

NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS

RACE EQUALITY FUNDING SURVEY 2001

INTRODUCTION

The National Union of Teachers has campaigned consistently for the stability, security and coherence of race equality funding and for sufficient levels of funding to be maintained. In responding to proposed changes to funding arrangements and the operation of race equality education, the NUT's priority has been to protect and increase funding for meeting the specific educational needs of minority ethnic pupils and to protect teachers' employment.

The NUT has argued consistently that LEAs should hold race equality funding centrally and that devolving money to schools prevents LEAs from using the grant flexibly in order to target resources where they are most needed.

During the 2001 summer term the NUT conducted a survey, of ninety-three LEAs in England, to assess the educational impact of the changes from Section 11 funding to the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) in 1999 to the Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Grant (EMTAG) in 2000 and the return to EMAG funding under the Standards Fund in 2001-2002.

Questionnaires were sent to LEA Chief Education Officers/Directors of Education, NUT headteachers, and EMAG teachers.

This report includes an executive summary of the overall results, recommendations to Government and LEAs, and a detailed breakdown of responses to the three surveys (165 in total).

CONTENTS

Introduction

Contents

Executive Summary

- LEAs
- Headteachers
- EMAG Teachers

Recommendations

- To Government
- To LEAs

Local Education Authority Survey Analysis

- Introduction
- Funding Arrangements
- Funding Formulae
- LEA Key Objectives for Minority Ethnic Pupils
- Training of EMAG Staff
- LEA Support to Schools
- Monitoring the Use of the Fund
- Anticipated Changes
- Additional Comments or Observations
- Conclusion

Headteacher Survey Analysis

- Consultation and Funding Arrangements
- Bureaucratic Burdens
- Employment Status
- Training of EMAG Staff
- Minority Ethnic Pupil Support
- Additional Comments or Observations
- Conclusion

EMAG Teacher Survey

- Employment Status
- Training of EMAG teachers
- Minority Ethnic Pupil Support
- Additional Comments or Observations
- Conclusion

Appendix

- LEA Questionnaire
- Headteacher Questionnaire
- EMAG teacher Questionnaire

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Local Education Authorities

Questionnaires were sent to ninety-three Local Education Authorities in England, in receipt of at least £150,000 EMAG funding for 2000-2001. Thirty-eight responses were received representing forty-one per cent of the sample.

The survey of LEAs reveals that over half of respondents had in place a scheme for schools to buy into EMAG services from the LEA; a positive finding, reflecting the hard work undertaken by local NUT divisions and associations.

The most common factors used by LEAs for allocating EMAG funds are: the number of minority ethnic pupils in school; the number of pupils with English as an additional language and the number of pupils in target groups with evidence of low achievement.

One LEA reported that it combined Special Education Needs with ethnicity as a factor for the allocation of EMAG funds.

On the whole, LEAs welcomed the move to a greater monitoring role and anticipated that, in time, more schools would wish to retain EMAG funding. There was a wide difference in the way LEAs monitor expenditure ranging from thorough and extensive procedures to no monitoring at all. Combining a number of monitoring mechanisms, including closer school/LEA liaison, appeared to be the most successful method of monitoring EMAG expenditure.

Uncertainties in terms of funding, however, appear to be preventing LEAs from planning strategically.

The evidence appears to suggest that the retention of a sufficient proportion of the budget to fund a specialist team provides stability and consistency; a practice particularly beneficial for the education of children of dispersed refugee and asylum seeking families.

LEAs reported wider implementation of race equality practice within schools and across the whole LEA.

Strategies to Overcome Problems with the New Arrangements

LEAs also used various strategies to counter some of the difficulties in operating the service under the new regulations. One LEA decided that EMAG funds should move with the pupil to reduce the problem of inadequate funding in some schools exacerbated by high pupil mobility. Another LEA bought into a neighbouring LEA's training provision to ensure that EMAG staff received comprehensive training.

Headteachers

Questionnaires were sent to 500 NUT headteachers within the ninety-three Local Education Authorities included in the sample. Seventy-one responses were received, representing a fourteen per cent return.

Thirty-eight schools (54%) responding to the survey had previously received Section 11 funding and thirty-two (45%) had not. This reflects a significant change in the targeting of race equality funding.

Headteachers were asked what features of the new arrangements had led to improved support for the education of minority ethnic pupils. Where improvements were reported, they were in relation to staffing and greater stability as a result of the employment of permanent or regular staff.

Headteachers were asked what features of the new arrangements had led to deterioration in support for the education of minority ethnic pupils.

- 13 per cent stated that the new arrangements had meant reduced funding for the school coupled with a reduction in staff or teacher time.
- 3 per cent stated specifically that their school could not now meet the educational needs of minority ethnic children.
- 6 per cent said that, with pupil mobility and fluctuating funds, the changing needs of the school could not be met by the new arrangements.

Thirty-two per cent of schools bought back into LEA services, their LEAs provided an excellent or good central service.

Sixty-five per cent of headteachers reported that bureaucratic burdens had not increased as a result of the changes and that the particulars of the increases, where reported, did not appear to be having a significant impact on the burdens on classroom teachers.

Only 52 per cent of schools were able to offer permanent contracts to qualified EMAG teachers.

Thirty-one per cent offered fixed term contracts to qualified teachers. Of eighteen schools using the fund to employ teachers on fixed term contracts or bilingual classroom assistants (on fixed term or permanent contracts) 72 per cent said that long-term budget stability would have led them to offer different employment contracts.

Strategies to Overcome Problems with the New Arrangements

Some headteachers gave examples of strategies that they had used to

combat or reduce the negative impact of aspects of the new arrangements. One such strategy was to share a qualified EMAG teacher with a nearby school where neither school could afford or justify a full time permanent EMAG teacher.

EMAG Teachers

One thousand questionnaires were distributed to NUT school representatives within the ninety-three LEAs included in the survey. NUT school representatives were asked to pass the questionnaires to EMAG teachers within their schools. Fifty-six responses were received from EMAG teachers, representing six per cent of the sample. This is explained by the fact that many schools did not qualify for EMAG funding from 2001 and that a number of EMAG teachers continue to be employed centrally.

Compared to the responses from local education authorities and headteachers, EMAG staff appeared to have a much bleaker outlook on the future of the education of minority ethnic pupils and pupils with English as an additional language.

The frequency and nature of changes to the EMAG funding arrangements in such a short period of time appears to have disrupted the work of EMAG teachers. Uncertainty about existing and future arrangements, in terms of teachers' employment security and in terms of the remit of the fund, has caused confusion and low morale amongst such teachers and this appears to have been exacerbated by inconsistency of practice nationally and locally. The finding that funding instability has led to low morale amongst EMAG teachers is supported by the recent Ofsted Report, 'Managing Support for the Attainment of Pupils from Minority Ethnic Groups.'

Although eighty-six per cent of respondents reported that they were on permanent contracts, a concern was that those who reported a change in their employment status explained that this was often as a result of increased responsibilities with no increase in salary. Only one respondent reported that their responsibilities had diminished.

EMAG staff expressed broad concerns for the education of minority ethnic pupils and bilingual pupils as a whole and the objective of raising achievement for those minority ethnic pupils who are particularly at risk of underachieving. They did not express specific concerns about increases in the numbers of refugee pupils in school or the mobility of refugee pupils.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To Government

Funding Levels

Since the remit of race equality funding has widened to include, not only support for pupils with English as an additional language, but also support for all minority ethnic pupils at risk of underachieving and refugee children and asylum seeker children, the Government should undertake a comprehensive funding review to establish what resources are needed to deliver effectively such wide provision to young people.

As part of a funding review, the mechanism of funding for the achievement of minority ethnic pupils through the Standards Fund should be re-examined, as the current system is preventing LEAs from planning strategically. The inability of LEAs to make long-term plans has caused logistical problems for schools in meeting the needs of minority ethnic children, refugees and pupils with English as an additional language. The situation has also had a detrimental effect on EMAG staff, causing low moral and resulting in specialist teachers leaving the profession with the consequential loss of expertise.

The Government should make arrangements for a separate national fund for the education of refugee children. Since increases in pupil mobility and unexpected increases in asylum seeker families have occurred in some areas, it is recommended that the fund be a ring-fenced grant, held centrally by the DfES for LEAs to apply for when unforeseen need occurs.

The ring-fencing of EMAG funds as part of the Standard Funds should continue and the use of funds should continue to be monitored to ensure that the funds are being used according to need.

If in the future review of the funding of education, the Standards Fund regime is reviewed and becomes part of the overall funding mechanism, it is recommended that there continues to be a separate DfES ring-fenced grant to meet the specific educational needs of minority ethnic pupils.

Stability and Coherence

The Government should:

- ensure that the mechanism for race equality funding is stable, secure and coherent. Despite Government assurances to the contrary, the transition from Section 11 to EMTAG and EMAG funding has been extremely disruptive for LEAs, schools, EMAG teachers and pupils. Fluctuating funds does nothing to contribute to the delivery of support to minority ethnic children; and
- demonstrate its commitment to raising the achievement of minority

ethnic pupils, by providing long-term funding stability which would allow LEAs and schools to appoint permanent EMAG teachers.

Quality of Service

The Government should:

- ensure that the race equality funding is targeted to address the specific educational needs of minority ethnic pupils; and
- develop, in consultation with the profession, minimum standards of service delivery to minority ethnic pupils.

Training and Development

The Government should:

- conduct an audit of the training needs of EMAG and mainstream staff in meeting the needs of minority ethnic pupils; and
- devise a national strategy for meeting their training and development needs.

To LEAs

Funding Levels

LEAs should take the following steps.

- Schools should be consulted on the local formula for allocating EMAG funds to encourage communication, partnership and cooperation between LEAs and schools. Such a process would allow LEAs to have a clearer insight into the needs of schools as a whole and would better place them to evaluate the effectiveness of their formula.
- LEAs should retain centrally the maximum funding allowed under the current arrangements. The retention by LEAs of sufficient proportion of the budget to fund a specialist team has been shown to provide stability and consistency.

Stability and Coherence

LEAs should:

- press schools to offer permanent contracts to specialist teachers; and
- create opportunities for schools and staff to share best practice in supporting the specific educational needs of minority ethnic pupils.

Monitoring and Accountability

LEAs need to:

- be consistent in the use of the funding locally;
- provide guidance to schools on the use of the fund for the purpose for which it is intended;
- put an end to the inappropriate use of teacher assistants; and
- implement effective and accurate monitoring mechanisms and monitor closely expenditure at school level.

Deployment and Support for Staff

LEAs should:

- encourage schools to work in partnership to share teachers where there are small numbers of minority ethnic pupils;
- offer a structured support and professional development programme to mainstream staff in schools;
- ensure that fully structured and adequate training is given to EMAG teachers; and
- take steps to raise the morale of EMAG teachers by providing them security of tenure and demonstrating that their work is valued.

LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY SURVEY

Questionnaires were sent to ninety-three Local Education Authorities (LEAs), in receipt of at least £150,000 EMTAG funding for 2000-2001. Thirty-eight responses were received representing forty-one per cent of the sample.

The percentages in this report represent the percentage of the total number of returned questionnaires, unless otherwise stated.

Funding Arrangements

LEAs were asked to provide the numbers of primary, secondary and other schools to which the LEA devolves funding; details as to whether the LEA offers a buy-back scheme to schools for the provision of additional support to minority ethnic pupils; and the proportion, as a percentage, of schools which had opted to buy-back the LEA's EMAG services.

Twenty LEAs (53%) reported that they offered a buy-back scheme to schools and fifteen (39%) reported that they did not. Two LEAs (5%) reported that they had previously offered such a scheme to schools but that the arrangements would cease from 2001 or 2002.

The range of take-up of the buy-back schemes on offer, by school type, is represented in the following table:

<i>Number of LEAs reporting that schools have bought back services</i>			
<i>% take-up</i>	Primary	Secondary	Other
100%	3	5	4
76-100%	3	2	0
51-75%	0	3	0
26-50%	3	1	2
0-25%	8	7	4
0	0	0	4
not known	2	2	2
not applicable	1	0	4
total	20	20	20

e.g. 5:secondary:100% = all secondary schools bought back LEA services in 5 LEAs

One LEA in the south of England reported that 100 per cent of headteachers had signed up to 100 per cent buy-back into central services for the three year

period, 2001 to 2004.

LEAs were asked to provide the percentage of EMAG funding utilised for the buy-back scheme. The range of the reported percentage of EMAG funding used for buy-back services varied from thirty-four per cent to one hundred per cent of the total LEA allocation.

Six LEAs (16% of responses, and 30% of the LEAs offering buy-back) used 85 per cent of the grant for the buy-back scheme suggesting that these LEAs were holding back the 15 per cent allowed under the Standards Fund regulations.

One LEA in the north of England used 100 per cent of the fund for its EMAG service, explaining its scheme, thus:

"The money for supporting minority ethnic pupils is devolved and delegated to schools with thirty or more EAL pupils on Form 7. Primary schools have £500 per EAL pupil and secondary schools have £200 per EAL pupil. The school is requested to pay all their delegated and devolved budget to the LEA in return for staff who are, in total, paid approximately the same as the buy-back amount."

LEAs were asked to provide a brief description of their buy-back schemes. The following points illustrate the main features of the schemes:

- Ten LEAs (26%) reported that schools either bought into the whole LEA EMAG service, that the service continued to be centrally managed, or that peripatetic teachers based in local centres provided support in schools with EMAG funding. One LEA offered consultants and advisers to schools as part of the service.
- Four LEAs (11%) reported that centrally employed EMAG staff continued to teach in the same schools as they had taught in prior to the changes.
- Two LEAs (5%) said that teachers and bilingual assistants were being employed and trained by the service.
- One LEA (3%) said that schools could take on existing EMAG staff under TUPE arrangements or could buy-back the same or different categories of teacher (within EMAG regulations) as they engaged prior to the changes.
- One (3%) reported that headteachers would decide which teachers to keep in the school and that the LEA would protect their salaries.
- One LEA (3%) offered tailor-made packages to schools.

Funding Formulae

Respondents were asked to provide details of the formula applied to allocate EMAG funding to schools. The factors provided by respondents have been listed in order of frequency:

- Nineteen LEAs (50%) applied a formula based on the number of

- minority ethnic pupils in the school.
- Fifteen LEAs (39%) used pupils' prior attainment, assessment or QCA descriptors and the number of pupils in target groups with evidence of low achievement.
 - Fifteen LEAs (39%) used the number of pupils with English as an additional language.
 - Twelve LEAs (36%) used pupils' competency in or fluency in English.
 - Four LEAs (11%) used the number of refugee children in the school.
 - Four LEAs (11%) used the *spoken language* level of the pupils, e.g. where pupils were identified as early English language learners or in need of first language support (not EAL).
 - Three LEAs (8%) used the length of time the pupil had been in the UK.
 - Two LEAs (5%) used the number of pupils on free school meals and two used the number of minority ethnic children on free school meals.
 - Two LEAs (5%) used SEN and ethnicity as a factor.
 - Two LEAs (5%) used other needs e.g. poverty.
 - One LEA (3%) used the number of pupils with less than two years' schooling.
 - One LEA (3%) used pupil's age.
 - One LEA (3%) allocated £500 to all schools with a capitation for each pupil with English as an additional language.
 - One LEA (3%) based the formula on the number of pupils and number of minority ethnic pupils.
 - One LEA (3%) used pupil turnover.

The most common factor was the number of minority ethnic pupils in the school, followed by prior attainment, the number of pupils in target groups with evidence of low achievement, and the number of pupils having English as an additional language. Several LEAs used a combination of these factors.

One LEA in the east of England said that, to counter the effects of pupil mobility on school funding, arrangements were made for EMAG money to move with pupils from school to school.

LEA Key Objectives for Minority Ethnic Pupils

LEAs were asked whether the devolution of funds had affected the LEAs' ability to meet its key objectives for minority ethnic pupils.

Twenty-nine LEAs (76%) said that the devolution of funds had not affected the LEA's ability to meet its key objectives for minority ethnic pupils while eight (21%) reported that it had.

Respondents were not asked to provide reasons for their answers though one LEA said that devolution had affected its ability to meet its key objectives because devolution had meant less flexibility.

Training for EMAG Staff

LEAs were asked whether they had been able to support schools in providing specialist training for EMAG funded staff.

Every LEA answered in the affirmative, whether or not they had arranged a buy-back scheme. However, training provision for EMAG teachers in different LEAs ranged from negligible to fully comprehensive.

- Ten LEAs (26%) offered training for EMAG teachers either as part of the general training scheme or as central EMAG specialist training. Two LEAs (5%) offered a fully structured training programme for EMAG teachers. Four LEAs (11%) offered training sessions to EMAG teachers ranging from one per year to three or four per term. Three LEAs (8%) offered induction courses for EMAG staff. Two LEAs provided opportunities for EMAG teachers to attend accredited courses and two LEAs mentioned University courses.
- Nine LEAs (24%) had established specific strategies for the teaching of English as an additional language or sharing good practice in the teaching of EAL. One LEA (3%) shared good practice in raising minority ethnic achievement as part of the training programme. Ten LEAs (26%) specifically mentioned training for the National Numeracy and National Literacy Strategies. One LEA (3%) mentioned training on the National Literacy Strategy only. Six LEAs (16%) offered specific training in teaching literacy, English language acquisition and other issues for asylum seekers and refugees, and pupils with English as an additional language. Five LEAs (13%) reported that the training offered to EMAG teachers specifically concentrated on EMAG issues, while two (5%) offered training on general topics.
- One LEA in the south of England bought into the training services of a neighbouring LEA.

LEA Support to Schools

LEAs were asked whether there had been any significant difference in the support they had provided to schools in developing and implementing their policies in relation to minority ethnic pupils at risk of underachievement, including EAL pupils, as a result of the changes from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding.

Twenty-two LEAs (59%) said there had been a change in the support they had given to schools and fourteen (37%) said there had not. There was no correlation between whether the LEA reported a change and whether the LEA offered a buy-back scheme.

Several LEAs reported positive changes:

- Ten LEAs (26%) emphasised a significant change in responsibility from

LEAs to schools, a move towards greater inclusion and towards a 'whole school approach' to raising achievement and promoting racial equality. One LEA said that the funding changes had enabled a wider implementation of race equality throughout the LEA.

- Six LEAs (16%) stressed that there was a closer relationship between central teams and mainstream staff since the changes from Section 11 funding.
- Three LEAs (8%) specifically mentioned that they now offered a structured programme of support for schools.
- Three LEAs (8%) said the LEA inspection team was involved in the work of the ethnic minority achievement team.
- Nine LEAs (24%) reported that the monitoring of achievement by ethnic group had improved since the funding changes. Three (8%) reported an increase in monitoring generally by LEAs.
- Seven LEAs (18%) reported that they had been able to increase the training for EMAG teachers.
- One LEA (3%) reported that they had more staff as a result of the changes but did not specify whether the additional staff were qualified teachers.

One LEA that offered buy-back arrangements said,

"There has been more training available to schools, in particular support for developing and implementing school policies, ethnic monitoring and Action Plans. The service level agreement for schools buying into the service has increased awareness of appropriate EAL support and ensured target setting for teachers and pupils through the implementation of an EMTAG Action Plan. Support for ethnic minority groups is an integral part of an overall strategy to raise achievement in schools, under section 11 funding it was often viewed as marginal and not part of mainstream educational development. We have successfully moved to a policy of inclusiveness in schools, continued funding under the new grant should ensure the implementation of this policy."

An LEA that did not arrange a buy-back scheme, reported:

"The key changes relate to the focus of management responsibility for change in schools' practice in relation to ethnic minority achievement. If anything the partnership between the LEA and schools in this area has been strengthened, and the responses by schools have been very positive."

A number of LEAs were perturbed about some of the changes that had taken place:

- Two LEAs (5%) reported that there had been an increase in the number of refugees in schools which received no EMAG funding.
- Two LEAs (5%) said that the central team had been disbanded.
- One LEA (3%) reported that schools spent more on resources and less on staff as a result of the changes.

- Another (3%) said that LEAs had lost control of EMAG funding.
- One respondent (3%) said that the service had lost expertise.
- One LEA (3%) expressed a concern that there had been insufficient provision for additional support for schools with no EMAG funding.
- One LEA (3%) reported that there had been a greater increase in the number of bilingual teacher assistants than there had been teachers.

An analysis of the responses indicates that there was no correlation between the quality of the support given to schools and whether the LEA had offered buy-back. Of significance, however, was that the two LEAs which had reported an increase in the number of refugees in schools which were not receiving EMAG funding had not offered a buy-back service to schools.

One LEA which had no buy-back arrangements, said:

"Since schools employ their own staff, there is insufficient provision for additional support to schools who do not qualify for devolved funding...The arrival of a number of refugees has further stretched the staffing resources and it is proving difficult to provide suitable support for refugee children."

Another said,

"Less control over the appointment of suitably qualified and experienced staff. Loss of expertise and the range of expertise which was available centrally. There has been a movement to the recruitment of bilingual support staff rather than teachers who are regarded as 'expensive'. Some staff (teachers and classroom assistants) have been made redundant (accepted ER/VR) as the Authority can no longer relocate staff easily."

Monitoring the Use of the Fund

LEAs were asked whether they were confident that all schools with devolved budgets were using the fund for the purpose for which it was intended and were asked to provide details of their mechanism for monitoring expenditure.

Thirty-two LEAs (84%) reported that they were confident that schools were using the funding for the intended purpose while five (13%) reported that they were not. One LEA did not answer the question.

Of those LEAs offering buy-back schemes, almost half reported that they were confident that schools were using the funding for the intended purpose and just over half reported that they were not, which suggests that the operation of a buy-back scheme does not necessarily improve the LEAs ability to monitor expenditure effectively.

Of the LEAs that were *not* confident that all schools with devolved budgets were using the funding for which it was intended, three said that they could not monitor the use of the fund, one used financial monitoring and one

monitored expenditure by means of an EMAG action plan and visits to schools.

Of the remaining eighty four per cent of LEAs which were confident that the fund was being used correctly, the majority (47%) used meetings, visits, and supervision between EMAG managers, headteachers and EMAG teachers as the monitoring mechanism while forty per cent used EMAG Action Plans. Sixteen per cent of the LEAs that expressed confidence in the use of the fund used visits by LEA inspectors or school link inspectors. Twenty-two per cent used financial monitoring and nine per cent used classroom observation. Nineteen per cent of the LEAs that were confident used pupil attainment and performance as a means of monitoring spending. Other mechanisms included self-evaluation forms, annual audits and monitoring the hours and workload of staff funded by the grant.

Anticipated Changes

LEAs were asked to provide details of any changes anticipated under the Standards Fund Grant 2001/2002.

Eight LEAs (21%) did not anticipate any changes though one anticipated that additional support would be required for refugee children and a rural LEA had concerns about the equity of formula funding in 2002/2003.

A number of LEAs anticipated positive developments, three LEAs made the following comments:

- *"More and more schools are ready to accept minority ethnic pupils as part of a whole school responsibility rather than a "foreign element" associated with Section 11's responsibility. We anticipate a full delegation of the budget to schools in April 2002. The LEA will retain its central team."*
- *"Further development of school based initiatives, wider dissemination of good practice, and a fuller focus on ethnic minority achievement within the national strategies at local level."*
- *"Closer links with LEA advisors on numeracy, literacy and inclusion."*

Other LEAs were concerned about funding and rising pupil numbers:

- *"Difficulties in staff recruitment due to insecurity of funding."*
- *"Reduced level of DfES grant. Although the overall level of funding support is maintained for 2001/2002, the funding position and its impact is unclear for the following year. We are concerned about a significant shortfall. Generally the grant enables more financial flexibility for schools, and less so in terms of centrally retained funding."*
- *"Further thinning of support, be it buy-back or non-buy-back as pupil*

numbers continue to rise. Schools want teaching support not advice and need it when the achievement thrust urges schools to move the majority onward ever faster."

A number of LEAs commented that more schools were likely to want to retain funding and anticipated a greater monitoring role for LEAs. Two LEAs anticipated a shift in the direction of funding which would place additional pressures on staff in other areas.

Additional Comments or Observations

Respondents were asked to provide any additional comments or observations on the educational impact of the changes to race equality funding.

The most common comments were that uncertainties in terms of funding prevented LEAs from planning strategically. The process of allocating funding on an annual basis meant insecurity for EMAG teachers and, as a result led to a number of EMAG teachers leaving teaching. This, in turn, led to a reduction in the expertise in the service and the quality of teaching in schools. Some LEAs were concerned that the funds were not being used appropriately and that there had been an increase in the employment of classroom assistants rather than the employment of qualified teachers to support minority ethnic pupils. The issue of teacher recruitment generally and the need for EMAG teachers to cover for absences was mentioned by two respondents.

Several LEAs were concerned at the very wide remit that the EMAG fund covered and were concerned that schools would not be able to meet the targets without further funding. One LEA was concerned that race equality issues were not covered sufficiently in initial teacher training.

Some of the concerns expressed by respondents have been reproduced, below:

- *"classroom assistants have taken over in preference to EAL teachers with similar expectations of roles and responsibilities. This must have an impact on the quality of real achievement of bilingual pupils in need of support. Specific support for acquisition of English as an additional language has simply been diluted in the process."*
- *"we have come across occasional cases where staff are being used as cover for classes rather than as support teachers, especially where there are staff shortages, an increasing feature in recent months."*
- *"with small numbers of pupils across schools, with a highly mobile and transient population, delegated funding has caused real problems."*
- *"The key concern for schools and the LEA alike is the need for recognition that the grant funding needs to be long term. The 'on/off' nature of the funding sources for this work has resulted in much uncertainty."*

- *"EMAG/EMTAG introduced an admirable but impossible brief. To provide, with the same budget not only support for EAL pupils as under Section 11 but also 'all minority ethnic pupils at risk of under-achieving,' and 'to meet the needs of refugees and asylum seekers'. Added to this was the necessity to devolve part of the budget to schools."*

The LEAs that were most satisfied with the arrangements were those that had retained a sufficient proportion of the budget to fund a specialist central team.

Several LEAs expressed their satisfaction that the change in the focus of the grant had allowed a wider use of the funds and had encouraged a whole school approach to race equality and the achievement of minority ethnic pupils.

Some observations from satisfied respondents, were:

- *"The number of pupils who benefit will increase, schools will recognise that the achievement of minority ethnic pupils is a whole school issue, and a challenge for everyone requiring commitment from the whole school community."*
- *"The change from section11 funding to EMTAG funding has been a very positive change. It has taken the support for minority ethnic groups from the fringe of education into the mainstream."*

Conclusion

The survey of LEAs in England shows that over half of respondents had in place a scheme for schools to buy into EMAG services provided by the LEA; a positive finding, reflecting the hard work undertaken by local NUT divisions and associations.

Since one of the NUT's priorities is to ensure that sufficient funding for meeting the specific educational needs of minority ethnic pupils is allocated according to need, the most common factors used for the allocation of EMAG funds do not raise any serious concerns. However, any LEAs combining ethnicity with SEN as a factor for the allocation of EMAG funds, should exercise caution to ensure that the distinction between SEN and the specific educational needs of minority ethnic pupils is not lost.

On the whole, respondents welcomed the move to a greater monitoring role and anticipated that, in time, more schools would wish to retain EMAG funding. Combining a number of monitoring mechanisms, including closer school/LEA liaison, appeared to be the most successful method of monitoring EMAG expenditure.

Uncertainties in terms of funding, however, appear to be preventing LEAs from planning strategically.

The evidence appears to suggest that the retention of a sufficient proportion of the budget to fund a specialist team provides stability and consistency. The evidence appears to suggest that the retention of a sufficient proportion of the budget to fund a specialist team provides stability and consistency; a practice particularly beneficial for the education of children of dispersed refugee and asylum seeking families. LEAs reported wider implementation of race equality practice within schools and across the whole LEA.

HEADTEACHER SURVEY

Questionnaires were sent to 500 NUT headteachers within the ninety-three Local Education Authorities included in the sample. Seventy-one responses were received, representing a fourteen per cent return.

The percentages in this report represent the percentage of the total number of returned questionnaires, unless otherwise stated.

Consultation and Funding Arrangements

Headteachers were asked whether they had been consulted on the 2000-2001 EMTAG funding formula for devolving funds to schools. Fifty headteachers (70%) said they had been consulted and eighteen (25%) said they had not.

Headteachers were asked whether their schools had received Section 11 funding before the changes to the funding arrangements. Thirty-eight schools (54%) had received Section 11 funding and thirty-two (45%) had not.

In accordance with good practice, the majority of the schools receiving Section 11 funding had been consulted on the EMTAG funding formula. Thirty-four headteachers (representing 89% of schools previously in receipt of Section 11 funding and 48% of the total responses) had been consulted by LEAs. However, five schools (representing 7% of the total responses and 13% of schools previously in receipt of Section 11 funding) had not been consulted. Of the headteachers who had not previously received Section 11 funding, half of them (22.5% of the total) had been consulted by their LEAs and half had not.

Twenty-five headteachers (35%) reported that their schools had bought into LEA EMAG services. Of those, nineteen (representing 27% of total responses) had previously received Section 11 funding and seven schools (10%) had not previously received Section 11 funding. Of the schools not buying into LEA services, twenty (28% of responses) had previously received Section 11 funding and twenty-four (34%) had not.

Headteachers were asked to give the reasons behind their decisions on whether or not to buy into their LEA services. The most common response (32% of those buying back services) was that the LEA provided an excellent or good central service. One headteacher commented,

"...the interests of the minority ethnic pupils ... are best served by a well funded, accountable, centrally organised service which has strategic powers."

Four headteachers reported that they needed the support that the central LEA service could offer. One simply said, *"Time!"*

Seven schools, representing twenty-eight per cent of the schools buying into LEA services, cited the high quality and expertise of staff as the reason for buying into the service. Two schools had bought-back from the LEA to sustain the service; the headteachers said the protection of colleagues or avoiding redundancies was their reason for doing so.

One headteacher said,

"The Governors and I found it important to contribute towards sustaining the service which was in danger of breaking up if schools did not buy into it. Also, the elements were offered at a very good rate for those schools who bought in."

Of those schools that had not bought into the LEA service, seventeen (63% of those not buying back) gave 'no need' or 'not eligible' as their reason. Three (11%) said they preferred to receive devolved funding for more flexibility or to employ staff directly. Two headteachers expressed their dissatisfaction with the competency of the staff provided by the LEA and one headteacher said that the service was too expensive.

An analysis of responses from schools within the same LEA revealed some inequities in the funding arrangements. One primary school in the north west of England said that it was very fortunate to have a healthy budget, whereas an infant school in the same LEA said it had to allocate £3000 from its main budget to supplement staffing costs.

Bureaucratic Burdens

Respondents were asked whether the change in funding arrangements had led to an increase in bureaucratic burdens for schools and, if so, in what way.

Eighteen headteachers (25%) said that bureaucratic burdens had increased and forty-six (65%) said they had not. The particulars of the increased bureaucracy, where reported, did not appear to be having a significant impact on classroom teachers. Types of additional administrative tasks included the balancing of delegated and devolved budgets, completing monitoring forms, preparing action plans, and dealing with recruitment and personnel issues where schools had not bought into LEA services. Some headteachers welcomed the monitoring aspect which they hoped would ensure that funds were being spent appropriately. Others recognised that the nature of the administrative burdens had changed. Most responses appeared to indicate that the burdens were not being placed on classroom teachers.

Employment Status

Where schools employed staff with all or part of the devolved grant, respondents were asked to provide details of the types of contracts that the schools were able to offer. The table below shows the number of schools which were able to offer either permanent or fixed term contracts for qualified EMAG teachers, bilingual classroom assistants and 'other' staff.

	<i>Fixed Term</i>	<i>Permanent</i>	<i>Total</i>
EMAG Teacher	12	20	32
Bilingual Classroom Assistant	7	14	21
Other	6	5	11

Thirty-eight headteachers responded to the question. The table shows that twenty schools (52% of those responding) employed some of their qualified teachers on permanent contracts but twelve schools (31% of those responding) employed some qualified teachers on fixed term contracts.

A more detailed analysis of the responses showed that seventeen schools (45% of those responding) employed teachers on permanent rather than fixed term contracts. Nine schools (24% of those responding) employed teachers on fixed term rather than permanent contracts.

Three schools (8% of those responding) used the grant to employ teachers on both permanent and fixed term contracts. Nine headteachers (23% of those responding) reported that their school did not employ any permanent or fixed term teachers with EMAG funds. Where schools reported that they had not been able to offer permanent contracts to qualified teachers, neither had they offered permanent contracts to bilingual classroom assistants or 'other' staff.

Eighteen schools (47% of those responding), rather than employing permanent teachers, used the fund to employ teachers on fixed term contracts only or bilingual classroom assistants. Of those, thirteen (72% of the 18) said that long-term budget stability would have led them to offer different employment contracts. Five (28% of the 18) said that long-term budget stability would not have made a difference to the contracts that they offered.

Training for EMAG Staff

Headteachers were asked whether it had been possible to offer appropriate training opportunities to EMAG funded staff. Thirty-eight headteachers responded, of which thirty-five (92% of those responding) answered in the affirmative and three (8% of those responding) in the negative. Two of the three schools which had said that appropriate training opportunities had not been possible, had bought into LEA EMAG services.

Minority Ethnic Pupil Support

Headteachers were asked whether they felt that support for the education of minority ethnic pupils in their school had improved following the transition from

Section 11 funding. Twenty-one headteachers (30% of total responses) felt that support had improved. Twenty-six (37%) felt that support had not improved.

Respondents were asked what features of the new arrangements had led to an improvement in the support for the education of minority ethnic pupils.

Three headteachers (4%) said simply that, under the new arrangements, they had at least been able to secure some funding. Two (3%) said that financial control had improved and two said that they were better able to prioritise resources.

One headteacher said:

"The money goes to those schools showing need according to an annual audit, unlike before when schools historically received money, but no one knew why!"

Five headteachers (7%) said that the changes to the funding arrangements had allowed their school to target and support a greater number of pupils.

The most common improvement reported was in relation to staffing. Four headteachers (6%) said that the service had improved as schools were able to recruit and line manage their own staff. Five (7%) said that they had strong teams or that they now had expertise within the school. Three schools (4%) had gained more staff. Two (3%) said that both staff and pupils had benefited from greater stability as a result of the employment of permanent or regular staff.

One primary school headteacher, in an LEA that secured 100 per cent buyback from 100 per cent of headteachers for 2001-4, said that the LEA support service was 'excellent'.

The headteacher of a school in the south of England said there had been no improvement in support for the education of minority ethnic pupils but said that they were very satisfied with the LEA service. The LEA stated in its own response, however, that there was a much stronger focus on achievement under the new arrangements.

Respondents were asked what features of the new arrangements had led to deterioration in support for the education of minority ethnic pupils.

Nine headteachers (13%) stated that the new arrangements had meant reduced funding for the school coupled with a reduction in staff or teacher time. Two headteachers (3%) stated specifically that their school could not now meet the educational needs of minority ethnic children. Four other respondents (6%) said that, with pupil mobility and fluctuating funds, the changing needs of the school could not be met by the new arrangements.

Individual headteachers reported that there had either been a reduction in

staff morale due to lack of job security, a decline in the strategic powers of the LEA or a lack of communication of information locally on the mechanics and consequences of the new arrangements.

Additional Comments or Observations

Respondents were asked to provide any additional comments or observations on the changes.

Again, responses raised the problems of pupil mobility, fluctuating funding and the difficulty in recruiting permanent teachers to deliver support to minority ethnic pupils in conditions where the minority ethnic population may change. A number of headteachers were thankful that their schools qualified for EMAG funding but others were concerned that their funding had been reduced. One headteacher made the point:

"I'm writing as a headteacher which has benefited from EMAG funding and which never received section 11 funding hence it all seems very good to me – probably those who receive less money under the new funding arrangements feel differently."

Some headteachers gave examples of strategies that they had used to combat the difficulties of the new arrangements:

"As we had an excellent teacher in post we were able to continue to employ her – although on a 'shared' basis with another school, this has worked well."

Other headteachers felt that the circumstances in their schools were so unusual that the service was not sufficiently flexible to meet the school's needs:

"There is never enough to cover the complex needs of a school such as ours. We have very very high mobility and 32 languages at the last count."

Three headteachers (4%) highlighted their continued concerns about the use of the fund, one said:

"I know from discussion with colleagues that many now employ teaching assistants in preference to teachers. At St. Mary's we have decided to keep teachers and feel this is supporting pupil progress."

Conclusion

The fact that thirty-eight schools (54%) responding to the survey had previously received Section 11 funding and thirty-two (45%) had not reflects a significant change in the targeting of race equality funding.

However, where improvements were reported, they tended to be in relation to

staffing and greater stability as a result of the employment of permanent or regular staff which had the knock-on effect of improving the educational provision for minority ethnic pupils and pupils with English as an additional language.

Where deterioration in the service was reported, respondents were concerned that their schools no longer met the educational needs of minority ethnic pupils.

A positive finding is that thirty-two per cent of schools buying back into LEA services, cited as their reason, that the LEA provided an excellent or good central service.

Another significant finding of the survey is that forty-six headteachers (65%) reported that bureaucratic burdens had not increased and that the particulars of the increases, where reported, did not appear to be having a significant impact on burdens on classroom teachers.

A considerable concern is the fact that only twenty schools (52% of those responding) were able to offer permanent contracts to qualified teachers and that twelve schools (31% of those responding) were only able to offer fixed term contracts to qualified teachers. This assertion is supported by the finding that, of eighteen schools using the fund to employ teachers on fixed term contracts only or bilingual classroom assistants or 'other' staff, thirteen (72% of the 18) said that long-term budget stability would have led them to offer different employment contracts.

Some headteachers gave examples of strategies that they had used to combat or reduce the negative impact of aspects the new arrangements. One such strategy was to share a qualified EMAG teacher with a nearby school where neither school could afford a full time permanent EMAG teacher.

EMAG TEACHER SURVEY

Questionnaires were sent to one thousand NUT school representatives within the ninety-three Local Education Authorities included in the survey. NUT school representatives were asked to pass the questionnaires to EMAG teachers within their schools. Fifty-six responses were received from EMAG teachers, representing six per cent of the sample. This is explained by the fact that many schools did not qualify for EMAG funding from 2001 and that a number of EMAG teachers continue to be employed centrally.

The percentages in this report represent the percentage of the total number of returned questionnaires, unless otherwise stated.

Employment Status

Respondents were asked to provide details of their current post. The responses were divided into three broad categories: thirty-five respondents (63%) were teachers; seventeen (30%) were EMAG leaders or coordinators and four respondents (7%) were 'assistants'.

Forty-eight respondents (86%) were employed on permanent contracts and the remaining eight (14%) were employed on a fixed term basis. Of the latter, six respondents stated that their contract was for one year, one stated that they were on a four year contract, and the other did not give details of the length of their contract.

The percentage of teachers, leaders/coordinators and assistants respectively on permanent or fixed term contracts is illustrated in the following table:

	<i>Fixed Term</i> %	<i>Permanent</i> %
Teacher	09	53.5
Leader/Coordinator	02	28.5
'Assistant'	03.5	03.5
Total	14.5	85.5

Twenty-one respondents (38%) said that their employment status had changed following the transition from Section 11 to EMTAG or EMAG funding, while thirty-one respondents (55%) said that there had been no change in their employment status.

Not all respondents who answered this question gave details of how their employment status had changed but several of those who reported that their employment status had changed explained that their responsibilities had

increased, often with no change to their salary. One support teacher said that, in addition to teaching English as an additional language, their responsibility had increased to addressing the underachievement of African-Caribbean children. One peripatetic EMAG service Team Leader said that they had been *"demoted with salary protection (after tribunal) and given more work to do."* Two respondents said that their contracts had changed from temporary to permanent. Several respondents said that their job descriptions or job titles had changed. Only one said that their responsibilities had diminished.

Thirty-one respondents (55%) said that their posts were funded from LEA budgets and twenty-three (41%) were from school budgets.

Training for EMAG Teachers

Respondents were asked whether their LEA or school had offered appropriate training opportunities relevant to their post for the year 2000-2001. Thirty-eight respondents (68%) confirmed that appropriate training had been offered while fifteen respondents (27%) advised that it had not. There did not appear to be any inconsistency between EMAG staff working within the same LEA; staff working within the same LEA tended to give the same answer.

Of those who answered in the affirmative, the training support offered ranged from monthly meetings to comprehensive training on EAL, the national literacy and numeracy strategies and attendance at conferences. Several respondents advised that they had attended INSET sessions. Other training courses included phonics, writing skills and more general training on good practice in the classroom. One LEA, which had recently experienced a large intake of children from refugee and asylum seeking families, arranged for specific training to be given to teachers on teaching refugees and on addressing trauma.

Of those who said they had not received appropriate training opportunities, one language liaison teacher expressed concern that their professional development had been damaged as a result of the lack of training. A centrally employed EMAG team leader identified their own professional development needs in business, marketing, finance and leadership. Another respondent raised the issue that their LEA had not provided any assistance in helping them to convert their overseas qualification to one that was acceptable for teaching in the UK. One respondent considered that EMAG staff needed more rigorous training in working with bilingual pupils and access to the latest research on teaching bilingual pupils.

Minority Ethnic Pupil Support

Respondents were asked whether they considered that the service or support for the education of minority ethnic pupils had improved following the change in the arrangements from Section 11 to EMAG and EMTAG funding.

Forty-six respondents (82%) answered the question; eleven (24% of those who responded) believed that the service had improved while thirty-five (76%

of those who responded) believed it had not. Where several respondents were employed within the same LEA, they did tend to agree on the response to this question though a few respondents departed from the broad opinion.

Where respondents believed that there had been improvements, it was encouraging that these tended to relate to addressing the needs of minority ethnic pupils. One respondent said that the changes had allowed schools to *"maintain the consistency of support to target children who are under achieving."* Other comments were that the funding arrangements were more flexible, that schools had more ownership of the service and thus were more accountable, that the profile of EAL staff had increased and that the change had facilitated a 'whole school' responsibility towards the education and support of minority ethnic pupils.

For those who believed that the service had deteriorated, the predominant theme was the lack of support from colleagues, the lack of contact with other EMAG teachers (for the purposes of problem-sharing and keeping up to date on relevant issues) and the disbanding of central support teams. One respondent said, *"staff are not able to meet regularly to discuss issues and learn from each others' experiences"*. Another said, *"schools are ambivalent in their regard to staff in that, in some instances, you are regarded as part of the school ... and at other times you aren't"*.

Eight respondents, who believed that the service had deteriorated, stated that inflexibility, insecurity, uncertainty or the inability to plan strategically had led to the deterioration. One respondent said that *"the rigid nature of the current staffing makes it difficult to meet the variety of language needs of pupils."*

Several respondents were concerned that the needs of minority ethnic pupils were not being addressed. As the brief for EMAG funded teachers had broadened, the concern was that the support for EAL pupils had been diluted. Some respondents said that previous good practice could no longer be implemented which was to the detriment of minority ethnic pupils.

Four respondents said that staff morale was low and one said that there was a lack of leadership. One EMAG teacher stated that *"headteachers also have started to ask for extra paperwork and the workload is becoming ridiculous."*

A number of respondents were concerned that changes in the formula for allocating funds had meant that minority ethnic pupils in certain schools would be disadvantaged. Six respondents were concerned that there was no local consistency of practice or suspected that EMAG funds were being misused.

Additional Comments or Observations

Respondents were asked to provide any additional comments or observations on the changes.

One respondent stated positively, *"As I now only work in one school, I feel I am more involved in the school's day-to-day events"*. However, this was

followed by concerns about training for EMAG staff.

Another teacher highlighted positive and negative outcomes of the funding changes:

"The fact that schools have been asked to produce a policy statement means that they have actually had to think more about the achievement of their minority ethnic pupils. However, in the current climate of SATs; league tables; achievement awards etc., EAL children are often being put on the SEN register simply because they will not achieve particular NC levels and not because they have any specific learning problem."

The remainder of the additional comments or observations by respondents were not so positive.

One respondent, commenting on the inflexibility of the service, stated:

"EMAG Services need to provide a wide range of specialist services to schools in order to support an increasingly diverse society. There is a conflict of interest between individual & groups of schools e.g. no one school needs to employ a whole Chinese speaking teacher, but many schools need access to one, the teacher concerned needs a decent contract & salary to stay put."

Another expressed concerns about the recent frequent changes to race equality funding, the consequences of which were:

"

- *disrupted support for pupils;*
- *incapacity to plan long-term support strategy for pupils & schools;*
- *stress for EMAG teachers who should be able to focus time & energy on supporting EM pupils & schools;*
- *losing experienced staff and associated skills;*
- *low morale amongst EMAG teachers when job is so important and has to be valued; and*
- *loss of EM teachers when LEA needs more of them."*

These concerns were shared by a number of respondents.

Particular fears about the increase in racism were expressed by one teacher in one of the northern towns where civil disturbances took place during the summer of 2001.

Other comments reiterated concerns conveyed in earlier answers, particularly, perceived deterioration in good relationships between schools and the service; lack of accountability on the part of headteachers on how the grant is spent and the very serious concern that EMAG funding would be absorbed into the general school budget.

Conclusion

Compared to the responses from local education LEAs and headteachers, EMAG staff appeared to have a much bleaker outlook on the future of the education of minority ethnic pupils and pupils with English as an additional language.

The frequency and nature of changes to the EMAG funding arrangements in such a short period of time appears to have disrupted the work of EMAG teachers. Uncertainty about existing and future arrangements has caused confusion and low morale amongst such teachers and this appears to have been exacerbated by inconsistency of practice nationally and locally.

Although the fear that the majority of EMAG teachers were being employed on fixed term contracts seems to have been dispelled by the finding that eighty-six per cent of respondents were on permanent contracts, a concern is that those who reported a change in their employment status explained that this was often as a result of increased responsibilities with no increase in salary. Only one respondent reported that their responsibilities had diminished.

EMAG staff expressed broad concerns for the education of minority ethnic pupils and bilingual pupils as a whole and the objective of raising achievement for those minority ethnic pupils who are particularly at risk of underachieving. They did not express specific concerns about increases in the numbers of refugee pupils in school or the mobility of refugee pupils.

APPENDIX I



NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS ETHNIC MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT GRANT SURVEY LEA CHIEF EDUCATION OFFICERS

The National Union of Teachers is conducting a survey of EMAG teachers, headteachers and local education authorities to assess the educational impact of the change from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding.

LEA Chief Education Officers or Directors of Education are asked to complete this questionnaire as fully as possible and to return it to Sandra Bennett, Education and Equal Opportunities Department, National Union of Teachers, Hamilton House, Mabledon Place, London WC1H 9BD by **Friday 25 May 2001**. If you require an electronic copy of the questionnaire, please email Sandra Bennett at s.bennett@nut.org.uk.

Please note that all responses will be treated in confidence.

Name of LEA

Name of Chief Education Officer
or Director of Education

1. How many schools are in the LEA?

- Primary
- Secondary
- Other

2. To how many schools does the LEA devolve funding?

- Primary
- Secondary
- Other

3. Since the changes from Section 11 to EMTAG/EMAG funding, has the LEA arranged a buy-back scheme for the support of minority ethnic pupils in schools?

yes no *please tick*

4. If so, please state how many schools opted for buy-back:

- Primary
- Secondary
- Other

5. What percentage of EMAG/EMTAG funding was used for buy-back?

6. Please provide a brief description of the buy-back scheme:

7. How much of the fund was retained by the LEA?

8. Please provide details of the local formula applied to devolve EMAG/EMTAG funds to schools:

9. Has the devolution of funds affected the LEA's ability to meet its key objectives for minority ethnic pupils in its EDP?

yes no *please tick*

10. Has the LEA been able to support schools in providing specialist training for EMAG/EMTAG funded staff?

yes no *please tick*

11. Please provide details:

12. Has there been any significant difference in the support the LEA has given to schools in developing and implementing LEA policies in relation to minority ethnic pupils at risk of under-achievement, including EAL pupils, as a result of the change from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding?

yes no *please tick*

13. If so, please provide details:

14. Is the LEA confident that all schools with devolved budgets are using the funding for the purpose for which it is intended?

yes no *please tick*

15. Please describe your monitoring mechanism.

16. What changes do you anticipate for 2001/2002 under the new Standards Fund Grant?

17. Are there any other comments or observations you would like to make on the educational impact of the change from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

APPENDIX II



NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS

ETHNIC MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT GRANT SURVEY

HEADTEACHERS

The National Union of Teachers is conducting a survey of EMAG teachers, headteachers and local education authorities to assess the educational impact of the change from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding.

Headteachers are asked to complete this questionnaire as fully as possible and to return it to Sandra Bennett, Education and Equal Opportunities Department, National Union of Teachers, Hamilton House, Mabledon Place, London WC1H 9BD by **Friday 25 May 2001**. If you require an electronic copy of the questionnaire, please email Sandra Bennett at s.bennett@nut.org.uk.

Please note that all responses will be treated in confidence.

Name of LEA

Name of School

Name of Headteacher

1. Were headteachers consulted by your LEA on the 2000-2001 EMTAG funding formula for devolving funding to schools?

yes no *please tick*

2. Did your school receive Section 11 support before the funding arrangements were changed?

yes no *please tick*

3. Does your LEA arrange a buy-back scheme for the support of minority ethnic pupils in schools under EMTAG?

yes no *please tick*

4. Has your school bought into the LEA service?

yes no *please tick*

5. Please give the reasons for this decision:

6. Has the change from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding led to additional bureaucratic burdens for your school?

yes no *please tick*

7. If so, how?

8. If your school has employed staff with all or part of the devolved grant, please answer the following questions:

- 8.1 What types of teacher contracts has the school been able to offer?

Fixed term	teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>please tick</i>
	bilingual classroom assistant	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	other	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Permanent	teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>please tick</i>
	bilingual classroom assistant	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	other	<input type="checkbox"/>	

- 8.2 Would long-term budget stability have led you to offer different employment contracts?

yes no *please tick*

9. Have you found it possible to offer appropriate training opportunities to your EMTAG funded staff?

yes no *please tick*

10. Do you feel that support for the education of minority ethnic pupils in your school has improved following the change from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG?

yes no *please tick*

10.1 *If yes:*

What improvements have there been?

What features of the new arrangements have led to improvements?

10.2 *If no:*

What has deteriorated?

What features of the new arrangements have led to the deterioration?

11. Are there any other comments or observations you would like to make on the educational impact of the change from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

APPENDIX III



NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS

ETHNIC MINORITY ACHIEVEMENT GRANT SURVEY

EMAG TEACHERS

The National Union of Teachers is conducting a survey of EMAG teachers, headteachers and local education authorities to assess the educational impact of the change from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding.

EMAG teachers are asked to complete this questionnaire as fully as possible and to return it to Sandra Bennett, Education and Equal Opportunities Department, National Union of Teachers, Hamilton House, Mabledon Place, London WC1H 9BD by **Friday 25 May 2001**. If you require an electronic copy of the questionnaire, please email Sandra Bennett at s.bennett@nut.org.uk.

Please note that all responses will be treated in confidence.

Name of LEA

Name of School

Name of Teacher

1. What is your current post?

2. Please state whether your post is:

permanent

fixed term

please tick

3. If fixed term, what is the length of the contract?

4. Did your employment status change following the changes from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding arrangements?

yes no *please tick*

5. If so, how?

6. Is your current post funded by the LEA or from the school budget?

LEA
school *please tick*

7. Has your LEA or school offered you appropriate training opportunities relevant to the post for the year 2000-2001?

yes no *please tick*

8. Please give details:

9. Do you feel that the service/support for the education of minority ethnic pupils has improved following the change in the funding arrangements from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG?

yes no *please tick*

9.1 *If yes:*

What improvements have there been?

What features of the new arrangements have led to improvements?

9.2 *If no:*

What has deteriorated?

What features of the new arrangements have led to the deterioration?

11. Are there any other comments or observations you would like to make on the educational impact of the change from Section 11 to EMAG/EMTAG funding?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.