

# 2.0

Every Child Matters In Lincolnshire



## School's Forum paper: EAL Formula Funding January 2010

### 1. Background Information

- Funding allocated to school to support pupils with English as an additional language was introduced in Spring 2007.
- The funding is allocated using a 'trigger' methodology. Pupils qualify if they have been in a school in England for less than 2 years.
- The funding is provided according to data collected from PLASC three times a year i.e. once every two terms.
- The trigger point is 5% of each school's January number on roll or 14 pupils, whichever is greater.
- £333 is allocated to schools with qualifying pupils above the trigger for each two term period.
- Schools below the trigger do not receive additional funding and are expected to meet children's needs using existing resources.
- In autumn 2008, schools receiving funding and a number of schools who did not meet the trigger, were asked for their opinions on the current formula.
- There was an overall opinion that the EAL formula should remain as it is.
- A second survey was carried out in December 2009, the summary of which can be seen appendix 1.

### 2. Funding allocations to date

Term	Total allocation	Number of schools
Summer 07	110,889	20
Autumn 07	190,809	26
Spring 08	174,492	26
Summer 08	144,220	22
Autumn 08	79,580	15
Spring 09	75,260	16
Summer 09	83,590	17
Autumn 09	93,230	18
<b>Total allocation</b>	<b>952070</b>	

### 3. Key issues since last report (January 08)

- The number of new arrivals entering Lincolnshire schools peaked in January 08 and has fluctuated but steadily decreased since then.

## School's Forum report Jan 2010: EAL Formula Funding

- Although number of new arrivals has decreased, there is no evidence to suggest that there is a reduction in the total number of EAL pupils other than what is expected due to 16+ school leavers.
- Pupils who triggered funding in spring 07 were not eligible for further funding from autumn 09.
- LA nursery settings do not access the funding due to the nature of the formula. In the past EMAS have financially supported these settings on a year by year basis.

### 4. Evidence of improvement in achievement and attainment of EAL pupils

- EAL pupils at key stage 1 are making progress in the three areas of reading, writing and maths. The gap has been narrowed by 4%, 6% and 6% respectively. (Performance Management (PM) data SATS July 2009)
- Key stage 2 girls with EAL are making progress in the three subject areas English, Maths and Science. The gap has been narrowed by 8%, 4% and 6% respectively. (PM data SATS July 2009)
- 89% of pupils from a White other background made two levels progress in Maths and 91% in English at the end of key stage 2. (PM data SATS Oct 2009) One secondary school receiving funding has set their target to 100% 2 levels progress for 2009/10 (from survey return Dec 2009)
- 85% of pupils from any other White background achieved 5+ A\*-G including English and Maths (PM data GCSE performance Oct 2009) One secondary school receiving funding has 100% EAL pupils achieving 5 A\*-G minimum (from survey return Dec 2009).
- 66% of pupils from any other White background made three levels progress in Maths and 64% made the same progress in English by the end of key stage 4. The % for the LA cohort is 64% and 70% respectively (PM data GCSE performance Oct 2009).
- In one primary school receiving funding, pupils who triggered the funding were tracked over the 2 years. 57% of these pupils are on age related levels for reading, 53% for writing and 69% for maths. Similarly in another school, those pupils who triggered funding were tracked and data shows that 89% made 2 levels progress in reading and 86% made 2 levels progress in writing (sourced from school's pupil tracking information July 2009)

### 5. Areas for improvement in relation to achievement of EAL pupils

Overall, there has been progress made for pupils with English as an additional language. In order to continue this progress and narrow the gap for one of Lincolnshire's targeted groups, the following areas need to be addressed:

## School's Forum report Jan 2010: EAL Formula Funding

- There is a 12% gap for EAL pupils in maths, 20% gap for EAL pupils in science and a 24% gap across literacy subjects at the end of key stage 1 (PM data SATS July 2009).
- Boys with EAL did not show the same rate of progress over the 2008/9 with an average 10% widening in the gap at the end of key stage 2. Further analysis of data is needed to understand the variation in performance for the cohorts of pupils across the given period (PM data SATS Oct 2009).
- There is a 17% gap in achievement at the end of key stage 4 for pupils from any other white background with 39% achieving 5 A\*-C including English and Maths compared with 56% for all pupils (PM data GCSE performance Oct 2009).
- There is a 22% gap in achievement at the end of key stage 4 for pupils with English as an additional language with 34% achieving 5A\*-C including English and Maths (PM data GCSE performance Oct 2009)

### 6. Summary of survey investigating schools' views of EAL formula funding.

A survey (Appendix 1) was sent to 23 schools who are receiving or who have received funding through the EAL formula. 63% of schools sent in returns (Dec 2009). A summary of the responses and comments is provided in Appendix 2.

### 7. Other funding sources for schools available specifically to support EAL/Ethnic Minority pupils

- **Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant** – this is a ring fenced standards fund grant. For 2009/10 Lincolnshire received £115,000 for schools. This is allocated to schools based on a request for funding returned to EMAS. Funding has been allocated to 65 schools to support EAL resourcing, translation, community cohesion and inclusion programmes and projects. This funding is reviewed by the DCSF in 2011.
- **Personalised Learning Funding** - as part of the Personalised Learning funding to schools, there is an EAL allocation. Schools receive a fixed amount per pupil with English as an additional language. For 08/09, Lincolnshire schools received £70,500.

### 8. Recommendations

Based on the information presented above, the following tasks are recommended.

Task 1 – to leave the EAL formula funding unchanged and continue to monitor its allocations and use of impact over the 2010/11 period.

Task 2 – to investigate possible changes to the formula. The formation of a working group consisting of a range of stakeholders would allow possible changes to be explored and potential impact to be discussed. Any changes would be implemented in April 2011.

## School's Forum report Jan 2010: EAL Formula Funding

Jill Chandar-Nair  
CSTM: Inclusion and Attendance  
January 2010

School's Forum report Jan 2010: EAL Formula Funding

Appendix 1

**Name of School:**

**Contact person:**

No	Key issues	Yes	No	Not sure	Provide Comments (where possible)
3.1	Do you agree with the criteria currently used for triggering EAL funding?				
3.2	Are you happy with the procedure followed for receiving the funding e.g. timing, communication				
3.3	Has the funding made a difference to the EAL pupils' educational experiences in your school?				
3.4	Has the funding for supporting the EAL pupils helped to develop your school's capacity to support pupils with EAL needs?				
3.5	Has the 2 year limit for funding had any implications on your current cohort of pupils?				
3.6	If there have been any implications, have you been able to address them?				
3.7	Do you feel there needs to be changes to the current funding allocations made by the Children's Services for supporting EAL pupils in your school?				

2.8 In addition to the information above, please provide any examples of achievement of EAL pupils which could be a consequence of the allocation of EAL formula funding in your school e.g. Numbers or cases of pupils making above average levels of progress.

Appendix 2

Summary of survey investigating schools' views of EAL formula funding.

**1. 42% of schools agreed with the criteria currently used for triggering the EAL funding.**

*Other suggestions were made, see 7 below.*

*5 schools were unsure of formula i.e. how it works and why specific criteria was chosen.*

**2. 71% were happy with the procedure followed for receiving the funding e.g. timing, etc.**

*As above i.e unfamiliarity with procedure especially with new SMT staff.*

*One schools felt the funding should be released on admission of pupil in order to put support in place immediately..*

**3. 86% felt that the funding made a difference to the EAL pupils' educational experiences in their school.**

*Schools have used the funding for human and material resources, translations, first language support.*

*One school mentioned an Ofsted report stating that EAL children are making good progress.*

*Those schools with small amounts could not attribute the progress of EAL pupils to the funding.*

**4. 86% felt that funding had helped the school develop their capacity to support EAL pupils.**

*Schools mentioned employment of specialist staff and training.*

*One school mentioned the changes in migration patterns from Portuguese, to Polish and then to Lithuanian and Latvian thus impacting on human and material resources needed.*

**5. 78% felt that the 2 year limit for funding had or would have implications on their current cohort of pupils.**

*Schools stated that more time is needed for pupils at the beginning of key stage 2 and 3 in order to reach required levels.*

*One school mentioned the difficulty when pupils move schools i.e. primary to primary or primary to secondary after 2 years with no funding attached.*

*One school felt that EAL pupils should be supported financially throughout their education with funding focussed in a smaller number of schools.*

**6. 50% stated that they had been able to address issues related to cessation of funding for specific pupils.**

*Schools mentioned effective management of support staff and use of own school budgets.*

**7. 71% felt there was a need to change the current funding allocations.**

## School's Forum report Jan 2010: EAL Formula Funding

*Schools suggested an increase in funding, more funding allocated to fewer schools, funding allocated to pupils for more than 2 years, an increase in amount per pupil in line with inflation, funding allocation based on pupil/school need.*