

Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant: Analysis of LEA Action Plans

Leon Tikly, Audrey Osler, John Hill and Kerry Vincent
with
Patrick Andrews, Jeremy Jeffreys, Tasneem Ibrahim,
Claire Panel, Michele Smith

The Graduate School of Education, University of Bristol
and
The Centre for Citizenship Studies in Education, University of Leicester

Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant: Analysis of LEA Action Plans

***Leon Tikly, Audrey Osler, John Hill and Kerry Vincent
with
Patrick Andrews, Jeremy Jeffreys, Tasneem Ibrahim,
Claire Panel, Michele Smith***

***The Graduate School of Education, University of Bristol
and
The Centre for Citizenship Studies in Education, University of Leicester***

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.

© Queen's Printer 2002. Published with the permission of DfES on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Crown Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.

ISBN 1 84185 795 5
September 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms and abbreviations 1
Executive summary 2

1 Introduction 4
2 Methodology 6
3 Limitations 7
4 Ethnic group performance analysis 9
5 The use of EMAG by improving local education authorities 15
6 Recommendations 18

List of tables:

Table 1 Ethnic group performance trends and targets:
Key Stage 2, English level 4 and above. 11
Table 2 Ethnic group performance trends and targets:
Key Stage 2, Mathematics level 4 and above..... 11
Table 3 Ethnic group performance trends and targets:
GCSE 5 or more A* - C grades..... 12
Table 4 Ethnic group performance trends and targets:
GCSE average point score..... 12
Table 5 Closing the attainment gap at Key Stage 2 and GCSE. 13

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------|--|
| DfES | Department for Education and Skills |
| EAL | English as an Additional Language |
| EMAG | Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant |
| EMTAG | Ethnic Minority and Travellers Achievement Grant |
| GCSE | General Certificate of Secondary Education |
| KS2 | Key Stage 2 |
| L4 | Level 4 in National Curriculum Tests |
| LEA | Local Education Authority |
| SEN | Special Educational Needs |
| SENCO | Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- i This research reports on LEA action plans for the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) for 1998/99 and 1999/2000 and on performance data for minority ethnic groups returned by LEAs for summer 2000. The research team, led by Dr Leon Tikly at the University of Bristol and Professor Audrey Osler at the University of Leicester, in partnership with Dr John Hill, Birmingham LEA, has also produced a searchable database, capturing key data from the LEA plans.
- ii The aim of the research was to identify the range and effectiveness of LEA strategies for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils and the relationship between these strategies and improvements in minority ethnic pupil performance.
- iii Action plans from 151 LEAs were analysed.
- iv There are variations in the quality of the data from LEAs, with some providing descriptive data and others providing detailed analysis of the implications of their plans for raising achievement. Achievement data is incomplete for some LEAs and is not broken down by gender. While the plans contain the intended actions of LEAs, cause-effect relationships between these actions and any improvements in achievement cannot be derived from the plans alone without further research on the implementation of the plans in practice.
- v At the end of Key Stage 2 the overall improvement rate from 1998-2000 in the proportion of pupils achieving Level 4 and above for the 81 LEAs which provided data for the three years was 11.9 percentage points in English and 14.9 percentage points in mathematics. Chinese and Indian heritage pupils are the highest achieving groups in both subjects. In both subjects rates of improvement were greater for Pakistani and Bangladeshi pupils. Rates of improvement for Black Caribbean pupils are slightly lower than average in English.
- vi GCSE results also show Chinese and Indian heritage pupils as the highest achieving groups, followed by White, Bangladeshi, Black African and Pakistani heritage pupils. Black Caribbean heritage pupils' achievements were significantly lower, with 27 per cent achieving 5 or more A* - C grades in 2000 compared to an overall average of 48 per cent.
- vii Overall, LEAs set challenging targets, the achievement of which would result in some narrowing of the 'attainment gap' for those groups currently performing less well on average than other groups.
- viii It is not possible to assess the reliability of the data from the plans, but there are considerable differences in the relative achievement of each ethnic group across LEAs. For example, Black Caribbean heritage pupils achieving 5 or more A* - C grades ranges between 16 per cent and 59 per cent, depending on the LEA.
- ix Overall Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Black Caribbean heritage pupils are achieving on average below the level of other groups. However, there is some evidence to suggest that Bangladeshi and Pakistani heritage pupils are improving at higher rates, leading to a narrowing of the gap.

- x Among those LEAs that were most successful in raising the achievement of the groups most at risk of underachieving (Black Caribbean, Bangladeshi, Pakistani heritage learners) the most common strategies were: supporting schools to review their performance, set targets and monitor achievement; and collating and disseminating good practice. Such LEAs were particularly concerned with improving the school management practices for supporting minority ethnic learners.
- xi In addition, LEAs who were successful in raising Black Caribbean learners' attainment focused on pupils' attendance, supporting supplementary schools and providing mentoring support for pupils, particularly at GCSE. They also had a broader range of strategies for liaising with minority organisations and parents.
- xii LEAs who were most successful in raising the achievement of EAL learners also placed considerable emphasis on mainstream classroom support including bilingual support, at Key Stage 2. They also targeted their efforts at newly arrived learners at GCSE and gave particular attention to meeting the needs of EAL learners with special educational needs.
- xiii The report highlights the strategies adopted by those authorities that have managed to raise the achievement of minority ethnic pupils at an above-average rate. In these authorities a greater proportion of EMAG was devolved to schools, but as these were authorities with significant minority ethnic school populations the size of the grant meant they were also able to achieve economies of scale in the provision of centralised support.
- xiv Successful authorities were also likely to make use of EMAG for advisory and administrative posts for monitoring and co-ordination.
- xv Successful authorities were more likely to report using LEA data analysis as a means of monitoring minority ethnic group performance and supporting schools in the use of these data to set challenging targets. They placed more emphasis on training and support in relation to EMAG and on central financial monitoring of its use.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The research was carried out by the Graduate School of Education of the University of Bristol and the Centre for Citizenship Studies at the University of Leicester and was jointly directed by Dr Leon Tikly and Professor Audrey Osler. The university research teams worked in partnership with the Research and Statistics Division in Birmingham LEA.
- 1.2 This report forms part of the output of the research. The other outcome is a searchable database (accompanied by a user guide), which captures key information in LEA Action Plans submitted to the Department for Education and Skills in the period 1999-2000.
- 1.3 The research involved a desk-based analysis of LEA Action Plans for 1998/99 and 1999/2000 and performance data to determine patterns and trends in provision and achievement of minority ethnic pupils since the introduction of EMAG.
- 1.4 The study aims to:
Identify the range and effectiveness of LEA strategies for raising the achievement of ethnic minority pupils and the relationship between these strategies and improvements in minority ethnic pupil performance.
- 1.5 The specific objectives are:
 - (a) To identify and analyse, on the basis of a study of LEA Action Plans and baseline data, minority ethnic achievement patterns and short-term trends in the achievement of individual minority ethnic groups since EMAG/ EMTAG¹ began in 1999-2000, in comparison to national achievement data for all pupils;
 - (b) To investigate whether there is tentative evidence of a link between total resourcing and the allocation of resources, and differential improvements in achievement;
 - (c) To assess whether it is possible to compare actual performance against targets set and whether those targets were realistic and/or sufficiently challenging (i.e. are LEAs setting targets that will lead to a narrowing of the attainment gap?);
 - (d) To assess whether the three years of information and targets contained within the plans show that LEAs are making meaningful progress in their approach to minority ethnic attainment and the use of EMAG money, and whether they are learning from each year's experience in drawing up the next year's plans and targets;
 - (e) To analyse and provide commentary on the following aspects of the LEA action plans as they relate to LEAs which were successful in raising the attainment of at least two 'at risk' groups:
 - the range of LEA strategies for raising attainment
 - how LEAs use central resources

¹ The name of the grant changed between the two years of the action plans from the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) to the Ethnic Minority and Travellers Achievement Grant (EMTAG). For consistency 'EMAG' has been used to refer to the grant throughout.

- the relationship between EMAG funding and targets and funding, including targets associated with other initiatives such as the literacy and numeracy strategies, Excellence in Cities
- criteria for devolving EMAG money
- extent of buy-back by schools of LEA central services
- data collection and monitoring strategies
- consultation with schools and communities
- evidence of potential good practice and innovative approaches
- the number and range of languages spoken
- evidence of differential success of individual ethnic minority groups

2. METHODOLOGY

- 2.1 The research was based on an analysis of LEA EMAG action plans for the years 1998/99 and 1999/2000 and on performance data for minority ethnic groups returned by LEAs for summer 2000.
- 2.2 Action plans for a total of 151 LEAs were analysed for each year including several that were submitted by a consortium of LEAs.
- 2.3 An analytical framework was developed to capture information for the database across the two years of the action plans (the analytical framework is reproduced within the database). This was developed by the team from scrutinising an initial sample of action plans.
- 2.4 The analytical framework was piloted using a sample of action plans and subsequently modified.
- 2.5 A relational database was constructed using 4th Dimension software based on the analytical framework.
- 2.6 The database was piloted by the research team using a sample of LEA action plans and subsequently modified.
- 2.7 Once the team were satisfied with the structure and functionality of the database, the data from the LEA action plans along with the performance data for 2000 was entered. The data recorded by each authority under each section was also assigned a quality rating related to how complete and comprehensive the data was. The quality ratings are recorded in the database.
- 2.8 Reports were then generated for each main area covered by the action plans, showing the frequency of response by LEAs to the items listed. The reports are included in the database.
- 2.9 The reports were then simplified in the form of tables for easy data analysis and presentation of findings. These are the tables that appear in this report.

3. LIMITATIONS

- 3.1 Comparing attainment and performance trends for each ethnic group was a problem due to gaps in the data. To extract reliable statistics from a sufficient number of LEAs the following approach was used:
- Performance trends 1998-2000 are based on those LEAs where data for each ethnic group were provided for each year
 - The aggregated performance figures and targets were ‘weighted’ according to the number of pupils in each ethnic group in each LEA. Where cohort numbers were absent from 1998 and 1999 data (as was the case for most LEAs) the 2000 cohort numbers were used and applied to the 1998 and 1999 percentages. The assumption is made that ethnic group cohort numbers will not change significantly from 1998 to 2000. The advantage of this approach is that a much greater number of LEAs can be included in the analysis.
- 3.2 The identification of LEAs that appear to be most successful in raising minority ethnic group achievement (Section 6) is based on LEAs where there are 100 or more pupils in this ethnic group cohort. This ‘cut off’ was chosen because LEAs can record large percentage improvements based on very small cohort numbers but they are unlikely to be statistically significant improvements.
- 3.3 Not all LEAs provided responses to each question for each plan year.
- 3.4 There are variations between LEAs in the level of analysis recorded in response to each question. Some LEAs provided brief descriptive responses while others provided a detailed analysis of the implications for raising achievement.
- 3.5 Data on the achievement of each ethnic group is incomplete for some LEAs. This limits the extent to which performance *trends* can be measured. In some cases percentage figures were recorded without corresponding pupil numbers so that the size of the ethnic group cohort cannot be determined. This affects the calculation of percentage changes from year to year.
- 3.6 Achievement data is not broken down by gender. This means that it is not possible to determine levels of achievement and rates of improvement for girls compared to boys, or any differential impact related to the use of EMAG. Nor is it possible to identify differences in achievement within the overall grouping girls or the overall grouping boys.
- 3.7 LEAs’ responses to each plan question and the data recorded in the plans have been taken at face value. It cannot be assumed, without further evidence, that the plans are necessarily descriptive of practice.
- 3.8 The data provided by the DfES does not permit a reliable analysis of the relationship between per pupil levels of funding and minority ethnic group performance. This is due to gaps in the data sets from some LEAs (see 3.3 above).

3.9 While many LEAs recorded improvements in the performance of minority ethnic pupils across the three plan years (1998 – 2000), cause effect- relationships cannot be derived from the plans alone. Further empirical research is required to establish the relative impact of EMAG deployment in those LEAs that appear to be making the most improvement.

4. ETHNIC GROUP PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

- 4.1 As part of their EMAG plan submissions, LEAs were asked to provide end of Key Stage 2 and GCSE performance data analysed by ethnic group. LEAs were also required to set targets for raising the achievement of each group.
- 4.2 LEAs were asked to provide both ethnic group cohort numbers and the percentage achieving for each of the plan years. In practice, few LEAs (less than 20 per cent on average) provided cohort numbers for the years 1998 and 1999, although most provided cohort numbers for 2000.
- 4.3 A further limitation to the data analysis, affecting the calculation of improvement rates, arises from inconsistencies in the performance data provided by LEAs from year to year. For example, only half the LEAs, on average, provided performance data for each of the three years.
- 4.4 It is important that these limitations are taken into account when interpreting the data.

Ethnic group performance trends and targets

- 4.5 Tables 4.1- 4.4 compare the performance of each ethnic group in the end of Key Stage 2 National Curriculum assessments and in the GCSE examinations. To produce national aggregates, the data in these tables have been 'weighted' according to the number of pupils from each ethnic group in each LEA.

It should be noted that the number of LEAs providing data for 1998 is much lower than for 2000 so some caution is needed when interpreting the 1998 results. To aid interpretation, the number of LEAs providing data is included in the tables.

Key Stage Two Results

- 4.6 Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show end of Key Stage 2 results for each group in 2000 and as compared with 1998. In the English tests, Chinese and Indian heritage pupils are the highest achieving groups, followed by White, Black Caribbean, Black African, Bangladeshi and Pakistani heritage pupils. Overall the improvement rate between 1998 and 2000 in the percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above in English for the 81 LEAs that provided data for the two years was 11.9 percentage points. Rates of improvement were slightly higher for Pakistani and Bangladeshi heritage pupils (12.6 percentage points and 13.4 percentage points respectively) and slightly lower for Black Caribbean heritage pupils (10.1 percentage points).
- 4.7 Chinese and Indian heritage pupils were also the highest achieving groups in mathematics at the end of Key Stage 2, followed by White, Black African, Bangladeshi, Black Caribbean and Pakistani heritage pupils. The overall rate of improvement was higher in mathematics compared to English at 14.9 percentage points and again Pakistani and Bangladeshi heritage pupils improved at a greater rate than other groups (18.2 percentage points and 21.4 percentage points respectively).

The final column in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 is an aggregate of the targets set by each LEA for each group for 2000. This shows that the targets set were challenging overall when they were set in 1999 and would, if achieved, result in some narrowing of the gap in the attainment of the 'underachieving' groups (Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Black Caribbean heritage pupils) compared to the national average (Table 4.5). In practice, while there has been some improvement, significant gaps remain. Thus although the average attainment of Black Caribbean heritage pupils has improved, the lower rate of improvement means that there has been, in practice, a widening of the attainment gap for this group of pupils in both English and mathematics at Key Stage 2.

GCSE Results

- 4.8 Tables 4.3 and 4.4 show the GCSE results for each group in 2000 and as compared with 1998. As at Key Stage 2, Chinese and Indian heritage pupils are the highest achieving groups, followed by White, Bangladeshi, Black African and Pakistani heritage pupils. Black Caribbean heritage pupils' achievements are comparatively lower with 27 per cent achieving 5 or more A*-C grades in 2000 compared to an overall average of 48 per cent.
- 4.10 Rates of improvement in the GCSE were highest for Chinese, Bangladeshi and Indian heritage pupils.
- 4.11 As for KS2, the GCSE targets set for each group are challenging and if achieved would result in some narrowing of the attainment gap for Bangladeshi and Black Caribbean heritage pupils, although not for Pakistani and Black African heritage pupils (Table 4.5). In practice, although all groups have made some improvement, rates of improvement have not been sufficient to achieve the targets and the attainment gap, particularly for Black Caribbean heritage pupils is still wide.

Table 1
Ethnic group performance trends and targets

KS2 English L4 and above

| Ethnic Group | No. of LEAs providing data for 1998 and 2000 | No. of LEAs providing data for 2000 | % Level 4 and above 1998* | % Level 4 and above 2000* | 1998-2000* improvement percentage point changes | 2000 (All LEAs)** | 2000 Targets *** |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------|------------------|
| White | 45 | 94 | 62.3% | 74.2% | 11.9 | 75.1% | 69.9% |
| Black Caribbean | 50 | 89 | 56.0% | 66.1% | 10.1 | 66.4% | 66.0% |
| Black African | 43 | 87 | 54.5% | 66.3% | 11.8 | 65.8% | 64.7% |
| Indian | 57 | 100 | 66.5% | 78.5% | 12.0 | 78.2% | 74.0% |
| Pakistani | 57 | 101 | 47.1% | 59.7% | 12.6 | 59.3% | 58.2% |
| Bangladeshi | 43 | 90 | 49.5% | 62.9% | 13.4 | 62.5% | 59.7% |
| Chinese | 43 | 94 | 73.7% | 85.6% | 11.9 | 83.9% | 77.2% |
| All groups | 81 | 134 | 62.0% | 73.9% | 11.9 | 74.3% | 70.6% |

* Based on those LEAs providing data for the group for 1998 and 2000

** Based on all LEAs providing data for 2000

*** The 2000 targets were set by LEAs in 1999 using their 1998 results as a baseline

Table 2
Ethnic group performance trends and targets

KS2 Mathematics L4 and above

| Ethnic Group | No. of LEAs providing data for 1998 and 2000 | No. of LEAs providing data for 2000 | % level 4 and above 1998* | % level 4 and above 2000* | 1998-2000* improvement percentage point changes | 2000 (All LEAs)** | 2000 Targets *** |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------|------------------|
| White | 43 | 93 | 57.5% | 71.7% | 14.2 | 72.0% | 67.1% |
| Black Caribbean | 49 | 89 | 44.3% | 58.8% | 14.5 | 58.9% | 59.9% |
| Black African | 43 | 85 | 43.9% | 60.6% | 16.7 | 60.8% | 57.7% |
| Indian | 56 | 100 | 60.0% | 75.9% | 15.9 | 75.6% | 70.9% |
| Pakistani | 56 | 100 | 37.4% | 55.6% | 18.2 | 54.6% | 52.9% |
| Bangladeshi | 42 | 90 | 40.1% | 61.5% | 21.4 | 60.5% | 56.6% |
| Chinese | 42 | 92 | 75.3% | 87.4% | 12.1 | 86.4% | 80.1% |
| All groups | 81 | 135 | 52.4% | 67.3% | 14.9 | 67.7% | 68.2% |

* Based on those LEAs providing data for the group for 1998 and 2000

** Based on all LEAs providing data for 2000

*** The 2000 targets were set by LEAs in 1999 using their 1998 results as a baseline

Table 3**Ethnic group performance trends and targets****GCSE 5 or more A*-C grades**

| Ethnic Group | No. of LEAs providing data for 1998 and 2000 | No. of LEAs providing data for 2000 | 1998* | 2000* | 1998-2000* improvement percentage point changes | 2000 (All LEAs)** | 2000 Targets*** |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-------------------|-----------------|
| White | 42 | 86 | 44.3% | 47.0% | 2.7 | 48.4% | 50.1% |
| Black Caribbean | 36 | 67 | 22.2% | 25.3% | 3.1 | 27.2% | 30.4% |
| Black African | 31 | 65 | 33.9% | 34.8% | 0.9 | 36.4% | 37.9% |
| Indian | 52 | 89 | 53.2% | 57.9% | 4.7 | 58.0% | 57.8% |
| Pakistani | 51 | 86 | 31.1% | 34.5% | 3.4 | 34.5% | 36.9% |
| Bangladeshi | 36 | 68 | 29.7% | 37.1% | 7.4 | 37.2% | 38.7% |
| Chinese | 40 | 77 | 64.7% | 73.5% | 8.8 | 73.4% | 70.1% |
| All groups | 70 | 118 | 43.4% | 46.5% | 3.1 | 47.7% | 49.2% |

* Based on those LEAs providing data for the group for 1998 and 2000

** Based on all LEAs providing data for 2000

*** The 2000 targets were set by LEAs in 1999 using their 1998 results as a baseline

Table 4**Ethnic group performance trends and targets****GCSE average point score**

| Ethnic Group | No. of LEAs providing data for 1998 and 2000 | No. of LEAs providing data for 2000 | 1998* | 2000* | 1998-2000* improvement percentage point changes | 2000 (All LEAs)** | 2000 Targets*** |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-------------------|-----------------|
| White | 31 | 82 | 36.4 | 39.1 | 2.7 | 38.7 | 38.3 |
| Black Caribbean | 27 | 70 | 28.0 | 29.7 | 1.7 | 29.3 | 30.2 |
| Black African | 24 | 70 | 30.4 | 32.9 | 2.5 | 34.1 | 32.8 |
| Indian | 38 | 86 | 39.1 | 43.3 | 4.2 | 42.1 | 42.6 |
| Pakistani | 37 | 82 | 32.4 | 34.2 | 1.8 | 33.3 | 34.1 |
| Bangladeshi | 26 | 68 | 29.6 | 33.9 | 4.3 | 33.8 | 35.0 |
| Chinese | 28 | 73 | 40.4 | 50.0 | 9.6 | 50.7 | 45.7 |
| All groups | 60 | 113 | 35.8 | 38.0 | 2.2 | 38.2 | 38.5 |

* Based on those LEAs providing data for the group for 1998 and 2000

** Based on all LEAs providing data for 2000

*** The 2000 targets were set by LEAs in 1999 using their 1998 results as a baseline

Table 5**Closing the attainment gap at Key Stage 2 and GCSE**

| Ethnic Group | Differences between each group's performance and the national average in KS2 English, Level 4 and above | | | Differences between each group's performance and the national average in GCSE 5 or more A*-C grades | | |
|-----------------|---|--------------|---|---|--------------|---|
| | 1998 Results | 2000 Results | What the difference between each group's results and the national average would be if LEA targets had been achieved | 1998 Results | 2000 Results | What the difference between each group's results and the national average would be if LEA targets had been achieved |
| White | + 0.3% | + 0.3% | - 0.7 % | + 0.9% | + 0.5% | + 0.9% |
| Black Caribbean | - 6.0% | - 7.8% | - 4.6% | - 21.2% | - 21.2% | - 18.8% |
| Black African | - 7.5% | - 7.6% | - 5.9% | - 9.5% | - 11.7% | - 11.3% |
| Indian | + 4.5% | + 4.6% | + 3.4% | + 9.8% | + 11.4% | + 8.6% |
| Pakistani | - 14.9% | - 14.2% | - 12.4% | - 12.3% | - 12.0% | -12.3% |
| Bangladeshi | - 12.5% | - 11.0% | - 10.9% | - 13.7% | - 9.4% | - 10.5% |
| Chinese | + 11.7% | + 11.7% | + 6.6% | + 21.3% | + 27.0% | + 20.9% |
| All groups | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Differences in performance across LEAs

4.12 A key feature of successful achievement strategies is the ability to identify where improvements are being made, analyse what factors contribute to success and disseminate the findings.

4.13 While the EMAG plans do not allow reliable cause effect analysis to be carried out, the data do give some indication of LEAs that appear to be making the most difference in raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils.

4.14 Wide variations are evident in the relative achievement of each group across LEAs. For example, the percentage of Bangladeshi pupils achieving Level 4 and above in English ranges between 53 per cent to 71 per cent depending on the LEA. The percentage of Black Caribbean heritage pupils achieving 5 or more A*-C grades ranges between 16 per cent to 59 per cent.

4.15 There may be a number of factors which account for these differences, including differences in the socio-economic profile of pupils from the same ethnic background but

living in a different part of the country. However, it is worth investigating the high achieving/improving LEAs more closely to determine if there are any differences in how they use EMAG funds (see Section 5).

- 4.16 In summary, the data show that Bangladeshi, Pakistani and Black Caribbean pupils are achieving on average below the level of other groups. However, there is some evidence to show that Bangladeshi and Pakistani pupils are improving at a higher rate than average, leading to some narrowing of the attainment gap. The improvement rate for Black Caribbean pupils is, on average, similar to or below that of other groups so the performance gap has not closed. Variations are evident in the relative achievement of each group across LEAs and further investigation of those LEAs achieving most success in closing the achievement gap would be worthwhile.

5. THE USE OF EMAG BY IMPROVING LEAS

5.1 This chapter focuses on the uses made of EMAG by authorities that have achieved higher than the national average improvements in attainment for the three minority ethnic groups which the data show are most at risk of underachieving (i.e. for learners of Black Caribbean, Bangladeshi and Pakistani heritage). The authorities analysed in this section had 100 or more pupils in each cohort. The section focuses on;

- the strategies used to raise attainment
- the use made of central resources (including centrally funded posts)
- arrangements for monitoring the uses of EMAG.

5.2 The analysis provides an indication of the range of uses of EMAG that may contribute to raising attainment amongst groups ‘at risk’ of underachieving. It does this by identifying the most popular strategies used by successful LEAs and comparing these to the most popular strategies used by other LEAs. Although it is not possible to attribute increases in achievement simply to the uses of EMAG as stated in the LEA plans, the analysis does provide an initial indication of how successful LEAs are making use of EMAG.

5.3 ‘Successful’ authorities are defined in relation to their success in raising the attainment of each sub-group of minority ethnic learners. The intention is to highlight any differences in strategies used in relation to each group and how this may be contributing to improved performance.

Strategies to Raise Achievement of ‘At Risk’ Minority Ethnic Learners at KS2

5.4 The three most common strategies used to raise the achievement of ‘at risk’ groups amongst the successful LEAs were:

- helping schools monitor achievement and target underachievement
- collating and disseminating good practice
- setting effective targets for minority ethnic learners.

In the case of collating and disseminating good practice, the percentage of successful LEAs adopting this strategy was, on average, twice as high as for all LEAs. This suggests that the successful LEAs may adopt an enhanced strategic role in relation to the aims of EMAG. Other strategies aimed at enhancing the management of EMAG such as helping schools develop specific and whole school policies to tackle underachievement were, on average, more popular amongst the successful LEAs at KS2 than amongst LEAs as a whole.

5.5 There is a high level of consistency in the choice of strategies adopted by successful LEAs for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils.

5.6 In relation to staff development, school-based training of mainstream staff (in addition to centrally provided training) was a common feature of successful LEAs at KS2 but did not feature as a main strategy for other LEAs. The range of staff development

strategies used by the successful LEAs was also greater than for other LEAs and included:

- strategies to train senior managers and governors in the use of EMAG
- co-ordinating the work of mainstream and specialist EMAG staff;
- providing SENCO training on the needs of SEN minority ethnic learners.

Strategies to Raise Achievement of ‘At Risk’ Minority Ethnic Learners at GCSE

5.7 Authorities that were successful in raising the attainment of the minority ethnic pupils at GCSE showed a similar pattern in their use of EMAG to those achieving success at KS2.

5.8 There are some minor differences, however, between the strategies linked to raising GCSE performance. In LEAs that have succeeded in raising the attainment of pupils of Black Caribbean heritage there is more support for providing supplementary schools, as well as role models and mentors for pupils at risk of underachieving. Providing mentors and role models is also popular amongst LEAs that have been successful at improving Pakistani heritage pupil attainment at GCSE. Strategies aimed at involving parents and the community were another common feature of the more successful LEAs, including:

- consultation with minority ethnic groups over the use of EMAG
- facilitating home/school visits
- the establishment of support groups for specific groups of minority ethnic learners and parents.

Strategies Used by Successful Authorities to Support EAL Learners at KS2

5.9 The broad patterns of use of the strategies to support EAL learners for successful authorities at KS2 is similar to the patterns for all authorities but with some notable differences. The production of good practice guidelines for meeting the needs of EAL learners was one of the three most popular strategies adopted by successful LEAs. This was not the case for other LEAs. Successful LEAs share with all LEAs an emphasis on providing mainstream support for EAL learners including bilingual support. However, the percentage of the successful LEAs adopting these strategies is on average higher, as is the percentage increase in the use of these strategies over the two years of the plan.

5.10 The range of strategies adopted by the successful authorities for helping EAL learners access the curriculum was broader than for other authorities, indicating greater diversity of practice. The successful authorities have targeted provision across Key Stages to achieve continuity of learning. The dissemination of good practice for supporting EAL learners amongst mainstream teachers is another common feature of successful LEAs.

Strategies Used by Successful Authorities to Support EAL Learners at GCSE

5.11 The strategies adopted by the successful authorities at GCSE are, once again, broadly similar to those for the successful authorities at KS2. One notable difference is that support for newly arrived EAL learners features as a main strategy for LEAs that are successful at GCSE but not for those who are successful at KS2. There are also a greater number of staff development strategies used by the former as opposed to the latter group, including joint centrally managed training for specialist and mainstream staff on providing support for EAL learners, and SENCO training in relation to providing support for EAL learners with special educational needs.

Use of Central Resources

5.12 Compared to other authorities, the more successful authorities gave greater priority in their use of resources central to providing:

- an advisory service for schools on the use of EMAG,
- professional development opportunities for mainstream and specialist staff
- management and co-ordination functions relating to the use of EMAG
- the dissemination of good practice.

5.13 The way that successful authorities made use of central resources is reflected in the use of central posts. Dedicated advisory and administrative posts were more popular amongst these authorities than was the case with other authorities.

Centrally Held and Devolved Funding

5.14 All of the successful authorities recorded more than the median level of overall funding for EMAG, a composite of funds received from central government for this purpose and top-up funds from the authorities themselves. It was not possible, however, on the evidence contained in the LEA action plans, to provide an accurate picture of the amount of top-up made by individual authorities to EMAG. It was, however, possible to compare criteria for devolving funds. Here there are no major differences between the more successful authorities and all LEAs. There is also very little difference in the criteria used for weighting EMAG for EAL except that all of the successful authorities used a measure of levels of English language competence as a factor in weighting their allocations.

Monitoring Arrangements

5.15 A higher percentage of successful LEAs (89 per cent) reported using LEA data analysis as a means of monitoring use of EMAG as compared to 55 per cent of all authorities in the 2000 plans. This was the most popular means of monitoring EMAG for the successful authorities. LEA monitoring of the training and support provided in relation to EMAG was the second most popular means but this did not feature as a main strategy for all LEAs. Central financial monitoring of EMAG was the third most popular means and was more than twice as popular amongst the successful authorities than was the case for all authorities (75 per cent as compared to 31 per cent in 2000).

RECOMMENDATIONS

To the Department for Education and Skills

1. Provide LEAs with a carefully structured planning framework and guidance for raising achievement of minority ethnic pupils (e.g. setting targets, action planning, monitoring and evaluation) to promote good practice and ensure greater consistency across LEAs.
2. Develop the current EMAG programme in a way that ensures consistency with overall LEA strategies for raising achievement for those currently at risk of underachievement, as identified in the LEAs' Educational Development Plans.
3. Require LEAs to analyse data by gender as well as by ethnicity.
4. Provide guidance and models of best practice.
5. Provide guidance to LEAs on ways of supporting schools to embed this best practice in raising achievement both for minority ethnic students who are EAL learners and those who are not, in their school improvement and inclusion strategies.
6. Ensure that ethnic minority achievement is promoted as a central feature of all school improvement strategies.
7. Consider LEA pairing, linking each successful authority with other LEAs, to share practice, staff development and expertise in monitoring and evaluation.
8. Commission further research on ethnic minority achievement which examines the implementation and application of strategies at LEA and school levels. In particular, future research and evaluation should address practice in:
 - LEAs which have shown success or improvement in raising the achievement of minority learners of Black Caribbean heritage, particularly at Key Stage 4.
 - LEAs which appear to be most successful in closing the achievement gap for bilingual learners.