoning behind this and for most of our students, they are ready for it. However, where we have students with reasonable adjustments or health issues, it is not always helpful to insist on 80%. Some of our students are considering part-time employment because of individual needs and so teaching for four out of five days will never be a part of their working lives.	5/23/2025 9:59 AM
7	The difficulty for secondary is Y11 and Y13 have left and so the teaching timetable is reduced for a normal teacher in that school. Providing an 80% teaching timetable of a teacher in that school is fine, but we need to know that this will not be inspected as gospel. Professional discretion of what 80% looks like in that school is crucial. We do not want Ofsted looking at a 15hr timetable saying it is too low as an example when a normal teacher in that school post GCSEs is only teaching 14 hrs	5/23/2025 8:40 AM
8	More pressure on schools and mentors. More pressure on trainees. Doesn't properly prepare trainees for ECT years as is unrealistic. Children face more disruption.	5/22/2025 8:56 PM
9	In relation to Q3 although overall student workload has only increased moderately this is because we have made adjustment to other activities which are normally part of our student experience. We consider that this will have a negative impact on their overall experience. We would also like to stress that the increased expectation was imposed during students' exiting programmes which meant that they are now working towards different requirements than they originally signed up for.	5/22/2025 3:41 PM
10	This comes with added challenge in Secondary as class teachers are loathe to hand over responsibility for class teaching for Y11 and Y13 groups. This has come with additional challenge as we are also hosting the final ITAP at start of June and as such have moved the start of the 80% earlier in the placement, when not all are ready for this. By presenting an expectation of 6 weeks at 80% a perceived additional stress has been placed on trainees and schools where a trainee might not necessarily be ready.	5/22/2025 3:40 PM
11	80% is the expected contact of an ECT (10% ECT and 10% PPA). If training should be progressive, the final 6 weeks of placement as an unqualified teacher, should be less than that of a qualified ECT. On placement there is still key learning taking place to reach QTS and teaching 80% timetable does not account for this. 6 weeks is a long period of time for trainees to be actively learning and improving towards QTS. The opportunity to observe expert colleagues for example is impacted. In addition asking trainees to take on 80% teaching load for 6 weeks - assumes that they have already reached the same standards as an ECT - technically saying they could have met QTS requirements 6 weeks earlier!	5/22/2025 3:24 PM
12	As this is the first year of 80% it is hard to answer these quetsions, I think it might support them going into thier ECT however stipulating 6 weeks with the 4 ItaPs is a challenge and the	5/22/2025 1:09 PM

	6 weeks needs to be reduced if it is going to stay	
13	80% comes at a time where the school year is significant discupted by examinations a but also at a time where school purposefully design their curriulum to enable enhancement and enrichment activities which add richness to student experience and significant value in learning beyond the curriculum. A trainee teacher should be involved in planing delivering and supervising and attending these activities with pupils and exprinced staff to preparethem for their career - the focus on teaching in class reducing these opportunities	5/22/2025 12:22 PM
14	80% contact teaching can be challenging for schools and mentors to arrange	5/22/2025 11:52 AM
15	While I understand the rationale behind the 80% contact teaching requirement, I do not believe it necessarily translates into improved quality of training or better preparedness for the ECT years. Quality of experience is often more important than quantity, and the 80% requirement risks prioritising time spent in the classroom over meaningful reflection, mentoring, and professional development. This requirement can place undue strain on schools, particularly smaller departments or schools with limited capacity. Some schools have been reluctant to offer both long and short placements due to concerns about maintaining curriculum continuity and the pressure it places on staff. Additionally, the 80% requirement can be counterproductive when it restricts opportunities for enrichment activities such as observing expert practitioners, engaging in wider professional training, or undertaking research-led practice. All of these are vital for a well-rounded teacher education experience and long-term professional growth.	5/22/2025 11:09 AM
16	We have always had a requirement for 80% teaching at the end of final placements but this would not have been for 6 weeks. The additional requirement for 6 weeks is adding pressure to both schools and students.	5/22/2025 10:52 AM
17	The increased workload for trainees and their mentors is significant and contributing to challenges trainees and mentors face, pressures of time, workload, summer pupil assessment expectations. Piling more onto already stretched teachers who mentor trainees, plus over-stretching trainees is counterrproductive to them completing successfully and wanting to remain in the profession after qualifying, ifthey do complete the course.	5/22/2025 10:04 AM
18	It should be reduced to 4 weeks, not 6.	5/22/2025 8:54 AM
19	I know my answers above might seem contradictory. I think that an increased workload is better preparation for ECT as it's more realistic but there is a lot of pressure on schools. It's also during GCSE time when Year 11s are on study leave, timetables are disrupted etc. For some subjects such as Art, it's difficult to get to 80%, particularly in a one person department.	5/22/2025 8:41 AM
20	Particularly in the secondary phase, meeting the 80% in reality is very difficult with Year 11s and 13s on study leave for example - we have scheduled some of the 80% for earlier in the year but this brings other challenges. For primary there is less negative impact, as our courses primarily had around 6 weeks at roughly 80% contact ratio anyway...	5/22/2025 8:32 AM
21	Secondary schools find it very difficult to construct a meaningful 80% timetable at this time of year due to exams, pupils in Y11 and Y13 leaving and younger years transitioning to their new classes and teachers in preparation for the next academic year. Furthermore, if schools (as we typically encourage them to do) take a trainee teacher on both first and second placements (short and long, term 1, terms 2-3), they typically do not want a class taught by a student teacher for the full year so are further constrained in terms of constructing a meaningful timetable within the subject specialism due to this reasonable consideration. The 80% is also being viewed by some mentors as a compulsory requirement for QTS (despite our clear communication that this is not a pre-requisite for QTS) - this has resulted in a number of additional forms of correspondence between provider and placement school staff to reassure them of this - wasting further mentor time. The reason teachers typically leave the classroom is not because they did not experience an 80% teaching load prior to starting their ECT years, and I would suggest that the resultant lack of flexibility at the end of the programme, whereby some trainees could be offered opportunities to experience wider school-related opportunities (shadowing middle and senior leaders, working within specialist interest areas (EAL/SEND/Pastoral/Extra Curriculuar) etc is having a more negative impact on their resilience and interest in the job.	5/22/2025 8:32 AM
22	I feel that the 80% contact time stops trainees from being able to complete other tasks during this period but taking full responsibility for classes and doing full timetable commitments allows them to practice ready for teaching in September.	5/21/2025 6:33 PM
23	I think the 80% requirments is positiove however, the 6 week specification is challening in	5/21/2025 6:31 PM

	some subjects at this time of year. Not all trainee tecaher have the same opportunity to access 80% teaching and so a more nuanced approach is needed.	
24	Our PGCE programme is a challenging, intensive one, aiming to prepare trainees for a career, as well as for their first term in post. The 80% requirement feels very much like a solution to a problem that didn't exist. Stepping up to a first post is always a challenge - that is not really about 14 or 16 lessons a week in the final stages of the PGCE. But other things are squeezed out.	5/21/2025 6:04 PM
25	It is increasingly difficult to find schools that are willing and able to offer placements when the Student teacher needs to teach so many lessons.	5/21/2025 5:31 PM
26	The 80% requirement has restricted access to other PD opportunities that our students would normally undertake at this period in the course. These are valuable enrichment opportunities (e.g. field work, time spent in alternative settings) that we struggle to position anywhere else in the course. It has also limited our contact with them as we have been unable to put any uni based days in this period of time. It has also limited our choices as to where we position our ITaP days. We have an assessment deadline in this period of time and I am very concerned about the impact of the 6 weeks on their wellbeing first and foremost but also on their academic work.	5/21/2025 4:37 PM
27	There are not enough suitable lessons for the trainees. As a result the timetables are a mix of sometimes random lessons that they have to plan and deliver. It is a real strain on the departments - made worse as this is exam time. The trainees have to discuss their planning, which they will not have to do as an ECT so it is a significant amount more work than being an ECT and therefore not helpful in preparing them for the workload next year. The impact on neurodivergent and anxious trainees has been very significant and there is a real danger that this policy will put them off teaching and applying for a job. This would be a massive waste of time and bursary money. We have some schools saying that they do not want to offer placements next year because of the 80% timetable. It is a policy that has to be changed. Please accept that they are on a course, not just teaching. They have classes and mentors to manage, they are learning all new content, as well as managing the important PGCE aspect of their education. It was not broken before - please return to how it was. Also, 80% plus the extra work of the ITAP is a real extra burden on trainees, mentors and provders. We need to reduce workload, not add to it.	5/21/2025 4:27 PM
28	Whilst it may help some student teachers be better prepared for ECT1 we are not working in silo's and if the school and or the training provider is negatively affected then this is something to consider. Options and smaller subjects in particular will struggle to meet the requirement, especially as year 11 leave.	5/21/2025 4:21 PM
29	Once it is factored into the organisation of a programme, it isn't difficult to maintain and gives students a clear picture of their workload as an ECT	5/21/2025 4:17 PM
30	I think it is impacting different students and different groups of students in varied ways. Some students are really benefitting from the 80% and will be better placed for ECT. However, some are being disadvantaged as they were already struggling, whether that be progress or due to individual barriers this is causing issues with them meeting the expectation of 80%. Also some schools simply don't have enough lessons to offer, particularly for 14-19 courses and UTCs.	5/21/2025 3:58 PM
31	We have exercised considerable caution in implementing this aspect of the new quality requirements, making it clear that where student teachers were making slow progress or in need of additional support measures they should not necessarily be expected to take on the full increase. This has been essential in avoiding the negative impact that would have followed from imposing unreasonable demands at a point when they would have damanged student teachers' confidence and commitment to succeeding on the course. We knew that schools would struggle to provide 80% in the summer term and therefore asked them to provice 4 weeks before Easter and just 2 weeks afterwards. Even with this adaptation is has proved exceptionally difficult for them to create appropriate timetables and the requirement led to some subjects concluding that they could not offer second school placements this year. While some student-teachers have found it valuable to experience a short period of teaching at this intensity (boosting their confidence for next year), their view is that 4 weeks would have been quite suffiicent for this purpose. Most mentors report concerns that it has destroyed opportunities for student teachers to learn about curriculum planning in the later stages of the course when they used to involve them in reviewing and revising schemes of work. It has also restricted the scope for our student teachers to work intensively on issues associated with inclusive practice (building on our existing SEND focus).	5/21/2025 3:34 PM

32	Schools in ur partnership have been very clear across the last month, they do not feel this is a positive move by the DfE for (i) trainee development and ability to react to feedback meaningfully; (ii) finding timetable that is adequate at a busy time of year for secondary schools with examination classes (less of an issue in primary); (iii) feeling that this new TT requirement will somehow make the trainees into better ECTs. From an HEI perspective this requirement has seen us have to move assignment dates/restrict small scale research projects so that trainees do not have to juggle both a high TT AND assignments for their PGCE. We feel it has denied this year's cohort the same kind of opportunities in school that they had up until this year e.g. experiences in units around the school outside their subject. Trainees report as feeling much more under pressure, with little room/space to reflect meaningfully on their practice when they are still learning at this stage. All in all we are not convinced as a partnership of schools and HEi teacher educators that this is a new quality requirement that is making a positive difference (unlike ITAPS and mentor training).	5/21/2025 3:32 PM
33	Many trainees need to work part time jobs alongside training to be a teacher given current financial challenges; ECTs would not be working a part time job in addition to this. Therefore it is unrealistic. 80% reduces the ability for trainees to observe high quality teaching from the mentor and expert colleagues, including engaging in wider professional dialogue. Certain times of the academic year produce pressures in schools where mentors and Head teachers are reluctant to allow 80% teaching such as prior to SATs and potential Ofsted inspection window.	5/21/2025 3:15 PM
34	We've had a version of this in place for years, so no change really	5/21/2025 3:10 PM
35	There is a sigificant issue for KS5 subjects where there is limited teaching in the summer term and finding 80% of a timetable is problematic	5/21/2025 3:06 PM
36	The additional workload is negatively impacted student teachers' well-being. It is limiting their deeper engagement with planning, classroom skills and reflection.	5/21/2025 2:59 PM
37	Trainees who are struggling can't move onto the 80% anyway. Very hard to find the additional classes in smaller departments - results in split classes which affects planning. Trainees don't know the pupils at all so it affects behaviour management and therefore their confidence at this crucial stage. Reduces their time for final assessment activities and assignments. Trainees who have taught 5 period days do get a great sense of achievement and it prepares them well for the ECT year.	5/21/2025 2:56 PM
38	The 80% timetable for six weeks is putting pressure on trainees to be "ready to teach" six weeks before their course finishes. It does not give them the time for the deeper planning or reflection, or wider involvement within the school that they would benefit from.	5/21/2025 2:53 PM
39	Schools are struggling to provide enough lessons for student teachers to teach and this will inevitably result in them considering whether they can accommodate placements which, in turn, puts extra pressure on ITE providers and significantly impacts how many qualified teachers we will end up with.	5/21/2025 2:50 PM
40	There is less time for reflective practice at a time when trainees still need to have clear feedback and time to reflect on their practice. Simlply increasing hours doen not improve the quality of their teaching, if anything the rigour we look for in planning is reduced as well.	5/21/2025 2:45 PM
41	The perception is that it is too much for both student teachers and the mentors and we are finding those conversations challenging. 6 weeks is a long time and we have discussed where to include it but feel it has to come at the end. However, the final 6 weeks coincided with GCSE and SATs and this exacerbated an already stressed environment.	5/21/2025 2:45 PM
42	We already did this so no change.	5/21/2025 2:43 PM
43	We are finding that schools and mentors are struggling to understand what 80% of teaching means and we have frequently had to explain what 80% of full-time teacher commitment means, especially in secondary departments. The increase does not seem to have been a negative impact on teaching	5/21/2025 2:42 PM
44	Expeiencign a fuller TT at some stage in training is important. However, it should be based on trainee need esp. when other opportunites will have a greater imapct on quality of teaching than more time in class room. For example developing aspects of practice using targeted intervention and reflextion with expert will be more impactfull than more tiem on TT.	5/21/2025 2:40 PM
45	With exam group s and in certain subjects (eg MfL) in secondary sometimes an 80% teaching timetable is just not feasible.	5/21/2025 2:39 PM

46	Some students are not quite ready for the full 6 weeks at that stage. It also comes at a time when exams are in full flow	5/21/2025 2:39 PM