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Executive Summary

This value for money review aims to trace the history and development of expenditure on English as an additional language (EAL) from 2001 to 2009 and to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of that expenditure for students at primary and post-primary levels who do not speak English or Irish as a first language.

Context

In the period from the mid-1990s, to 2008 Ireland changed from a country of net emigration to one of net immigration. In 2008/2009 non-Irish students from over 160 countries made up 8% of the post-primary cohort. At primary level, in 2007/08, migrant students made up approximately 10% of the cohort, but no specific data are available on their nationalities.

In 2009 migration patterns were fluctuating. Ireland was becoming a less popular destination for new immigrants. However, at the time of writing the evidence is that immigrants with children in schools are not leaving the country in significant numbers (CSO, 2009b). In fact, the numbers of students declaring their nationality (other than Irish) at post-primary level increased in the school year 2008/09 to over 24,000 as compared with approximately 21,000 in 2007/08 and 17,632 in 2006/07. Furthermore, into the future, many children born in Ireland to parents who do not speak English as a first language may not speak English on a par with their peers whose parents are native English speakers when they start school. Over 70% of migrant students do not speak English or Irish as their first language (Smyth et al, 2009).

Supports for EAL Students

The current approach to EAL support was initially developed in response to a limited need. When that need expanded significantly, the system responded by expanding what had been an initial ad hoc solution to a systemic solution. At no time were formal objectives for the programme of expenditure articulated although there were always implicit objectives.

The number of teachers at primary and post-primary catering for EAL students has risen from some 260 in 2001/2002, to over 2,100 in 2009. Over the same period, expenditure on EAL has increased from approximately €10 million to approximately €140 million.

Research

Recently a number of different research projects specifically addressed the question of migrants and EAL in Irish education

---

1 The only year for which data are currently available
The ESRI Report “Adapting to Diversity: Irish Schools and Newcomer Students” (Smyth et al, 2009) was commissioned by the Department of Education and Skills to obtain the opinions of school principals on how schools were adapting to the migrant students who had enrolled in their schools. The report found that the vast majority of second-level schools had at least one migrant student; most had 2-9% migrants. In contrast, 40% of primary schools had no migrants, 10% of primary schools had more than 20% migrants and 2% of schools had more than 50% migrants. As was the case at post-primary many primary schools had between 2-9% migrants. School principals indicated that language difficulties for students and their parents were their main concern.

In addition to this national report, Ireland together with Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands and Austria, took part in an OECD thematic review of migrant education. Some of the key recommendations in the country report for Ireland, relevant to this review are: provide continuing professional development (CPD) for EAL teachers and mainstream class teachers to meet the needs of migrant students; strengthen the role of the Inspectorate in the context of EAL; and collect data to enable analysis of the impact of EAL policies and practices.

The Department of Education and Skills’ Inspectorate carried out an evaluation of the provision of EAL and the quality of teaching and learning in a sample of 45 primary and post-primary schools. Their findings, outlined in chapter 5 are an integral component of the evidence based data used in this report and therefore provide vital evidence for many of the recommendations in this report.

The Inspectorate highlights the need to improve the co-ordination of EAL, EAL programme planning, and planning for EAL learners in mainstream settings; to extend the range of teaching and learning methods to support not only communicative English language acquisition but also to focus on academic language development; and to ensure awareness among all teachers that they have a key role to play in developing the language competence of all learners, including EAL learners.

**Expenditure**

The review highlights that expenditure on teachers’ salaries represents the vast bulk of EAL costs under the current model. It identifies the limited expenditure on CPD as a considerable inefficiency in the programme of expenditure particularly as the majority of teachers do not have qualifications or much CPD in EAL as it is a relatively new aspect of teaching for the majority of Irish teachers.

The findings show that the current programme of expenditure which has developed organically from an ad hoc solution for smaller numbers is not effective for quality teaching and learning in the context of the rapid increase in current numbers of migrant students. It is not efficient or effective to continue current practice with the limited available resources.
**Outcomes**

EAL students in Ireland appear to do well in international standardised tests (PISA) and relatively well in national standardised tests (NAMA, NAER). However, these data can only be interpreted as indicative due to the sample sizes.

As data on performance in State certificate examinations is not currently available by nationality, a proxy has been used. The limited available evidence broadly points to EAL students generally doing well under the current arrangements with some caveats. The analysis of the data, therefore, can only provide indicative rather than conclusive findings.

A fundamental flaw with all outcome data is that there is no way to verify whether EAL students have actually benefited from language support.

**Objectives of Expenditure**

Considering the findings of the report, the Working Group which oversaw the development of this Review has recommended that the following be the revised objectives for EAL expenditure into the future.

*EAL resources are provided to primary and post-primary schools by the Department of Education and Skills:*

- **to meet the needs of EAL students so that they can**
  - acquire the knowledge, skills, understanding, attitude and confidence to become proficient in communicative and academic English (or Irish)
  - participate fully in their educational experience in school (both social and academic) on a par with their peers
  - maintain a connection with their own culture and language through school life.

- **to enable the whole school team, including Boards of Management, to build capacity so as to**
  - create a quality, relevant, inclusive and respectful school environment for all students, including EAL students and their parents, irrespective of their nationality, language, religion, culture or other differences
  - promote sharing of expertise and good practice
  - provide CPD that will
    - support the principal, class/subject specialist teachers, EAL teachers and guidance counsellors in meeting the particular needs of their EAL students
    - make all teachers aware of the language dimension of their subjects and of their role, among others, as teachers of language.

Efficiency and effectiveness indicators have been developed to measure the extent to which these objectives are met.
Recommendations and Implementation

The main key recommendations arising from the report’s findings are set out below. They are based on a number of findings and recommendations referenced throughout the report.

To meet the needs of EAL students and to enable the whole school to build capacity, the following measures are recommended.

Recommendations for the Department of Education and Skills and Bodies under its Aegis

1. EAL allocation models at primary and post-primary levels should be reviewed to develop a more efficient and effective mechanism which reflects the differing needs of each sector and provides support to EAL students based on their assessed language needs (using the Assessment Kit).

2. To allow for the building of whole school capacity on EAL and integration, EAL expenditure should be apportioned differently with a higher proportion of available funding allocated to CPD, not just for EAL teachers, but for all teachers, including guidance counsellors, and principals.

3. The Department should issue guidelines on best practice for schools in supporting EAL students.

4. Data should be available to provide evidence for the monitoring and analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of EAL expenditure and for regular research as to the performance of EAL students. The Inspectorate of the Department should continue to conduct evaluations of EAL provision, teaching and learning.

5. Post-graduate qualifications for EAL teaching should be identified.

6. Initial teacher education should prepare teachers to work with a diverse student population, not all of whom will speak English (or Irish) as a mother tongue.

Recommendations for Schools and Teachers

7. Schools, including their Boards of Management, should ensure, through the self-evaluation process, that a whole-school approach is adopted to create a positive school environment where all students, including migrants, can participate fully in their educational experience (both social and academic).

8. Assessment, both formative and summative, in EAL teaching and learning must be prioritised. The use of the Assessment Kit will provide information on whether EAL students are acquiring the knowledge, skills, understanding, attitude and confidence to become proficient in communicative and academic English (or Irish).

9. Teachers (of EAL, in particular) should give due cognisance to the importance of mother tongue. Migrant students should be encouraged to maintain a connection
with their mother culture/language as enhancing their mother tongue proficiency also enhances their competence in English.

It is estimated that the cost of implementing the short term recommendations over two years is of the order of €5 million. It is recommended that these costs should be met by diverting existing funds from teacher allocation, for example, by reducing the number of EAL teachers to enable the system to provide CPD and therefore build whole school capacity. The Working Group recommends a reapportionment of funds between teacher salary costs and other costs which would give a more effective and efficient service for all students, particularly EAL students.

In view of the likely permanent change in the make-up of the student population, in the short and medium term, at least, the Working Group concludes that EAL provision will continue to be a feature of school life. These recommendations, if implemented, should lead to a service which uses the available funds more efficiently and also meets the needs of EAL students in a more holistic and effective way.

Methodology

The preparation of this review was overseen by a Working Group which used a range of qualitative and quantitative methods. To provide guidance, the Working Group used the Programme Logic Model with its emphasis on inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes. The Group analysed research reports, internal data and the outcomes of consultation as well as meeting representatives from Northern Ireland to hear about their experience. As part of the VFM process, the text was submitted to an independent assessor for review.
Chapter 1 – Introduction

1.1 Context

In the past ten to fifteen years Ireland experienced significant levels of net immigration. This has resulted in Irish society and Irish schools becoming more diverse with a wide range of nationalities, languages, cultures and religions. For example, in 2008/2009 migrant students in post-primary schools came from over 160 countries and made up 8% of the cohort. At primary level, in 2007/08 migrant students represented approximately 10% of the cohort.

It is important to note that not all of the students who have nationalities other than Irish require extra English language assistance. The ESRI Report, Adapting to Diversity: Irish Schools and Newcomer Students, (Smyth et al. 2009) estimates that 75% of migrants at primary level and 70% at post-primary level do not speak English as their first language.

The number of teachers catering for the additional language needs of these students (to be referred to as EAL students in this report) has risen from some 260 in 2001/2002, to 1,500 in 2007, to over 2,100 in 2009. The substantial increase in expenditure on English as an additional language (EAL), from ca. €10 million to of the order of €140 million in less than ten years is the focus of this expenditure review.

This review looks at what has been happening in Irish schools in relation to English language support between 2001/02 and 2008/09 in this context. Over the past ten years schools have been in the front line in integrating migrants into our schools. They are social laboratories as well as places of education. How well our schools support integration of migrants and their native Irish peers will have profound effects on Irish society into the future. This report balances quantitative and qualitative research to show what has been achieved to date. It looks at objectives for the future and presents short, medium and long term recommendations for development.

1.2 Background to the Value for Money Review Initiative

In 1996, the Co-ordinating Group of Secretaries, established under the Strategic Management Initiative (SMI), identified in Delivering Better Government “a need for systematic analysis of what is being achieved by the €15.24 billion in Government resources spent annually” recommended that “agreements between the Department of Finance and individual Departments on delegated authority for programme expenditures [should] provide a schedule of reviews of expenditure to be carried out during the currency of the agreements, with the aim of ensuring that each programme

---

2 This is the only year for which figures are currently available at primary level.
3 The overwhelming majority of newcomer students who require language assistance require EAL, while only very small numbers require additional language support through Irish
4 This report covers the period to the end of the academic year 2009. Reductions were made in the numbers of language support teachers in 2009/10 for budgetary reasons.
of expenditure is subject to a thorough review at least once every three years”
"(Department of the Taoiseach, 1996).

The Comptroller and Auditor General (Amendment) Act, 1993 and the Public Service Management Act, 1997 set the context for expenditure reviews in terms of the achievement of economy, efficiency and effectiveness, and the maintenance of appropriate systems, practices and procedures for the purpose of evaluating effectiveness (Expenditure Review Central Steering Committee, 2004 at p 41).

The Expenditure Review Initiative (ERI), which commenced in 1997, is a systematic process of evaluation conducted by Government Departments and Offices under the guidance of the Expenditure Review Central Steering Committee and the Department of Finance. Expenditure reviews analyse exchequer spending in a systematic manner and provide a basis on which more informed decisions can be made on priorities within and between programmes.

As indicated in a National Economic and Social Council Report (NESC, 2002), the ERI moved public sector management away from the traditional focus on inputs to an emphasis on outputs and the achievement of results.

In June 2006, the ERI was enhanced and renewed as the Value for Money and Policy Review process. In 2008 the value for money structure was reviewed and reshaped. In the future, Departmental Working Groups will be chaired by an independent person. The Department of Education and Skills (the Department) is conducting this Value for Money Review under the Value for Money and Policy Review Process (2006).

1.3 Structure of Review Initiatives in the Department of Education and Skills

This review is being conducted under the 2006 criteria as work had begun on the review before the 2008 criteria were finalised. In the Department, value for money reviews, under the 2006 criteria, are undertaken by Working Groups which are chaired at Principal Officer level and comprise officials from the relevant policy and administrative sections, the Department of Finance and other representatives, as deemed appropriate. An external assessor is appointed to provide an independent evaluation of the review process and its findings. The Working Groups report to the Management Advisory Committee of the Department.

The Department has carried out a number of value for money reviews in the past and a number are also in progress. See Appendix 1 for details.

1.4 Background to this Review

On April 2, 2007 a briefing note for the Management Advisory Committee of the Department indicated that there would be a Value for Money Review carried out in 2008 on the “Expenditure on the education of persons who do not have English or Irish as a first language (€37m).” This was to be part of the programme of expenditure reviews provided for by the Department of Finance (as outlined at 1.2 above). It was considered opportune to carry out the review in light of the increase in
expenditure for EAL students in primary and post-primary education who do not have English or Irish as a first language.

The specific expenditure on EAL developed incrementally, particularly since 2001 as the needs of the ever increasing number of EAL students enrolling in primary and post-primary schools became apparent. There were some supports available to schools before 2001 but they were small in scale and provided mainly through learning supports. As demand for EAL increased, provision became more formalised and systemic.

The start of the review was deferred to late 2008 to ensure that the results of research commissioned from the ESRI on “Adapting to Diversity – Irish Schools and Newcomer Students” (see Chapter 4) as well as the findings of both the Department’s own Inspectorate’s evaluation of the quality of the teaching and learning of English as an additional language (which are detailed in Chapter 5) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Thematic Review of Migrant Education (see Chapter 4) were available. This research would, therefore, provide key evidence based data for the review.

This review is also timely given the decreasing rate of immigration into Ireland in 2009, the length of time that many migrants have now been in the country and the need to ensure value for money in this area particularly at a time of severe budgetary constraint.

A Working Group was established to carry forward the work of the review. The membership of the Group is given in Appendix 2. The Working Group held its first meeting in November 2008. There were 6 meetings in total.

1.5 Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for the review, based on guidelines from the Department of Finance, are as follows:

1. Identify programme objectives
2. Examine the current validity of those objectives and their compatibility with the overall strategy of the Department of Education and Skills
3. Define the outputs associated with the programme activity and identify the level and trend of those outputs
4. Examine the extent to which the programme’s objectives have been achieved and the effectiveness with which they have been achieved, including the appropriateness of the educational provision, as reported by the findings of the Inspectorate’s evaluation of English as an additional language (EAL).
5. Examine the level and trend of costs and staffing resources associated with the programme and the efficiency with which it has achieved its objectives.
6. Evaluate the degree to which the objectives warrant the allocation of public funding on a current and on-going basis and examine the scope for alternative

---

5 Note that there was a programme of expenditure on EAL but that EAL was not part of a formalised programme.
policy or organisational approaches to achieving these objectives on a more economical, efficient and effective basis.
7. Specify potential future performance indicators that might be used to better monitor the performance of the programme
8. Benchmark provision here with international provision (for example, in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Netherlands and Austria - the OECD countries involved in the thematic study on migrant education with Ireland, and also with Great Britain and Northern Ireland).
9. Provide recommendations for the future.

1.6 Scope

This review considers the expenditure used to support the provision of EAL to students who require it so that they can successfully access the curriculum and participate fully in school life and as members of society. In particular, the review covers the allocation of funds to cover the salaries of EAL teachers in primary and post-primary schools, as well as grant aid. It considers the effectiveness and efficiency of that spending by examining the results from the current research (summarised in chapters 4 and 5) commissioned or undertaken by the Department.

The review identifies expenditure levels and trends from the academic year 2001/02 to the end of the academic year 2008/09. It considers the effectiveness and efficiency of the provision based on the research findings.

Some continuing professional development (CPD) was provided by Integrate Ireland Language and Training Limited from 2001 to 2006 for primary and post-primary schools. Reference to it is included to provide context and background on CPD prior to 2008 but it is not explored in detail as provision was relatively limited.

In relation to other CPD provision a new programme of support is being provided through the Primary Professional Development Service from autumn 2008 and through the Second Level Support Service for the post-primary sector from spring 2009. It is not considered timely to assess the effectiveness of this recently established CPD service as it was just established while this review was taking place. Based on the research findings, recommendations are made on CPD provision (see chapter 9).

1.7 Methodology

The Working Group used a range of qualitative and quantitative methods for this review, as outlined below.

1.7.1 Research Findings

The Group analysed the findings from research which provided both a national and an international perspective. The key research findings which were analysed included:
The ESRI report “Adapting to Diversity: Irish Schools and Newcomer Students”, (Smyth et al, 2009) which provides the views of the key players in schools including staff and students. See Chapter 4 for further details.

The Inspectorate’s evaluation of the quality of teaching and learning of EAL. Their evaluation involved consultations with school staff, students and parents. See Chapter 5 for further details. School inspection reports are available at www.education.ie.

The OECD Thematic Review of Migrant Education in Ireland (OECD, 2009h). The views of key stakeholders were sought by the OECD in relation to the thematic review. See Chapter 4 for further details.

1.7.2 Consultations

To inform the development of an intercultural education strategy the Department consulted with the key stakeholders in the latter half of 2008. This consultation ranged wider than the question of the provision of language support. Language was one of the key topics which this consultation addressed. The findings of this consultation process as they relate to EAL were considered by the Working Group. See Chapter 4 for further details.

The Working Group met representatives from Northern Ireland to discuss provision there. Glasgow City Council provided information on provision in its local authority area.

1.7.3 Data analysis – internal and external

The Working Group examined policy documents and Department circulars.

In relation to data, the Group analysed statistical material and obtained data from a range of sources.

Some of the key internal data sources include the following:

- Data from a range of sections but particularly primary and post-primary administration (now known as Teacher Allocations and School Governance) on EAL teacher numbers and costs
- Data from the post-primary pupil database from Post-Primary Administration (now Parents, Learners and Database Section). The post-primary pupil database is an important source of data on migrants but it is not entirely reliable. The data is self-declared and, if the school does not put in a nationality descriptor for the student, then the system defaults to Irish. The data from this database are probably best described as trend data. Details of the information sought from post-primary schools for this database are given in Appendix 3.
- Data from Teacher Education Section on CPD and other resource provisions
- Data from Statistics Section
Data from the Inspectorate, particularly in relation to the quality of teaching and learning
Data from the Central Policy Unit on Value for Money Reviews
Data from the Finance Unit on overall costs of education.

Some of the key external data sources, in addition to the research mentioned at 1.7.1 include the following:

- Data from the State Examinations Commission on EAL students and their achievements in the state examinations
- Data from the Education Research Centre on PISA processes and tests and on the National Assessment of English Reading and the National Assessment of Mathematical Achievement.
- Data from the OECD on PISA results.
- Data from the Central Statistics Office in relation to migrant profiles.

The Working Group discussed, analysed and evaluated the above qualitative and quantitative data in order to address the terms of reference and to prepare this report. To provide guidance, the Working Group used the Programme Logic Model with its emphasis on inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes. Figure 1.1 provides a diagrammatic representation of the model.

**Figure 1.1 - Programme Logic Model**

![Programme Logic Model Diagram](image)

*Source: Department of Finance, 2007 at p 28*

1.7.4 Time range

Throughout the report trends from 2001/2002 to 2007/08 or 08/09 are analysed. This reflects the fact that comparable data are available since 2001/2002 and also that 08/09 represents the end of provision under the criteria as set out in the Department’s circular M53/07.\(^6\)

---

\(^6\)Circular 0053/2007 on *Meeting the needs of pupils for whom English is a second language* is discussed extensively in Chapter 4.
### 1.7.5 Independent assessor

An independent assessor was appointed to the review. The assessor attended the meetings of the Working Group, and actively participated, and provided advice and guidance as the Working Group prepared this report. He provided a report outlining his views on the evaluative process and methodologies employed.

### 1.8 Structure of the Report

**Chapter 2** provides the general contextual material on demographic trends, on the legislative context and summarises Irish and international policy contexts. **Chapter 3** examines the history and objectives of the programme of expenditure. **Chapter 4** examines the research in this field. **Chapter 5** provides a summary of the findings of the Inspectorate’s evaluation of the quality of learning and teaching of EAL.

**Chapter 6** examines the level and trends of expenditure over the period of the review and the efficiency of that expenditure. **Chapter 7** looks at the effectiveness of the expenditure through consideration of the findings of the data available.

**Chapter 8** sets out the revised objectives and gives performance indicators for the future. Finally, **chapter 9** outlines, in summarised format, the key recommendations which are identified throughout the report. It suggests next steps that may be considered.

For ease of reference, Table 1.1 outlines the chapter(s) in which each term of reference for this report is addressed.

*Table 1.1 - Terms of Reference and Relevant Chapter(s)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of Reference</th>
<th>Relevant Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify programme objectives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine the current validity of those objectives and their compatibility with the</td>
<td>3 and throughout the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall strategy of the Department of Education and Skills</td>
<td>document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define the outputs associated with the programme activity and identify the level</td>
<td>6 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and trend of those outputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine the extent to which the programme’s objectives have been achieved and</td>
<td>5 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the effectiveness with which they have been achieved, including the appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the educational provision, as reported by the findings of the Inspectorate’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation of English as an additional language (EAL).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.9 A Note on Terminology

A glossary of terms is provided in Appendix 4. Given the many terms used to describe those who have chosen to make Ireland their home, for the sake of clarity, we have used the following terms throughout this report:

Migrants – This term means those of non-Irish origin who have settled in Ireland and also their children. The term “newcomers” is also used in some instances. This is the term which is often used in education circles to describe migrants. In this report, these terms are interchangeable.

EAL students - We use this term throughout the text to describe migrant students who require English language support.

The term “pupil” may be used when referring to young people attending primary education and “student” is usually used when referring to young people attending post-primary education. The term “student” is used as a generic term in the Education Act, 1998 where it is defined in section 2 as “a person enrolled at the school”.

Dictionary candidates – We use this term to identify students who are entitled to use bilingual dictionaries in examinations under the State Examinations Commission’s scheme of reasonable accommodations.

In quotations, or in references to other sources, different terms may be found in the text.

There is a bibliography at the end of the report.
Chapter 2 – Policy Context

2.1 Introduction

This chapter shows that the expenditure under review during the period 2001/02 to 2008/09 arose in a social and demographic context which was changing very rapidly and which continues to evolve. It points to a continued presence of children and young people needing EAL support in Irish schools in the future.

It shows how the needs of these children and young people are recognised in the relevant legislation and specifically addressed through a number of national policy documents and the appointment of the Minister of State with responsibility for integration. It identifies the Department’s strategic and practical initiatives to meet the needs of EAL students.

The international policy context shows how issues around language learning and intercultural education are considered in EU, Council of Europe and UNESCO contexts.

2.2 Social and Demographic Changes

2.2.1 What the Census Tells Us

In 1996, immigration surpassed emigration for the first time in recent history. While emigration has been fairly stable, the main change has been a sharp increase in the number of immigrants, which, over the period covered by this review, has been very high by OECD standards (OECD, 2008).

The profile of the Irish population changed significantly between the mid 1990s and 2010. The Central Statistics Office (CSO) published a report “Non-Irish Nationals Living in Ireland” (CSO, 2008a), based on the findings of the 2006 census. There were 420,000 non-Irish nationals living in Ireland in April 2006, representing approximately 10% of the overall population and coming from 188 different countries. This is an increase of 87% on the previous census figures in 2002 and the numbers continued to rise, at least until 2008\(^8\). The Quarterly National Household Survey, for quarter 4 of 2008 (CSO, 2009a) gives an estimated figure of 476,100 non-Irish nationals aged 15 and over in the State. For quarter 4 of 2009, the equivalent figure is 422,900 (CSO, 2010) While these figures show that numbers are declining, this figure for migrants over 15 is still in excess of the total numbers of migrants (420,000) recorded in the census.

The overwhelming majority (82%) of non-Irish nationals in the 2006 census were from just 10 countries (CSO, 2008a).

---

7 Much of the remaining data in section 2.2.1 comes from this report which uses the term non-Irish national
8 The 2002 census reported 224,251 non-Irish nationals; by 2006 this had risen to 419,733 (CSO, 2003 and CSO, 2008b).
Table 2.1 - Top 10 Countries of Origin for Migrants (Data from Census 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>112,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>63,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>24,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>16,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>13,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>12,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>11,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>9,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>9,046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the figures above it is clear that many of the immigrants to Ireland are native English speakers who will not need additional English language support. Further information is given in chapter 6 on the percentage of EAL students who need English language support.

The census also revealed that non-Irish nationals were well dispersed throughout the country, living in every town in Ireland. Furthermore, 26%, of whom two-thirds were UK nationals, lived in rural settings.

The non-Irish national population in 2006 had a different demographic profile from that of the Irish, and this is clearly illustrated in the population pyramid in figure 2.1 overleaf. The non-Irish are predominantly working age people in their twenties and thirties with more men than women. There were proportionally fewer children among the non-Irish nationals compared to the general Irish population\(^9\).

---

\(^9\) This appears to have changed somewhat in the period since the census. See section 2.2.3 below for further details.
The census found that overall non-Irish nationals had higher levels of education than the Irish population. This, however, is attributable to a cohort of older Irish people who finished their education before free second level education became available in the late 1960s. If the comparison is with the Irish population aged 15 – 44, then education levels are comparable. There are, in fact, significant variations in levels of education between different nationality groupings, as is clear from figure 2.2.
Immigrants to Ireland are well-educated, young and, although concentrated in towns and cities, widely distributed around the country. All of these factors are important in considering the educational and linguistic needs of migrant children attending schools.

2.2.2 Who are the migrants? What the OECD Tells Us.

The OECD (OECD, 2008) divided Ireland’s migrants into three broad groups:

- “Irish return migrants and their descendants and British immigrants – namely, Irish emigrants who came back, Irish nationals born overseas and British nationals”. Given their skill levels the OECD suggests that they provide few economic policy challenges.

- Migrants from the new EU member states whose numbers exceeded expectations10. (When the OECD report was written, the inflow of immigrants had not slowed. At the time of writing this value for money review – 2009/10 - it has slowed considerably).

- Migrants from “rest of the world” i.e. outside Europe and the United States which the OECD says is “sizeable by international standards” (OECD, 2008 at p 102):

---

10 “This cohort has dominated the surge since around 2004. The government expected perhaps 15,000 to 20,000 migrants in the first year after EU accession, and for the rate to slow down after that, but the inflow turned out to be much higher (Killeen, 2006).” OECD, 2008 at p 102
The OECD describes this group as diverse: “It covers highly skilled migrants entering under one of the employment channels as well as asylum seekers and refugees. While the number of successful asylum seekers is small, they present the toughest integration challenge.” (OECD, 2008 at p 102)

2.2.3 Are the migrants “Going Home”?

When this review was originally proposed, in 2007, Ireland was enjoying an economic boom, the population was growing year on year and people were immigrating into Ireland in unprecedented numbers. This context has changed radically since autumn 2008. The numbers of new Eastern European migrants coming to Ireland are dropping, as noted in figure 2.3.

Figure 2.3 - Monthly New PPS Totals Each Year from May 2004 to May 2010 for the Accession Countries (includes Romania and Bulgaria from 2007)

Table 2.2 below shows the number of work permits issued and refused in 2007, 2008 and 2009. This shows a 41% decrease in the number issued in 2009 as against 2008-

However care should be taken in interpreting these figures as the system for allocating work permits and the frequency for renewals changed over the years.

### Table 2.2 - Work Permits Issued and Refused in 2007, 2008 and 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Permits</td>
<td>10,134</td>
<td>8,481</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>13,457</td>
<td>5,086</td>
<td>-62%</td>
<td>3,938</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Issued</td>
<td>23,604</td>
<td>13,567</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>7,962</td>
<td>-41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally in 2009 2,689 applications for asylum were received. This represents a 30% decrease from the 2008 total of 3,866 applications which in turn represented a 3% decrease on the corresponding figure of 3,985 in 2007. Applications are down from a peak of 11,634 in 2002\(^{12}\).

The Central Statistics Office has published information which shows that to April 2009 the numbers of new migrants are falling but are still very significant (CSO, 2009b). The CSO summarises the situation thus:

“*The number of emigrants from the State in the year to April 2009 is estimated to have increased by over 40% from 45,300 to 65,100, while the number of immigrants continued to decline over the same period, from 83,800 to 57,300. These combined changes have resulted in a return to net outward migration for Ireland (-7,800) for the first time since 1995.*” (CSO, 2009b at p 1)

The report also shows, however, that minimal numbers (1,200) of those aged under 15 are emigrating(CSO, 2009b, Table 5). In other words, families with children in school do not appear to be leaving in significant numbers. Furthermore, while all the indications are that inward migration has slowed, there is still an inward flow of 57,300 in the year to April 2009 which is at about 2004 levels and still significant (CSO, 2009b, Table 1).

This should be considered in conjunction with PPS numbers for immigrants in the age cohort 0-14 years. CSO figures show that in 2005, 7.5% of PPS numbers issued to immigrants were to that age cohort. Over 2006, 2007 and 2008, the figure increased to 17.5%, showing that the proportion of younger immigrants within migrant communities is increasing (CSO, 2009c, Table 5b).

This changing population profile combined with the birth rate (see chapter 3.3) indicates that there are likely to be significant numbers of EAL students in the Irish education system into the future. It is true that, in general, the longer EAL students are in the system, the more their proficiency in English should increase. Their need for EAL support should therefore decrease but this depends not just on their

---

communicative proficiency but also on attaining academic proficiency (Cummins, 2008).

In conclusion, it would appear that Ireland is becoming a less popular destination for all kinds of new migrants. There is, as yet, no firm evidence that migrants with children in schools are leaving the country in any significant numbers. The CSO figures indicate that they are not. It is, perhaps, therefore not surprising that the numbers of students declaring their nationality (other than Irish) at post-primary level increased in the school year 2008/09 when compared to 2007/08 (see chapter 6 for further details).

2.3 Legislative Context

Article 42 of the Irish constitution emphasises the importance of parents and the family. This emphasis permeates the Irish strategic approach to school education. Article 42.1 provides as follows:

*The State acknowledges that the primary and natural educator of the child is the Family and guarantees to respect the inalienable right and duty of parents to provide, according to their means, for the religious and moral, intellectual, physical and social education of their children*

The education sector, until 1998, was characterised by a lack of legislation. There has been a considerable body of legislation enacted in the past ten years. The *Education Act, 1998* is most relevant to this review.

In its preamble, the Act makes provision, in the interests of the common good,

“For the education of every person in the State…; to ensure that the education system is accountable to students, their parents and the state for the education provided, respects the diversity of values, beliefs, languages and traditions in Irish society and is conducted in a spirit of partnership between schools, patrons, students, parents, teachers and other school staff, the community served by the school and the State”

The objects of the Act as set out in section 6 also, however, acknowledge that its aim to provide a level and quality of education for those resident in the State has limits:

“Every person concerned in the implementation of this Act shall have regard to the following objects in pursuance of which the Oireachtas has enacted this Act:…
(b) to provide that, as far as is practicable and having regard to the resources available, there is made available to people resident in the State a level and quality of education appropriate to meeting the needs and abilities of those people” [Emphasis added.]
2.4 National Policy Context of EAL Provision

2.4.1 Reports Setting the National Context

Towards 2016: Ten-Year Framework Social Partnership Agreement, 2006-2015 provided for enhanced support for the effective integration of migrant children at both primary and post-primary level through the provision of an extra 550 language support teachers by 2009 and the reform of the then limit of two additional language support teachers per school.

It also specified that

“a new framework will be finalised to address the broader issue of integration policy. The Government will develop a comprehensive strategy for all legally resident immigrants following consultation with relevant stakeholders including the social partners which will build on and be linked with progress already achieved in the areas of social inclusion and anti-racism. Appropriate co-ordinating mechanisms to implement such a strategy will be developed and the scope for a role for civil society organisations will also be explored.”

Such an approach was also promoted in the National Action Plan for Social Inclusion, 2007-2013 in high level goal 12 under the “Communities” strand of the Plan, and in the National Development Plan 2007-2013 - Transforming Ireland - A Better Quality of Life for All.

The Agreed Programme for Government, 2007, in the context of promoting successful integration in schools, stated that -

We will:

- Further increase the number of language support teachers from 1,450 to 1,800.
- Improve teacher training and give extra supports to schools with large numbers of students with different languages and cultures to improve home-school links.
- Provide access to English language classes for adult immigrants.
- Ensure that our education system and personnel are well-equipped for a multi-cultural society.

More generally, in relation to integration, it provided that the Government will:

- Develop a national integration policy, based on equality principles and taking a revised and broader view of social inclusion which builds on the experience of other countries.
- Appoint a Minister of State to implement the national integration policy. The Office will bring together in one administrative unit key officials from relevant government departments who provide services to immigrants.

Continue to promote national campaigns aimed at challenging racism and promoting understanding of diversity and fund campaigns that educate the Irish public about the role of immigration in Irish society.

Support the services offered by ethnic-led non-governmental organisations working with the immigrant community, in particular those that provide for the educational, cultural and linguistic needs of migrant workers.

The Renewed Programme for Government, October 2009 emphasised the importance of language support in schools by providing as follows:

“We will maintain Language Support funding to schools and guarantee that extra language support assistants will also be available in schools where more than 50% of pupils do not speak English as a first language.”

The Report of the Special Group on Public Service Numbers and Expenditure Programmes, 2009 (colloquially known as the McCarthy report or the Bord Snip Nua Report) looked at possible areas for expenditure reduction across the public service. In relation to English language support, the report states:

“There are currently almost 2,200 language support teachers providing services to non-English speaking children requiring additional tuition in the English language. This is due to reduce to about 1,500 from September 2009, arising from policy changes being introduced in the context of the 2009 Estimates decisions. The Group is of the view that the allocation for this service should still be reduced further in 2010 because of the decreasing levels of immigration, the increasing trend of immigrants leaving the country due to the current economic difficulties, and the length of time that most existing immigrants have now been in the country. The Group recommends a progressive reduction of 1,000 in the number of teachers to a reduced complement of 500 in this area from September 2010, saving an estimated €7m in 2010 rising to over €21m in a full year. This proposed reduction would return the number of language support teachers to long term trend requirements based on estimated immigration and labour market parameters.” (Department of Finance, 2009, volume II at p 61)

2.4.2 Minister of State for Integration

The Government appointed a Minister of State for Integration, Conor Lenihan, T.D. in July 2007. This Minister’s remit formally incorporated three government departments: the then Departments of Justice, Equality and Law Reform; Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs; and Education and Science. Minister John Curran, T.D took over the brief in April 2009 and Minister Mary White, T.D. Minister of State with responsibility for Equality, Integration and Human Rights, took over the brief in March 2010. In the context of the education brief, the Minister is responsible for:

14 Department of Finance, 2009
15 The names and remits of these Departments have changed somewhat since 2007.
Ensuring that the range of education policies across different areas of the department, and the bodies under its aegis, take account of the need to integrate migrants and their families;

Coordinating the work of the Department of Education and Skills on the integration of migrants with the related work of other relevant Departments and State Agencies.

The policy document “Migration Nation: Statement on Integration Strategy and Diversity Management” was published in May 2008. The document sets out the overarching policy in relation to migration in Ireland and contains the key principles which inform and underpin State policy with regard to integration. This requires:

- A partnership approach between the Government and non-governmental organisations, as well as civil society bodies, to deepen and enhance the opportunities for integration.
- A strong link between integration policy and wider state social inclusion measures, strategies and initiatives.
- A clear public policy focus that avoids the creation of parallel societies, communities and urban ghettos, i.e. a mainstream approach to service delivery to migrants.
- A commitment to effective local delivery mechanisms that align services to migrants with those for indigenous communities.

With regard to successful integration the policy document notes that host language education is essential and highlights the need for more targeted support for teachers and parents in dealing with diversity in the classroom or school setting. Language acquisition is identified as an integration indicator.


The National Action Plan Against Racism provided 10 actions for the Department of Education and Skills which were actively monitored during the lifetime of the Plan. The most relevant to this review include:

1. Develop a national intercultural education strategy with reference to equality/diversity policy;

2. Develop a more inclusive and intercultural school practice and environment through the whole school planning process, admissions policies, codes of behaviour, and whole school evaluation;

3. Accommodate cultural diversity within the curricula;

4. Enhance the participation of refugees and asylum seekers in education up to 18 years of age, as well as the participation of refugees and those with humanitarian leave to remain in the State in Further and Higher Education Provision. A specific focus on the needs of females will be part of this process;
5. Enhance access and education service delivery to unaccompanied minors;
6. Enhance provision of English as a second language;
7. Evolve education related data systems to provide a comprehensive picture of diversity and policy progress.

2.5 The Department of Education and Skills Policy Context

2.5.1 The Department’s mission, high level goals and activities relevant to this review

The mission of the Department\(^{16}\) is to provide for high-quality education, which will:

- Enable individuals to develop their full potential and to participate fully as members of society, and
- Contribute to Ireland’s social, cultural and economic development.

In pursuit of its mission, the Department has four high level goals:

1. Support and improve the quality, relevance and inclusiveness of education for every learner in our schools.
2. Enhance opportunities in further education and youth services.
3. Sustain and strengthen higher education and research.
4. Support the delivery and development of education through policy formulation, high-quality planning and a strong customer focus.

The first and last of these high-level goals are of most relevance to this review.

The Department is engaged in a wide range of activities at all levels of the education system. Of particular relevance to this review are the following activities:

- The provision of high-quality policy advice to the Minister and Government as an aid to decision making and accountability to the Oireachtas;
- Conducting research, review, evaluation and development of policy relating to all areas of education;
- Ensuring high-quality education through the role of the Inspectorate at first and second levels;
- Discharging a wide range of operational, resourcing and support functions relating to the funding of the sector, including the payment of teaching and non-teaching staff and grants to schools and other education bodies, the allocation of teaching resources and other supports;
- Enhancing education through co-operation on a North-South basis and through active involvement in a variety of EU activities and with a number of other international agencies, such as the OECD.

2.5.2 Integration Unit

In response to the commitments in the 2007 Programme for Government and the National Action Plan against Racism, the Department set up an Integration Unit in November 2007. The objectives of the Integration Unit include:

➢ Contributing to the development of education policy in the integration area and co-ordinating, as appropriate, the Department’s responses to the education needs of migrants so as to promote quality, relevance and inclusiveness for migrant learners;
➢ Carrying out this value for money review of existing provision of English as an additional language to migrant students in primary and post-primary to determine its effectiveness in meeting their needs.

2.5.3 Expenditure on additional language support

At the time that much of the expenditure under review occurred (2001/02 – 2008/09), the policy context from the Department’s perspective was best specified in the circular letter M 53/0717 which relates to the provision of language support in schools. The content of this circular and the expenditure on additional language support are discussed in detail later in Chapter 3.

2.5.4 Continuing Professional Development

A. Integrate Ireland Language and Training

In March 1999 the then Minister for Education and Science, Micheál Martin T.D., announced the establishment of a Refugee Language Support Unit which subsequently became Integrate Ireland Language and Training (IILT). The organisation had two main functions:

i) overall responsibility for co-ordinating action for language support for adult refugees in the State
ii) support for schools to assist them in catering for the English language needs of non-English speaking children.

In the context of this review the key functions of IILT were to provide resource materials for primary and post-primary schools and to provide CPD to teachers and principals in schools. IILT ceased to operate in August 2008.

B. Primary Professional Development Service (PPDS) and the Second Level Support Service (SLSS)

IILT’s CPD role in the primary and post-primary sectors was taken over by the EAL teams from the PPDS and the SLSS in the academic year 2008/2009. The work of the PPDS and the SLSS is further discussed in chapter 6.8.

17 Set out in full in appendix 6
2.5.5 Language Education Policy Profile, Department of Education and Skills and the Council of Europe, 2007

The Department and the Council of Europe (CoE) jointly published their report on Language Education Policy Profile in 2007 (CoE, 2007). The CoE’s position on language is that

“Language teaching and learning in a country needs to be understood holistically, to include teaching of the national language/mother tongue, of regional and minority languages, of the languages of recent immigrant groups, of foreign and second languages.”

It notes that an NCCA paper, 2003, acknowledged the presence of large numbers of students whose mother tongue is neither English nor Irish and identified three main issues –

“firstly, the need to integrate newcomers into the education system; secondly, the need to provide the necessary language skills for children whose mother tongue is neither Irish nor English; thirdly, the question of appropriate mother tongue support for the children of newcomers”.

The profile report highlighted the idea of creating a “specific curriculum for English as an additional language” while pointing out that “no final decision has been taken, but there are voices in favour of clarifying the situation”. The profile acknowledged that “school is in a key position to smooth the way for the linguistic and cultural recognition and the social inclusion of children of foreign origin”.

The profile report recommends that

“all languages be fully taken into consideration

 As means of communication, expression, information, construction and transmission of knowledge, aesthetic creation and appreciation;
 And as all contributing to the development and growth of diverse individual identities and to the affirmation of collective loyalties within a society”

The profile report proposes guiding principles for a language education policy profile for Ireland. These principles note, inter alia, that

 “the aim of language education is to support language learners in developing a plurilingual repertoire, as part of their personal, social, cultural and civic education

 the DES will aim to give all learners access to a language education programme suited to their motivation, abilities and interests, and will aim to recognise and record diverse profiles of attainment in language learning”.

The profile report also highlighted that language is not the sole concern of language teachers
“A fully integrated and implemented language in education policy would, on the contrary, see all teachers aware of the language dimension of their subject and of their role – among others – as teachers of language”.

2.5.6 The National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA)

The NCCA published its *Intercultural Education in the Primary School, Guidelines for Schools* in 2005 and the *Intercultural Education in the Post-Primary School, Guidelines for Schools* in 2006. These comprehensive documents are designed to help all teachers “enable students to respect and celebrate diversity, to promote equality and to challenge unfair discrimination”.

The two documents set out seven characteristics of intercultural education. One of the characteristics is that “Language is central to developing intercultural abilities and capacities”. The Guidelines also note that “experience of a second language is thought to have a number of additional benefits for pupils including enhancing cognitive development and increasing the capacity for learning subsequent languages”.

The NCCA’s website also hosts the resource materials prepared for schools by IILT (see 2.5.4 above)18.

2.7 International Policy Context

2.7.1 EU


The European Council agreed eleven principles in November 2004 and they form the policy background to work on integration at EU level. The principles which are most relevant to this review are set out in table 2.3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.3 - Selected Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic knowledge of the host society's language, history, and institutions is indispensable to integration; enabling immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge is essential to successful integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Efforts in education are critical to preparing immigrants, and particularly their descendants, to be more successful and more active participants in society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Access to these materials is also available via the AIM (Accessing Intercultural Materials) portal hosted on the DES and OMI websites:
http://www.integration.ie/website/omi/omiwebv6.nsf/page/usefullinks-irish-
DepartmentEducationportal-en
http://www.education.ie/home/home.jsp?pcategory=10856&ecategory=51922&language=EN

Chapter 2 – Policy Context
The EU Green Paper, 2008

The European Commission produced a Green Paper "Migration & Mobility: challenges and opportunities for EU education systems" in 2008 (European Commission, 2008) and, subsequently, in November 2009, the Education Council adopted conclusions on “Education of Children with a Migrant Background (Council of the European Union, 2009). The Green Paper aimed to open the debate on how education policies can better address immigration and internal EU mobility flows. The presence of significant numbers of migrant children has substantial implications for European education systems.

The paper provides a number of positive policy responses to address the specific aspects of migrant pupils’ educational experiences including the importance of member states stressing acquisition of the host language as key to integration. The paper noted that all member states have put in place specific provisions to support host language acquisition.

The policy challenges identified through the consultation process for the EU Green Paper (European Commission, 2009) included “learning host language” since they identify “insufficient knowledge of the host country language as one of the main barriers to educational success for children. It was the 9th most common barrier identified. In the policy responses, the most frequently recurring policy response highlighted is support for the acquisition of the language of instruction followed by partnership with parents and teacher training. The report notes that “a majority of contributions emphasised the need for powerful and early intervention for the acquisition of the teaching language, which should be followed by continuous support during the entire compulsory education phase”.

2.7.2 Council of Europe


The White Paper highlights the importance of education for democratic citizenship. It points out that schools are “important fora for the preparation of young people for life as active citizens”. It underlines that teacher training curricula “need to teach educational strategies and working methods to prepare teachers to manage the new situations arising from diversity...” It also highlights the importance of parents in contributing to successful intercultural dialogue.

Language as Subject and Language in other subjects

The Council of Europe highlights that language as subject (e.g. French, Chinese and Arabic) is one dimension of the language(s) of schooling which also includes language in other subjects.

---

19 Ireland produced a two part comprehensive response to the Green Paper following an extensive national consultation. Part one gave the department’s perspective and part two summarised the findings of the consultation process with key stakeholders.
“...language education does not stop with language as subject. Education in the language(s) of schooling is equally necessary in all other subjects, which are sometimes falsely considered as “non-linguistic” subjects (whereas in fact they are subjects with a “non-language content”). Language learning is always part of subject learning, or to put it more radically, subject learning is always language learning at the same time.” (Council of Europe, 2009a at p 4)

The two roles need to be clearly understood. Joseph Sheils, Council of Europe, at a seminar in Malahide in April 2009, on “Newcomer Pupils in the Post-Primary Context”, stressed the importance of the mastery of the language of schooling through language as a subject in itself and also the importance of the language of other subjects which require specific language competences e.g. the use and understanding of specialist vocabulary. He also highlighted the “academic language of school” that post-primary students require if they are to successfully participate in the curriculum and in the State examinations. He differentiated language proficiency particularly between basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), as defined by academic expert, Professor Jim Cummins. Cummins observed that:

“very different time periods [are] typically required by immigrant children to acquire conversational fluency in their second language as compared to grade-appropriate academic proficiency in that language. Conversational fluency is often acquired to a functional level within about two years of initial exposure to the second language whereas at least five years is usually required to catch up to native speakers in academic aspects of the second language (Collier, 1987; Klesmer, 1994; Cummins, 1981a).”

2.7.3 UNESCO – Guidelines on Intercultural Education, 2006

UNESCO regards language as “one of the most universal and diverse forms of expression of human culture, and, perhaps even the most essential one. It is at the heart of issues of identity, memory and transmission of knowledge”.

The Guidelines issued by UNESCO in 2006 present a set of three fundamental guiding principles for an intercultural approach to education. These principles note that intercultural education

- “respects the cultural identity of the learner through the provision of culturally appropriate and responsive quality education for all.
- provides every learner with the cultural knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary to achieve active and full participation in society
- provides all learners with cultural knowledge, attitudes and skills that enable them to contribute to respect, understanding and solidarity among individuals, ethnic, social, cultural and religious groups and nations”.

2.8 Conclusions

Some conclusions can be drawn from the contextual material in this chapter:

- Firstly, notwithstanding the rapid rate of social and demographic change, there has been a considerable government response to the needs of EAL students both in policy terms and in practical support;

- Secondly, this response fits well in the context of international policy which points to the importance of intercultural education and the key role of language support; and

- Thirdly, in the current economic climate, there is a perception that migrants are leaving Ireland and that it would be appropriate to reduce support in the future. This does not appear to be supported by the statistics insofar as migrants of school going age are concerned. It is, however, clear that numbers of new migrants arriving in Ireland in 2009, while still very significant, are lower than in the past.
Chapter 3 – History and Objectives of the Programme of Expenditure on English as an Additional Language

3.1 Introduction

This chapter looks at the history and objectives of the expenditure on EAL and how the current programme of expenditure has evolved. It is important to note at the outset that all EAL students on a school’s roll are included in estimating ordinary staffing entitlements and for all other grant purposes in a manner similar to Irish students. EAL resources are provided to schools in addition to all regular resources.

3.2 The Development and Expansion of EAL

3.2.1 Pre-1999

Prior to 1999, support was provided to schools for EAL on an ad hoc basis. English language classes were provided to migrants such as the Vietnamese in 1979 and the Bosnians and Kosovars (early 1990s). Such provision was based on special requests to the primary or post-primary administration sections of the Department of Education and Skills. In response to these requests, resources were provided to assist schools to meet the additional needs of EAL students.

3.2.2 1999-2000

In September 1999, the Department sought Department of Finance sanction to put in place formalised EAL teaching resources at a ratio of fifteen EAL students to one EAL teacher. The Department also sought approval for a grant scheme to support schools where there were fewer than fifteen EAL students.

In January, 2000 sanction for this request was received from the Department of Finance. A major initiative was then announced to ensure that there was appropriate educational provision in place for EAL pupils at primary school level.

The new initiative was to ensure that:

“a) Primary schools which have fifteen or more non-national pupils with significant English language deficits will be automatically entitled to an additional temporary teacher for a period of up to two years. This additional temporary teacher would have specific responsibility for the English language needs of these pupils, many of whom are presenting to primary schools with no English language capability.

b) Primary schools in which between four and fourteen (inclusive) non-English speaking non-Nationals are enrolled will be grant aided. This grant aid will enable such schools, which would not require the services of a full time temporary teacher, to acquire the services of a suitably qualified person to teach English to the non-English speaking pupils. Schools with three or fewer such pupils would be expected to provide for the educational provisions of those pupils from within their existing resources.”
A press release issued by the Minister on 24\textsuperscript{th} January, 2000, noted that the primary objectives of the new initiative are to

- enhance the educational provision for non-English speaking pupils;
- improve their levels of comprehension and literacy;
- result in the direct positive effect on the social participation of these children in our country;
- lead to positive ongoing educational benefits;
- prepare these pupils for integration into second level education.\textsuperscript{21}

The initiative referred only to primary schools but in practice teacher support was also given to post-primary schools (Scott, unpublished paper).

In February 2000, the Department sought sanction from the Department of Finance for a “start-up grant” for schools when they got an EAL teacher post. This was at a time when there were few EAL students enrolled in primary or post-primary schools.

\textbf{3.2.3 2001-2005}

The 15:1 ratio announced in January 2000 was improved to 14:1 by February 2001\textsuperscript{22}.

An “Information Booklet for Schools on Asylum Seekers” (Department of Education Science, 2001) was published in April 2001. The booklet was issued to all primary and post-primary schools. The booklet noted that there were more than 70 full time teachers working with EAL students in primary schools and 24 in post-primary schools.

The data on available resources, detailed in the booklet, reflected the information primary and post-primary administration sections gave to school principals seeking language support. The booklet provided that

\textit{Schools, which have 14 or more non-English speaking non-national pupils enrolled, are entitled to an additional full–time temporary teacher. Schools with 28 or more such pupils are entitled to two temporary teachers. Where two primary or two post-primary schools operate on one campus and have fourteen or more such pupils, they will be entitled to an additional teacher on a shared basis. Schools eligible for an additional teacher will in future receive a start up grant of £500 with a top up grant of £250 in each successive year, while a full-time teachers post continues to be sanctioned.}

\textit{Primary schools, in which between three and thirteen non-English speaking pupils are enrolled, will receive grant assistance. Schools with between nine and thirteen such pupils will receive £7,500 for the full academic year and schools with between three and eight such pupils will receive £5,000 for the full academic year. This grant

\textsuperscript{21} http://www.education.ie/home/home.jsp?maincat=&pcategory=10861&ecategory=40232&sectionpage=12251&language=EN&link=link001&page=1&doc=16642 consulted February 24, 2009

\textsuperscript{22} Parliamentary Question response Parliamentary Question reference number 4491/01
is intended to enable schools to take appropriate measures to improve the standard of English of non-national pupils with significant English language deficits.

Where there are fewer than three non-English speaking non-national pupils in a primary school, the school is expected to provide for the educational needs of those pupils from within existing resources. Where exceptional difficulties would be experienced in catering for this small number, a case can be made to Primary Administration for special consideration.

In the case of post-primary schools which have fewer than fourteen non-national pupils, with significant English language difficulties enrolled, additional hours will be sanctioned on the following basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupils in need</th>
<th>No. of extra hours</th>
<th>Pupils in need</th>
<th>No. of extra hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22 (full post)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequently, in May 2003, the Inspectorate published “Looking at our School – An aid to self-evaluation in primary schools” and “Looking at our School – An aid to self-evaluation in second-level schools”. (Department of Education and Science, 2003a and 2003b). These publications were designed to assist the school community in reviewing and evaluating their work, based on a set of themes. One of the themes was “provision for pupils from minority groups”. Principles were outlined for each theme.

These two publications reflected the reality of the increasing numbers of migrants in schools and addressed specifically the question of provision for pupils from minority groups.

3.2.4 2005-2007

In June 2005 the Department established an internal committee to co-ordinate its response to the education needs of newcomers to Ireland. It was chaired by the Director of Regional Services.

The terms of reference of the committee were:

- To co-ordinate the Department’s response to the education of newcomers to Ireland
- To identify emerging issues relating to the education of newcomers
- To propose solutions to the issues identified
- To arrange for the implementation of agreed solutions/policies
- To report to the Management Advisory Committee on major issues as they arise.
One of the issues identified by the committee was the existing cap of two language support teachers per school, where there were more than 28 EAL students.

In July 2006, the Department of Finance indicated to the Department that the decision on the removal of the two teacher cap per school was an operational matter and did not require its sanction. The Department of Finance did give sanction for the recruitment of an additional 550 language support teachers at primary and post-primary levels within the subsequent 3 years, as recommended in a number of national policy documents outlined earlier in chapter 2.4.

3.2.5 2007

The Department has a long history of regulating matters in schools through circulars. In part, this arose from the significant absence of general legislation relating to education before 1998 (see chapter 2.3). The Department continues to communicate with schools by circular on many administrative matters.

Circular M53/07 (the Circular) was issued in May 2007 to the management authorities in primary and post-primary schools and to the VECs. The circular was the most detailed written statement for schools on “meeting the needs of pupils for whom English is a second language”. The Department lifted the cap of two teachers per school and allowed schools with 121 students with less than two years EAL support to have six EAL teachers.

Given its importance in articulating the objectives (although not described as such) of the language support programme of expenditure, the text of the circular is given in full in Appendix 5. The extrapolated objectives of the expenditure, from M53/07, are outlined below.

3.2.6 Extrapolating the Objectives of the Programme of Expenditure on Language Support from Circular M53/07.

While there were no formal objectives specified for the programme of expenditure on EAL, the press release of January 2000 (see 3.2.2 above) did specify general objectives and it is clear that the implicit overarching aim was always

- to facilitate and provide for a high level of flexibility to enable newcomer students to acquire English to access the curriculum as quickly as possible.

While M53/07 does not set out to provide programme objectives, it is nevertheless the most detailed, formal statement of what was to be achieved by the expenditure. For the purposes of this review M53/07 has been used to identify the objectives of the programme of expenditure.
Table 3.1 - Objectives of Expenditure Programme on EAL, as extrapolated from Circular M53/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A whole school approach should be adopted to assist schools in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ providing an inclusive school environment to meet the needs of students for whom English is a second language (an inclusive school environment is one which reflects, values and affirms linguistic, ethnic and cultural diversity);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ providing additional language support teachers for students;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ developing a defined whole-school policy, procedures and systematic approach to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o identify and assess pupils requiring additional language support,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o devise and deliver programmes and monitor students’ progress;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ promoting and facilitating the inclusion of all children;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Leaders should**

➢ ensure that the roles of all school personnel in relation to meeting the needs of pupils for whom English is a second language are clearly defined and understood by all;

➢ deploy (EAL) teachers flexibly having regard to the proficiency levels of individual pupils involved and in line with their evolving needs;

➢ emphasise the role the class teacher plays in supporting the EAL students

**Communication is vital and all school staff should**

➢ share expertise, communicate and disseminate good practice to optimise the opportunities pupils have for developing their proficiency in English;

➢ encourage and facilitate pupils in maintaining a connection with their own culture and language through curricular activities and displays;

➢ be encouraged to work closely with parents.

New objectives for EAL expenditure are proposed in Chapter 8 based on those extrapolated from M53/07 and an analysis of the findings of this review. The new objectives will help to inform the development of performance indicators.
3.2.7 2008 Onwards

The impact of the increasing numbers of migrant students enrolling in primary and post-primary schools and the lifting of the two teacher cap were significant. Various policy documents written in 2006/2007 (see chapter 2.4) had specified that there should be 550 additional language support teachers by 2009. By 2008/2009, there were a total of 2,192 EAL teachers in the system, up from 826 in 2005/2006, reflecting the significant increase in EAL students.

In the October 2008 Budget, the Minister for Finance announced that there would be a reduction in the number of EAL teachers from September 2009. The new criteria are set out in Circular 0015/2009 (Appendix 6) which was issued to the managerial authorities of primary and post-primary schools and to the VECs in March 2009. The Report of the Special Group on Public Service Numbers and Expenditure Programmes (Department of Finance, 2009) has recommended further reductions in language support teacher numbers in the future (see chapter 2.4.1).

3.3 Continuing Relevance of the Programme of Expenditure

In the current economic climate, the rate of inward migration, although still significant, has slowed, as outlined in chapter 2.2.3. Data from the post-primary pupil database show that the numbers of migrant students studying at this level have continued to grow (more details are given in chapter 6). The post-primary data are self-declared and, therefore, not entirely reliable but they indicate trends which have been further substantiated by the ESRI report (Smyth et al, 2009). At primary level, there is no student database so numbers cannot be tracked as reliably over the period. Some figures are, however, available (see chapter 6). The continued rise in the numbers of EAL teachers, particularly in recent years, even with enhanced provision, indicates that there has been no reduction in numbers of EAL students to date.

It is likely that, following the intensive phase of inward migration that occurred over the 15 years from the mid 1990s, there will be a lasting change in the profile of the Irish population. The growing numbers of migrant children in schools are an indication that families have put down roots in Ireland and are currently not leaving in significant numbers because of the deteriorating economic situation.

Furthermore, the birth rate in 2008 was the highest since 1896 and over 15% of those children were born to mothers from countries other than the UK or Ireland23. Even allowing for the fact that these children may have English speaking fathers or that their mothers may come from English speaking countries other than the UK or Ireland, there is still likely to be a very significant cohort of children starting school who will not speak English as their home language. The English language support needs of these children will have to be met.

In the longer term, it makes sense to have a coherent, targeted programme of intervention to assist migrant children who need to acquire English (or Irish) language skills. The objectives as extrapolated in 3.2.6 above aim to achieve this and are a

23 Source – CSO
clear statement of what is necessary. Based on these objectives and the findings of this review, revised, expanded objectives are suggested in chapter 8. These should ensure that EAL students can access the curriculum and become fully integrated in Irish society in the future in line with the vision set out in the overarching strategy statement, “Migration Nation” (Office of the Minister for Integration, 2008).
Chapter 4 - National and International Research

4.1 Introduction

A number of national and international research and consultation processes which have a bearing on this review have recently been conducted. They provide the evidence-based data required for any strategy or policy. This chapter will provide an outline of the research, and the main findings, as they relate to this review.

4.2 National Research

4.2.1 Economic and Social Research Institute

In 2006, the Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI) was commissioned by the Department to undertake a large-scale study entitled “Adapting to Diversity: Irish Schools and Newcomer Students”. As outlined in chapter 2, this was at a time of unprecedented demographic change with significant net migration into Ireland. At that point, little was known about the impact of such changes on school organisation and processes. The study examined migrant students’ progress in schools, and how their presence was impacting on schools, if at all. Migrant students were defined as “children and young people both of whose parents originally come from outside Ireland”. The study was based on quantitative data from a survey sent to all post-primary principals, and principals in a representative sample of 1,200 primary schools. There was a response rate of over 60%. In addition, qualitative data were obtained from 16 schools (primary and post-primary). The report was published in June 2009. The main findings of the report relating to this review are summarised below.

Distribution of migrant students

- In 2007, the vast majority of second-level schools had at least one migrant student; most had 2-9% migrants.
- 40% of primary schools had no migrants, a significant number had 2-9%, 10% of schools had more than 20% migrants and 2% of schools had more than 50% of their student body composed of migrants.
- Migrants are more highly represented in urban schools, and those dealing with disadvantaged populations.

Whole school approach

- A whole school approach to intercultural education is needed. Non-specialist mainstream classroom and subject teachers both have an important and complementary role to play in language acquisition, as children spend most of their days in mainstream classrooms.
- A positive school climate (that is, one of good relations between students, teachers and parents) best enhances academic progress and social integration of migrant students into mainstream school life.
- A positive school environment benefits all students.


Language proficiency

- Many migrant students in Ireland are from non-English speaking countries. The report found that 75% of migrants in primary and 70% in post-primary do not speak English when they enrol in schools.
- School leaders indicated that language difficulties have marked consequences for academic and social progression, if not addressed. Over 50% of primary and post-primary principals indicated that there were language difficulties for “more than half” of their migrant students. They also noted that language difficulties are seen as impacting mostly during the students’ initial transition phase.
- Language support in schools needs to be situated within the broader context, taking account of adult language support, and access to interpretation and translation services.

Academic achievement

- Most principals noted that academic achievement amongst migrants was at least as good as their native peers, if not better. However, 10% of principals perceived nearly all of their migrant students as having sustained academic difficulties and this could be related in part to language difficulties, as noted above (Note that the NESF (2009) citing E Eivers, et al., 2004 states that nationally one-tenth of all children have serious literacy problems so this finding may indicate that their difficulties are on a par with their native peers.)
- A number of principals noted that migrant students may raise the standard and learning expectations in DEIS schools.
- Migrant students are seen to be hard working and motivated.

Availability of teachers

- Many schools commented on the difficulties of recruiting specialist English as additional language (EAL) teachers. EAL teachers generally have a background in mainstream teaching and few have received specialist training in EAL. The teaching contracts in this area are temporary, which is seen as an impediment to developing skills and building capacities within a whole school team.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

- The vast majority of school principals want more CPD on intercultural education for all their teachers; many teachers have not had training on this topic or on the teaching in a classroom where English may be the second language of a number of students.
- Teachers noted that their initial training left them unprepared for teaching in a diverse society.
- Training and support for principals, specialist and mainstream teachers is needed.
Appropriate materials

- Many teachers reported difficulties in sourcing materials, particularly material suitable for older students.
- The greater use of dual-language materials would be beneficial to language acquisition.
- Curricula and textbooks are not seen as taking adequate account of diversity.
- Many seek access to suitable teaching resources and materials.

Parents

- Most migrant parents are highly educated.
- Principals note that contact with migrant parents is hindered by a lack of access to interpretation and translation services; most schools report language difficulties as their main barrier to communicating with migrant parents.

Other relevant matters highlighted

- Some schools provided short periods of language immersion teaching. However, there were concerns about the implications for social integration of such separate provision over a long period.
- Irish students believe that migrants and the increased diversity in the country are positive developments.
- Provision for migrants could be enhanced by:
  - Increasing the combination of withdrawal and within class language support; and by supporting differentiated teaching methodologies
  - Flexibility in resource allocation;

The ESRI report found that whilst the Department’s objective of having migrants achieve on a par with their native peers is a reality for most, there are still areas which can be improved for the minority who are not achieving or integrating.

In summary, the report emphasises the importance of adopting a whole-school approach to integration, with all staff and students engaged in creating a positive school environment. Parents should be involved in their children’s education. CPD for whole school staff is very important, so that they remain abreast of developments in intercultural education.

4.2.2 Inspectors’ Evaluation

The Inspectorate commenced an evaluation of the provision of EAL in 30 primary and 15 post-primary schools in 2008. The findings of the evaluation are detailed in chapter 5.
4.2.3 OECD Thematic Review

A. Introduction

Ireland together with Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands and Austria, participated in the OECD thematic review of migrant education policy and practice at pre-school, primary and post-primary. This review was carried out by an international team of OECD experts.

The overarching policy question informing the OECD review was “What policies will promote successful education outcomes for first and second generation migrants?”

The purpose of the OECD review was:

1. To evaluate existing measures to ensure that migrant children are able to perform in primary and post-primary education on a par with their native peers and to identify any gaps in policy/current provision in this regard.
2. To facilitate open policy dialogue among key stakeholders on migrant education.
3. To provide recommendations that will effectively help to address any migrant student performance gap identified in the current provisions.

Whilst the scope of the review was mainly primary and post-primary levels, it also examined pre-school provision.

First generation migrant students were the target cohort in Ireland, as the number of second-generation migrant students in the country in 2009 was negligible. The Irish country report is discussed below. The findings from other countries are considered at 4.3.1 below.

B. Irish Country Report

The OECD’s Ireland County Report (2009h) addresses 5 policy areas:

1. Early childhood education and care
2. School – primary and post-primary
3. Partnership and engagement
4. Access to quality education
5. Data collection for evaluation and feedback.

Policy areas 2 and 5 on school and data collection are particularly relevant to this review.
The key points emphasised by the OECD under these headings include:

- **the importance of providing CPD for all teachers and school leaders,**

  “While training for language teachers is not sufficient, training for mainstream teachers and school leaders is even more limited... there is a recognised need for specialised training for all teachers to better equip them to diagnose and adapt to the learning needs of immigrant children” (OECD, 2009h, p 37)

  “...language support provided by class or subject teachers requires all teachers to be skilled in understanding language acquisition and its techniques in their subject areas.” (OECD, 2009h, p 44)

- **the fact that into the future EAL support will continue to be required by many migrant students and will be particularly important for second generation students,**

  “While the arrival of new immigrants appears to have slowed down, it should not be assumed that the demands for English language support will quickly die away. New entrants born in Ireland to migrant parents will continue to arrive into the primary school system with little English for a number of years to come. Also, the evidence points to the current cohort of migrant children staying in Ireland. OECD PISA data show that in several countries second generation migrants fare less well than those of the first generation and in other countries second-generation children perform better than their parents. Ireland will want to take advantage of the potential of its migrants by ensuring that they fall into the latter category.” (OECD, 2009h, p 45)

- **the need to gain proficiency not just in conversational English but also in academic English if the EAL students are to successfully progress into further and higher education,**

  “...further attention might be given to extending the period of support available for individual students, based on identified English language need. The current provision of two years of support is generally considered sufficient for conversational English, but if migrant students are to make a successful transition to upper second level education and then on to further or higher education they will need to have mastery of academic English.” (OECD, 2009h, p 47)

In relation to data collection, the OECD report emphasises several points which are relevant to this review.

- **the importance of assessment for learning and the role of the Assessment Kits**

  “Assessment for learning is being introduced into Irish schools through the NCCA assessment guidelines and the professional development supporting AfL. However, it is not clear to what extent it has been put into practice in general or whether the practices are inclusive of assessment of immigrant students as a case in need for specific attention (individually or as a group).” (OECD, 2009h, p 61)
“The primary and post-primary assessment (language) kits and the data they provide should not be seen as simply the domain of the EAL teachers. They provide important information for primary classroom and post-primary subject teachers, and should be integrated into the whole school’s approach to assessment for learning. There needs to be formal opportunities for co-operation and collaboration between all players in the school team.” (OECD, 2009h, p 63)

➢ the importance of identifying migrant performance within existing data.

“Feedback’ refers to various kinds of information on the results of developments and action. To operate as a systemic policy instrument, it needs to occur at the classroom, the school and the system levels, and be tied to a coherent approach to developing and implementing strategies for improvement. Ireland has elements operating at each level, but they lack systemic coherence, and almost always mask the migrant students’ issues because identifying data on immigrant status or language competence is not generally available. Where the teacher has knowledge of the language base and immigrant status of the individual student he or she does not have the broader comparative data required to know whether the outcomes being achieved could be improved upon. However, where the outcome data is held at the system level, at the State Examinations Commission, for example, no data are currently retained that can differentiate by migrant status or language characteristics.” (OECD, 2009h p 61)

“There is a wealth of outcome data available at varying levels of the Irish schooling system, but rarely are migrant students made visible in them.....At some stage, if the complexity of its population continues to grow, and if it is concerned about outcomes for particular groups in its education system, the Department of Education and Science will need to re-examine what distinguishing information is necessary to monitor the interventions it funds to support different groups. The policy-driven data collection may facilitate analysis of the varying outcomes by years in the Irish education system, or the impact of the quantity and nature of second language support on outcomes...” (OECD, 2009h p 64-65)

4.2.4 Consultations for the Intercultural Education Strategy

A conference to contribute to the development of an intercultural education strategy was held in October 2008. Stakeholders from across the education spectrum were invited. It marked the beginning of the consultation process for the development of the strategy. A series of seven sectoral consultation meetings were then held, with representatives from different sectors within the area of education. Approximately 200 delegates took part in the process and over 50 written submissions were made.

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 below set out the proposed principles and actions for the Strategy, along with the principles and actions suggested by delegates at the consultative meetings and in the written submissions:
Table 4.1 - Proposed Principles for the Intercultural Education Strategy and Suggestions from the Consultation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Proposed Principles</th>
<th>Suggestions from consultation process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming of education provision through inclusive practices by and</td>
<td>This principle should be based on the concept of social justice, and human rights.</td>
<td>A whole school approach to interculturalism is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for all involved in the education of both migrant and host community</td>
<td>Integration must be recognised as a dynamic two-way process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at national and, most importantly, at local level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of English (and Irish) for all residents.</td>
<td>The role of mother tongue was highlighted as was the importance of second language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and responsibilities for all students.</td>
<td>acquisition for all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High aspirations and high expectations for all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership and engagement through dialogue with the wider education</td>
<td>Widespread engagement with all stakeholders, across agencies and departments, leading</td>
<td>Learner must be at the centre of the Strategy, with the important role of parents in education recognised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community.</td>
<td>to partnership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other suggestions included the need for

- Commitment to long-term strategic planning; national objectives, with local implementation, along with monitoring and evaluation
- Use of clear and inclusive terms. It was suggested that a definition of interculturalism which goes beyond a requirement that it be mainstreamed.
- A clear statement regarding the purpose of education and priorities within the area.
Table 4.2 - Proposed Actions for the Intercultural Education Strategy and Suggestions from the Consultation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive leadership. Leaders must believe that integration is a dynamic two way process of mutual accommodation by all migrants and residents, at national and local levels.</td>
<td>Capacity building for both learners and service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness raising and recognition of the importance of diversity through training of providers and the provision of information on the education system to migrants.</td>
<td>Interpretation and translation services should be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research to establish what progress is being made towards ensuring that all students are achieving to their full potential.</td>
<td>It was suggested that the following areas be considered for research purposes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Denominational nature of the Irish education system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Irish language requirement for primary teaching, in the context of ensuring a more diverse teaching staff throughout the education system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ EAL teaching practices with a view to reform; more innovation is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Existing models of good practice, and lessons learnt to be shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Innovative ways of engagement and delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Mother tongue literacy problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultation process was carried out taking a sectoral basis approach. In summary, it was interesting to note that there were many generic themes which were common to each sector. In addition to those discussed under principles and actions, the following themes also emerged:

➢ The strategy should be inclusive - for all groups, not just migrants;
➢ There was a need to avoid any forms of segregation;
➢ Priorities must be spelt out and commitment given to delivery;
➢ There was a need to make better use of existing resources;
➢ Outcomes, timelines and resources should be built in to the strategy;
➢ The strategy needs an implementation plan.

The Strategy is currently being finalised, taking into account the findings from the ESRI study, the OECD Thematic Review, and the Inspectorate’s evaluation of EAL teaching and learning. It will also take into account the recommendations of this review.
4.2.5 Other research work

This includes the Language Education Policy Profile for Ireland, a joint publication in 2008 by the Department of Education and Skills and the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe, which is described earlier in chapter 2.5.4.

4.3 International Context

It is important to compare provision in Ireland with other countries. To this end, we examined provision in the OECD countries involved in their thematic review. We also considered EAL provision in the UK and Northern Ireland. The EU dimension has already been covered in chapter 2.7.1 which considers the Green Paper “Migration and Mobility: Challenges and Opportunities.”

4.3.1 OECD Thematic Review

The countries involved in the OECD study with Ireland were Austria, Denmark, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden.

The information provided by the other participating countries provided a range of possible policy options. These are outlined in the OECD publication “Closing the Gap for Immigrant Students – Policies Practice and Performance” (2010d) which the OECD prepared to accompany and support the country reports. The country reports were, in turn, supported by the country background reports. The material below is drawn from all of these documents unless otherwise indicated. The experience in other countries is of particular interest in the Irish situation, due to the recent phenomenon of immigration in the country. Ireland can learn from the experiences and practices of other countries. One of the major differences between Ireland and the other participants is the centralised nature of the Irish education system, as opposed to the devolved provision through local municipalities/ federal authorities featured in many of the other countries.

Both modes of provision have advantages and disadvantages. Services can be finely tailored to local circumstances, with devolved provisions. However, it can, on the other hand, be difficult to achieve a uniform standard of national provision and to share good practice across local administrative divides. There is varied provision, for example, of reception/induction classes, and entitlements to mother tongue provision. Some countries offer mother tongue provision for a limited time, whilst others allow teaching through the mother tongue, to assist with mainstream subject learning.

By contrast, a centralised system may help to ensure the provision of nationally standardised services and equality of delivery. However, it may fail to address particular needs in specific geographical areas.

Ireland, unlike some of the other OECD countries in the Thematic Review, has an adult migrant population that has, in general, high levels of education (see figure 2.2...
In chapter 2). In contrast, in the Netherlands, for example, the average number of years of formal education of mothers and fathers from the main non-Western migrant groups “differs sharply from that of parents of native pupils. Whereas the highest educated parent of four out of five native Dutch primary school pupils has completed an education to at least level ISCED 3 (senior general secondary (havo), pre-university (vwo) or senior secondary vocational education (mbo)), the educational distribution of Turkish and Moroccan parents is still concentrated around the lowest level (maximum ISCED level 1). This is despite the gradual increase in the education level among these groups. Surinamese and Antillean parents are better educated than Turkish and Moroccan parents, but still lag well behind native Dutch parents” (OECD, 2009d p 20)

Each country noted that migrants are a very heterogeneous group. Some are achieving on a par with or even better than the indigenous population. For example, in Norway, research shows that students with Vietnamese, Sri Lankan and Bosnian backgrounds do well. On the other hand there is “relatively low educational attainment [by] groups of Turkish and Pakistani origin.” (OECD, 2009e p 35)

Migrants are often concentrated in urban areas such as Oslo, Amsterdam, Vienna and Copenhagen.

In Denmark, Norway, Austria and Sweden, for example, official statistics show that there is an over-representation of migrant students who are not attaining the goals of compulsory education. In general, in most countries migrant girls are achieving at a better rate than boys.

There is a lack of (or incomplete) data on how migrants are achieving in education in a number of countries such as Denmark and Austria.

There is a great variety of service provision found in several key areas:

- Reception/induction classes aim to introduce migrants to many aspects of their new society. Classes tend to include social and cultural lessons, so that migrants can familiarise themselves with the society in which they are now living. In Norway students receive special language training for one year, after which they enter ordinary classes. In 2008, the Netherlands finished a trial phase of the use of such induction classes, and plans to gradually extend their use.

- Early interventions are adopted in Denmark where 3 year olds are tested for Danish language proficiency. If they are identified as requiring language support then language stimulation is made available. This initiative was first introduced for migrants but now is provided to all 3 year olds.

- Provision of tuition in host-state languages varies from country to country. In Austria, for example, migrant students receive a second year of German language support only if it is proved that their requirement for a second year is not due to a lack of personal effort at acquiring the language during the first support year. Norway provides support in the Norwegian language for migrants, usually for one year or until they can enter mainstream education. In Denmark, there is concentrated effort in the early years of compulsory education to enable migrants to become proficient in
Danish. This may be successful as far as conversational Danish is concerned but students have difficulties with academic/technical Danish in lower secondary education or in youth education, particularly in vocational education. In Sweden it is the poorly performing Swedish and migrant students who are offered Swedish as a second language as a discrete subject, instead of mainstream Swedish (Skolverket, 2009).

- Mother-tongue provision varies from country to country. In Sweden, municipalities have an obligation, if there are over a certain number of students with a particular mother tongue, to provide both mother tongue and Swedish language at pre-school stage, to those who do not have Swedish as their first language. This early intervention approach is designed to increase proficiency in Swedish, and facilitate the transition to mainstream education as soon as possible.

- Research in Sweden shows that mother tongue proficiency is a positive factor for migrants when learning other subjects (Skolverket, 2009). In fact, such students who participate in mother tongue tuition (outside of school hours) have a significantly higher average merit rating, even compared with students of Swedish background. The Norwegian Government provides funding for day care facilities to employ bilingual assistants. In contrast, most initiatives in this area in the other countries (including Ireland) are on a local basis, and often occur later than pre-school stage.

- There is mixed provision of resources and materials for teaching second languages. Norway recently introduced a new curriculum in “basic Norwegian”, and the central government distributed national teaching guidelines and assessment kits.

- In Sweden, nearly a quarter of all teachers will receive further education over the next few years. Some 30,000 fully qualified teachers will be offered a chance to study at a higher education institution. The programme is available for teachers who already have a teaching qualification, and who want to improve their knowledge in different subjects. The courses available are arranged by universities and colleges. The state finances the programme by offering a government grant to municipalities, so that teachers participating in the programme can still receive 80% of their salaries. The Government is putting SEK 1 billion (about €95 million) into supplementary education for teachers who are not fully qualified, continuing professional education for teachers for Swedish for immigrants (SFI) and training for teachers. (OECD, 2009c)

- Interpretation and translation services are not universally provided in any country; it depends on the resources available at either local or central level.

- High aspirations on the part of both the migrant students and parents are mentioned by the other participant countries, in line with the Irish experience.

- In all states, the migrant cohort is heterogeneous, as noted above. In Denmark some succeed on a par with Danes and some even do better. However, many first and second generation migrants do not succeed in school. 30% of male and 49% of female migrants complete their vocational training within the upper secondary education system, compared to their Danish counterparts where 51% of males and 55% of females complete their training. In addition, there are more migrant students in the
vocational training sector than in the more academic upper secondary sector, when compared to their Danish peers as their proficiency in academic Danish is not sufficient to enable them to succeed at this level. Similar completion rates are noted in Norway.

➢ In Sweden, every fourth migrant student left compulsory education without a basic qualification, compared to every tenth in compulsory schooling as a whole.

➢ Danish migrants are also over represented in the unemployment statistics. The gap in employment rates between the Danes and their migrants is greater than in any other OECD country (Liebig, 2007 cited in OECD, 2010c).

The overall impression from the OECD thematic review is that a significant proportion of migrants in the participating countries, other than Ireland, are socio-economically and educationally disadvantaged. Such a position was also noted in the EU Green Paper “Migration and Mobility: Challenges and Opportunities” published in 2008 (see chapter 2.7.1).

In looking at potential strategies to improve educational outcomes for migrants, “Closing the Gap” (OECD, 2010d at p 41-42) suggests that the following measures may be effective:

- “preparing school leaders and teachers to meet the needs of diverse student groups;
- stimulating language learning at an early age through institutional arrangements such as expanded participation in ECEC, as well as pedagogy, such as systematic continuous language support for children throughout their education;
- increasing student opportunity to learn language in regular school lesson;
- supporting students from less advantaged socio-economic backgrounds to stimulate their learning at home (better information and use of libraries, home-visiting programmes, etc.);
- ensuring flexible learning opportunities for adult immigrants, in particular those with limited education or language proficiency;
- encouraging family support for their child’s education;
- increasing provision of compensatory educational support outside regular school time;
- prioritizing support to immigrant students who are at risk of not achieving basic academic standards;
- managing the student composition of schools;
- collecting appropriate data on educational outcomes for immigrant students;
- using effectively student performance data (e.g. using data for identifying challenges for immigrant students and offering timely targeted support.”

4.3.2 Northern Ireland

The number of migrant students has been increasing in recent years from approximately 2,000 in 2004 to almost 7,000 in October 2008. Two thirds are attending primary schools, 30% are attending post–primary schools and the remainder
A whole school approach had been adopted to ensure that all migrant students can participate fully in the school curriculum. The Department of Education (DENI) published its policy *Every School a Good School – Supporting Newcomer Pupils*, in April, 2009. This policy recognises that migrant students may have significant difficulty with the language of instruction. The policy confirmed that the existing whole school approach to addressing the needs of migrant students would be retained. It would continue to develop the capacity of the school to respond to the linguistic and social needs of migrant students so that they are supported in accessing the curriculum.

A two pronged approach has been developed and funded by DENI:

1. **The Inclusion and Diversity Service (IDS) is available to all grant-aided schools and special schools.** The service assesses priorities, responds to changing pastoral, curricular, linguistic and intercultural needs and monitors provision. The service provides support via:

   a. A regional network of co-ordinators who work with cluster groups of schools helping them to adopt a whole school approach to the needs of their migrant pupils
   
   b. A quality translation and interpreting service for schools and parents to assist them to communicate at initial interviews and at other specific occasions when officially sanctioned by the IDS
   
   c. The provision of multi-lingual information to parents
   
   d. The provision of information, training and resources for principals, teachers, classroom assistants and other staff in schools as well as their Boards of Governors to allow for capacity building within the schools
   
   e. The production of progress assessment aids for schools with particular attention to formative assessment

2. **Direct funding is provided to schools on a per capita basis (approximately £1,000) for each newcomer pupil who has significant language acquisition needs.**

The overall aim is to build the capacity and skills of the entire school workforce to support migrant students. Teachers are trained to be not only specialists in particular subject areas but also to be language teachers. They are also helped in this work by classroom assistants, where they are appointed.

In the 2008/2009 financial year, the Department of Education in Northern Ireland allocated a total of £6.5m to support migrant students. Just over £1m or 15% was allocated to the Inclusion and Diversity Service (IDS) and almost £5.5m or 85% was allocated to schools for a special additional migrant student capitation.

This two pronged approach replaces a previous one which provided a number of peripatetic teachers to schools. The increase in migrant students and the need for ever greater numbers of peripatetic teachers led to an economic appraisal of the service in
2007. Following the review, the peripatetic service was replaced by the current two pronged approach of whole school training and per capita funding for EAL students, as outlined above.

The Education and Training Inspectorate in Northern Ireland carried out “An evaluation of the Provision to Support Newcomer Pupils in a range of Primary and Post-Primary Schools” The Inspectorate’s report was published in May 2009. Their evaluation concluded that

“The strengths of the provision to support newcomer pupils in a range of primary and post-primary schools include:

- The range of useful, effective strategies and resources provided by the IDS to support schools and the good working relationships between IDS co-ordinators and the schools participating in the initiative;
- The schools’ commitment to improving their provision for newcomer pupils and the identification of appropriate areas for development through effective self-evaluation;
- The successful induction and integration of newcomer pupils and the good standards achieved by many of these pupils;
- The increased confidence and capacity in schools to meet the needs of newcomer pupils at various stages in their education;
- The good or better quality of most of the teaching observed, which meets the needs of all the pupils; and
- The well-conceived strategies to encourage newcomer parents to contribute to their child’s learning and to become involved in the life and work of the school.

The areas for improvement include the need:

- To define more clearly the roles and responsibilities of staff to strengthen the co-ordination, and the monitoring and evaluation, of the provision for newcomer pupils;
- To develop further the means of assessing and tracking the progress of the newcomer pupils; and
- To disseminate good practice within and across schools to inform the means of addressing the key common priorities for improvement.

The overall quality of the provision to support newcomer pupils in the schools visited is good. The evaluation has identified areas for improvement which the schools and the IDS have the capacity to address.”

The report also noted the need to maximise the potential, within, across and beyond the cluster groups to share good practice, encourage collaboration in addressing common areas for development and to inform future work.
4.3.4 Scotland

In Scotland, provision for EAL students is managed locally through councils. This report looks at the situation in Glasgow City Council24.

Historically a relatively small number of schools in Glasgow had EAL students although there have been EAL services in Glasgow since the 1970s. Now, almost every school in Glasgow has at least some EAL students. There are approximately 68,000 students in Glasgow of whom of the order of 10,000 or about 15% are EAL students.

There are some 5,300 teachers and over 4,000 ancillary staff working in Glasgow’s schools. CPD is available for all of these staff to develop their capacity to meet the needs of EAL students. The Council believes that

“The EAL service ... has a key role in supporting and empowering mainstream staff to support these children and young people. Supporting children and young people with English as an additional language is everyone’s responsibility. There is some excellent practice in this regard which will be shared as part of the CPD programme.” (Glasgow City Council, 2008 at p 7)

There are approximately 140 dedicated EAL teachers. All of these have received intensive CPD and the aim is that they should have “regular and systematic access to CPD on developments in supporting children and young people with English as an additional language” (Glasgow City Council, 2008 at p 8). The majority of these EAL teachers are based permanently in schools. A team of approximately 30 have other roles, sometimes in addition to teaching roles.

These 30 teachers are based across Glasgow’s five education areas. Ten to fifteen of these work in particular areas such as, for example, providing additional support for EAL students with multiple special needs or providing specialist intensive initial support. A further cohort works on CPD in various capacities. Four work on CPD as one of their primary tasks (two within the city council and two as heads of primary and post-primary schools with a special remit to provide EAL support in cases of particular need). They develop CPD for all school staff and support and promote clusters of schools. About ten teachers work for what is called the response team. They provide support to schools which experience unexpected and significant increases in numbers of EAL students. Although their role is supporting students, they also have a role in modelling best practice and building capacity in schools which may not previously have had EAL students.

To summarise, about 30 teachers out of a cohort of 140 EAL teachers are involved in activities which are not those of the “standard” EAL teacher. True, some of them may be teaching but in quite different contexts from their other EAL counterparts. This implies teacher salary costs for “standard” EAL support are 80% of total expenditure and costs for other EAL activities of the order of 20%, somewhat similar.

24 Material on Glasgow was sourced from Margaret Doran, former Executive Director of Children and Families at Glasgow City Council and Maria Walker, ASL/EAL Co-ordinator, and the relevant City Council Policy Paper (Glasgow City Council, 2008)
to the situation in Northern Ireland. The average cost per EAL teacher in Glasgow is of the order of stg£40,000 and this is less than the average teacher cost in Ireland (see table 6.4 in chapter 6.3).

In determining how their resources should be applied, the policy in Glasgow is that

"[a]ccess to EAL support should be available to all those who need it. Resources and staffing should follow need based on a system of staged intervention." (Glasgow City Council, 2008 at p 6)

4.4 Conclusions

4.4.1 On Language

The ESRI report (Smyth et al, 2009) indicates a cohort of migrants who are, in general, doing well in Irish schools and who are positively regarded by principals. Nevertheless, there are concerns around language support in particular. The Inspectorate evaluation considers this in detail (see chapter 5). The OECD also highlights language concerns and the importance of the cognitive language necessary to access the curriculum. Language emerges as a key concern in consultations on the intercultural education strategy and on the European Commission’s Green Paper on “Migration and Mobility: Challenges and Opportunities for EU Education Systems” (European Commission, 2008). The message emerging from all the research is that migrant children can perform as well or better than their native peers provided that they receive the necessary language support when they need it. In this regard, the policy in Glasgow where resources clearly follow need is an interesting one.

4.4.2 On CPD and Other Supports

The ESRI, Inspectorate and OECD are entirely ad idem on a greater need for CPD for all teachers and for school leaders. The situation where approximately 15% of the EAL budget is assigned to CPD and other EAL supports in Northern Ireland and Scotland is not replicated in this jurisdiction where the vast bulk of funding goes on teacher salary costs (see chapter 6 for more details).
Chapter 5 – English as an Additional Language: An Evaluation of Provision, Teaching and Learning in Primary and Post-Primary Schools

In 2008, the Inspectorate of the Department of Education and Skills undertook an evaluation of EAL provision in forty-five schools. This chapter draws on the findings and recommendations of the resulting national composite reports, the full text of which will be published on the web site of the Department of Education and Skills (www.education.ie) in early 2011.

5.1 Context and Methodology of the Evaluation

Whole-school evaluations conducted in primary and post-primary schools in recent years have considered provision for immigrant students as an aspect of areas such as inclusion, resources and pastoral care. In these evaluations, the teaching and learning of English as an additional language was considered in reviewing the school’s support for these students. In 2006-7, post-primary inspectors of English included an EAL element in their subject inspections and the reports arising from them. In 2007, the Inspectorate engaged in planning and preparatory work for a national evaluation of EAL provision in primary and post-primary schools.

A working group comprising both primary and post-primary inspectors was established to develop evaluation criteria, instruments, guidelines and reporting templates. This work was overseen by the Inspectorate’s Evaluation Support and Research Unit (ESRU). The group researched current EAL and intercultural principles and practice, with input from EAL practitioners. It adapted existing evaluation instruments and activities and devised others to seek specific information and evidence where required. The evaluation framework included an interview with a focus group of EAL learners as well as interviews with school management and relevant members of staff. Questionnaires for pupils in fifth or sixth class (primary) and for all EAL students (post-primary) were prepared, along with separate questionnaires for their parents. The parent questionnaires were made available in English and 50 other languages.

The education partners including school management bodies and teacher unions were consulted and informed about the planned evaluation of schools and the procedures to be used.

From September to December 2008 the Inspectorate carried out whole-school evaluations that included a focus on EAL provision in thirty primary schools. From May to December 2008, the Inspectorate undertook an evaluation of the quality of provision, planning, and support for EAL students in fifteen post-primary schools. An evaluation of the teaching and learning of EAL students in both EAL support classes and mainstream classes was central to both the primary and post-primary inspections. These forty-five evaluations provided the evidence...
base for composite reports on EAL provision, in addition to the individual reports prepared for each school, and for this chapter of the present study.

Typically, the forty-five evaluations included an initial in-school day during which the inspector(s) carried out a number of interviews and made arrangements for the administration of the student and parent questionnaires. The main in-school phase was conducted over a number of days during which the inspector(s) visited both support and mainstream classes and observed the teaching and learning of EAL students, interacted with staff and students, examined students’ work and interviewed a focus group of students. The inspector(s) also reviewed relevant planning documentation. Following the evaluation visit, the inspector(s) provided oral feedback on the outcomes of the evaluation to the principal and teachers, and also to the board of management in the case of primary schools in line with normal WSE practice. The draft findings and recommendations of the evaluation were presented and discussed at this meeting.

Each school was subsequently issued with an individual report which presented the findings of the evaluation of EAL provision in the school and made recommendations for its further development. The management of each school was given the opportunity to comment in writing on these findings and recommendations and their response was published as an appendix to the report. The individual reports are available on the Department web site (www.education.ie).

5.1.1 Context of the Evaluation in relation to the Relevant EAL Circulars, CPD and Materials

Circular 53/07\(^{25}\) issued to all schools in May 2007. It raised the existing maximum number of teaching posts for EAL support from two to six, and gave some guidelines on the appropriate use of this allocation. It also referred to the Primary and Post-Primary Assessment Kits to be issued to all schools for the initial and ongoing assessment of English language proficiency. The Inspectorate evaluation was carried out at a time when circular 53/07 had been in force for one school year. The Primary Assessment Kits were issued in May/June 2008 and the primary EAL evaluations took place between September and December 2008. The Post-Primary Assessment Kits were issued in February 2009 and were therefore not in schools at the time of the post-primary EAL evaluations. Circular 15/09 which superseded 53/07 was issued in March 2009 and took effect from September 2009.

The primary and post-primary school support services began to deliver EAL in-service programmes during 2008/09. Familiarisation with the relevant assessment kits was a focus of these programmes. Most primary EAL evaluations and all post-primary EAL evaluations were carried out prior to this in-service.

\(^{25}\) See Appendices 6 and 8 for the full texts of Circulars 53/07 and 15/09.
5.1.2 Context of the Primary Schools Evaluated and Profile of EAL Pupils

The thirty primary schools were selected on the basis that they had been scheduled for a whole-school evaluation and had a significant enrolment of EAL pupils. This evaluation did not review the provision for EAL pupils who are more widely dispersed in rural areas and who have access to part-time EAL supports in their schools. The schools were located in urban areas or in large provincial towns. The majority were managed by the patrons of denominational bodies, and two were multi-denominational schools. Almost all the primary schools in the sample had access to full-time or temporary full-time EAL teachers. One shared its EAL teachers with other schools. There was an average of three EAL teachers in the schools evaluated.

There were 10,684 pupils enrolled in the 30 schools, with a total of 2,968 EAL pupils. The proportion of EAL pupils ranged from 8% to 69% of the school enrolment, with an average of 30%. Appendix 7 provides an overview of the percentage enrolment of EAL pupils as a proportion of total enrolment in each school. 19 of the 30 schools had an enrolment of less than 30% of EAL pupils. Two schools in the sample had more EAL pupils than native Irish pupils.

A few pupils in the schools evaluated were born in Ireland but had little experience of speaking English before starting school. A significant minority of pupils were born outside of Ireland and spoke English as their first language. Inspectors reported that, in two of the schools evaluated, these pupils were receiving supports from EAL teachers. 79 different home languages were spoken by the EAL pupils in the schools evaluated. The number of home languages varied from a minimum of five to a maximum of 30, the average per school being 14.

Principal teachers were requested to identify the language proficiency levels of the EAL pupils in their schools in terms of the level of EAL support they required: Level 1 (In severe need), Level 2 (In some need) and Level 3 (In little need).26 Data on approximately two-thirds of the EAL pupils in the thirty schools were returned. See table 5.1.

Table 5.1 - Level of Supports Required by EAL pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 (In severe need)</th>
<th>Level 2 (In some need)</th>
<th>Level 3 (In little need)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>835 pupils</td>
<td>961 pupils</td>
<td>345 pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=2,141

On average, 72% of EAL pupils for whom data were provided had been identified as requiring additional EAL support. In two-thirds of schools the principals stated that an average of 33% of EAL pupils enrolled in the school did not require additional EAL support.

26 These terms were used in the Department’s circular letter 53/07 on allocations for EAL support. See Appendix 5 for the full text of the circular.
5.1.3 Context of the Post-Primary Schools Evaluated and Profile of EAL Students

Of the fifteen post-primary schools, seven were in the voluntary secondary sector, four were maintained by vocational education committees and four were community schools. The number selected in each sector reflects the overall number and distribution of schools with EAL students in each sector. (See tables 5.2 and 5.3 below.) The community and comprehensive sector has the smallest number of schools, but the highest percentage of schools with an EAL allocation, and the highest percentage of schools with two or more whole-time teacher equivalents (WTEs\(^{27}\)) for EAL support. While schools maintained by Vocational Education Committees (VECs) have the smallest percentage in these categories, they include a number of schools with high proportions of EAL students.

Table 5.2 - Numbers and Percentages, by Sector, of Post-Primary Schools with an Allocation for EAL support – 2008-9 Figures Generated in February 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total number of schools</th>
<th>Number (and % of total) of schools with EAL allocation</th>
<th>Number (and % of total) of schools with 2+ WTEs for EAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary secondary</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>292 (75%)</td>
<td>55 (14.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC schools and community colleges</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>165 (65.7%)</td>
<td>34 (13.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and comprehensive</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79 (86.8%)</td>
<td>18 (19.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>536 (73.3%)</td>
<td>107 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 - Numbers of Post-Primary Schools Evaluated in Each Sector and Numbers of WTEs, EAL Enrolments and Total Enrolments in Evaluated Schools in Each Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number of schools evaluated in each sector</th>
<th>Number of WTEs for EAL in the schools evaluated</th>
<th>Number of EAL students (and total enrolments) in the schools evaluated in each sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary secondary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>288 (3075)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC schools and community colleges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>277 (1731)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and comprehensive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>238 (3223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>803 (8029)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{27}\) One WTE equals twenty-two teaching hours. These can be allocated by the school to one teacher or a number of teachers.
All fifteen post-primary schools were selected on the basis that they had an allocation of at least two WTEs for EAL support, indicating that they had at least twenty-eight students who were entitled to such support. Although schools with this level of allocation are in a minority in each sector, the criterion was applied to ensure that the evaluation focused on those schools where the level of additional resources was highest. School size, location and gender profile (see Appendix 8) were also considered in making the selection.

No standardised, objective method of assessment of EAL students’ levels of English proficiency was available to post-primary schools at the time of the evaluation. Each school was asked to give the numbers of EAL students at one of the three levels of need described in Circular 53/07. The levels reported by the fifteen schools are given in Table 5.3 below.

Table 5.4 - Level of Supports Required by EAL Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 (In severe need)</th>
<th>Level 2 (In some need)</th>
<th>Level 3 (In little need)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>222 students</td>
<td>545 students</td>
<td>133 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=900

The total of 900 EAL students arising from this table exceeds the number of EAL students (803) for whom the 15 schools were receiving their EAL allocation. Six schools reported that they were offering EAL support to a bigger number of students than were counted in determining their allocation. In some cases, these students had enrolled after the beginning of the school year and the school had not applied for additional support or was in the process of doing so. In other cases, students had already received two years’ EAL support (the maximum normally allowed). The school had applied for continuing support on the grounds that these students had insufficient levels of English language proficiency, but no extension of support had as yet been granted.

EAL enrolments as a percentage of total enrolments in the schools evaluated ranged from 6% to 41%. The figures used in these calculations came from the schools and included all students for whom English is an additional language, including those no longer receiving EAL support. The average percentage enrolment of EAL students was 19%. Two schools in the sample had EAL enrolments below 10% of the total enrolment and two were above 30%.

A total of 723 parent questionnaires and 987 student questionnaires were completed as part of the evaluation. Respondents to student questionnaires included a number of students no longer receiving EAL support. Post-primary parent questionnaires were translated into 45 languages (see Appendix 9). In the parent questionnaire responses, more than 100 countries of origin and over 90 home languages were named. The number of countries of origin of EAL students in individual schools ranged from seven to thirty, and the number of home languages spoken by students in individual schools ranged from eight to thirty-three. The Post-Primary Pupil Database records a total of 160 nationalities among students nationally.
The findings and recommendations of the evaluations are presented in two sections. Section 5.A covers primary schools and section 5. B relates to post-primary schools.

The following quantitative terms are used:

*Table 5.5 - Quantitative Terms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative term</th>
<th>Approximate occurrence</th>
<th>Percentage of occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost all</td>
<td>More than 90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>75-90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>50-74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than half / A significant minority</td>
<td>25-49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small number</td>
<td>16-24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few</td>
<td>Up to 15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5A - Primary Schools

5A 1 Quality of School Management

Overview of findings in the area of school management

School managements were effective in providing for EAL pupils in most schools evaluated. The most encouraging findings related to the establishment of a positive climate and ethos and the management of pupils. Significant strides have been taken by boards of management to establish inclusive schools characterised by the principles of equality and mutual respect. Boards used the allocated resources effectively and the management of staff, resources and accommodation were strengths of the provision. Principals and in-school management teams were effective in most settings in ensuring a good-quality provision for EAL pupils. Areas for improvement identified included the need to allocate a member of the in-school management team to co-ordinate provision for EAL pupils and the need to develop a whole-school approach to EAL provision.

5A 1.1 Characteristic spirit of the school – school ethos

Very good practice is found where:
- The school creates a positive ethos which actively reflects, values and affirms linguistic, ethnic and cultural diversity and which promotes a culture of mutual respect for learners, staff and the wider community.

Almost all of the schools evaluated had established a positive ethos and had devised mission statements clearly reflecting a respect for diversity and inclusion. These statements expressed schools’ openness to enrolling pupils from a wide range of religions, backgrounds and nationalities while endeavouring to nurture the characteristic spirit. Most principals stated that the school affirmed and valued EAL pupils’ home languages. The success of schools in fostering inclusion was evident in the good-quality relationships between EAL pupils and other pupils, the staff and the rest of the school community. Responses to the parent and pupil questionnaires were overwhelmingly positive with regard to school atmosphere. Where school atmosphere was evaluated as leaving scope for development, weaknesses were also identified in most other areas including the quality of leadership, the provision of resources and the quality of teaching.

Recommendations for Schools
- School mission statements and policies should reflect a commitment to inclusion and diversity.
- Schools should acknowledge and affirm pupils’ home languages and cultures.
Evidence of good practice taken from an inspection report on an urban, infant school
This school has a very positive atmosphere. Pupils are regularly affirmed for their participation in school life and for their efforts and achievements. All pupils, whatever their language, culture or country of origin, are treated equally. Multilingual welcome notices are prominently displayed in the school’s reception area and pupils are encouraged and supported in maintaining links with their own culture. The school’s mission statement asserts that the school strives to provide a well ordered, caring, happy and secure atmosphere.

Evidence of good practice taken from an inspection report on an urban, vertical school
The school’s ethos is communicated to all parents through its intercultural and enrolment policies. Religious celebrations and events form an important part of the life of the school. The school’s aim is to promote the full personal and social development of its pupils. The success of the school in achieving this aim is evidenced through the wide range of activities available to all pupils at the school. Pupils from 32 different nationalities currently attend the school. Pupils who are multilingual are valued as important members of a diverse and inclusive school community. The school celebrates the richness and diversity of the school community through its international day and displays around the school.

5A 1.2 The work of the board of management in managing the provision for EAL pupils

Boards of management are evaluated as very effective in providing for EAL pupils when:
- Their management of the provision for EAL reflects the principles of equality, diversity and inclusion.
- They monitor the quality of EAL teaching and learning.
- They ensure that a well-resourced, stimulating learning environment is in place.

Most boards of management managed the provision for EAL pupils effectively. They were aware of the educational provision for EAL pupils, organised the supports for EAL pupils and were knowledgeable about the initiatives and strategies to improve teaching and learning which were being undertaken in the school. Effective boards reviewed the models of provision in their schools at regular intervals and were aware of the educational achievements of EAL pupils. The majority of boards supported the continuous professional development of staff. In a small number of schools, the composition of the board of management included a representative from a minority group. Where weak practice was found, boards of management were generally unaware of low standards in literacy and numeracy in their schools and had no overview of EAL pupils’ progress.
Most boards of management ensured that the accommodation provided for EAL teaching and learning was of a high standard. Inspectors commented on the provision of attractive and stimulating learning environments. The resources available for teaching and learning in EAL were also of a high standard. Most schools had a broad range of curriculum materials that were well organised and managed. Classrooms provided print-rich environments and many schools had libraries stocked with graded reading materials. A small number of schools had accessed dual-language books, and resources designed to be free of cultural stereotypes and bias.

**Recommendations for Schools**

- Boards of management should be aware of their role in managing the educational provision for EAL pupils. This responsibility includes:
  - managing judiciously the supports provided to pupils
  - evaluating the educational programmes provided for EAL pupils
  - monitoring the learning outcomes of pupils.

- Boards of management should ensure that their schools promote inclusive learning environments where the needs of all pupils are equally addressed.

**Extract from an inspection report highlighting effective practice – large, urban school**

The teaching posts are deployed effectively to meet the learning needs of all pupils, including EAL pupils. Two of the EAL posts are used to teach mainstream classes. This results in a reduction in the overall size of classes in the school with class size ranging from 22 to 26 pupils, and provides opportunities for increased differentiation of teaching and learning in order to meet the significant range of individual pupil need in classrooms, particularly in relation to language proficiency. Delivery of EAL support by the four remaining EAL teachers is on a withdrawal basis whereby small groups of EAL pupils attend the EAL teachers in a room shared by the four teachers and their pupils. There is a good level of collaboration and consultation among the EAL teachers and between the EAL and mainstream class teachers in planning for and delivering support to EAL pupils.

**5A.1.3 Staffing**

Very good practice is found where:

- The school assigns experienced and enthusiastic teachers to the role of EAL support teacher and has clearly defined the role.
- Teachers have accessed continuous professional development in the area of language teaching and in the development of intercultural understanding.
- Formal and effective structures are in place for the dissemination of teachers’ acquired knowledge and expertise among all school staff.
Most boards managed the allocation of teaching staff to EAL teaching assignments effectively. Almost all schools in the sample employed teachers with recognised primary-teaching qualifications. In a small number of schools EAL teachers were university graduates but did not hold recognised teaching qualifications. Some EAL teachers had completed qualifications in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)\(^{28}\). Only one school in the sample employed unqualified teachers. The teachers assigned to EAL teaching roles had a variety of experience as classroom teachers. On average EAL teachers were teaching for 14 years. Some members of the EAL team were beginning teachers with only one year’s experience while others had extensive teaching experience in mainstream class settings. However, most of the EAL teachers had less than two years’ experience in their current roles.

While Circular 53/07 provides flexibility to schools in assigning the EAL teaching resource, schools generally allocated the additional supports for EAL pupils in the same manner as for learning support. EAL support teachers were designated as such and were members of the support team. Most did not have mainstream class teaching duties except in a support context. They provided dedicated support to pupils on a withdrawal basis and through specific in-class supports. Only three schools reported using the allocation of EAL teachers in mainstream class settings, thereby creating smaller classes. This was considered good practice where it promoted inclusion and facilitated greater teacher-pupil interaction. The dominance of the dedicated EAL support teacher model may be attributable to the long tradition of allocating support teachers in primary schools on the basis of a defined cohort of pupils.

While the management of EAL provision was good in most schools, it is important to note that this evaluation focused generally on schools where full-time EAL teachers were employed. The quality of the management of part-time EAL provision in schools, where there are small numbers of EAL pupils, was not examined in the Inspectorate’s evaluation.

**Recommendations for Schools**

- Boards of management should note the flexibility given to schools in the deployment of EAL teachers. Teachers provided to support EAL pupils should be deployed in the manner deemed most responsive to the needs of these pupils.
- Boards of management should review the deployment of staff annually and staff allocations should reflect the changing and developing needs of their EAL pupils.

---

\(^{28}\) See Section B, 5.1.2 for further comment on TEFL qualifications.
In almost all schools, inspectors found that EAL pupils were placed in age-appropriate settings. This provided for their cognitive and social development and

Extract from two inspection reports highlighting evidence of good practice

(a) Large urban, infant school
The EAL teachers have an agreed approach as to how support is organised for those pupils whose first language is not English. Pupils with similar needs are withdrawn daily in small groups and each EAL teacher has responsibility for the support of pupils in a specific mainstream class or in a number of classes. The EAL teachers have agreed an ongoing plan of training for the coming year that will be specific to the needs of the EAL pupils in the school.

(b) Large school in a provincial town
Teachers of EAL have been proactive in engaging in continuing professional development in the provision of EAL for migrant pupils. As part of this provision, an opportunity was taken to view provision for EAL in another school and to become a member of the English Language Support Teachers’ Association (ELSTA).

5A 1.4 Enrolment procedures and placement of EAL pupils

Very good practice is found where:

- There are clear and transparent arrangements in place for the admission, enrolment and induction of EAL pupils in the school.
- Initial meetings are held with parents prior to pupils’ enrolment at which parents are comprehensively informed of school routines and procedures, curriculum content, events and activities.
- Pupils are enrolled into age-appropriate settings and a range of differentiated supports is provided for the social and cognitive development of EAL pupils.

Most boards of management had effective systems in place to facilitate the enrolment and integration of EAL pupils in their schools. A significant minority of schools had revised their enrolment policies to this end. In a majority of cases, principals were responsible for enrolling EAL pupils. The principal met the parents and the EAL child to discuss the enrolment form, and provided the parents with information on book lists, uniform, code of behaviour, school rules, and policies in the school such as healthy eating, extra-curricular activities and homework. Good practice was noted where the pupil’s educational history was elicited at this stage. In a number of schools the language support teacher and the deputy principal, together with the principal, met the family on enrolment day and explained the nature of the supports available to the child in the school. A significant minority of schools had sourced interpreters, both voluntary and paid, to facilitate enrolment meetings with EAL parents who did not speak English.

In almost all schools, inspectors found that EAL pupils were placed in age-appropriate settings. This provided for their cognitive and social development and
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ensured that they experienced challenge in their learning experiences. In a few schools, inspectors commented that a considerable proportion of the migrant pupils had fluent English and came from homes where English was spoken, yet were attending EAL support lessons. These pupils required instruction at a more challenging level and one inspector commented “some pupils do not appear to need supplementary tuition at all.”

**Recommendations for Schools**

- Schools should ensure that their enrolment policies are inclusive of EAL pupils. They should consult the publication Toolkit for Diversity in the Primary School (ILT/SELB, 2007) to guide them in their work.
- Schools should ensure that the EAL pupil’s educational history is established at the pre-enrolment meeting.
- Schools should use the translated documents on the Department’s website to facilitate enrolment and information giving.
- Pupils should be enrolled in age-appropriate classes.
- Additional EAL support should be provided only to pupils who require it.

**Recommendation for the system**

Recommendations with regard to translated documents at 5B 5.1.4 below are equally applicable to the primary context

**5A 1.5 Communication with parents**

Very good practice is found when:

- Clear structures are in place for involving EAL parents in in-school and out-of-school activities. Activities are arranged that encourage EAL parents to participate.
- The home-school liaison teacher, where available, organises language classes for EAL parents and attendance at these classes is good.

Questionnaire responses showed that almost all parents considered communication between school and home to be good. They found parent-teacher meetings and other events organised by the school in relation to the education of their children to be helpful and informative, and felt welcomed when they visited their child’s school.

The inspectors’ findings were more critical of the level of communication between schools and EAL parents. The lack of translated documents regarding school life emerged as a constant theme in these reports. A significant minority of schools had not taken any positive actions to involve EAL parents in the life of the school. Only a few parents’ associations had EAL parents on their committees.
Good or very good practice was in evidence in a majority of schools. They had established formal communication structures with parents and clear procedures for dealing with parents’ concerns. Some schools had devised ‘welcome packs’ for EAL parents and pupils to assist them in becoming familiar with the school. Schools organised cultural celebrations where the customs, traditions and languages of parents were celebrated and parents were central to the organisation of these events. A small number of schools offered English language lessons to parents. Principals and boards of management acknowledged that the translation of school documentation into different languages posed a considerable challenge and many referred to the lack of funding for this.

Principals reported that most EAL parents visited the school regularly. EAL parents interacted with the principal, the classroom teachers and the EAL support teachers. This indicates that EAL parents were confident in meeting with all staff members and were encouraged by schools to discuss their child’s education. In some schools principals and post-holders were accessible to parents in the early morning before school and after school to discuss any emerging issues. However, more than half the principals found that it was difficult to engage EAL parents in school activities and organisations. Principals reported that work commitments sometimes limited EAL parents’ opportunities to link with the school or support their children’s education. At the same time, only one-quarter of principals found that parents’ level of spoken English constrained their contact with the school, a figure significantly lower than that given in the ESRI report (Smyth et al, 2009).

**Recommendation for Schools**

- Schools should devise strategies to ensure that parents from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds are encouraged to visit the school, communicate with the school staff and become involved in school-based initiatives.
Extract from an inspection report describing effective practice - Urban, disadvantaged school

Communication with the parent body is facilitated through the homework journal, a regular newsletter and the school’s informative and attractive website. All parents are met individually and as a group upon their child’s enrolment and key school policies are disseminated. An opportunity to discuss each pupil’s progress is facilitated through the annual parent-teacher meetings and many teachers meet parents at the beginning of the school year to build home-school links. Parents of EAL pupils are met individually upon enrolment. Where necessary, some parents are accompanied by translators for meetings within the school and the services of the Home School Community Liaison (HSCL) teachers are employed to assist communication. A written report on all aspects of development and learning is issued at the end of each academic year. In addition, informal contact on an ongoing basis is facilitated and promoted by the principal and teachers. Further efforts to communicate with parents are evident in the school’s annual open day, where parents are invited into their child’s classroom to observe and celebrate the work and achievements of the class.

5A 1.6 The principal’s role in managing the educational provision for EAL pupils

The principal’s work in leading and managing the provision for EAL pupils in the school is very effective where he or she:

- leads and manages the whole-school provision for EAL pupils;
- has a deep understanding of EAL pupils, their backgrounds and their learning needs;
- promotes an inclusive learning environment where multilingual pupils are valued; and
- provides very effective curriculum leadership in the area of EAL, monitoring the quality of teachers’ schemes of work, and educational initiatives and curriculum provision within the school.

While inspectors found that most principals provided good leadership and management in their schools, only two-thirds were judged to manage and lead provision for EAL pupils effectively. Effective principals had a clear vision for the school and were supportive of its ethos. They played a pivotal role in managing EAL provision and made consistent efforts to develop a good knowledge and awareness of the EAL pupils, their backgrounds and their learning needs. Some principals had established links with other agencies that provide supports to migrant families. A few principals had sought the assistance of the National Educational Psychological Services for EAL pupils who had experienced traumatic events in their home countries.

The principals who ensured effective provision for EAL pupils supported ongoing and frequent collaboration between EAL and mainstream teachers and established formal structures to support collaborative planning. They usually appointed a senior member of staff to co-ordinate provision for EAL pupils. Effective principals ensured that the most qualified and up-skilled teachers worked in
support roles in EAL. They encouraged the teachers to access CPD appropriate for their roles in supporting EAL pupils. They organised classroom accommodation for pupils and this was particularly important in schools where pupils arrived without notice. These principals led the policy development process for EAL provision and were central to decisions regarding the models of support to be provided.

Where poor practice was identified, principals passed responsibility for EAL pupils to the EAL support teachers, many of whom were newly qualified or without the necessary experience to manage whole-school issues. They did not give leadership to their school community in relation to inclusion and diversity issues and made few attempts to involve EAL parents in the life of the school.

All of the principals stated that the introduction of EAL pupils into the school had been a positive experience. They noted that EAL pupils had added a great richness and cultural diversity to the school. Many principals referred to EAL pupils as highly motivated, keen and competitive learners with a strong work ethic. EAL pupils whose parents held third-level qualifications were reported to be high achievers who had helped to raise the overall standards in the school. Only two principals referred to parents expressing fears that enrolling EAL pupils would lead to a decrease in standards in the school.

Recommendations for Principals

➤ All principals should demonstrate a willingness to learn about the backgrounds, cultures and learning needs of the EAL pupils enrolled in their schools. They should be committed to the development of an inclusive school culture and environment.
➤ Principals should oversee the programmes planned in mainstream and support settings for EAL pupils and lead the school staff in improving the quality of learning and teaching for EAL pupils.
➤ Principals should develop meaningful communication with parents of EAL pupils.

Recommendation for the system

Specific guidance should be provided to principals of schools where a significant number of migrant and EAL pupils are enrolled. It should outline the role of principals in supporting the education and inclusion of EAL pupils in schools.
5A 1.7 Role of in-school management in EAL provision

Very good practice is found where:

- A member of the in-school management is assigned to co-ordinate the provision for English as an Additional Language

Just over half the schools had designated a special duties post-holder to co-ordinate the supports for EAL pupils. Their duties were wide-ranging, and encompassed administrative, curricular and pastoral roles. For example, duties included the induction of EAL pupils in the school, the management of timetables and support class formation, and responsibility for liaising with classroom teachers in relation to EAL. In a number of DEIS schools, EAL post-holders were responsible for the transition of pupils to post-primary school and liaison with HSCL co-ordinators. Commendably, some post-holders had a significant role in EAL and intercultural planning and policy development.

A majority of in-school management teams were considered to contribute effectively to whole-school approaches for co-ordinating EAL provision. Where whole-school provision was co-ordinated, inspectors commended the provision of supports in ways that minimised disruption to mainstream classes and ensured that EAL pupils did not miss core subject lessons. In a few schools, all EAL work – pastoral, organisational and curricular – was undertaken exclusively by the EAL support teachers. Inspectors found this less effective than a whole-school approach to managing EAL provision.

Recommendations

- School management should assign a post-holder to co-ordinate the supports for EAL pupils, while ensuring that all members of staff are aware of their own roles and responsibilities in providing for EAL pupils.
- EAL co-ordinators should lead the school in developing policies on intercultural education, equality and language across the curriculum. They should set in place structures for the ongoing assessment of EAL pupils and the recording of progress.
- EAL co-ordinators should hold annual reviews of the supports provided for EAL pupils and the programmes planned for these pupils. Co-ordinators should ensure that specific targets relating to EAL pupils’ learning, progress and achievement are devised.
5A 1.8 Continuing Professional Development of Staff

Very good practice is found where:

- Teachers have accessed continuing professional development (CPD) in the area of language teaching and in the development of intercultural understanding.
- Formal and effective structures are in place that provide for the dissemination of teachers’ acquired knowledge and expertise among all school staff.

The fact that centrally-organised CPD regarding good EAL provision began only in October 2008 frames these findings (see chapter 6.8).

Teachers availed of courses provided in their local teachers’ centres and information from these courses was disseminated at staff meetings by the EAL team. Some teachers had completed online courses in EAL provision and others had accessed courses on intercultural education and the promotion of an inclusive classroom. In one school the EAL team members collaborated on a handbook to share advice with the mainstream class teachers. In a small number of schools the EAL support teachers up-skilled other members of staff in assessment practices.

A significant minority of whole-school plans made no provision for teachers’ CPD, including EAL teachers, in the area of EAL education. Inspectors found that CPD practice was good in less than two-thirds of schools. Very good provision was in evidence in only one school evaluated. In some schools the professional development of staff in EAL focused only on those teachers working in EAL support roles. In some schools, teachers had received little if any CPD to support them in their roles. In these cases, boards of management reported that they lacked financial resources to fund CPD courses or that the members of staff who worked as EAL support teachers were unqualified and held temporary positions.

Inspectors observed that the constant re-assignment of teachers from support roles to mainstream class settings impeded the development of specific expertise in the area of EAL in some schools. They recommended that EAL teachers be provided with a defined period of time to work in support teaching contexts so as to develop their expertise in EAL teaching and learning.

Recommendations

- Continuing professional development in EAL should be on a whole-school basis.
- Schools should avail of the EAL in-service provided by the PPDS.
- Schools should ensure that structures are established for the sharing of expertise and good practice among the staff, and for capacity building in the area of EAL provision. Good practice should be shared with other schools through Education Centres.
Recommendation for the system

- The support programme delivered through PPDS should continue and be developed to include all teachers who have responsibility for EAL pupils.

5A 2 Quality of Planning (Whole-School Planning and Classroom Planning)

Overview of quality of whole-school and classroom planning

Whole-school planning for EAL was good or very good in the majority of schools. The inspectors’ evaluation identified classroom planning for EAL as the aspect of the work of schools and teachers that was most in need of development. The most significant weakness, observed in the majority of classrooms, was an insufficient focus by mainstream classroom teachers on planning a differentiated programme for EAL pupils. This highlights the lack of continuing professional development in this area.

5A 2.1 Whole School Policies

Very good practice is found where:
- The board of management, parents, teaching staff and the wider community contribute actively to the school’s policies on inclusion, enrolment and intercultural education.
- Whole-school plans recognise the importance of providing pupils with EAL with full access to the curriculum.
- Whole-school plans value diversity and foster a sense of belonging in the school. Curricular plans promote language as a central component of the school’s work, and language teaching and learning are recognised as underpinning the success of pupils.

Whole-school planning was good in a large majority of schools. Most boards of management had an active role in the development of policies on enrolment, attendance, communication with parents, and child protection. Just over half had devised a plan for the inclusion of pupils from different minorities in the school. Most schools set out clearly the measures taken to achieve the principles of equality of access and participation in the school.

All the schools in the sample provided EAL pupils with full access to the curriculum. However, in practice, a small number of schools withdrew pupils for language support during Irish classes, effectively excluding EAL pupils from one aspect of the curriculum.

Most boards communicated the policies to parents, including EAL parents, but inspectors judged these approaches to be effective in only half the schools. Policies were communicated to parents orally and in writing in most schools.
These usually included the school’s code of behaviour, homework and enrolment policies. One-quarter of schools had translated whole-school plans and policies into the home languages of EAL pupils. Inspectors recommended that plans and policies be made available to parents through school websites, newsletters, and as written documents.

A majority of schools had devised policies on intercultural education or were in the process of doing so. Inspectors found that less than one third of schools incorporated an intercultural perspective into all whole-school plans. Some intercultural policies did not identify a teacher responsible for overseeing their implementation, or provide adequate guidance for class teachers. In other schools, greater celebration of diversity among the school population was recommended.

**Recommendations for Schools**

- Boards of management should ensure that policies reflect a commitment to inclusion and equality. They should give strong leadership on establishing inclusive school environments.
- Schools should use the applicable translated documents on the Department’s website.
- The school’s policies and plans should be made available to parents in different formats – in newsletters (in shortened formats), and on the school’s website.
- Schools should ensure that pupils have access to the full curriculum and that language support is timetabled so that pupils’ access to the curriculum is not restricted.

**5A 2.2 Curricular plans for EAL and language across the curriculum**

Very good practice is found where

- Whole-school plans in each curriculum area emphasise the importance of language development.
- There is a whole-school strategy to enable EAL pupils to access the language of the curriculum.
- Whole-school plans for EAL pupils include methods of ongoing assessment of EAL pupils’ language proficiency.

A majority of schools devised good curricular plans for EAL and language across the curriculum. Only one school had not devised any plan for EAL. Some EAL plans were described as comprehensive while others were considered generic and only incorporated provision for EAL pupils within the curriculum plan for English. Some plans were evolving as schools devised procedures and built expertise on how to cater for EAL pupils in their specific contexts.

Many of the plans for provision of EAL included mechanisms for identifying the level of supports required by pupils, strategies for the use of home languages
within the school context, and teaching methods appropriate for EAL pupils. Most EAL plans included specific information on organisational issues within the school and provided clear guidelines to the teachers on how to manage pupils at the different stages of language acquisition. In a small number of schools inspectors noted that plans needed to provide more specific advice and guidance to teachers on how to manage pupils during the silent phase. Most plans included strategies to support the initial assessment of pupils following enrolment. In most schools the language support teacher undertook this initial assessment. However, in two-thirds of schools the class teacher also had an active role in the initial assessment of pupils, and the principal was involved in analysing assessment data and deciding on the supports required by individual pupils.

One-quarter of schools did not assess pupils formally when they enrolled in the school. Inspectors advised schools to outline how pupils were going to be assessed and to clarify the procedures for assessing pupils on an ongoing basis. Over half the schools had not given sufficient attention to how pupils were to be enabled to manage the language demands of the various curricular areas. These schools were advised to consider how best to develop pupils’ academic language so that they could access the full curriculum.

Recommendations for Schools

- All schools with a cohort of EAL pupils should devise whole-school policies for EAL to ensure that:
  - pupils have access to all curricular areas
  - discretionary time is allocated for the teaching of English
  - whole-school approaches are devised for the initial assessment and ongoing monitoring of EAL pupils’ development. Increasingly, these should incorporate the Primary Assessment Kits.
  - Teachers have guidance on the different stages of language acquisition

- Schools should review their curricular plans to ensure that they contain strategies for teaching language across the curriculum and that the language of each curriculum area is taught purposefully.

---

29 The Swedish country background report for the OECD thematic review of migrant education (OECD, 2009), citing Skolverket, 2009, points out that in Sweden “students who participate in mother tongue tuition (but not in Swedish as a second language) have comparably higher grade” and that “good knowledge in the mother tongue [is] a positive factor for students learning other languages and other subjects.”

30 It is not unusual for newly arrived EAL pupils to go through a ‘silent phase’ or non-verbal phase when they do not speak. This phase can last for a relatively short time but may also persist for many months. (IILT/SELB (2007) Toolkit for Diversity in the Primary School)
5A 2.3 Classroom planning for EAL pupils

Effective practice is found where:
- Teachers’ planning takes account of the language demands of the curriculum including the specific vocabulary required in such subjects as Mathematics, History, Geography and Science.
- Challenging learning experiences across all areas of the curriculum are planned so that EAL pupils develop cognitively while being supported in their language acquisition.
- Teachers differentiate their planning to take into account the learning needs of their EAL pupils

Classroom planning for EAL pupils was poor or only fair in the majority of class settings. The major weakness in planning was the lack of differentiation: there was little evidence of teachers differentiating their planning to meet the needs of EAL pupils in mainstream classrooms. Just over a quarter of teachers made specific provision for EAL pupils in their planning. Good practice was noted where mainstream class teachers and EAL teachers set specific targets for pupils in Mathematics and English.

Inspectors observed that whole-class planning dominated and they were critical of the over-emphasis on social language development. Inspectors observed that mainstream class teachers did not emphasise the development of cognitive language to assist the pupils in accessing the curriculum. These findings may simply reflect the fact that most teachers have not had access to formal CPD on providing for EAL pupils in mainstream classrooms, or on differentiation and formative assessment. While various documents have been circulated to schools, these guidelines have not been accompanied by a formal programme designed to enhance teachers’ planning. Bearing these factors in mind, it is important to note that teachers have a professional responsibility to maintain the highest standards of professional service in their teaching and to understand that their primary professional obligation is to their pupils. Therefore, there is an onus on teachers to respond to the ongoing needs of their pupils and to continue to improve their own professional practice and to engage in professional development that equips them to meet the challenges presented by the diversity of pupils in their classrooms. These professional values underpin the concept of teacher professionalism and are espoused in the Codes of Professional Conduct for Teachers (Teaching Council, 2007).

Recommendations
- Mainstream classroom teachers should ensure that their classroom planning includes differentiated learning activities, content, tasks and methodologies for EAL pupils.
- Classroom teachers should plan to ensure that pupils are taught the language that they require to access the curriculum.
Recommendation for the system

- Continuing professional development in the area of differentiation for EAL pupils should be made available to mainstream teachers in order to support them in discharging their responsibilities towards all the children in their classes.

Extract from an inspection report highlighting good practice in an urban school

The quality of classroom planning is very good. Mainstream class teachers prepare comprehensively ensuring breadth and balance in their long and short-term plans. Collaboration among teachers of similar class levels has led to coherence in the delivery of the curriculum across classes. In the majority of instances the specific learning objectives of the Primary School Curriculum are outlined in short-term planning. In the early years, in particular, formative assessment data is used to inform teachers on pupil needs and to identify short and long-term learning outcomes. In an increasing number of instances the monthly progress record is used to identify ongoing pupil attainment of planned outcomes and to inform future planning. In general, differentiation to meet pupils’ specific learning needs is practised.

5A 3 Quality of Teaching and Learning of EAL Pupils in Mainstream Class Settings

Overview of quality of teaching and learning

The quality of teaching was good or very good in three-quarters of mainstream class settings. This is a very positive finding given that most of the teachers in the schools evaluated did not receive specific professional development in the area of teaching EAL pupils. However, it is obvious that most teachers benefited from the in-service provided with the introduction of the revised curriculum (1999) over the last ten years. The inspectors’ findings are presented in the following sections.

5A 3.1 Quality of Teaching

The quality of teaching in mainstream class settings is very effective when:

- All teachers have a clear understanding that they have responsibility for EAL pupils, even where there are specialist support teachers available.
- EAL pupils are included in mainstream classroom work. Classroom teachers are aware that they need to assist EAL pupils to learn English and to learn the content of the curriculum.

Responsibility for EAL pupils

In most classroom settings, teachers were aware of their responsibility for the instruction of EAL pupils. Teachers actively sought to involve EAL pupils in lessons and were observed to give EAL pupils individual attention and provide
them with supports when engaging in different tasks. Where good practice was in evidence, teachers liaised formally and informally with the language support teachers. They co-ordinated their classroom planning with the support personnel, and support teachers worked in the mainstream classroom alongside the mainstream class teacher.

Extract from an inspection report highlighting good practice in a large, urban school

Class teachers assume full responsibility for teaching the EAL pupils in their own classrooms. The support of EAL teachers is complementary to mainstream class teaching. Mainstream class teachers and EAL support teachers use a classroom observation schedule to monitor EAL pupils in their mainstream class. The observations noted on this schedule inform the programme planned by the class teachers. Where an EAL pupil presents with a significant learning need, the information from the formative assessment is used by the EAL support teacher to plan a specific, intensive programme that is delivered in a withdrawal setting.

Level of integration of EAL pupils in the mainstream class

The participation of EAL pupils in English lessons taught by the mainstream class teacher was good in most classrooms. Where good or very good practice was in evidence, class teachers differentiated the activities based on the pupils’ ability in English. Visual cues were used effectively to assist pupils’ understanding. In one school, the teachers consulted EAL pupils about teaching approaches used in their home countries and these approaches were incorporated into lessons where appropriate. Pupils had many opportunities to engage in group work and pair work and interacted with their peers who modelled the use of language. EAL pupils were engaged by teachers who used skilful questioning and their answers were welcomed and scaffolded to make complete sentences or responses.

The integration of EAL pupils in Mathematics lessons was good in most classes. Teachers used concrete materials effectively to develop EAL pupils’ understanding of mathematical concepts and the language of Mathematics was reinforced throughout the lessons. Gestures, visual cues and symbols were used to support understanding and to involve the pupils.

Recommendations

- EAL pupils are primarily the responsibility of the mainstream teacher. Schools should ensure that mainstream class teachers understand this and should put in place whole-school approaches to planning, teaching and learning that support teachers in this role.
- EAL pupils should be included in mainstream class activities.
5A 3.2 Quality of teaching strategies

Very good quality teaching is provided for EAL pupils when:

- Teaching approaches based on active learning strategies and pictorial representations are purposefully selected and succeed in enabling pupils to engage with mainstream curriculum learning.
- Participation and engagement are optimised through the judicious use of a combination of methods including direct instruction, teacher-modelling, role-play, games, structured group work, and experiential learning. Graphic organisers, keyword exercises, scanning and predicting are effectively used in the teaching of reading.
- Language skills are consistently reinforced in innovative learning contexts.
- Pupils are affirmed in using their first language through singing and story writing.

Inspectors found that in three-quarters of classroom settings the provision for EAL pupils was good. Very good practice was noted in a minority of classrooms where teachers facilitated EAL learners in both learning English and learning through English as they accessed the curriculum. These teachers provided cognitively challenging activities for pupils across the curriculum and supported their access to concepts through the medium of English during the emergent language phase by encouraging pupils to respond using symbols and visual clues. Their EAL pupils had opportunities to use language in meaningful contexts and engaged in pair and group work and role play. They had access to their peers who modelled language for them and who engaged in talk and discussion with them.

The teaching of oracy, literacy and writing were good in the majority of classrooms. Oral language skills were developed in discrete lessons and as part of reading and writing lessons. There was a good balance of whole-class, pair and group work. Active learning was promoted and pupils were provided with a good range of co-operative tasks. Teachers used a variety of questioning techniques to stimulate higher-order thinking. In general, many pupils were provided with opportunities to extend vocabulary, make oral presentations regarding their work, and talk and discuss in small groups. Schools encouraged pupils to read a range of materials and EAL pupils maintained reading logs, and completed books reviews. Some reading materials provided for EAL pupils reflected different cultures. Teachers encouraged pupils to read with meaning, understanding, fluency and expression. Where best practice was observed, there were clear links between the development of listening skills, speaking, reading and writing.

In one-quarter of classrooms practice was only fair. The range of teaching approaches was limited and differentiation of the work in order to meet the needs of the pupils was lacking. In some schools, oral language was taught through games and tasks that were not co-coordinated or did not contribute to the development of oral skills in a progressive and developmental manner. Where practice was weak or fair, a limited range of reading materials was provided for pupils and instruction was usually textbook-focused rather than based on the needs of the pupils.
Almost all parents were happy with the education provided to their children in the schools evaluated and considered that their children were making good progress in schools.

**Recommendation for the system**

- CPD for mainstream class teachers and EAL support teachers should identify appropriate supports for EAL pupils at the different stages of language acquisition.
- Teachers should be advised on strategies to develop language across the curriculum.

**5A 3.3 Quality of EAL pupils’ learning in English and in Mathematics**

Effective learning occurs when:

- Records indicate that pupils make satisfactory progress with reference to the English Language Proficiency Benchmarks.
- Achievement is evident in listening, reading, spoken interaction, spoken production and writing.
- Pupils demonstrate a good grasp of vocabulary control, grammatical accuracy, phonological control and writing skills.
- Pupils demonstrate consistent progress in curricular areas.

Parents in the thirty primary schools felt that their children were making good progress in language development in English. Almost all agreed or strongly agreed that their children had good English language skills, including well-developed English reading and writing skills.

Inspectors found that the quality of EAL pupils’ learning was good or very good in a majority of classroom settings. Where good learning was in evidence, pupils were described as expressive and able to use a wide range of language to discuss topics and answer and compose questions. Pupils were able to review novels, discussing plot, characters and settings. Pupils’ writing in a variety of genres was good to very good in most class settings.

Where good practice was in evidence, teachers ensured that all tasks, reading materials and writing assignments were differentiated, and most EAL pupils experienced success in these activities and undertook their work with confidence. Pupils were reported in almost all schools to engage enthusiastically in their learning. In a number of schools, inspectors commented that EAL pupils were progressing as well as their peers, with some pupils’ progress being described as “remarkable”. In most schools, records of EAL pupils’ progress indicated that they were making very good progress in general with reference to the English Language Proficiency benchmarks.

Pupils’ learning in Mathematics was good or very good in a majority of class settings. In some schools EAL pupils were achieving as well as or better than their native peers in Mathematics. Inspectors commented that Mathematics is one of the
earliest success subjects for those with developing English language skills. Some teachers and principals reported that children from Eastern European countries found mathematics less challenging here than in their home countries. These children had previously worked on mathematical algorithms and problems demanding complex understanding. Inspectors noted that the quality of EAL pupils’ learning varied with their language competence and conceptual development. Inspectors generally advised schools to differentiate Mathematics work and incorporate more group work and a greater focus on the language of Mathematics into their programme planning.

**Recommendation**

- In addition to whole-school analysis of the outcomes of standardised tests, schools should track the progress of EAL pupils separately from their peers.

**5A 4 Quality of Teaching and Learning in the EAL Support Classroom**

**Overview of quality of teaching and learning in the EAL support classroom**

This was evaluated as good or very good in a majority of schools. One of the most significant findings is that the quality of teaching provided by EAL teachers was good or very good in almost all schools. Weaknesses in the provision included a significant lack of effective collaborative planning between mainstream and EAL teachers. In half of the schools evaluated EAL teachers gave insufficient attention to using assessment data to inform their teaching programmes. These findings are discussed in the following sections.

**5A 4.1 Nature of the Supports Provided for EAL pupils**

Effective practice is found where:
- dedicated EAL support teachers are deployed flexibly to meet the needs of EAL pupils

Most schools organised language support for EAL pupils effectively. A range of supports was provided to EAL pupils in the schools evaluated. Most language support teachers provided dedicated supports to EAL pupils on a withdrawal basis in small groups or individually. Groups comprised pupils of the same age and class level and similar need. 23 schools provided supports to individual pupils who required specific interventions. Where good practice was in evidence, there was a balance of in-class support and withdrawal of pupils for dedicated supports. Very good practice in some schools included an entirely in-class programme for pupils in junior infants so that their experience of school would not become fractured.
In most schools good efforts were made to co-ordinate the supports for EAL pupils in such a way as to minimise disruption to the mainstream classes and also to ensure that EAL pupils did not miss out on core subjects.

**Recommendations for Schools**

- Schools should seek a better balance between in-class support and withdrawal support for EAL pupils. Pupils requiring specific interventions or supports should be withdrawn for short periods.
- The provision of in-class supports and dedicated support in withdrawal lessons should be underpinned by differentiated classroom teaching and suitable resources.

**Extract from an inspection report highlighting good practice – school in a provincial town**

The teachers are committed to developing their expertise in EAL teaching, and the board of management facilitates continuing professional development. Team teaching is used successfully to support pupils with learning needs, including those with language needs. The EAL support teacher works to provide individual or small-group support in the mainstream class setting. The focus of the support teaching is placed on EAL pupils during the infant classes. The language programme devised for EAL pupils is based on the language themes identified by the IILT and relevant and achievable learning targets are devised. Pupils in the ‘silent’ and emerging phases of language instruction are well-supported. The language support teacher works collaboratively with classroom teachers in planning the programmes for EAL pupils.

**5A 4.2 Quality of Teaching Provided in the EAL Support Teaching Context**

Very good practice is found where:
- EAL support teachers use appropriate teaching methods to meet the language acquisition needs of the pupils
- The lessons have clear aims and learning outcomes
- Overall pupil progress is in keeping with ability and teaching targets set.

Almost all EAL support teachers provided good-quality teaching in the support contexts. Inspectors commented on the commitment and professionalism of the teachers. EAL teachers provided stimulating learning environments which were print rich and well resourced. In many contexts, real-life texts such as newspapers, magazines, timetables, TV schedules and other materials were used in lessons. Teachers used varied stimuli and strategies. EAL teachers placed very good emphasis on building self-esteem and confidence in small group settings.

Very structured teaching in the lessons facilitated pupils to experience active learning approaches allowing for peer interaction and language development. Aspects of good practice included the use of a wide range of resources and teaching methodologies including direct instruction, play, games and group work.
In some contexts very effective use was made of visual resources to enhance meaning and learning for EAL pupils. Song-singing was used with pupils during the infant and junior classes, introducing them to the rhythm and sounds of different words. Teachers who used gestures and key visual aids supported pupils in their learning. Pupils were given adequate time to respond and to speak. They were encouraged in their attempts at communication and their language skills were reinforced effectively. Space was provided for pupils to engage actively with language while the seating arrangements allowed pupils to make direct eye contact with the teacher and their peers and to witness good language modelling. Effective questioning was used and teachers adjusted their questioning according to individual pupils’ needs. Very good pre-teaching of language essential for learning concepts and skills in Mathematics and in other areas of the curriculum was observed in some withdrawal contexts. Teachers demonstrated particular empathy for pupils in the silent and emerging phase of language acquisition. Where several EAL teachers were working in a school, inspectors commented that they worked as a cohesive unit, implementing similar programmes and sharing good practice.

However, aspects of poor practice were observed in a significant minority of schools. Inspectors noted that while language games and other activities were in evidence, the communicative purpose of these games was insufficiently clear. Inspectors noted that the pacing of lessons was sometimes too slow and did not reflect the plurilingual abilities of many of the children. In these cases, the pupils’ language skills were at a higher level than the target language being taught. Inspectors commented that the work in EAL contexts was sometimes at a level and pace more suitable for those with learning needs than those requiring language teaching. Inspectors recommended that schools ensure an appropriate correspondence and alignment between the pupil’s individual needs and the level of supplementary tuition provided.

**Recommendation**

- EAL teachers should ensure that the language programmes planned match the language capacities of the EAL children, both in support contexts and in mainstream classes. They should ensure that language-based activities for EAL pupils are sufficiently challenging.
Extract from an inspection report highlighting good collaborative planning for EAL pupils

EAL support teachers collaborate with mainstream class teachers by sharing information about the outcomes of assessment on an ongoing basis. The EAL support teachers regularly observe their pupils through the use of an in-class classroom observation schedule and these observations have become a core element of teaching and learning for EAL pupils. Meetings between EAL teachers and mainstream teachers regularly occur after school to plan in-class and withdrawal activities to support the developing needs of the EAL pupils. Mainstream teachers have become very aware of the needs of EAL pupils and this informs their long and short-term planning.

5A 4.3 Quality of In-class Support Provided to EAL Pupils in Mainstream Class Settings

Very good practice is found where:

- EAL support teachers work collaboratively with class teachers to ensure that the EAL pupils’ learning needs are met within the mainstream and support teaching contexts.

Three-fifths of schools had made provision for in-class supports for EAL pupils in English. A similar number of schools organised effective in-class supports for EAL pupils in Mathematics. However, where in-class supports were provided, inspectors commented that these supports were at an early stage of development and were in operation in a small number of classrooms in each school. A significant minority of schools provided in-class supports at each class level.

In-class supports were most effective when experienced EAL teachers worked alongside classroom teachers. In these settings EAL pupils were working with their peers and learning through listening to other pupils with similar abilities and greater language skills as they discussed, debated, and worked formally and informally. Where good practice was observed, language-rich classrooms were created and opportunities were provided for EAL learners to hear and engage in extended, sustained talk.

Highly effective team teaching structures such as these were in place in only one-fifth of schools and these were characterised by teachers sharing learning objectives, co-ordinating the use of resources and space, and differentiating their teaching methods. In a small number of schools, the EAL teachers worked alongside mainstream teachers to support language development in other subject areas with high language requirements such as History, Geography and Science.
**Recommendations for Schools**

Schools should ensure that high quality in-class supports are facilitated. Structures to foster team teaching should be promoted.

**5A 4.4 EAL Teachers’ Planning**

Good practice is found where:

- Pupils’ individual language programmes are based on their assessed competences in the four language skills
- EAL support teachers and mainstream classroom teachers undertake collaborative planning which outlines specific targets for EAL pupils.

A majority of teachers had good or very good practice in planning for the stages of language development. Most teachers based their planning on the thirteen themes devised by IILT. Individual plans and group plans incorporated specific targets based on the pupils’ language needs. These plans responded to individual needs, identified pupils’ strengths and built upon previous learning. IEPS and IPLPs contained specific learning targets which were informed by diagnostic testing and input from the class teacher, the support teacher, parents and special needs assistants. The targets outlined in these plans were specific, measurable and realisable within the defined period of the plan.

Only half of the EAL teachers and mainstream class teachers engaged in good collaborative planning for EAL pupils. Where good practice was in evidence, teachers worked as a team and had formal and informal meetings usually at the beginning of each term and subsequently each week to plan specific programmes and targets for EAL pupils. In these settings mainstream teachers had copies of individual plans and programmes for pupils. Effective collaborative plans focused specifically on the EAL pupils’ learning needs, identified language demands across the curriculum and made provision for the development of specific language in each curricular area. Copies of plans were discussed with parents and parental input to planning was encouraged and accommodated. In larger schools where very good practice was in evidence, language support teachers were assigned to work with specific classes groups and concentrated their teaching on a specific age or class grouping of EAL pupils.

Where poor or fair practice was observed, inspectors noted that a whole-school approach to collaborative planning was lacking and there was little awareness of the need for teachers to plan co-operatively. Where poor practice was in evidence there was also a lack of communication with parents about the programmes planned.

---
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Recommendations

- Pupils receiving EAL support should have an individualised plan or programme that is devised by the EAL support teacher in collaboration with the mainstream class teacher.
- Achievement criteria based on English Language Proficiency Benchmarks should be identified in plans for EAL pupils.
- Programmes should be devised for groups of pupils withdrawn for dedicated EAL support. These programmes should inform classroom practice and give strategies for the provision of in-class supports for EAL pupils.
- Class teachers should have a copy of the plans for EAL pupils. These plans should inform the teachers’ classroom planning.

5A 4.5 Initial and Ongoing Assessment of EAL Pupils

Good practice in assessment is found in mainstream classrooms when

- Pupils’ competences in the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) are assessed

Good assessment practice was identified in three-quarters of schools. Pupils were initially assessed using materials devised by Integrate Ireland Language and Training (IILT) and the Primary School Assessment Kit which was circulated to schools in June 2008. Where very good practice was in evidence, pupils were assessed in the four language skills. Most schools carried out initial assessments on EAL pupils at an appropriate interval after enrolment. These assessments informed the types of supports provided for EAL pupils and determined whether pupils were given supports in their mainstream classroom or on a withdrawal basis.

Most schools supplemented these assessments with teacher-devised assessments based on the pupils’ linguistic competences. Schools also maintained folders of pupils’ work. Where very good practice was observed, IEPs or learning programmes were based on the outcomes of these assessments. A majority of EAL support teachers maintained very good records of pupils’ progress and assessment data. However, almost half of the schools lacked a systematic whole-school approach to teacher planning and recording. Teachers were unaware of the work of the EAL teacher and did not have the specific plans devised for the pupils in their class. Assessment modes outlined in teacher planning were generic, usually referring to teacher observation methods. In a number of schools the individual plans devised for EAL pupils were too broad and made the monitoring of learning outcomes difficult. In other instances, EAL teachers did not outline achievement criteria in their plans, making it difficult to measure pupils’ progress.

Most inspectors recommended that assessment information be used more formatively by teachers to assist in devising individual learning programmes for
pupils. They also recommended that assessment information be used to differentiate the provision of in-class supports.

**Recommendations**

- Schools should ensure that assessment data for EAL pupils is generated in the four language skills. Systematic records of assessment data should be maintained and copies shared with class teachers, parents and, where appropriate, pupils.
- Assessment should be an ongoing and continuous element of teaching and learning in mainstream and support teaching contexts.
- Assessment data should be used to inform the teaching and learning programmes devised by class teachers and EAL support teachers.
Section 5B - Post-Primary Schools

5B 1 Provision and Whole-School Support for English as an Additional Language

5B 1.1 Allocation and Whole-School Support

Good practice is found where the allocation for language support:

- complies with the provisions of the Department’s circular letter 53/07\(^{32}\).
- is used in a targeted and differentiated way to meet the needs of the diversity of EAL students in the school.

Good whole-school support for EAL provision is found where school management (the board of management, principal and deputy principal, and holders of relevant posts of responsibility) gives effective leadership. In practical terms this is demonstrated where:

- inclusive policies and practices have been developed
- whole-staff continuous professional development (CPD) on EAL and interculturalism is promoted.

In one-fifth of the schools inspected, the allocation criteria above were fully met. Good practice was particularly noted where the full entitlement to EAL support was used to offer support at a range of levels and through various models. However, significant deficiencies in this area were found in one-third of the schools inspected. The most serious of these was a substantial under-use (for the designated purpose) of the allocation given. In some instances, schools cited difficulties in deploying suitable teachers and in accommodating EAL provision in an often complex timetable. Rarer instances of poor practice included a failure to provide any EAL support for eligible senior cycle students, whose need for support is acute given the curricular and examination challenges they face.

In a minority of cases, the school was unaware that it could make application for eligible EAL students who enrolled after the provisional allocation had been given. In some instances, the initial allocation given in September was lower than the previous year’s and was subsequently increased, but not until October or November. This led to difficulty in deploying the revised allocation as timetables had to be altered and teachers had to be redeployed or sourced. Such cases highlight the need for an allocation model that supports continuity and capacity building.

While the circular permits flexibility in using the EAL allocation, a relatively narrow range of models of support was encountered. The most common was the use of the allocation to create mixed-proficiency withdrawal groups from Irish as the sole means of delivering direct EAL support. Students with Level B1 proficiency in English were

\(^{32}\) See Appendix 5 for the text of the circular
frequently placed in these settings because they were not studying Irish. Students with Level 0 or A1 proficiency were observed to struggle in such settings. Inspectors commended the use of part of the allocation to facilitate initial and ongoing assessment of EAL students’ English proficiency but found it in few schools.

None of the schools evaluated used the allocation purely for the direct provision of EAL support in a dedicated EAL support context. This should not necessarily be regarded as a negative finding, given concerns about the overuse of the withdrawal model to meet various educational needs. Over half of the schools visited used part of the allocation to create smaller class groups. This use was judged to be appropriate to the aims of the allocation where the school could demonstrate the benefit to EAL students. However, in some cases the creation of smaller classes had no clear bearing on the needs of EAL students, especially those at Level 0 or A1 proficiency, and was judged to be a misuse of the allocation. In a few cases, schools had pooled some of their EAL allocation with the hours allocated to support students with special educational needs (SEN). These allocations are for separate purposes and should be combined only to support specific students who have both SEN and EAL needs.

Exemplar of good practice
The school used part of its EAL allocation to create four rather than three mixed-ability base classes in a junior cycle year that had a large EAL enrolment. The EAL students were distributed equally across all base classes, thus promoting inclusion and creating a supportive learning environment. Both EAL and mainstream teachers reported positively on this arrangement.

Satisfactory whole-school support for EAL provision was found in about half of the schools evaluated. However, factors largely outside the school’s control have had a bearing. In particular; appropriate Department-sponsored CPD both for EAL teachers and for the staff as a whole was in short supply prior to 2009. Significant challenges face the Department and others if schools are to deliver EAL provision more effectively. CPD has to meet an acute level of need, because of the very sharp rise in EAL numbers from a low base and the related lack of relevant experience and expertise in EAL among teachers. The need to support students in accessing and successfully progressing through the post-primary curriculum poses a challenge for all teachers. Nonetheless, school managements were praised for facilitating available CPD for EAL teachers and, in particular, for encouraging the sharing of expertise and established good practice within the school.

Recommendations for Schools

- Schools must ensure compliance with the terms on which EAL allocations are made.
- Schools should be able to demonstrate the benefits to EAL students of any use made of the allocation. It should be used in a varied and flexible manner.
- The needs of students with Level 0 and A1 proficiency, and of senior cycle students, should be prioritised.
- School managements should promote the sharing of all good practice and expertise in the area of EAL that is already within the school. This is essential...
in order to develop an integrated and inclusive approach to provision for EAL students.

**Recommendations for the System**

- Application and allocation procedures for EAL support should take into account the unpredictable nature of EAL enrolment. Therefore, future EAL circulars should state that schools may apply for EAL support for all eligible students that they have enrolled, irrespective of the date of enrolment.
- The use of enrolment trends as well as known numbers in determining allocation should be investigated to support school management in timely planning and effective deployment.
- The Department should produce or commission EAL guidelines for schools, setting out appropriate and targeted use of the allocation. The overarching criterion should be the enabling and supporting of EAL students to access the curriculum, progress through the educational system, and participate in all aspects of school life. This requires both direct provision of EAL support and other integrated supports to enable EAL students to access and advance within the fullest curriculum possible.
- CPD in the area of EAL should focus on whole-school capacity building and to this end should involve key school personnel including management and permanent teachers.
- CPD of teachers require a dual approach:
  - specialist in-service for EAL teachers to improve teaching and learning in the support context; and
  - whole-staff CPD to promote the effective teaching and learning of EAL students in the mainstream context.

**5B 1.2 Deployment of Staff and Timetabling**

Good practice is found where:

- registered teachers with an appropriate language-teaching background and/or relevant qualifications are deployed to teach EAL
- deployment facilitates continuity of provision and capacity building
- EAL is timetabled satisfactorily for all eligible students within all years and programmes
- timetabling arrangements assist the continuous and cumulative development of key language skills. Level 0 and A1 students in particular have a daily lesson to facilitate English language acquisition and reinforcement of language learning.

At present no specific teaching qualification in EAL in mainstream schools has been recognised by the Teaching Council or the Department. However, teachers may have EAL teaching qualifications gained in other jurisdictions. The education departments in a number of third-level colleges offer courses in teaching English to speakers of other languages. These are recognised as qualifications for teaching only in non-
mainstream English language schools, such as those within the Advisory Council of
English Language Schools in Ireland (ACELS). Teachers who have taken courses in
teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) were involved in EAL teaching in
many schools. While a number of these courses are very substantial and widely
recognised internationally, the usual context of TEFL is outside the mainstream
educational system in countries where English is a foreign language. By contrast, the
focus in EAL is on the teaching of students within the mainstream system in an
English-speaking environment in order to assist their access to, and progress through,
the curriculum, and their integration into the school community.

Schools were commended for deploying registered teachers with an appropriate
language-teaching background and/or relevant qualifications to teach EAL.
Significant teaching competence in the EAL support context was observed in many,
but not all, cases where EAL teachers also taught modern languages and where they
had experience in teaching English to speakers of other languages. Teachers with
TEFL qualifications and experience were frequently observed to focus on
communicative and social English language acquisition more than on English in a
curricular and academic context.

In more than half the schools evaluated, deployment of staff was deemed less than
satisfactory. Contextual factors must be taken into account. Deployment is more
complex in post-primary than in primary schools, given that each class group has a
number of teachers and a multi-subject timetable. EAL teachers and lessons have to
be fitted in to the master timetable. The fact that the EAL allocation is given on a
yearly concessionary basis affects continuity of deployment. However, the use of the
EAL allocation is a matter for each school, and the evaluation identified deployment
patterns that militated against good provision for EAL. The total allocation for EAL
support to the fifteen schools evaluated was 46 WTEs. In fact, this allocation was
dispersed among over 100 teachers who were delivering direct EAL support and
among many more teachers where the allocation was further spread, for example to
create smaller class groups. The practice of assigning EAL lessons to teachers on the
basis that they had spare capacity on their timetables was reported in a significant
number of schools. It is an inappropriate basis on which to involve teachers in
providing direct EAL support.

Continuity and capacity building were best served where there was a core EAL
teaching team with a substantial and sustained timetable commitment to EAL.
However, a significant negative finding was that many of the ‘core’ EAL teachers
were on part-time or temporary contracts. 60% of those teaching EAL were part-time
or on pro rata contracts. The percentage was considerably higher in the case of
teachers who were solely or mostly teaching EAL. This pattern of deployment clearly
hinders continuity of provision and capacity building.

Poor deployment was also strongly evident in the practice of assigning several EAL
teachers to the one EAL group, at times to the point where the class group had a
different teacher for each EAL lesson. This practice occurred to a greater or lesser
degree in almost three-quarters of the schools visited, underlining the extent to which
EAL was viewed as an “add-on” to teachers’ other teaching commitments. EAL
teachers themselves overwhelmingly viewed this practice as detrimental to proper planning and delivery of EAL.

Two broad patterns of timetabling emerged from the evaluation. In a minority of schools, some form of partial immersion programme with separate timetable arrangements had been created. In the majority of schools however, EAL support was offered through concurrent timetabling with Irish, and also in some cases through withdrawal from other subjects including modern languages and religious education. Very few instances of in-class support through team teaching were observed, although circular 53/07 recommends this form of support. This is an area for development.

The practice of timetabling EAL support every day assists low-proficiency students and facilitates regular reinforcement of language learning, and where seen it was commended. However, in two-thirds of the schools visited, students reported that they did not have an EAL lesson every day. Good practice was noted in a small number of schools where the EAL co-ordinator worked with senior management on timetabling arrangements for EAL.

**Recommendations for Schools**

- School managements should seek to deploy teachers of modern languages or teachers with EAL qualifications and experience to deliver EAL. TEFL qualifications are not designed to prepare teachers for EAL teaching in mainstream post-primary schools.
- EAL hours should not be allocated to teachers without due regard to their language-teaching expertise.
- A concentrated delivery of direct EAL support through a core group of teachers promotes continuity and capacity building, and deployment should be organised to this end. Permanent whole-time teachers should therefore have a significant involvement in the delivery of EAL support.
- The practice whereby EAL groups have more than one teacher should be avoided unless it can be justified as adding to the quality of EAL support to students.
- Deployment of teachers to provide a measure of in-class support rather than purely withdrawal support would assist in the successful mainstreaming of EAL support.
- EAL students should have an EAL lesson every day, at least initially.
- The deployment of teachers and the timetabling of EAL should be planned in tandem so that optimal use can be made of the allocation given to provide regular and consistent support to EAL students.

**Recommendations for the system**

- The establishment and recognition of a qualification in EAL teaching for mainstream post-primary schools, open to registered and registerable teachers, is necessary to develop expertise in the teaching and learning of EAL students and to build capacity within the system.
Future EAL circulars should advocate use of the allocation to promote continuity of delivery and the development of expertise. Specifically, the circular should recommend the assigning or appointing of a suitably experienced teacher to lead the development and delivery of EAL in the school. This would be the most efficient means of mitigating the discontinuity and poor capacity building associated with current deployment patterns.

The proposed EAL guidelines should promote both in-class support and partial immersion programmes as appropriate means of meeting the needs of EAL students.

5B 1.3 Provision of Resources

Good practice is found where

- a wide range of resources, including ICT and appropriate dictionaries, is available.
- a stock of suitable reading material is available both in English and home languages to promote reading among EAL students.

Two-thirds of schools were evaluated as satisfactory in this area although none exemplified consistently good practice. The increasing availability of ICT in schools was noted, but few instances of ICT-interactive teaching and learning were observed, despite its effectiveness in second language acquisition. ICT use was largely in evidence only as downloaded hard copies of exercises and worksheets. A very large discrepancy emerged between schools’ sense of the use of ICT resources in EAL and the students’ responses to a question about computer use. While most schools listed ICT as one of the resources used in the provision of EAL support, just a fifth of students said they used computers in EAL lessons.

The incidence of the use of dictionaries varied considerably even within schools. Of most concern was the low level of use of bilingual dictionaries, which EAL candidates are permitted to use in most certificate examinations, as part of the reasonable accommodations provided by the State Examination Commission. The arrangement applies to EAL Leaving Certificate candidates in all examinations except English, Irish and the candidate’s first language. However, this concession can be of little benefit where students are unaccustomed to using bilingual dictionaries.

Six of the fifteen schools visited did not have a functioning library, although some had class libraries or book boxes. A majority of student questionnaires agreed that it was easy to borrow books in English, but not in home languages. The importance of maintaining proficiency in the home language in order to aid the acquisition of English was not widely appreciated in schools.

Recommendation for Schools

- Bilingual dictionaries should be regarded in the same light as other textbooks. Their use should be incorporated into subject planning. English learner

33 See Circular S01/09 in the Schools section of the SEC web site, www.examinations.ie.
dictionaries should be part of the EAL stock of resources, and those with good visual and curriculum-related content are to be preferred.

- Accessible high-interest books are essential in any school library. Dual language books are increasingly available and provide an excellent means of maintaining contact with the home language while extending proficiency in reading English. Web sites that provide access to newspapers in English and in other languages should also be used to this end.
- Good links should be established with local libraries to enhance the supply of suitable material.

**Recommendations for the system**

- Encouraging a greater sense of the possibilities of ICT is the surest way to bring about its greater use. ICT should be demonstrated and used as both vehicle and focus of CPD. Those involved in developing EAL materials should be encouraged and assisted to do so using multimedia.
- The EAL guidelines recommended at 5B 1.1 should also indicate to schools a range of suitable resources for EAL students and their teachers, including learner and bilingual dictionaries, publishers and titles of accessible high-interest books and dual-language books, and web sites.

**5B 1.4 Enrolment Procedures and Practices**

Practice is good where:

- Enrolment procedures are transparent and inclusive for EAL students.
- School personnel gather comprehensive information about EAL students’ educational and language background.
- The school actively assists EAL parents to enrol their children.
- Formal links with feeder primary schools aid provision and placement of EAL students.

Practice in this area was satisfactory in a majority of the schools visited. Among the strengths noted were: open and inclusive enrolment practices (although policies sometimes read less inclusively than actual practice); the involvement of a post-holder with responsibility for international students in the enrolment and induction process; good procedures for gathering and recording information about students’ educational history; and liaison between key personnel and feeder primary schools to assist the smooth transition of EAL students. Good liaison with primary schools is essential, to ascertain the level and duration of support received by incoming EAL children, their English language proficiency and their continuing needs. These all have a bearing on the level of support that may be required and can be offered in the post-primary context. Areas for development that were identified reflected deficiencies in some or all of the above practices.

Schools were commended for involving bilingual teachers, senior students and parents in assisting with new enrolments where appropriate. The good practice of accessing translated documents on the Department’s web site was also noted, as were the efforts made by schools to communicate their policies and practices to parents of EAL
students. Almost all parent questionnaires reflected positively on the experience of enrolment. A significant minority reported that enrolment forms and other documents were available in their home language; a figure that was surprisingly high, in the light of the evidence gathered indicating that translated documents were available in few schools and few languages. The response may be accounted for by the fact that many parents gave English as one of their home languages, even where they had answered the questionnaire in another language. Both schools and parents reported significant ‘non-gathering’ of information about students’ educational history. However, schools attributed this to difficulties in getting this information, while almost half of parents reported that the school did not seek the information.

**Recommendations for Schools**

- Schools are advised to ensure that their written enrolment policies are inclusive and, where necessary, to reword policies to accurately reflect inclusive practices.
- Full use should be made of the translated documents available on the Department’s website.
- Post-holders with responsibility for the care of international students should have a role in the enrolment and induction process.
- Schools must actively and methodically seek information about EAL students’ educational history. This is especially important where schools operate banding or streaming systems of class formation and there is a risk of inappropriate placement of EAL students because low proficiency in English may be wrongly interpreted as low academic ability.

**Recommendations for the system**

- 19 official documents are currently available in eight languages (English, Irish, German, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Russian, Spanish) on the Department’s website. It is recommended that the suite of translations be expanded, at least to include French and Portuguese. This would be a cost-effective means of providing information to EAL parents and aiding communication between them and schools.
- Since translation costs would be very large in terms of an individual school’s budget, consideration should be given to producing generic forms and documents (including enrolment and subject choice forms, and standard codes of behaviour outlining procedures) and making these available to schools in a range of languages with definitive Irish and English versions.
- Consideration must also be given to how the system can best accommodate the continuing needs of EAL children transferring from primary to post primary, in particular with regard to ongoing development of cognitive language proficiency.
5B 1.5 Arrangements for Student Access to EAL Support

Good practice is found where

- timely and effective initial and ongoing assessment ensures students’ access to appropriate EAL support
- arrangements for access to EAL support provide well for varying levels of need
- the provision of EAL support is flexible and varied and may include immersion, special classes and in-class support

Initial assessment of EAL students to ascertain their English language proficiency took many forms. In the best instances observed, teachers familiar with the European language proficiency benchmarks administered tests to assess competence in the four language skills. Students were then placed in support class groups appropriate to their level and were able to progress from one level of support to the next following re-testing to measure their progress. The concurrent timetabling of EAL support at different levels facilitated this good practice.

However, fewer than one-third of the schools formed EAL class groups on the basis of similar proficiency levels. Where students were placed in mixed-proficiency groups, good practice was noted where teachers were aware of each student’s English language competence and differentiated materials and methods accordingly. For the vast majority of EAL students in the schools evaluated, access to regular timetabled EAL support was predicated on their not taking Irish. Thus the frequency and distribution of EAL lessons in the majority of schools evaluated depended largely on the arrangements made for Irish and on the availability of EAL teachers at those times. The need for more flexible access to better differentiated support is indicated.

In one-fifth of the schools evaluated, some form of immersion was used, in either an induction or inset programme, to provide intensive EAL support for students with Level 0 or A1 proficiency. EAL students in such programmes were generally integrated for some part of the day into mainstream class groups and lessons. Additional and post-induction support was provided through withdrawal. Schools were commended for devising such programmes as a response to the acute needs of significant numbers of EAL students, and as part of a stepped programme of support. However, some schools expressed concern that immersion as induction had an adverse effect on the integration of EAL students.

The provision of in-class support for EAL students (where an EAL teacher provides support in the mainstream classroom setting) was noted in very few schools. Inspectors are increasingly encountering this form of team teaching to provide literacy and numeracy support, and schools are encouraged to consider it to deliver EAL support to students.
Recommendations for Schools

➢ The post-primary assessment kits should be used to provide initial and ongoing assessment of students’ English language proficiency in order to inform decisions on appropriate placement and support.
➢ The support offered should reflect and respond to different levels of need using all available means.
➢ Induction programmes should include a gradually increasing level of participation in mainstream activities.

Recommendations for the System

➢ The proposed EAL guidelines should outline a variety of models of EAL provision to promote more flexible and differentiated access to support.

B5 1.6 Arrangements for Student Access to the Curriculum

Good practice is found where
➢ the provision of EAL support does not preclude students from participation in a broad and balanced curriculum, including Irish.
➢ EAL students not taking Irish and/or modern languages are facilitated to study other subjects.
➢ EAL students are placed in class groups according to a range of appropriate criteria including interest, general ability, prior learning, competence in English, age, and the advice of the EAL co-ordinator. School policy promotes regular review of the class placement of all students, including EAL students.
➢ the school actively encourages EAL students to take certificate examinations in their home languages where these are available either as curricular or non-curricular subjects.

Practice in this area was deemed satisfactory in three-fifths of the schools visited. Inspectors commented favourably on the placement of EAL students in mainstream class groups with access to the full curriculum, including modern European languages and Irish. However, in practice the pattern of timetabling of EAL support has obvious implications for EAL students wishing to study Irish, or requiring Irish to enter their chosen third-level course.

In many schools, senior management and teachers praised the work ethic, motivation and high aspirations of EAL students, and were eager to offer appropriate challenges as well as supports. For example, it was pointed out that most of the students in a junior cycle higher-level mathematics class visited were EAL students. Asked about favourite subjects and difficult subjects, EAL students reported a wide variety in both categories, from which no firm conclusions can be drawn. However, a significant number referred to difficulties with English as a subject.
Where the school’s guidance service offered specific information and advice on subject choices and their implications to EAL students and their parents, this was highly commended. Another instance of good practice was noted where the school’s guidance service investigated the educational system from which most of the school’s EAL students had come, and could therefore assist EAL students and their parents to make informed and appropriate subject choices. In these instances, the school’s guidance service could also provide very useful information to teachers.

Some schools themselves raised the issue of senior-cycle EAL students who had neither Irish nor a modern European language, and whose home language was not among the curricular or non-curricular languages offered in the state examinations. Often these students had only five Leaving Certificate subjects, and were felt to be at a disadvantage with regard to third-level entry. A small number of schools offered alternative subjects to EAL students in the senior cycle, and this was commended. Concern was also expressed at the very large number of subjects encompassed within the junior cycle curriculum, presenting significant challenges to EAL students.

The non-curricular language option is available to students from the EU only, and at present fifteen EU languages are included. The examination is based on the final written paper in the first foreign language in the European Baccalaureate. While most schools reported that they informed students of the option and assisted with applications, and that the rate of uptake was good, the relevant SEC data show low uptake in almost half of the schools evaluated. Nationally, the uptake of the non-curricular language option has been small, although the data available for 2009 indicate a significant increase in the uptake of Polish, Portuguese, Lithuanian, and Romanian (see Appendix 9).

Inspectors noted with concern the tendency in a minority of schools to place EAL students in a lower ability band or stream without sufficient evidence of their actual ability. Where this occurred, EAL students did not have access to the full range of subjects or to subjects at higher level. As indicated above, it was also of concern that EAL students not taking Irish and not in need of daily EAL support were offered no alternative subject and were expected to study independently, often “at the back of the class”.

Exemplar of good practice
Three hours of the EAL allocation was used to offer senior-cycle EAL students a sixth subject with a strong practical element, which was approached with a view to providing meaningful language learning as well as subject-specific knowledge and skills.

Recommendations for Schools

- Full integration into the mainstream classroom is the goal of EAL provision. The class placement of EAL students should support this goal and every effort should be made to ensure their access to a broad and balanced curriculum with an appropriate level of challenge. Non-verbal diagnostic tests such as Raven’s Standard Progressive Matrices (see link from Department circular 99/07 on the
Department web site) should be used to ensure that low proficiency in English is not equated with low ability generally.

- Schools should endeavour to interest EAL students in the study of Irish, should be assiduous in ensuring that they understand the implications of not studying Irish and should facilitate EAL students who wish to take up or continue the study of Irish.
- Schools should use all means available to offer EAL students a full complement of subjects, especially in the senior cycle.
- Schools should inform eligible students of the non-curricular languages provision, and encourage and facilitate them to avail of it.

Recommendations for the system

- The proposed EAL guidelines should advocate the provision of EAL support to senior-cycle EAL students within the context of a full complement of subjects.
- Consideration could be given to facilitating the taking up of certain Leaving Certificate subjects ab initio in fifth year for the benefit of all students, including EAL students.
- The NCCA is currently reviewing the junior cycle curriculum, and the needs of EAL students have been raised in the consultation process. The next phase of the review following the rebalancing of the syllabuses will consider the broader issue of the nature of the junior cycle curriculum. The opportunity this review offers to address the needs of EAL students should be fully exploited.
- In third-level colleges in Ireland, 25 courses require higher level Irish, and 236 require Irish at ordinary level. In particular, all primary teaching courses require higher-level Irish. The Department and teacher education colleges should be proactive in ensuring that the primary teacher cohort includes, in the fullness of time, former EAL students.
- Consideration should be given to producing guidelines for examiners on applying marking schemes to the papers of EAL candidates in language-intensive subjects in the certificate examinations.

5B 2 Planning and Co-ordination of EAL Provision

5B 2.1 School Policies

Good practice is found where

- whole-school planning incorporates measures to address diversity and EAL-specific issues in relevant policies. These include the purposeful use of home languages as a means of linking prior and new learning.
- a whole-school EAL policy has been developed and ratified.

Most schools evaluated were found to have good practice in this area. Two-fifths of schools already had specific policies on inclusion/international students/EAL, and such policies were being developed in most other schools. Typically, policies committed schools to welcoming diversity, ensuring equality of opportunity for all
students and protecting students from bullying and racist behaviour. Schools were commended for including such commitments in their school plan. However, it was consistently found that policies, whether written or unwritten, did not support EAL students’ use of home languages in school. School personnel were largely unaware of the value of the purposeful use of home languages in supporting the acquisition of new learning.\textsuperscript{34}

**Recommendation for Schools**

- The school policy on EAL students should support the properly-managed use of home languages. It should also commit the school to activities and initiatives supporting inclusion and interculturalism. The NCCA’s Intercultural Guidelines should be consulted to inform this process.

**Recommendation for the System**

- The proposed EAL guidelines should highlight resources such as the NCCA’s Intercultural Guidelines and recommend their use in informing policy.

**5B 2.2 EAL Planning Structures**

Good practice is found where

- school management facilitates and encourages planning for EAL provision
- EAL is co-ordinated effectively to support proper provision. Co-ordination of EAL actively facilitates the sharing of resources and good practice. EAL teaching team meetings are held regularly and are appropriately documented
- good and productive links have been forged between the EAL teaching team and other subject areas
- EAL planning structures support the involvement of the school’s care and guidance services

Fewer than half the schools evaluated were found to have good practice in this area. In the majority of schools, practice was not so much poor as undeveloped or ad hoc. The temporary and short-term nature of allocation and deployment has hindered the establishment of effective planning and co-ordination structures. However, very good practice was noted particularly in schools with longer histories of EAL enrolment and those where subject planning was well established. Instances of good practice included the allocation of dedicated time to the EAL co-ordinator for planning and liaison with subject departments; the inclusion of EAL team planning in the schedule of subject planning sessions; and the participation of senior management and the school’s guidance and care services in EAL meetings.

\textsuperscript{34} This is supported by the finding in the OECD report “Closing the Gap” which indicates that valuing mother tongue “can… help students bridge the gap between home and school, build …confidence and raise motivation (Driessen, 2005; Brind et al., 2008). Research indicates that competencies acquired in one language can be relatively easily transferred to another language (Cummins, 1979; 1980; 2000).” (OECD, 2010d at p 49)
Recommendations for Schools

- In the interests of co-ordinated and well-planned delivery of EAL support, schools with more than one WTE for EAL support should appoint an EAL co-ordinator with time allocated for planning and liaison.
- Good subject planning practices should be extended to planning for EAL, and should include regular meetings with records of decisions made, and effective communication structures encompassing senior management, subject departments, and the school’s guidance, care and learning support services.

Recommendation for the system

- The measures recommended to promoting stability and continuity in delivering EAL support should be targeted also at effective co-ordination.

5B 2.3 EAL Team Planning

Good practice is found where

- plans clearly identify the knowledge, skills and learning outcomes that EAL students should acquire on a staged basis. Planning identifies a range of effective methods in teaching and learning, including the use of ICT
- there is clear evidence of planning to meet the needs of individual EAL students and to identify current and future EAL requirements
- textbooks and teaching materials used are appropriate to achieving EAL learning outcomes, specifically with regard to the learning of the language of instruction

Not surprisingly, findings in this area corresponded closely to those at 5B 2.2, but there was a greater incidence of identifiably poor practice. Three-fifths of schools were found to have more weaknesses than strengths in this area. The good planning encountered included targeted learning outcomes expressed in terms of what students are able to do – ‘can do’ statements. Plans organised on a staged basis and linked to identified levels of proficiency were commended, but were encountered only in a small minority of schools. Most plans did not place due emphasis on the language of instruction, either in the materials or the approaches selected. Links with the mainstream curriculum and with subject departments were generally poorly developed.

Many of the EAL teachers involved in the evaluation commented on the difficulty of planning and teaching a course without a syllabus or guidelines. Publications designed to assist with planning an EAL programme, including IILT’s “A resource book for language support in post-primary schools”, were not widely known or used. In some instances, planning was based on popular textbooks used largely in the TEFL context.

Individual planning generally benefited from strong team planning, although instances of good individual planning in schools without effective team planning structures were encountered and acknowledged. Good practice was noted where teachers
planned classwork based on real-life materials and situations that provided a meaningful context for language learning. Areas for development were consistent with those identified under team planning.

**Exemplar of good practice**
A very good EAL department plan has been developed, outlining programmes of work for all EAL support classes. The intensive EAL course offered focuses on the attainment of communicative English in the context of the school and draws on school documents like the Code of Behaviour, and notices like the canteen menu, as resources for teaching and learning. The withdrawal support programme outlined in the department plan draws on the IILT curriculum framework and focuses on learning outcomes related to the acquisition of the language of instruction. There is a commendable emphasis on helping students meet the language demands posed by a range of subjects on the school curriculum.

**Recommendations for Schools**

- The development of an EAL plan using the English Language Proficiency Benchmarks as the staged learning outcomes should be the focus of EAL planning. The EAL plan should have a clear focus on the language of instruction and should seek to develop all four language skills: speaking, listening, reading and writing. The Post-Primary Assessment Kit should be referenced in the plan as the key means of formative assessment.

**Recommendations for the system**

- The EAL planning resources already in existence (e.g. the IILT resource book and the NCCA’s Intercultural Guidelines) should be made available on the Second Level Support Service web site.

- The proposed EAL guidelines should include advice on planning the EAL programme, as a means of ensuring the productive use of existing resources, and in particular the Post-Primary Assessment Kit.

**5B 2.4 Planning for EAL Students in Other Subject Areas**

Good practice is found where

- subject department plans take cognisance of the needs of EAL students within that subject with regard to the teaching and learning of relevant terminology, concepts and skills.

- subject planning addresses the effective preparation of EAL students for state examinations, including the use of bilingual dictionaries so that students can benefit from the reasonable accommodation provisions of the State Examination Commission (SEC).
In the evaluations carried out, this area produced the largest number of negative findings, with practice deemed to have more weaknesses than strengths in almost all schools. Notwithstanding this, instances of good practice were observed and highly commended in the case of individual subject departments and indeed individual teachers in some schools.

In the most negative cases, inspectors’ questions about an EAL focus in subject planning elicited the view that this was not the remit of the subject teacher. In other instances, there was little awareness of the specific difficulties EAL students were likely to encounter or of the possibility that effective planning could contribute to overcoming these difficulties. Planning for the use of bilingual dictionaries was rarely seen, and many teachers were unaware of their permitted use in certificate examinations. However, many subject teachers accepted that planning for EAL students was necessary and they welcomed advice and information. Indeed, in a number of instances senior management and subject teachers saw such planning as benefiting all students, especially with regard to the explicit teaching of key terminology and appropriate writing structures.

### Exemplar of good practice

Very good support for EAL students was noted in subject department schemes where a “literacy focus” column, subject-specific opportunities to affirm diverse cultures, and specific planning for active methodologies and for a variety of resources were included. Also, lists of subject keywords in English alongside their equivalents in some of the home languages of EAL students were designed to enable EAL students to build their subject learning on the foundation of their home language literacy, and this is commended.

### Recommendations for Schools

- The school’s EAL policies and practices should make plain the importance of an EAL focus in all subject department planning. All subject department planning should incorporate specific measures, such as those described above, to support the learning of EAL students.
- Close liaison between experienced EAL teachers and subject departments should be facilitated as a means of sharing good practice with regard to effective teaching and learning methods for EAL students.
- Planning for the effective use of bilingual dictionaries should be incorporated into all relevant subject department plans.

### Recommendations for the system

- The development of good practice in the teaching and learning of EAL students cannot be confined only to EAL support lessons in the post-primary context. The most cost-effective way of raising awareness and improving practice in all subject areas is to provide a regular programme of in-service to develop EAL expertise among a critical number of teachers who can be consulted by subject departments, by those involved in school development planning and by school management.
5B 3 Teaching and Learning of EAL Students

5B 3.1 Teaching Methods in the EAL Support Classroom

Good practice is found where
- a thematic and contextual approach reinforces students’ language acquisition.
- the teacher communicates information clearly, using a moderate speaking pace, repetition, visual resources and non-verbal clues.
- the teacher explicitly teaches the language of instruction, including both general and specific academic vocabulary. Appropriate dictionary use is taught and practised.
- the teacher uses differentiated teaching methods to meet the language acquisition needs of students. Good independent and active learning opportunities are provided.
- particular attention is paid to extending students’ spoken and written language use.

51 EAL lessons were observed during the course of the evaluation. Teaching methods in the EAL support classroom were satisfactory in most EAL lessons observed, although practice of a consistently high quality was not identified in any school. This inconsistency was not unexpected, given the findings that planning structures and team planning for EAL were less than satisfactory in a majority of schools. In these circumstances, the sharing of good practice and the development of expertise are less likely.

Many instances of good practice were observed. These included the use of material focusing on the development of the language of instruction; good modelling of language use by the teacher; and the explicit teaching of school and subject-specific vocabulary. In some instances, students were compiling simple lists of key words with translations, so that they built up their own dictionaries and were reminded by their EAL teacher to add to them both in EAL and mainstream lessons. Where students were working towards Level A1 proficiency, good vocabulary work was noted where the meaning of words was communicated and then the words were placed in a school or subject context.

Strategies aimed at extending both spoken and written language production were especially commended. For example, where students at Level A1 (breakthrough stage) volunteered a one-word response, teachers placed the word in a full statement and the student then repeated this. Cloze exercises provide a good means of learning and reinforcing vocabulary, but the use of writing frames was seen as particularly useful in encouraging EAL students to write complete sentences and paragraphs. However, insufficient attention to the development of all four language skills in the methods observed was frequently noted. Listening and speaking were generally more to the fore than reading and writing, indicating a dominance of the communicative approach more appropriate to the TEFL context. Even with the greater attention given to spoken language, a need for better practice in eliciting more extended speech was noted.
Exemplars of good practice

In the support context, pair and group work was used to develop speaking and listening skills, and to practise certain language constructions. For example, the “pair then share” sequence allowed students to discuss a topic in pairs and then provided a good opportunity to practise indirect speech when reporting to the whole group.

New vocabulary was given a subject-specific context where possible. The word “smooth” was explained using concrete examples in the classroom, and then given a specific application to cake-making in Home Economics and sanding wood in Materials Technology.

Recommendations for Schools

- EAL planning structures and practices should facilitate the sharing of good practice and the development of expertise within the EAL teaching team.
- Teaching methods should focus on the development of all four language skills, with particular attention to extended spoken and written language, and to the language of instruction.

Recommendations for the System

- The CPD programme begun through SLSS in 2009 should continue into 2009-10, in order to identify and share good practice in the EAL classroom.
- Peer training in good EAL practice complements centrally delivered in-service, and the Teachers’ Professional Network based in Education Centres should be used to this end.

5B 3.2 Teaching Methods in the Mainstream Classroom with EAL Students

Good practice is found where

- the lesson has clear aims and learning outcomes and these are clearly communicated to students at the outset.
- the teacher models good and appropriate language use, communicates instructions and information clearly, moderates speaking pace and uses repetition judiciously. The teacher mediates meaning effectively through non-verbal clues, gestures, clear ‘line of sight’ and the use of visual resources.
- the teacher explicitly teaches the language of instruction, including both general and specific academic vocabulary. Appropriate dictionary use is taught and practised.
- the teacher uses differentiated teaching methods to meet the learning needs of EAL students. Good independent and active learning opportunities are provided.
- students use the home language in mainstream lessons to facilitate peer tutoring as appropriate.
56 mainstream lessons were observed during the course of the evaluation. Observation focused on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the teaching methods used with regard to the EAL students in each class group. Good practice was noted where teachers spoke clearly and at moderate pace, and where they readily used gesture, expression and visual aids to communicate meaning. Subject-specific vocabulary was explicitly taught in many lessons, and the reinforcement of key words through visual display and repetition was noted with approval. Where the teacher stated the learning outcomes at the beginning of the lesson, it was often used as an opportunity to explicitly teach key words and write them on the board. This is a good and helpful practice for all students.

Where active learning methods were used, they were observed to assist EAL students to engage with the lesson topic and to grasp key concepts. The importance of visual reinforcement and resources was well understood by many teachers. The setting of concrete tasks that provided a real context for new concepts and vocabulary was noted and commended as an approach which engaged all students. The use of ICT as a teaching tool was encountered more in the mainstream than the support context, and some very effective practice was observed.

While the organised use of home languages by students in the context of peer tutoring was observed only in a small minority of lessons, it was seen to be successful in allowing students to make clear links with prior learning and to grasp new concepts.

However, the teaching methods used in over half the lessons observed were considered to be less than satisfactory in meeting the needs of EAL students. While this is an undesirably high proportion, it is important to point out that some simple adjustments in teaching style would greatly benefit EAL students, and that teachers were frequently very receptive to the inspectors’ suggestions in this area. The most basic of these relate to the pace and clarity of teachers’ speech, greater attention to non-verbal cues and visual reinforcement, and more widespread use of active and task-based learning methods.

Having said this, it must also be noted that a minority of teachers were resistant to the notion of differentiated approaches to support EAL students. In other instances, they were unaware of the mutual benefits of peer tutoring, and spoke about EAL students being ‘held back’ by assisting their less able or less proficient co-linguists. In fact, the purposeful use of their home languages in the mainstream classroom allows EAL students to share new learning and to link it with prior knowledge. In this way, their understanding of underlying concepts is enhanced and the specific English vocabulary can then be taught within a cognitive context. Very little use of bilingual dictionaries was observed, and in many cases mainstream teachers were unaware of the reasonable accommodations made for EAL students in certificate examinations.

There is a striking consonance between these negative findings and those on subject planning. The school’s board of management and senior management team are essential to the process of bringing about attitudinal change and promoting effective teaching of EAL students in the mainstream classroom.
Exemplars of good practice

1. The manner in which a Metalwork teacher had adapted the use of ICT to support the learning of EAL students was an example of very good practice. Here, students engaged in exercises arising from ‘dropdown’ menus connected to more extensive written texts. These texts were then stored in students’ electronic folders. As well as this, students had their own subject-specific folder on the school network in which they could store their work.

2. Practical investigative work was also observed. In a science lesson, students investigated the rate of spread of a virus, using test tubes of liquid which were shared with a number of contacts and then tested for “infection”. Students were required to write up the process and their findings, and the practical nature of the task, along with the template given, enabled them to prepare a clear report. This was a very effective strategy involving the development of a range of skills, including report writing.

Recommendations for Schools

- The practice observed indicates the need to raise awareness among mainstream teachers of practical and simple steps they can take to assist their EAL students. It also indicates the need for subject departments to identify, share and put into practice teaching methods and approaches that address the learning needs of EAL students.
- At a practical level, school management should facilitate EAL teachers to fulfil their role as disseminators of good practice by ensuring that they have input to staff meetings and CPD days.
- A consistent and school-wide approach to the teaching of key words is also necessary. Particular attention should be paid to the explicit teaching of words and concepts that are common to many subjects. For example, the instructions ‘state’, ‘describe’, ‘outline’ and ‘explain’ occur frequently on examination papers. It would be of great assistance to all students, including EAL students, if definitions and simple writing frames appropriate to these words were agreed on a school-wide basis, so that regular and consistent reinforcement of essential reading and writing skills could take place.
- Teachers of relevant subjects should incorporate into classroom practice the appropriate use of bilingual dictionaries, so that students become accustomed to them as a useful tool and can benefit from the reasonable accommodations provided by SEC.
- Peer tutoring, including where appropriate the purposeful use of the home language, should be facilitated and encouraged in the mainstream classroom.

Recommendations for the system

- CPD for school management and the whole teaching staff is essential in order to ensure the implementation of the effective practices indicated above.
5B 3.3 Assessment of EAL Students’ Work and Progress

Good practice is found where

- The English Language Proficiency Benchmarks are applied effectively to measure students’ progress. Assessment outcomes are used to inform appropriate progression to and within mainstream. Students’ progress is recorded systematically.
- Assessment of students’ progress in the four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing is carried out systematically.
- Homework assigned to EAL students is appropriate and is used to build linguistic competence and to affirm progress.

The assessment of EAL students’ progress in the support context was managed effectively in just over half of the schools evaluated. However, use of the Benchmarks as an objective measure of progress was limited, and students’ growing spoken fluency was most often used as an indicator of proficiency, with less attention given to listening, reading and writing. In the mainstream context, only two-fifths of schools had satisfactory assessment procedures for EAL students in mainstream subjects. In many schools, there was little differentiation of assessment methods, and a lack of feedback to EAL students to affirm their progress and to indicate constructively areas for development. An in-house report sheet where mainstream teachers recorded EAL students’ progress and difficulties had been developed by the EAL team in some schools, and was used effectively to give targeted support to EAL students in both the mainstream and EAL classroom. Good practice was also noted where progress in EAL was included in students’ reports.

**Exemplar of good practice**

Where constructive written feedback was given, it was clear that EAL students learned from their previous mistakes. There was very good evidence of learning among all students in the class, including EAL students, and the work of the teachers in this regard is highly commended, given the fact that many students had low levels of English on entry to the school. In most lessons, EAL students were challenged and rose to this challenge in their work. Students’ copies, in particular, demonstrated clear progression in learning.

**Recommendations for Schools**

- The Post-Primary Assessment Kits now issued to all schools, along with the in-service on their effective use, should be availed of to promote more systematic assessment practices in the EAL support context.
- The monitoring of EAL students’ progress and the identification of difficulties should be done systematically to inform the provision of more targeted support.

**Recommendations for the system**

- Continuing support to schools and teachers on the appropriate use of the Assessment Kits in 2009-10 is advisable, and should focus on the use of the
kits as a means of providing ongoing formative assessment of EAL students’ progress, and thus as a means of informing teachers of areas requiring targeted support.

5.2 Conclusions and Key Recommendations

5.2.1 Recommendations for Schools

The Inspectorate’s evaluation of EAL provision identified strengths in both primary and post-primary schools in relation to inclusion and to good teaching practices in the EAL support context. A number of factors contribute to differences in findings between primary and post-primary: the more receptive language-learning age of primary pupils; the fact that primary teachers are trained to teach language; the fact that primary pupils have one class teacher, rather than many subject teachers; deployment and timetabling constraints in post-primary schools; and the demands made on post-primary teachers and students by high-stakes examinations. While the findings of the primary evaluation are generally more positive, similar areas for development were identified in both sectors, most notably with regard to planning and differentiation to meet the needs of EAL learners. The key recommendations applicable to both sectors can be summarised as follows.

There is scope for

- Enhancing the leadership role of management in EAL provision to ensure more effective deployment of staff, the flexible but targeted use of the additional teaching resource, and the building of the school’s capacity in this area
- Improving the co-ordination of EAL, EAL programme planning, and planning for EAL learners in mainstream settings
- Extending the range of teaching and learning methods to support English language acquisition with a focus on cognitive language development
- Increasing awareness among teachers that all teachers are teachers of language and have a key role in developing the language competence of all learners, including EAL learners

The above recommendations have arisen directly from the findings of the forty-five individual evaluations carried out. All of them are relevant to the effective and efficient use of resources allocated to EAL provision and therefore have implications for Department policy in this area. Crucially, they have also brought into focus certain overarching recommendations which must be addressed at a system level rather than at the level of the individual school. These recommendations and the context in which they are made are given below.
5.2.2 Context of the Recommendations for the System

Circulars 53/07 and 15/09
The Department circular issued in May 2007 (53/07) greatly increased the number of posts or WTEs allocated to the provision of EAL support, from a maximum of two (44 hours) to a possible six (132 hours). This permitted the delivery of more and better-targeted EAL support. It also enabled the development of different models of support, including intensive EAL programmes and mainstream classroom support through team-teaching. Less directly, it facilitated the building of expertise, the creation of EAL teaching teams and the development of organisational and planning structures to support EAL delivery.

However, 53/07 did not lead to uniform good practice because it was in many ways a move made in isolation, preceding the availability of adequate CPD, assessment instruments and teaching materials, particularly in the post-primary sector. The value delivered through increasing the EAL allocation while these deficits remained is to some extent questionable. Nevertheless, the circular’s stated aims and the practice it advocates are laudable. It is clear on issues of inclusion, on the need for a whole-school approach to EAL provision and on the need to build capacity within schools to deliver EAL support. Its successor, issued in March 2009 (15/09), restates these goals. However, it is fair to say that the circulars are perceived in post-primary schools largely in terms of the size of allocation they grant, rather than the educational aims and practices they advocate. Indeed, at Department level, financial considerations have been prominent in dictating EAL provision, leading to the generous increase in allocation in 2007 in response to a critical need, and also to the retrenchment of 2009. It is necessary therefore to identify the educational and pedagogical considerations that should henceforth inform the prudent allocation of resources and the future direction of the Department’s EAL policy.

Progress and Challenges

A number of positive developments have occurred. Most schools recognise their responsibilities with regard to EAL learners although they may lack specific expertise. There are many more EAL teachers in schools. The Assessment Kits are in schools, and training in their use has been provided. More broadly-focused CPD has also begun, intended to develop teachers’ competences in teaching EAL learners and to build capacity within schools. Crucially, this has also included CPD for post-primary senior management as leaders in the inclusion and support of EAL learners. A greater culture of planning exists in schools, including planning to address additional educational needs. Materials and resources to support EAL learners are more plentiful and available.

However, each advance has brought further challenges which must be met if sustainable long-term EAL policy and practices are to be developed.

- Schools require greater guidance in building their capacity to meet the needs of EAL learners.
The Assessment Kits provide a means of formative assessment of English language proficiency across the four language skills. However, no planned programme or curricular framework to support the acquisition of these skills has been developed, and this deficit is most acute at post-primary.

The increased number of EAL teachers must not lessen the engagement of class or subject teachers with EAL learners.

No agreed mechanism exists for the transfer of assessment information between schools, and in particular between primary and post-primary schools.

Ongoing CPD is essential if schools and classrooms are to support EAL learners fully. However, if CPD can only be delivered during school time, its impact on class contact time and on substitution costs is unsustainably severe. CPD delivered within these constraints cannot but be unsatisfactory.

The Inspectorate reports have identified the need for co-ordinated and collaborative planning and dissemination of good practice within schools to support EAL learners. However, if the time required for this compromises class contact time, it is counter-productive.

**5.2.3 Recommendations for the System**

The recommendations given here summarise the recommendations made after each section throughout this chapter.

In the light of the challenges listed above, the following recommendations are made:

- The Department should draw up and issue guidelines for schools on EAL provision. Separate EAL guidelines are required for primary and post-primary schools in recognition of their different contexts and needs. An advisory committee should be established to draw up the guidelines which should identify good practice in the following areas: models of deployment and support; co-ordination and in-school liaison; planning the EAL programme; teaching and learning methodologies for both support and mainstream contexts; and initial, ongoing and formative assessment. They should provide references to all existing material and resources, thus drawing together the range of available supports and avoiding duplication and excessive length. These guidelines should be available for the 2010/11 school year.

- Discrete curriculums or examinations for EAL students are not recommended. However, programmes to support specific groups of students within existing curriculums have been devised, and the development of a similar model of support for EAL students should be considered by the advisory committee.

- The process of reviewing and rebalancing the junior cycle syllabuses should be used as an opportunity to meet the needs of EAL students.

- EAL circulars should address primary and post-primary schools separately in recognition of their different contexts and needs. Their provisions should complement the proposed EAL guidelines.

- The use of the relevant Assessment Kits should be required in applications for support for all EAL learners already within the system. All learners below Level B1 proficiency should be eligible for support.
The calculation on which EAL allocations are based should be weighted towards addressing proficiency deficits and meeting the needs of learners at critical stages, such as certificate examination years. The allocation should be deployed accordingly in schools. This should enable the provision of daily support to those in greatest need, and a less intense ‘maintenance’ programme in other cases.

The post-primary guidelines/circulars should approve the use of the EAL allocation to release suitable permanent and experienced teachers to deliver EAL support, as a means of mitigating the discontinuity and poor capacity building associated with current deployment patterns. Post-Primary CPD should target teachers who have the experience and standing to disseminate good practice within the school, thus assisting subject teachers in their work with EAL students.

Primary schools should be required to forward the following information to post-primary schools at transition: EAL supports provided; language proficiency levels reached; assessment data; the most recent Individual Pupil Learning Profile.

The EAL budget is almost entirely dedicated to providing additional teaching resources. A rebalancing of available funding to ensure an ongoing CPD programme is recommended. Consideration should be given to changing current CPD arrangements in order to facilitate such a programme without compromising class contact time. This recommendation is made in the context of both section 31 of “Towards 2016” and the Teaching Council’s Code of Professional Practice.

It is recommended that EAL provision be co-ordinated by delegation of this role to a member of staff, and that part of the EAL allocation be used for co-ordination, planning and assessment. Liaison with other teachers and with the whole staff is essential as part of effective planning and delivery of support to EAL learners. Consideration should be given to the formal identification of time in addition to the required class contact hours and hours of instruction for collaborative planning. In the case of EAL, this would facilitate liaison, collaborative planning and the co-ordinated delivery of supports.
Chapter 6 – The Level and Trend of Costs and Staffing Resources associated with the Expenditure and the Efficiency with which the Objectives have been achieved.

6.1 Introduction

As specified in the Terms of Reference for this review, this chapter sets out to “examine the level and trend of costs and staffing resources associated with the programme and the efficiency with which it has achieved its objectives”. Efficiency can be defined as the relationship between input and output of an activity and the extent to which it is possible to maximise output from the input available or to minimise the levels of input for the given level of output. In line with the programme logic model, this chapter examines the inputs, activities and outputs associated with EAL.

This chapter will, therefore,
- provide data on the numbers of students who need English as an additional language support in primary and post-primary schools and establish, in broad terms, the average unit cost of providing this support;
- look at the numbers and cost of teachers providing English as an additional language support from 2001/02 to 2008/09;
- set out the trends in the numbers of these teachers across schools from 2001/02 to 2008/09 and draw conclusions from this;
- provide data on the cost of continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers; and
- provide information on the cost of developing resources for EAL teachers.

The chapter also looks at shortcomings in the current available data and considers likely demographic trends in the future.

6.2 Numbers of Migrants in Schools (including EAL Students)

The CSO diagram in chapter 2 (Figure 2.1) draws on 2006 census data to show the age profile of migrants in Ireland. That diagram shows that the bulk of migrants in Ireland are people of working age. Nevertheless there are significant numbers aged between 5 and 19. The data from the CSO for the census 2006\(^{35}\) has been disaggregated and the following figures are given for non-Irish nationals for each of these age groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Numbers of Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9 years</td>
<td>20,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14 years</td>
<td>19,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19 years</td>
<td>18,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSO

At primary level there are no definitive figures on the numbers of migrants in schools. There is an annual primary school census which gives general data. For the first time in 2007 the primary school census asked about the nationality of all pupils. The 2007 primary school census returns show that of a total of 459,443 students in primary schools, of the order of 44,000, or approximately 10%, were non-Irish\textsuperscript{36}. This figure is somewhat higher than that given in the census. The data from the primary school census is based on principals’ estimates and may be subject to principals differing assumptions about or applications of the definition of nationality. Also some principals did not make a return or did not feel they had enough information to make a return, so the results are far from absolute. Given these possible quality issues, caution should be exercised when making comparisons between schools or drawing concrete conclusions from these data. However, it does give trend information which is useful for the purposes of this review. The figure is confirmed by the ESRI which, based on the questionnaire returns from primary schools, also estimated that in September 2007 10% of primary students were migrants (Smyth et al, 2009).

The ESRI, relying in part on CSO data and in part on an analysis of a sub-sample of Quarterly National Household Survey data from 2004, estimates that some two thirds of migrants “\textit{do not have English as their first language, but that their English language ability may vary substantially}” (Smyth et al, 2009 at p 10). Based on estimates from their data, combined with DES information and the 2006 population census, the ESRI report finds that about 70% of second level migrant students do not speak English. At primary level, they estimate, based on survey data, that 75% of the migrant population do not speak English (Smyth et al, 2009 at p 44-45).

At post-primary level the post-primary pupil database provides data on students who are not Irish nationals. This database also provides information on attendance at Post Leaving Certificate courses and attendance at some of the Vocational Training Opportunities Scheme programmes. This report is only concerned with the data relating to mainstream post-primary students. These data are, however, self-declared and come with some caveats. For example, where no nationality is specified, the system defaults to Irish nationality.

Table 6.2 below shows a steady rise in absolute migrant student numbers and a steady increase in the numbers of migrants as a percentage of the total second level school population, from 2.5% in 2001/02 to 8% in 2008/09. Total numbers of students at post-primary dropped from 01/02 to 05/06 and thereafter started to rise. Migrant students contributed significantly to offsetting the overall fall in post-primary numbers and also to the growth of figures after 2005/06. The ESRI estimated that in Spring 2007, 6% of the total second level student population were migrants (Smyth et al, 2009 at p 44).

\textsuperscript{36} The 2008 primary school census did not ask a question on nationality of all pupils but it was asked again in 2009 and it is intended to include it in subsequent years.
In 2006/07, 5,117 students, or 29% of the total, were from the UK and the US. In 2007/2008 the percentage was 26% and in 2008/09 it was 25%. Although nationality...
profiles are not available for each year at primary level, on the basis of the ESRI figures, a figure of 75% needing additional English language support would appear to be a reasonable estimate (Smyth et al, 2009 at p 44-45).

6.3 Distribution of EAL Support across Schools

6.3.1 Primary Schools

At primary level in 2008/2009 only 35% of schools sought language support. Table 6.4 shows that 38% of all schools with language support did not have a full teaching post (see 6.5 below for further information on this), over a third had one or two language support posts and just under a quarter had three or more posts. This contrasts with ESRI findings which indicate that 60% of primary schools have migrant students (although these data date from September 2007). Possible reasons for this discrepancy are discussed in 6.3.3 below.

Table 6.4 - Distribution of EAL Support across Primary Schools in 08/09

| Allocation of grant aid or posts | Number of Schools | As a percentage of all schools with language support | As a percentage of all 3,284 primary schools
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2 Post-Primary Schools

At post-primary level there are figures available which indicate the numbers of WTEs per school in 2008/09. They show that at post-primary level the majority of schools with language support have two language support posts or fewer.

Table 6.5 gives an overall picture of the distribution of language support in post-primary schools. 73% of all post-primary schools have language support hours. Of that 73%, over 60% had just one WTE (22 hours) or less. These findings again contrast with the ESRI report (Smyth et al, 2009) which indicates that the vast majority of post-primary schools have migrant students (this data relates to March 2007). Possible reasons for the discrepancy are suggested at 6.3.3 below.

37 3,160 mainstream primary schools and 124 special schools
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**Table 6.5 - Distribution of Post-Primary WTEs**\(^{38}\) across Schools in 08/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation (WTEs)</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>As a percentage of all schools with language support</th>
<th>As a percentage of all 731 post-primary schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.49</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 - 0.99</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 1.49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 - 1.99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2.49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 - 2.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 3.49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 - 3.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>536</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.3 Matching Patterns

As mentioned above, the ESRI report (Smyth et al, 2009) indicates that a higher percentage of schools have migrants than the allocation figures would suggest at both primary and post-primary levels.

Allocations figures show that in 2008/09 a total of 1,143 primary schools (i.e. the combination of additional grant support and full teacher allocation for 14 or more students) or just over a third of the total were in receipt of funds to provide English language support. At post-primary level nearly three-quarters of schools have some language support. The ESRI findings show that nearly 60% of primary schools and 90% of post-primary schools have migrants, see figure 6.3 (Smyth et al, 2009 at p 45). This discrepancy may be explained in a number of ways:

- it is possible that some schools may not be seeking support for all their EAL students when they may be entitled to do so. The Inspectorate’s evaluation does show that “[i]n a minority of cases, the school was unaware that it could make application for eligible EAL students who enrolled after the provisional allocation had been given.”

- it may also be possible that schools have migrant students who are native English speakers, or

---

\(^{38}\) A figure such as 0.99 may indicate an EAL allocation given after the beginning of the school year.
schools may have a significant cohort of students who have already received two years EAL support and would not normally be entitled to further allocations.

**Figure 6.1 - Irish Schools, Showing the Proportion of Migrants (School Level)**

![Bar chart showing the proportion of migrants in primary and secondary schools.](image)

*Source Smyth et al, 2009 at p 45*

Even if the figures based on allocations are an under-representation, they still indicate that a third of primary and two thirds of post-primary schools have students needing English language support. In other words, they show a need for language support in a majority of post-primary schools and a very significant minority of primary schools.

The discrepancy between allocation and ESRI data which appears here highlights the need for reliable data on EAL students at Department level.

### 6.4 Numbers and Cost of Teachers

Total costs relating to EAL are given at 6.10 below. This section and those which follow show each element of the total cost.

The numbers of EAL teachers\(^\text{39}\) and the year on year related costs have been rising steadily as table 6.6 shows.

\(^{39}\) Note that at post-primary level, throughout this chapter the term whole time equivalent (WTE) post is used. One WTE equals 22 teaching hours. Due to the deployment methods used at post-primary level, one WTE post could be divided between several individuals (see chapter 5 for further details).
Table 6.6 - Numbers and Cost of EAL Teachers from 2001/02 to 2008/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Primary – Number of Posts</th>
<th>Post-Primary – Number of WTEs</th>
<th>Standard cost of primary post (euros)</th>
<th>Standard cost of post-primary WTE (euro)</th>
<th>Average Total cost primary (millions of euro)</th>
<th>Average Total cost post-primary (millions of euro)</th>
<th>Average Grand total (millions of euro)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>136.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total average cost has increased thirteen fold from a starting point of €10.8 million in 2001/2002 to €136.2 million in 2008/09.

This figure is based on using a standard average cost for teachers used by the Department and includes all salary costs covered by the Department. The standard cost relates to a teacher in the middle of his/her career. As EAL teachers are appointed on temporary contracts, it may well be that many EAL teachers are at the outset of their careers. The total expenditure figures above may, therefore, be at the upper end of cost.

As is clear from figure 6.2, while costs rose significantly at both primary and post-primary level, the bulk of the increase was at primary level. There the rise was 17 fold compared to just over seven fold in post-primary. This difference can be explained by the estimated numbers of EAL students in each sector.
The percentage increase in cost, year on year, is set out in table 6.7 and graphically shown in figure 6.3.

**Table 6.7 - Annual Percentage Increase in Teacher Costs, Year on Year from 2001/02 to 2008/09**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Grand total (millions of euro)</th>
<th>Percentage increase on previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These figures, represented graphically in figure 6.3 above, indicate that there were significant percentage increases in 02/03 and 07/08. The increase in 2002/03 is, presumably, due to the greater awareness among schools of the EAL provision available (see chapter 3.2.3) and also greater numbers of migrant students (see table 6.2 for figures at post-primary level, no comprehensive figures are available at primary level).

By far the largest increase occurred in 2006/07. It is largely accounted for by the increase in teacher numbers at primary level which jumped by more than 500 between 05/06 and 06/07. This increase is, presumably, based on a significant increase of the number of EAL students at primary level. Unfortunately, in the absence of primary pupil data on EAL student numbers in particular or migrant student numbers in general, this cannot be further quantified.

As circular M53/07 (which lifted the two teacher cap) only came into operation in May 2007, one might expect the increase to be greater for 2007/08. The higher figures for 06/07 may reflect the impact of more children in the system following accession by the new EU Member States in 2004 but it might have been expected that this would have had an impact on the system in 2005/06 rather than in 2006/07.

In 2007/08 when M53/07 was circulated to schools, there was a 42% increase in teacher costs but matters appear to have settled in 2008/09 where there was the lowest increase to date (13%). This reflects a stabilisation in the system as there was no change in the administrative arrangements between 2007/08 and 2008/09.
6.5 Cost of Additional Supports for Primary Schools with Fewer than 14 EAL Students

At post-primary level, once a school has at least one EAL student, then it is entitled to additional teaching hours. This contrasts with the situation at primary school level where schools with fewer than three EAL students receive no additional support and are expected to provide for the educational provisions of those pupils from their existing resources other than in exceptional circumstances. Primary schools with between 3 and 13 EAL students qualify for additional support.

This additional support is in the form of financial grant aid for the employment of part-time English language support teachers as outlined in chapter 3.2.3. Primary schools in which between three and thirteen (inclusive) non-English speaking migrant pupils are enrolled are eligible to receive grant assistance for a period of up to two years. Schools with between 3 and 8 such pupils receive grant assistance of €6348.69 while schools with between 9 and 13 receive grant assistance of €9523.04.

Up to end 08/09 over €17.5 million has been spent under this expenditure heading.40 The funds are made available to schools to spend on EAL. Since there is no reporting on expenditure under this heading, there is no detailed knowledge of how the funds are used. Schools in this category were not part of the Inspectorate’s EAL evaluation reported in chapter 5.

Table 6.8 - Cost of Additional Grant Scheme and Numbers of Schools Supported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Schools Supported</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>€225,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>€2,049,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>€2,406,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>€3,215,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>€3,503,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>€3,339,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>€3,043,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>€17,782,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6 Cost of Start-up Grant

For each new language support teacher appointed at primary level, a “start-up grant” of €634.86 was paid by the Department of Education and Science in the year of the teacher’s appointment. A grant of €317.43 was paid in subsequent years. These grants were used to defray expenses related to obtaining resource materials etc. The rates of the start-up and subsequent grant have not changed since the inception of the grant.

40 Figures for 01/02 and up to January 2003 are not readily available.
Table 6.9 - Cost of Start-Up Grant and Annual Percentage Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/2003*</td>
<td>€96,182</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>€118,402</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>€157,318</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/2006</td>
<td>€230,584</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2007</td>
<td>€478,372</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2008</td>
<td>€617,403</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>€467,993</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures from January 2003 only

These figures mirror to some extent the increase in the numbers of new teachers in 06/07 and 07/08 (following the implementation of M53/07) but also reflect the fact that fewer new appointments in 2008/09 than had been made in 2006/07 despite the fact that the rules governing new appointments were more generous in 2008/09 than they had been in 2006/07. This could mean that more teachers were staying in their posts rather than moving on or that the numbers of students had somewhat stabilised.

6.7 Costs related to Resources and to Integrate Ireland Language and Training

6.7.1 Integrate Ireland Language and Training

The Department of Education and Skills first commissioned Integrate Ireland Language and Training (IILT) to provide support for primary and post-primary English as second language (ESL) teachers in 2000. IILT’s original remit focused on research and development of resources whilst also providing for some CPD. This section summarises the support IILT provided to the primary and post-primary sectors.

IILT developed English Language Proficiency Benchmarks (ELPB) for primary and post-primary students in autumn 2000 together with pilot versions of the European Language Portfolio (ELP). Between 2000 and 2003, IILT also developed teaching and support materials as well as holding twice yearly in-service seminars.

In summer 2003, the ELPBs were revised as were the ELP documents. In 2004 IILT organised 7 seminars for primary school teachers. Two seminars were held for post-primary teachers; in the spring and the autumn. In 2006, IILT also held 10 in-service seminars for primary schools and four for post-primary schools.

Over the period of its existence IILT published a range of resource materials for primary and post primary schools much of which is now available on the NCCA’s website (www.ncca.ie). For the purposes of this review, the tools developed by IILT for assessing the English language proficiency of EAL students are key.

In 2007 the EAL Primary Assessment Kit was published and copies were sent to all primary schools in summer 2008. At post-primary level, the EAL Post-Primary
Assessment Kit was published in late 2008 and two copies were sent by the Department of Education and Skills to all post-primary schools in February 2009.

Both assessment kits were designed to assist language support teachers in determining the language proficiency of migrant students. They contain three full sets of tests. The tests help to establish a student’s level of English on arrival in school, monitor progress over time in language support and identify the point at which a student no longer requires additional language support.

IILT ceased trading in July 2008 and its functions were taken over by the Department using its existing structures.

The annual grant paid to IILT by Teacher Education Section (i.e. in relation to its activities at school level and not including its role in further and adult education) was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.10 - Payments to IILT by Teacher Education Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes cost of assessment kit funded, through NDP, by IILT (€24,302.08)

These costs in relation to CPD and materials development as outlined above are very modest when compared to the EAL teachers’ costs. Even in 2003 when total teacher salary costs were much lower than they are at present, expenditure on CPD and resources was 0.2% of the expenditure on teacher salaries. There is a significant imbalance between expenditure on teacher salary and related costs and the expenditure needed to enable them to deal with their tasks in an efficient and effective manner, particularly since many of them have had no formal qualification or CPD in EAL.

6.7.2 NCCA Materials

The NCCA spent the order of €47,000 on providing CPD to facilitators who were associated with 21 Education Centres so that they in turn could provide CPD to teachers on the Intercultural Guidelines (NCCA, 2005 and NCCA, 2006). This was funded through the National Action Plan against Racism. Some €22,000 was spent in 2009 on developing a website and materials as well as a database of intercultural education trainers and various administrative costs. These costs are not strictly related to EAL students and the Intercultural Guidelines are intended as a resource for teachers of all students.
Table 6.11 - NCCA Costs for Materials and Related CPD 2006 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Costs €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>30,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.8 Costs related to the Provision of CPD for EAL Teachers

There was a clear demand for CPD by teachers as was evidenced by over 1,500 participants who signed up for the online course in EAL provided jointly by the Marino Institute of Education/INTO between July 07 and October 08. This was at the participants’ expense and usually completed during summer vacations. This online course used a group of facilitators who were experienced EAL teachers to run online discussion forums with groups of teachers participating in the course.\(^{41}\)

Another measure, the Education Equality Initiative was jointly run by Lóghrann, the Centre for Inclusion in Education, part of the Marino Institute of Education and the Christian Brothers. It involved a cluster of 17 schools in Dublin 8 and Portlaoise. This initiative aimed to support schools in developing a whole school approach to inclusion. It involved families and local communities, especially those from diverse ethnic, cultural and linguistic minority backgrounds.\(^{42}\)

In light of this clear need, which was also highlighted by the ESRI ((Smyth et al, 2009 at p171), the Department put in place measures to meet the CPD needs of teachers in relation to EAL in 2008.

6.8.1 Costs for CPD for EAL in 2008 and 2009

The Department of Education and Skills began to provide CPD directly for EAL teachers in 2008/09 through the PPDS and SLSS.

The CPD costs for 2008 are as set out in table 6.12

---

\(^{41}\) Source Barbara O’Toole, Marino Institute of Education  
Table 6.12 - CPD Costs for 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration costs</td>
<td>€3,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Costs (includes admin, venue, seminar costs, meals and teacher travel)</td>
<td>€42,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDS Team Travel and Subsistence</td>
<td>€61,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDS Team Salaries</td>
<td>€163,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (primary costs)</strong></td>
<td><strong>€271,337</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Primary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Primary CPD</td>
<td>€24,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLSS team salaries, travel and subsistence</td>
<td>€41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (post-primary costs)</strong></td>
<td><strong>€65,302</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CPD Costs 2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>€336,639</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure given for post-primary CPD relates to the funding Teacher Education Section made available for the development of the post-primary assessment kit (detailed above at 6.7.1). As there was no actual CPD day, substitution costs for post-primary teachers do not arise. There are no substitution costs at primary level as the English language support teacher is a resource teacher and does not have timetabled classes.

The CPD costs for 2009 are as set out in table 6.13

Table 6.13 - CPD Costs for 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPDS Team Travel and Subsistence/ Programme costs (includes admin, venue, seminar costs, meals and teacher travel)</td>
<td>€154,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDS Team Salaries</td>
<td>€390,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (primary costs)</strong></td>
<td><strong>€545,052</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Primary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post primary seminars (venue costs, materials, travel and subsistence for participants and administration costs for the seminars on EAL)</td>
<td>€47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLSS team salaries, travel and subsistence</td>
<td>€84,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-primary substitution costs</td>
<td>€280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (post-primary costs)</strong></td>
<td><strong>€411,333</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>€956,386</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seminars at post-primary level only began in January 2009. As noted above, substitution costs are not provided at primary level due to the nature of the post.

At under a million euro for 2009, these costs represent less than one percent of the overall spending on EAL teachers’ salaries for 2008/2009. What has been achieved with this expenditure in 2008 and 2009 is outlined in 6.8.2 and 6.8.3 below.
6.8.2 Primary Professional Development

The Primary Professional Development Service delivered 120 seminars to primary school teachers in the 08/09 school year. These were part of a two-day programme.

60 seminars were facilitated in autumn 2008 and a subsequent 60 were provided in spring 2009 with teachers asked to complete a task on the Primary School Assessment Kit between both seminar days.

The 7 trainers continued to support schools in EAL for the rest of the school year 08/09 by, for example:
- providing guidance and advice to EAL teachers on assessment and instruction strategies
- facilitating whole-staff meetings on EAL (may include upskilling mainstream teachers on second language acquisition and intercultural education)
- facilitating whole-staff planning days on intercultural education and EAL
- providing evening workshops on EAL to mainstream teachers
- providing evening workshops on team-teaching to mainstream teachers, all support teachers and principals
- creating support documents and resources for the EAL section of the PPDS website
- upskilling a team of 38 EAL teachers to act as local/regional facilitators

Approximately 1,080 language support teachers from the primary sector attended both days of this 2 day programme.

6.8.3 Post-Primary Professional Development

In 2008 Teacher Education Section put in place a professional development initiative to support teachers of EAL in post-primary schools. The programme of support was provided by 5 members of the Second Level Support Service (SLSS) who working part-time on this initiative. The primary aim of the initiative was to support schools and teachers in their work to promote the successful integration and participation of migrant students in mainstream classes. The main focus of their work was the delivery of two rounds of seminars nationally. The team also provided a series of information seminars for Principals and offered whole-staff CPD.

The first round of 23 seminars was delivered in January and early February of 2009 and the second round of 20 seminars was delivered in late February and March, 2009. The seminars were delivered in Education Centres across the six SLSS regions.

A total of 670 teachers were invited to these seminars. The number of teachers invited from any one school was determined on the basis of Whole Time Teacher Equivalents (WTEs) allocated to schools for language support and substitution cover was provided for those attending the seminars.

42% of teachers invited to round 1 attended and of those 87% returned for round 2. A number of factors may explain the relatively poor level of attendance for round 1:
The lack of awareness in schools generally in relation to this area of teaching and learning.

The lack of awareness at management level in relation to EAL and the confusion between EAL and TEFL.

The distribution of the EAL teaching hours among many teachers which leads to a fragmentation of teacher responsibility in relation to the EAL.

The turnover of teachers in this area.

The timing of the notice to schools – immediately prior to Christmas

Awareness of the Assessment Kit was limited at the time of Round 1 as the Assessment Kit was only distributed in February 2009.

Whilst the attendance at Round 1 may have been somewhat disappointing the return rate of 87% was most satisfactory and does suggest that attendees found the support very valuable. This is also reflected in the participant evaluations which were exceptionally good with almost all participants rating the seminar at the highest level.

The seminars were designed to be of practical use to teachers. Round 1 dealt with the following topics: Context, rationale and basic principles of EAL teaching; The Post-Primary Assessment Kit and classroom strategies for EAL. Round 2 focused on methodologies appropriate to the teaching of EAL and on planning for the teaching of EAL.

The team of trainers continued to have some of their working week devoted to EAL for the rest of 2009. The team has delivered 6 seminars for principals and has delivered whole school seminars which are designed to support the mainstream classroom teacher in the effective inclusion of migrant students in the classroom and especially in their accessing of the curriculum.

A DVD of the CPD provided in Rounds 1 and 2 was available to teachers on request from September 2009.

6.8.4 Need for CPD - Cost of CPD Compared to Cost of Teaching Posts

Primary and post-primary teachers are generally not qualified to teach English as an additional language having completed their initial teacher education before the recent demographic changes.

Primary school teachers are qualified to teach English and Irish as part of a broad and balanced curriculum. Therefore they have knowledge, understanding and skills related to language teaching. Of course, they may not have followed courses specifically on EAL teaching and learning.

At post-primary level, teachers are subject specialists. Some language teachers may have obtained the relevant skills for EAL teaching in their initial teacher education. However, most other specialist subject teachers at post-primary level will not have EAL skills or an understanding of their key role in supporting EAL students in enhancing their English language proficiency based on their initial teacher education.

In this context, CPD both for EAL teachers and for mainstream class teachers at primary and particularly at post-primary level is essential. There is a mismatch
between the funding available for EAL teachers’ salaries (over €136 million in 08/09) and the funding available for their CPD (under €1 million in 2009\(^3\)).

In 2008/09, expenditure on CPD was 0.7% of expenditure on teachers’ salaries\(^4\). As will be shown in 6.9, teachers’ salaries account for about 99% of total EAL expenditure. This contrasts with the experience in other jurisdictions, as outlined in chapter 4.3. In Northern Ireland and in Scotland, over 15% of expenditure on EAL and inclusion goes towards CPD.

### 6.9 Total Cost of English language support

This section identifies and calculates the estimated funding which relates to English language support and provides an approximate total spend for each year from 01/02 to 08/09.

**Table 6.14 - The Estimated Total Cost of Language Support in Millions of Euro for Each Year from 01/02 – 07/08**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teacher Pay €M</th>
<th>Additional Support €M</th>
<th>Start-up Grant €M</th>
<th>IILT €M*</th>
<th>CPD Costs €M*</th>
<th>NCCA €M*</th>
<th>Total €M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>32.39</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>46.22</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>49.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>85.22</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>89.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>121.02</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>125.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>140.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costs based on calendar years

These figures highlight that almost all of the funding available has been used to fund EAL teaching posts. Note that additional support is understood to be generally used to fund teacher salaries in primary schools with fewer than 14 EAL students. Since 2001/02 expenditure on teachers’ salaries has consistently been of the order of 99% of total EAL expenditure. For example, in 2008/2009 only 0.7% of the overall funding was used for CPD and a further 0.3% towards the start up grant to assist schools in obtaining resources for their EAL teachers. As noted at section 6.8.4 above, this contrasts sharply with the situation in Northern Ireland and Scotland where between 15 and 20% of EAL expenditure may be apportioned to support activities.

---

\(^3\) Note that allocation costs are calculated based on the academic year and CPD costs on the financial year. Despite this discrepancy the figures given above are indicative of the gap between CPD and salary funding.\(^4\) Start-up grants etc. account for the remaining 0.3%.
6.10 Costs as a Percentage of Overall Budgets

The overall education budget for first and second level for the period of the review is set out in figure 6.4.

Figure 6.4 - Total Expenditure at First and Second Level 2001-2009 in Millions of Euro

Calculating academic year costs by dividing up the annual cost into units of 4/12ths and 8/12ths, the percentage of EAL expenditure as a percentage of overall current and total spending at first and second level is set out in Figure 6.5. Even though the increase in expenditure has been considerable, it still represents only just over 2% of total expenditure at first and second level in 2008/09. It is important to note that the majority of EAL students only get support for two years.
Figure 6.5 - EAL Costs as a Percentage of Total Current Expenditure and as a Percentage of Total Overall Expenditure at First and Second Level, 2001/02 – 2008/09

6.11 Average Unit Cost of Language Support

It is clear from Table 6.13 that the main driver of costs is teacher numbers and their salaries. Teacher numbers, in turn, are driven by EAL student numbers. A very crude unit cost could be arrived at by dividing teacher numbers by student numbers. There are a number of drawbacks to this approach, not least that there are no accurate figures for the numbers of students entitled to language support. There is also no sliding scale for language support so a single teacher might be teaching 14 or up to 27 students. This means that it is not sufficient to multiply the number of teachers by 14 to arrive at the number of students. Finally, the nature of the support means that the unit cost is only incurred for two years of the student’s school career other than in exceptional cases.

6.11.1 Summary of Difficulties in Relation to Calculating Student Numbers

Based on the profile of migrant students’ language proficiency, section 6.2, it is assumed that approximately 30% of migrant students do not need language support, therefore this section deals only with the estimated 70% of migrant students who may need support.

Students can receive English language support for a period of two years, if they have identified EAL needs. Those in their third year can receive EAL support only in exceptional circumstances. The schools have to apply specifically to DES extend EAL support for a third year and it is not automatically granted. Therefore, the numbers of
students officially receiving English language support at any one time is less than the ca. 70%-75% who are not native English speakers.

Although the Department does have information on numbers of students in the individual applications from schools, it is not readily retrievable or collated to give a global figure (see section 6.12 below).

It is known that at post-primary level in 2008/09 there were 10,730 first time migrant entrants to the post-primary system. However, in the past data were not available on those who transfer from primary to post-primary and who have already received support in primary schools. If there were sufficient numbers with language support needs in the child’s primary school, then he or she may well have already received the normal maximum of two years’ language support. Data on numbers of migrants at primary level are not available over the period of the review other than for 2007/08. Furthermore, like the data at post-primary level, these data have limitations and while they are useful for establishing a general picture, they do not claim to be completely accurate.

It is vital to establish numbers and progression of migrant students at primary level in a readily available format. The establishment of a learner data base is also essential to ensuring that transition data, as students move from primary to post-primary, are available in the future.

6.11.2 Summary of Difficulties in Relation to Calculating Teacher Numbers

Following implementation of circular M53/07, a language support teacher was provided for every 14-27 students, as set out in the circular. A school received additional teachers, if there were more than 28 EAL students (see appendix 6). Prior to the introduction of M 53/07 in May 2007, the maximum student teacher ratio could have been considerably in excess of this as schools were allocated a maximum of two language support teachers, other than in exceptional circumstances and on appeal. Evidence suggests that some primary schools with students needing language support would have had in excess of 28 students (see also McGorman and Sugrue, 2007).

6.11.3 Unit Cost

Taking all of the caveats outlined above into account, it is possible to give a very approximate range for unit cost in 2007/08 and in 2008/09 following the introduction of circular M53/07. The circular meant that if there was one teacher in a school then there were between 14 and 27 students. Excluding schools where there were well over 121 students (very much a minority), the lowest student teacher ratio under the circular was 1:14 and the highest was 1:27. See table 6.15.

---

45 Annual Census of Primary Schools
Table 6.15 - Pupil Teacher Ratio under Circular M53/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Number of Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 to 27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42 to 64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91 to 120</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 to 41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65 to 90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>121 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures have been used to give a rough approximation of the range of the unit cost for 2007/08 and 2008/09. Note that, by definition, these figures would normally exclude EAL students who have had two years support. The unit cost for these students is zero.

In calculating the unit cost, teacher salaries are used for convenience, rather than total costs. As teacher salaries account for approximately 99% of EAL expenditure, excluding other costs should not significantly affect the result.

Table 6.16 - Primary Level – Average Unit Cost Range for EAL compared to Standard Primary Student Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Average Standard cost of primary teacher (EAL)</th>
<th>EAL Unit cost range where there is one teacher in the school (14-27 students)</th>
<th>Unit cost of primary school education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>€60,000</td>
<td>€4,286 – €2,222</td>
<td>€6,546*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>€62,000</td>
<td>€4,429 – €2,296</td>
<td>No figures available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure for calendar year 2008

Table 6.17 - Post-Primary Level - Average Unit Cost Range for EAL Compared to Standard Post-Primary Student Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Standard cost of post-primary WTE (EAL)</th>
<th>Unit cost range where there is one teacher in the school (14-27 students)</th>
<th>Unit cost of post-primary school education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>€62,000</td>
<td>€4,429 - €2,296</td>
<td>€9,447*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>€64,000</td>
<td>€4,571 - €2,370</td>
<td>No figures available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure for calendar year 2008

6.11.4 Conclusions on Unit Cost

The deficiencies in the data are such that trying to arrive at a reliable unit cost is not possible. There are too many variables and the data on student numbers are too uncertain to allow for this. Nevertheless, an indicative unit cost range is given at 6.11.3 to allow for comparisons with other cost data. The unit cost when compared to standard unit cost does highlight that the current cost of support, which is very much driven by the allocation method, is substantial.
6.12 Shortcomings in the Data

There are few reliable figures at primary level for migrant students. There is information on total student numbers at primary level (from the primary census) and from 2009/10, these data will include nationality data at an aggregate level. Data are collected on nationality for migrants at post-primary level which are relatively accurate but there are no reliable data retained in an accessible format on the numbers of migrant students who have had language support each year.

In fact, each year, in the past, hard copy data were collected by the Department of Education and Skills from primary and post-primary schools in relation to students’ language needs and the provision of EAL support. This included:

Primary: Name, Date of Birth, Enrolment Date in School, Country of Origin, Year of Arrival in Ireland, Class in which Enrolled, English Language Level.
Post Primary: Name, Nationality, Date of Birth, Enrolment Date in School, Year of Arrival in Ireland, School Programme Code, Number of Years Support Received by Pupil.

Although this material is returned to the Department of Education and Skills, it is not systematically collated or analysed to assess the rates of student progression or the effectiveness of the funding.

The overall policy aim of EAL expenditure is that EAL students should acquire sufficient levels of English to access the curriculum on a par with their Irish peers. There is currently no way to ascertain the throughput of students or the rate of progression of students who have had language support to date. Nor is there comprehensive qualitative data on the timeliness of the support received or its quality. The Inspectorate’s evaluation of EAL provision, as outlined in chapter 5, is a starting point in assessing the quality of teaching and learning of EAL in schools.

The availability of assessment kits and CPD (both in 08/09) should improve the knowledge, skills and abilities of teachers to assess their students and to determine the students’ progress.

It is recommended that in future:

- Schools should formally use the Assessment Kit to evaluate students and assess progress beginning in 2010/11
- In addition to the data already provided to the Department schools should state students’ starting points and detail their progression as assessed using the relevant Assessment Kit
- the data which schools supply to the Department should be returned on line and retained on record electronically so that they can be used to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the expenditure; ideally, in the case of post-primary the data should be recorded on the post-primary pupil database
The data required at primary and post-primary level should be further harmonised e.g. primary schools should also record the number of years support received by the student. Both sectors should be required to record the nationality and country of origin data, both should ask that English language level be specified so that data are available as students transfer from primary to post-primary.

It should also be possible to correlate this data with students’ results in the certificate examinations.

EAL data on individual schools should be made available to members of the Inspectorate before carrying out a whole school evaluation.

The ESRI study (Smyth et al, 2009), the Inspectorate evaluation and the OECD thematic review (OECD, 2009h) go some way to addressing the question of the quality and timeliness of the support provided but they are snapshots in time and do not provide a regular assessment of student progression and appropriateness of provision. In effect, there is no longitudinal data available.

6.13 Possible Future Demographic Trends

As is apparent from the material outlined in chapter 2.2.3, there is no evidence that migrants to Ireland with children in school are leaving the country in significant numbers. This is reflected also in the growing numbers of migrant children in post-primary schools many of whom are progressing directly from primary schools. The Post-Primary Pupil Database shows that total numbers of new migrant entrants to post-primary schools have gone up from 7,201 in 2005 to 12,331 in 2008. However numbers of new migrant entrants to post-primary schools who came to the post-primary system from outside Ireland (rather than from primary schools in Ireland) have gone from a peak of 5,051 in 2007/08 to 4,512 in 2008/09. It is also clear, however, that numbers of migrants coming into the country are dropping. The CSO’s estimates on population and migration (CSO, 2009b) show that inward migration in the year to April 2009, at some 57,000 was at about 2004 levels. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that there is still significant inward migration, albeit in reduced numbers.

Furthermore, children born in this country to non-English speaking parents may not speak fluent or indeed any English when they start school. As noted in chapter 3.3 the birth rate in 2008 was the highest since 1896 and over 15% of those children were born to mothers from countries other than the UK or Ireland. Even allowing for the fact that these children may have English speaking fathers or that their mothers may come from English speaking countries other than the UK or Ireland, there is still likely to be a very significant cohort of children starting school who will not speak English as their home language. These young children will continue to enrol in our schools into the future and will require EAL support.

The working assumption is therefore that there will be no significant drop in numbers of students needing language support but that there will be some fall in the short to medium term as EAL students participate in our education system for more than 3-4
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years and are therefore not entitled to continuing EAL support. Predicting enrolments for the future is a somewhat inexact science. The statistics section of the Department of Education and Skills has, however, produced some data in this area (Department of Education and Science, 2010). They introduce the data with the following caveats:

Previous experience of working with projections have shown that short-term trends in both migration and fertility remain volatile and difficult to predict – not least because of uncertainties about the direction of future economic and social change as well as their relationship to patterns of social behaviour. Nevertheless, even if future births and migration patterns are at variance from those projected, the high level of actual births experienced in 2007, and particularly in 2008, will impact on enrolment at Primary Level in the near future.

It should be noted that the recently published (as of September 2009) Population and Migrations Estimates for the year ending April 2009 (CSO, 2009) show a return to net outward migration for Ireland for the first time since 1995. However, against the trend for the population as a whole, the figure for the 0 to 14 age group continues to show net inward migration, albeit at much lower levels than in previous years.

There is an emphasis on the very high birth rate in 2007 and 2008. The latter was the highest since 1896. Births are the main driver of enrolment figures. As noted above, it is reasonable to assume that children of non-English speaking parents born in Ireland will need English language support when they start school.

Again, it is important to stress the significant numbers of non-native English speakers among the migrant population (up to 70%) whose children will form part of this cohort and who cannot be assumed to speak English with the same fluency as their peers, if at all.

Following the revised arrangements for English language support provided for in circular 15/09 (set out in full in appendix 9), for 09/10 there are some 1,500 EAL teachers in schools. Beyond that, it is very difficult to predict what numbers of EAL students there will be and how many EAL teachers will be needed in the future. There is also concern about their academic proficiency and the adequacy of 2-3 years language support provision.

6.14 Findings

6.14.1 On Costs

The figures show that spending on providing EAL support has increased sharply. This increase is driven by teacher salaries. Additional teachers were appointed in line with growing student numbers and, from 2007 to 2009 on a more generous allocation model. At post-primary level, where figures are available, as a percentage of the total cohort, migrants represented 2.5% in 2001/02 and 8% in 2008/09.

The current model is to allocate teaching resources and, broadly speaking, depend on the professionalism of teachers and schools, when there is only limited CPD available, to apply those resources appropriately. Using this allocation model which arises from decisions on staffing ratios, salary costs have increased thirteen fold from €10.8 million in 2001/02 to €137 million in 2008/09. The approximate average unit cost in
08/09 ranges between just over €2,000 and about €4,500. The question arises as to whether there are allocation models likely to deliver better value for money.

6.14.2 On CPD

There are some difficulties with the current approach to meeting the needs of EAL students as outlined in chapter 5 of this report. It is evident that allocating large numbers of dedicated EAL teachers is not, on its own, the most efficient way to support children in their acquisition of English. The experience of Northern Ireland, as outlined in chapter 4, has been quite different; there the focus has altered from concentrating on provision of peripatetic teachers to building capacity of all teachers through CPD and providing capitation grants for additional teaching support. In Scotland, there has also been a greater emphasis on CPD, as discussed in chapter 4.

In this jurisdiction approximately 99% of EAL expenditure goes on teachers’ salaries. This is notwithstanding the fact that teachers have an acute need for CPD in this field since few have qualifications in EAL.

6.14.3 On Data

The stark difference in the availability of data on primary and post-primary students highlights the importance of a learner data base which would track students through school and enable comparable analysis of data at both primary and post-primary levels. At present, there are no data on EAL student numbers at primary level other than the snapshot of migrants provided by the ESRI report (Smyth et al, 2009) and the primary census answers in 07/08 which give aggregate data.

The exercise in trying to establish unit cost is a clear indication of serious deficits in current data collection. If policy in the future is to be evidence based, then current data collection and retention methods need to be improved considerably to allow for analysis and evaluation.
Chapter 7 – Effectiveness of Expenditure

7.1 Introduction

This chapter looks at the effectiveness of the existing expenditure. It addresses the part of the term of reference which requires the review “to examine the extent to which the programme’s objectives have been achieved and the effectiveness with which they have been achieved.

In line with the programme logic model, this chapter looks at the inputs by the Department of Education and Skills and outcomes of the expenditure. It examines to what extent and how effectively the implied programme objectives, as described in chapter 3, have been met by considering:

- the support provided by the Department
- the role of school management
- the role of teachers and teaching methodologies
- the outcomes for students who have received EAL support

Unfortunately, there is no direct link between the inputs as described in chapter 6 and in this chapter and the outcomes described below. It is reasonable to assume that EAL students who do well in their examinations have had effective EAL support but there is no guarantee that this is the case. The progress of individual EAL students through the system and their outcomes cannot be measured with the data currently available.

Although quantitative data on EAL provision are in short supply, the Inspectorate evaluation, as set out in chapter 5, does provide qualitative data on the effectiveness of existing provision. For this reason, this chapter draws extensively on the Inspectorate’s findings, as set out in chapter 5.

In reviewing effectiveness, it is noted that considerable change and development has been in train in relation to EAL since its introduction, in particular, in 2007, following the implementation of provision as outlined in the circular on language support (M53/07 set out in appendix 5), the issuing of the Assessment Kits at primary and post-primary levels in 2008/09 and, also in 2008/09, the roll-out of CPD for EAL teachers.

7.2 Effectiveness of Department of Education and Skills Structures

7.2.1 Division of Funding between Salary Costs, CPD and Resources

Within the Department of Education and Skills, almost all of the budget for providing EAL support rests with primary and post-primary teacher allocation section (now, Allocations and School Governance). As discussed in chapter 6, less than one percent of the overall cost is dedicated to CPD (provided through Teacher Education Section).

Note that there was a programme of expenditure on EAL but that EAL was not part of a formalised programme.
In light of the clear findings by the OECD, ESRI and the Department’s Inspectorate on the dearth of CPD for EAL teachers (few of whom have qualifications in the EAL area) and the need to upskill the mainstream teaching workforce and principals and ancillary staff on EAL and the inclusive/intercultural school, the imbalance between funding for teaching posts and funding for teachers’ CPD and capacity building in schools would appear to be inappropriate and less effective than otherwise might be the case. While the Inspectorate findings do show that there is some very effective practice in schools, it is also true that they also identify some weaknesses which could be addressed through improved CPD.

7.2.2 The Two Year Rule

The Department has placed a cap of two years on language support (with some flexibility on appeal, but this is the general rule). The Inspectorate found that, de facto, children continued to need support beyond the two year period and schools sometimes provided this within their existing resources.\(^{48}\)

As noted in chapter 2.7.2, Dr. Jim Cummins, one of the leading researchers in this field, has observed that there are different time periods necessary to acquire conversational fluency and the academic language necessary to access the curriculum.\(^{49}\) International research indicates that students need at least 5 years to catch up with the academic language of their peers.

The Swedish National Agency for Education in a review of provision for students who speak another home language, comments as follows citing national research:

“Research into the field of second language has however indicated that good skills in everyday language are not sufficient for successful participation in the school’s different subjects in the higher school years. Students’ ability to talk fluently between lessons does not necessarily mean that they do not have difficulties in keeping up in class. There is a fundamental difference between “everyday knowledge” and “school knowledge”, with the latter assuming different kinds of linguistic ability.” (Skolveket, 2009)

In the IILT resource book for language support teachers, the authors comment as follows:

“.. even after language support has ended, there are occasions when the non-English speaking student may need reassurance or some particular support. Many fulltime language support teachers have introduced an ‘open’ period each week when students can come to discuss a particular language difficulty or can be referred by the subject teacher for some extra support. This system has worked well.”\(^{50}\)

\(^{48}\) Further, 62% of the 85 teachers interviewed by the Trinity Immigration Initiative between June 2007 and September 2008 had students who were still receiving language support after the two year limit had expired. See Little and Lyons, 2009.


\(^{50}\) “A resource book for language support in post-primary schools”, 2007 IILT
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There is also evidence that children learn languages more easily and more effectively before puberty – the critical period hypothesis. This may mean that children who join the education system earlier need less support and those who join later need more.

In a paper synthesising research findings for policy makers, Heckmann refers to the matter as follows:

“Age is another important factor. Is there a critical age after which “perfect” language acquisition is more difficult than before, holding constant motivation, intelligence, access and other possible influences? Hartmut Esser (2006) has reviewed the relevant and complex literature on the critical period hypothesis. It seems that second language learning is possible at all ages, but that there is a gradual decline in learning ability after puberty. Second language acquisition is easier up to puberty, after which greater effort and motivation are required (Esser 2006, 59).” Heckmann, 2008 at p 70

As noted in chapter 4.2.3.B, the OECD has also expressed reservations about the two year rule. The OECD also comments on possible age related difficulties:

“the “critical period hypothesis theory” in second language acquisition and brain research suggests that students who arrive in Ireland when they are of post-primary school age will have more difficulties in acquiring a second language than students commencing their education when they are of primary school age.” (OECD, 2009h at p 27)51

The OECD’s “Closing the Gap” report gives an example of a different model where EAL support follows need.

“In Canada (British Columbia), English as a Second Language (ESL) funding is provided for each eligible student for up to five years. In order to receive funding the following conditions must be met (and documented):

- an annual assessment of English language proficiency has determined that the student’s use of English is sufficiently different from standard English
- an annual instructional plan is designed to meet the needs of the student
- specialised ESL services are provided for each student
- progress in the acquisition of English is reported to parents in regular reporting periods (five times a year)
- an ESL specialist is involved in planning and delivering services
- additional ESL services must be provided”

51 See also OECD, 2010d at p 91 where the OECD comments that “brain research indicates that immigrant students arriving in the country at a later stage of schooling may need more support to develop the required level of proficiency in the language of instruction (OECD, 2002). This may imply a need for extra funding and support for students in higher education level for effective language acquisition”
7.2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

At present, the Department does not have records showing progression in EAL. Although schools do provide data annually, as outlined in chapter 6.12, this is not retained in a readily accessible way. The data are neither computer based nor easily available for analysis and evaluation.

With the now universal availability of the Assessment Kit and the recent CPD, schools should from 2010/11 be required to use the criteria as defined in the kit and identify the proficiency of each of their students in all four areas (speaking, listening, reading and writing) as recommended in chapter 6. Again as recommended in chapter 6, this information should be readily available within the Department of Education and Skills. It should be regularly analysed to monitor the progression of students and the need for EAL expenditure. It should be possible to assess at national level what percentage of the EAL cohort has progressed from one level to another and during what time frame. This should help to inform policy and allocation decisions.

The Inspectorate's evaluation of EAL in 2008 (as outlined in chapter 5) was the first thematic evaluation to focus on the provision for EAL students. However, since 2004 the Inspectorate has included the evaluation of EAL provision as an aspect of whole-school evaluations in schools where EAL students are enrolled. The Inspectorate will continue to evaluate the quality of EAL provision in schools through the WSE process. This work will be assisted and informed by the findings and recommendations of the thematic evaluation.

7.2.4 Recommendations on Department of Education and Skills Structures

The findings above on effectiveness clearly suggest that the current model is not the most effective one.

The evidence points to a serious need for CPD. It is recommended that CPD should be provided to all teachers and school leaders in the primary and post-primary sectors on EAL and the inclusive/ intercultural school.

Given both the academic research and the practical application of language support on the ground, it is recommended that Departmental policy be revised to reflect the reality that language support does not end after 2 years in many cases. The Assessment Kit should be used to monitor the progress of students and allocation should follow need. Such an approach is particularly required where students enter the Irish education system for the first time at post-primary level with very limited proficiency in English. They need to develop both communicative and, particularly, academic language proficiency. The latter takes time and continuous support.

The deficits of current data have been highlighted in a number of areas of this report. It is recommended that data on EAL student progression should be gathered by the Department and be readily accessible for analysis so that global and individual EAL student progression can be monitored and analysed. This information should be made available to inspectors before they assess the quality of EAL provision in individual schools.
7.3 Effectiveness of School Structures

7.3.1 Whole School Approaches

The ESRI report (Smyth et al, 2009, p 106 et seq) found that a wide range of staff were involved in supporting migrant students at primary and post-primary level, though at primary level, the survey found that it was the class teacher who was most cited as the person supporting migrants. This would relate to general support of migrant students, including language support. At post primary level, the situation was somewhat different but the most commonly mentioned support was the class tutor or year head with principals and guidance counsellors also being frequently mentioned.

Complementing this finding, at post-primary the Inspectorate also found that there was good practice where:

- whole-school planning incorporates measures to address diversity and EAL-specific issues in relevant policies.
- a whole-school EAL policy has been developed and ratified.

The Inspectorate’s findings also emphasise the role of subject specialist teachers at post-primary and their role in supporting English language learning a fact of which, in many cases, the teachers themselves did not seem to be aware. The Inspectorate recommends that:

The school’s EAL policies and practices should make plain the importance of an EAL focus in all subject department planning. All subject department planning should incorporate specific measures, such as those described above, to support the learning of EAL students. (See section 5B 2.4.)

This complements findings by the Swedish National Agency for Education which found that:

“For schools to be more effective in their work on these [multilingual] students’ language and knowledge development, they must employ a long term, conscious and considered approach. The research indicates the necessity of co-ordination at all levels as far as the multilingual students are concerned, such as an integration of language and subject tuition.

This study is however able to convey some more positive aspects. For instance, using these students as a starting point in the planning and organisation of the work. In addition, regarding multilingualism as a resource rather than as a problem. There are positive examples in some schools’ work such as exercising an overall view, having a diversity of different solutions, projects, efforts to utilise existing resources and the like, rather than occasional major efforts. It is not least important that the school is well prepared, such as by equipping itself with and utilising competence in questions of diversity and second language perspectives. The study emphasises the importance of the school administration having that kind of competence.” (Skolverket, 2009)
It would appear that despite the considerable achievements to date in involving the whole school in English language support, there is still significant work to be done in this area. In particular, there is a need for initial teacher education to include EAL, and for CPD for all school staff to build whole school capacity to support EAL students. There is, as noted earlier, an imbalance between provision of teaching support and provision of CPD.

It is also an objective that students needing language support should integrate well into the life of the school. Insofar as social integration is concerned, the ESRI’s report (Smyth et al 2009, p 83 et seq) shows a broadly positive picture although it is somewhat difficult to judge in the absence of comparable figures for the migrants’ Irish peers. In most schools, principals at primary and post-primary level do not consider that the majority of their migrant students have social difficulties, as illustrated in figure 7.1 below. Interestingly, in relation to absenteeism, the ESRI report found that “[p]rimary schools using separate intensive provision are somewhat more likely to report absenteeism issues among newcomers...” (Smyth et al, 2009 p 129).

Figure 7.1 - Proportion of Primary and Second-Level Schools where more than Half of Migrant Students Experience Sustained Difficulties

The ESRI also measured school climate in their research. They indicate that

“High values in measuring school climate …indicate more positive relation within the school as a whole and more commitment on the part of students, teachers and parents to the school” (Smyth et al, 2009, p 101)

They go on to point out that migrants integrate less well in schools with less positive school climates:
“The overall school climate is seen to have a significant effect on newcomer students. Schools with a less positive school climate (lower score) have greater difficulties, and this is statistically significant. Thus, a more positive school climate contributes to the social integration of newcomer students.” (Smyth et al, 2009, p 101)

The ESRI measured positive school climate by asking school principals:

“the extent to which the following statements were true for ‘nearly all’, ‘more than half’, ‘less than a half’ or ‘only a few’ of the groups in their school:

- Students are well-behaved in class;
- Students are motivated about their schoolwork;
- Students show respect for their teachers;
- Parents attend parent-teacher meetings in the school;
- Parents give their children help and support with schoolwork;
- Teachers are positive about the school;
- Teachers in the school are open to contact with parents;
- Teachers are open to new developments and new challenges.”

(Smyth et al, 2009 at p 100)

7.3.2 School Leadership

At primary level, the Inspectorate found that most Boards of Management managed provision for EAL students effectively and also managed allocation of teaching staff to EAL assignments effectively. At post-primary level, the Inspectorate found that “in more than half of the schools evaluated, deployment of staff was deemed less than satisfactory”. While acknowledging various contextual factors which hinder effective deployment at post-primary level, the Inspectorate stated that “the evaluation identified deployment patterns that militated against good provision for EAL.”

At primary level, while inspectors found that most principals provided good leadership and management in their schools, only two-thirds were judged to manage and lead provision for EAL students effectively. The Inspectors commented that “Where poor practice was identified, principals devolved responsibility for EAL pupils to the EAL support teachers, many of whom were newly qualified or without the necessary experience to manage whole-school issues.”

Commenting on in-school management at primary level, the Inspectorate considered that a majority of in-school management teams contributed “effectively to whole-school approaches for co-ordinating EAL provision” but in a few schools, “all EAL work – pastoral, organisational and curricular – was undertaken exclusively by the EAL support teachers. Inspectors found this less effective than a whole-school approach to managing EAL provision.”

7.3.3 Deployment of English Language Support Teachers at Post-Primary Level.

While there are some difficulties with allocation at both primary and post-primary level and schools can lose teachers and expertise due to changes in student numbers and the fact that EAL teachers may be on one year contracts, the overwhelming difficulties appear to arise at post-primary.
In its evaluation, at post-primary level, the Inspectorate found that in more than half of the schools evaluated deployment of EAL staff at post-primary was unsatisfactory. Their findings, as outlined in chapter 5B 1.2, drew attention to how schools used the EAL resource to increase teachers’ timetabled hours without apparent regard to the teachers’ expertise and interest or the students’ needs:

…the use of the EAL allocation is a matter for each school, and the evaluation identified deployment patterns that militated against good provision for EAL. The total allocation for EAL support to the fifteen schools evaluated was 46 WTEs. In fact, this allocation was dispersed among over 100 teachers who were delivering direct EAL support and among many more teachers where the allocation was further spread, for example to create smaller class groups. The practice of assigning EAL lessons to teachers on the basis that they had spare capacity on their timetables was reported in a significant number of schools. It is an inappropriate basis on which to involve teachers in providing direct EAL support.

This deployment model can create the situation where, conceivably, the same student could have several different teachers for EAL all of whom regard their main academic focus as being elsewhere, particularly on their own specialist curricular area. Such a situation would require a co-ordinated planned course and communication between different EAL teachers.

This is clearly an approach which boosts teacher hours but disrupts learning rather than consolidating effective teaching. The unnecessary numbers of teachers involved with varying degrees of commitment creates an obstacle to team building and effective learning by the student.

7.3.4 Co-ordination and Planning

At primary level, inspectors identified “whole-school and classroom planning for EAL as the aspect of the work of schools and teachers most in need of development.”

At post-primary level, “fewer than half the schools evaluated were found to have good practice in [relation to planning structures].” The Inspectorate identified good practice in certain schools such as “the allocation of dedicated time to the EAL co-ordinator for planning and liaison with subject departments; the inclusion of EAL team planning in the schedule of subject planning sessions; and the participation of senior management and the school’s guidance and care services in EAL meetings.” EAL team planning was an area where three-fifths of schools had more weaknesses than strengths. At post-primary level planning for EAL students in other subject areas was the category which produced the largest number of negative findings with almost all schools showing more weaknesses than strengths.

The Inspectorate states that:

The weaknesses in the provision included a significant lack of effective collaborative planning between mainstream and EAL teachers [in some schools at primary level]
In the majority of schools, practice was not so much poor as undeveloped or ad hoc. The temporary and short-term nature of allocation and deployment has hindered the establishment of effective planning and co-ordination structures [at post-primary level].

While CPD may go some way to addressing this difficulty, there is a fundamental issue, if teachers do not have formal time to work together to plan delivery of EAL across the curriculum.

7.3.5 Recommendations on School Structures

The findings on school structures show that there is much good practice in our schools. Nevertheless, there are areas which could be strengthened to provide more effective and efficient support to EAL students.

It is clear both from the ESRI’s findings on school climate and the Inspectorate’s evaluation that the role of school leaders is key and a whole-school approach to EAL students’ needs is likely to be most efficient and effective. A key recommendation needs to be reiterated here, namely the need for whole-staff CPD to build capacity in schools.

There are serious deficiencies in the deployment models currently in use at post-primary in particular. It is clear that a different more focused method of deployment of WTEs could give more consistent teaching input and better learning outcomes for the same financial input. It is recommended that there be a review of allocation models which would also address deficits in current deployment models.

The Inspectorate found that co-ordination and planning is one of the weakest areas at both primary and post-primary levels. In part, this is due to the restrictive nature of the school day which allows very little time for this kind of work. In part, it may be due to a perception, particularly at post-primary level that language support is not the responsibility of the subject specialist teacher. CPD for all teachers can go some way to addressing these issues but there also needs to be more time available for planning and co-ordination between different staff members. It is recommended that the question of changing teachers’ contracts to allow for additional planning and co-ordination time be considered.

7.4 Effectiveness of Teachers and Teaching Methodologies

7.4.1 The Inspectorate

The Department of Education and Skills’s Inspectorate is the only body involved in evaluation with the authority to observe classroom teaching and learning where it is happening. This makes the Inspectorate’s evaluation particularly valuable in assessing the effectiveness of teachers and teaching methodologies. For this reason, the Inspectorate’s findings are referred to extensively in this section.
7.4.2 EAL teachers

At primary level\textsuperscript{52}, the Inspectorate observed that

\textit{One of the most significant findings is that the quality of teaching provided by EAL teachers was good or very good in almost all schools.}\textsuperscript{52}

Unlike their specialist counterparts at post-primary, all primary school teachers are qualified to teach English and Irish as part of a broad and balanced curriculum. Some also choose to learn to teach continental languages. Therefore primary teachers have knowledge, understanding and skills related to language teaching. Of course, they may not have followed courses specifically on EAL teaching and learning.

At post-primary level, the Inspectorate evaluation found that

\textit{Teaching methods in the EAL support classroom were satisfactory in most EAL lessons observed, although practice of a consistently high quality was not identified in any school}\textsuperscript{54}

Inspectors also identified significant deficits in some cases which may be a result of insufficient CPD on the part of the teachers concerned:

[At primary level]… inspectors noted that while language games and other activities were in evidence, the communicative purpose of these games was insufficiently clear.\textsuperscript{55}

[at post primary level]…insufficient attention to the development of all four language skills in the methods observed was frequently noted. Listening and speaking were generally more to the fore than reading and writing, indicating a dominance of the communicative approach more appropriate to the TEFL context.\textsuperscript{56}

Students need to be proficient not only in conversational but also in academic language to participate successfully in State examinations and achieve their full potential.

7.4.3 Mainstream Class Teachers

The Inspectorate evaluation at both primary and post-primary highlighted the role of mainstream class teachers in providing EAL.

At primary level, the Inspectorate evaluation found that

\textsuperscript{52} Note that at primary level, 38\% of schools have less than 1 EAL teacher (i.e. a part time resource) and review of provision in these settings was not part of the EAL study.
\textsuperscript{53} Section 5A 4
\textsuperscript{54} Section 5B 3.1
\textsuperscript{55} Section 5A 4.2
\textsuperscript{56} Section 5B 3.1
The quality of teaching was good or very good in three-quarters of mainstream class settings. This is a very positive finding given that most of the teachers in the schools evaluated did not receive specific professional development in the area of teaching EAL pupils.

At post-primary, while finding much good practice, the inspectors also observed that the teaching methods used in over half the lessons observed were considered to be less than satisfactory in meeting the needs of EAL students. While this is an undesirably high proportion, it is important to point out that some simple adjustments in teaching style would greatly benefit EAL students, and that teachers were frequently very receptive to the inspectors’ suggestions in this area.

The findings of the Inspectorate clearly point to a lack of CPD for language support teachers and for mainstream teachers. This is supported by the ESRI report (Smyth et al, 2009 at p 144) which found that principals and teachers are unhappy with the lack of availability “of trained specialist language support teachers, and the dearth of professional development for mainstream class and subject teachers”. This is illustrated by the demand for CPD as demonstrated by figure 7.2 below.

**Figure 7.2 - Attitudes to Continuing Professional Development**

![](chart.png)

Source: ESRI, Smyth et al, 2009, p. 171

The OECD in reviewing the Irish system also points out the need for CPD for EAL and mainstream teachers as well as school leaders (see chapter 4.2.3).

**7.4.4 Findings on Academic Achievement**

The ESRI found that over 80% of principals viewed the academic achievement of migrant children as average or above average:
Figure 7.3 - Principals’ Perceptions of the Relative Rating of Academic Achievement of Newcomers

Source ESRI, Smyth et al, 2009, p. 149

When asked what percentage of students experience sustained academic difficulties, two thirds of principals found that only a minority of migrant students had sustained academic difficulties although 30-35% found that more than half had sustained academic difficulties.

Figure 7.4 - Perceived Prevalence of Sustained Academic Difficulties among Newcomers

Source ESRI, Smyth et al, 2009, p. 158

While these outcomes are based on principals’ opinions, they would appear to indicate that teachers and teaching methodologies are reasonably effective. Section 7.4.3 does highlight difficulties in this area.
7.4.5 Qualifications

The OECD (2009h) highlighted the lack of CPD for both EAL and mainstream teachers. The Inspectorate evaluation also highlighted the lack of qualifications for EAL teachers in Ireland. This is clearly a difficulty for schools who cannot identify qualified candidates for EAL positions, for teachers who are unclear as to what the best qualification might be and for EAL students as, by definition, none of them are being taught by a teacher with a qualification recognised by the Department of Education and Skills as appropriate for the purpose.

7.4.6 Recommendations on Teaching and Teaching Methodologies

It is not proposed to reiterate here the detailed recommendations at the conclusion to chapter 5 relating to teachers and EAL methodologies which address the difficulties raised at 7.4.2 and 7.4.3 above. It is clear that while there is much good practice at both primary and post-primary level, the Inspectorate saw a clear need for improvement in some areas and recommendations have been made accordingly in chapter 5.2.

On the question of an EAL qualification, the Department of Education and Skills itself is in a position to tender for the development and provision of a suitable postgraduate qualification in EAL and it is recommended that this should be done.

7.5 Outcomes for Students

7.5.1 Introduction

The overall policy objective, as identified in chapter 3, is that migrant students should be well integrated into Irish school life socially and academically. In this context, it is important that they should perform as well as their Irish peers in school settings. The provision of language support should enable students to acquire English (or Irish) to access the curriculum on the same basis as their native peers.

As discussed in chapter 6 the Department does not currently seek to record progression by students who receive English language support. Nor does it identify these students in any way so that their subsequent progression through the school system can be assessed. There are a number of measures of student achievement which identify students by nationality (these are discussed below). It is reasonable to assume that most non-native English speakers would have had two years English language support by the time that they sit the certificate examinations. There is, clearly, no control group of EAL students who have not had English language support, so it is difficult to assess the exact impact of the support but it is fair to say that it must have increased the ability of these students to access the curriculum. This is supported by the ESRI (Smyth et al, 2009) who found that the majority of migrant students were well integrated in language, academic and social life. It is also supported by the indicative OECD PISA (discussed at 7.5.3) and Inspectorate findings as set out in chapter 5.
7.5.2 National Assessment of Mathematics Achievement (NAMA) and National Assessment of English Reading (NAER)

Unlike at post-primary school, there is no State certificate examination at primary level. However, the Education Research Centre in association with the Department of Education and Skills has carried out national surveys of achievement at primary level. The surveys have been conducted in the areas of English (reading) and mathematics. These surveys are designed to test achievement levels of the general student body and are not designed specifically to capture the performance of migrants and therefore, the results must be treated with some caution.

The results of the 2009 survey will be of interest when available in 2010 but, for the purposes of this review, the most recent material dates from May 2004. This is before the numbers of migrants rose sharply after the accession of the new EU Member States in 2004.

In English reading and mathematics over 4,000 pupils at each of first and fifth class completed tests of English reading and mathematics achievement. Contextual data were obtained in questionnaires completed by pupils, parents, class and learning-support teachers, principals and members of the Inspectorate.

The report on mathematics (Shiel et al, 2006) finds no statistically significant difference between the achievement scores of those born outside Ireland and those born in Ireland. It would appear, therefore, that any potential English language difficulties are not affecting the mathematical performance of children born outside Ireland. The cohort of EAL students involved in this study may be very small and therefore the results have to be interpreted with some caution.

Table 7.1 - Mean Mathematics Scores of Pupils, by Country of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3631</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>251.0</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>249.1</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English reading, the research found that:

“The 2.4% of First class pupils who spoke a language other than English or Gaeilge achieved a significantly lower mean score (229.6) than pupils who spoke English as their first language (250.4) (almost 21 points lower)...The mean achievement scores of the sizeable minority of pupils (8.4% at First class and 10.5% at Fifth) who were not born in Ireland did not differ significantly from the mean scores of Irish-born pupils” (Eivers et al, 2005)

This shows that at first class level, children who do not speak English at home do less well in reading than those who do.

Interestingly, when looking at achievement and place of birth, at first class, children born outside Ireland have a mean achievement

---

57 http://www.erc.ie/?p=23 on 7 April, 2009
58 Source: Table 5.1 Shiel et al, 2006. adapted to remove reference to age, gender and member of Travelling Community which are not relevant for the purposes of the current exercise.
59 For detailed tables see Appendix 11.
score which does not differ significantly from their Irish born counterparts. A proportion of the children born outside Ireland will, of course, be native English speakers.

The current assessment evidence therefore points, prima facie, to some underperformance by migrants at primary level in reading. It is unclear whether this underperformance is due to inadequacies in language support or some early delays when working with two or more languages. The results should be seen as indicative and require further research specific to students who do not speak English or Irish at home. Clearly, asking about home language is a better way to identify EAL students than country of birth.

7.5.3 PISA

The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is an internationally standardised assessment that was jointly developed by participating countries in the OECD and administered to 15-year-olds in post-primary schools. Together with 56 other countries, Ireland participated in the third assessment in 2006.

The PISA data in relation to migrants in Ireland have to be approached with some considerable caution as the sample size is very small. In Ireland, 165 randomly selected schools were invited to take part in PISA 2006. The selection process ensured an appropriate mixture of schools by type (secondary, community / comprehensive, vocational), size, and gender composition (Eivers et al, 2007) but did not necessarily include a representative sample of migrant students.

The data show that migrant students as a whole performed slightly above the OECD average (500) and the performance gap between first-generation migrant students and their native peers was 14 points (statistically not significant) in Ireland. (OECD, 2009a).

---

60 Results at fifth class are more positive but this may be because of the very large standard error. See detailed tables in Appendix 11.
61 http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,3417,en_32252351_32235907_1,1_1,1,1.00.html on 7 April, 2009
The results of PISA 2006 reading scores, when disaggregated, show a gap in reading performance between ‘English-speaking’ migrant students and ‘non-English-speaking’ migrant students in Ireland. For instance, English-speaking migrant students had mean reading scores exceeding those of their native peers, while non-English-speaking migrant students had mean scores significantly below those of native students (around 60 points), (OECD, 2009a).

**Table 7.2 - Mean Reading, Science and Mathematics Scores in PISA 2006, by Newcomer/Language Status in Ireland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>519.99</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>90.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer - English speaking</td>
<td>530.88</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>90.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer - Other language</td>
<td>460.32</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>127.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Table 17 in Irish Country Background Report (Eivers et al, 2007)*
These data indicate that non-English speaking migrants do less well at age 15 and require support to catch up with their English speaking peers.

Together with the data on NAMA/NAER outlined at paragraph 7.5.2, the PISA data paint a picture of EAL students who are performing less well than their native English speaking peers. As outlined above, all these data has to be treated with some caution but the trend being identified is negative for non-English speaking migrants.

7.5.4 Transition Year

Participation in Transition Year is regarded as very positive by the Inspectorate and an ESRI study on transition year found that

taking Transition Year has an impact on students’ academic outcomes, even taking account of initial differences between participants and non-participants. On average, students who take part in Transition Year achieve higher Leaving Certificate exam grades and are more likely to go on to higher education than non-participants. (Smyth et al, 2005)

For migrant students with English language support needs, it gives them a chance to work on their English language skills, become more knowledgeable about Irish education and their choices for senior cycle, to socialise, be involved in the community and other non-mainstream curricular activities, without the pressure of preparing for certificate examinations which is so much a feature of the junior cycle and the remainder of senior cycle.

Absolute figures for take up of transition year among migrant students and their Irish peers are given in table 7.3 below. As with all figures from the Post-Primary Pupil Database, they must be taken as trend data only as migrants are self-declared and all migrants may not declare their nationality.

Table 7.3 - Numbers of Irish National and Migrant Students in Transition Year 2001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TY</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish Nationals</td>
<td>21962</td>
<td>22456</td>
<td>22796</td>
<td>23762</td>
<td>24427</td>
<td>25512</td>
<td>25982</td>
<td>26289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>2087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4 compares the percentage of migrants in the overall student body to the percentage of migrants in the Transition Year cohort. The figures show that migrant participation rates have increased somewhat in line with the overall increase as a percentage of the total cohort.

Table 7.4 - Migrants as a Percentage of Transition Year Cohort and as a Percentage of Total Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants as a percentage of TY cohort</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants as a percentage of total cohort</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5.5 School Drop-out Data

Retention rate data do not at present include information on nationality although it would be possible to make this data available in the future as the raw data are collected. However, to make these data available by nationality would require that the whole retention process be amended and/or rewritten and at the time of writing the resources were not available to facilitate this.

Under 10% of principals at primary and post-primary levels reported to the ESRI that more than half of their migrant students experience sustained difficulties in relation to absenteeism (see figure 7.1 above) (Smyth et al, 2009, p. 84). The ESRI also found that the way language support is provided can have an effect on absenteeism:

“primary schools using separate intensive provision are somewhat more likely to report absenteeism issues among newcomers, which may reflect the potentially negative impact of being in a separate classroom on student morale and engagement.” Smyth et al, 2009, p129

The EU Green Paper Migration & Mobility: Challenges and Opportunities for EU Education Systems (European Commission, 2008) found that

… at secondary level, a clear degree of segregation in enrolment emerges as migrant pupils are over-represented in vocationally oriented schools that typically do not lead to higher education. And, most clearly of all, there is a greater incidence of early school leaving among migrant pupils in almost all countries.

The ESRI (Byrne and Smyth, 2010) found that 20% of migrant students drop out of school compared to 11% of students with Irish parents. The researchers conclude that while finding is of concern, further research is needed to identify the causes:

“the study highlights new evidence in the Irish context which suggests that at least some newcomer young people are at risk of school dropout. Further research would be needed to determine whether this pattern reflects age at immigration, language difficulties, school experiences or broader social factors.” (Byrne and Smyth, 2010 at pages 173-174)

7.5.6 Description of Certificate Programmes

Irish post-primary schools offer a range of state certified programmes which are open to their students. A description of these programmes is given below. Take up of these programmes by migrant students offers some indication of the progress of these students.

➢ The Junior Cycle curriculum offers a broad and balanced education that lasts three years. The Junior Cycle caters for students generally in the 12 to 15 year old age group. The Junior Certificate examination is held at the end of the Junior Cycle. Students normally sit for the Junior Certificate examination at the age of 15.62

62 http://www.examinations.ie on 7 April, 2009 supplemented by Inspectorate
The Junior Certificate School Programme (JCSP) is operating in over 200 post-primary schools (out of a total of over 700) throughout the country, within the Junior Cycle. The Junior Certificate School Programme aims to provide a curriculum framework that assists schools and teachers in making the Junior Certificate examination more accessible to those young people who otherwise may leave school without formal qualifications. It attempts to help young people experience success and develop a positive self-image by providing a curriculum and assessment framework suitable to their needs. On completion of the programme students receive a profile which is an official record of their achievements from the Department of Education and Skills.\(^\text{63}\)

The Leaving Certificate (Established) programme offers students a broad and balanced education while allowing for some specialisation. The certificate is used for the purposes of selection into further education, employment, training and higher education. The examination is the terminal examination of post-primary education. It is held at the end of the Senior Cycle in post-primary schools. The Senior Cycle caters for students in the 15 to 18 year old age group. The majority of candidates, who sit for the examinations are recognised students in post-primary schools, are 17 or 18 years of age and have completed 5 or 6 years of post-primary education.\(^\text{64}\)

The Leaving Certificate Vocational Programme (LCVP) is a senior cycle Programme of the Department of Education & Skills, designed to give a stronger vocational dimension to the Leaving Certificate (established). The stronger vocational focus of the LCVP is achieved by arranging Leaving Certificate subjects into Vocational Subject Groupings and through the provision of two courses (in addition to those offered to Leaving Certificate Established students) of study in work preparation and enterprise, known as the Link Modules. Candidates taking the LCVP have a unique opportunity to develop their interpersonal, vocational and technological skills. These skills are equally relevant to the needs of those preparing for further education, seeking employment or planning to start their own business.\(^\text{65}\)

The Leaving Certificate Applied Programme (LCA) is a distinct, self-contained two-year programme aimed at preparing students for adult and working life. It is designed for students who do not wish to proceed directly to third level education (although students may progress directly to further education) or for those whose needs, aspirations and aptitudes are not adequately catered for by the other two Leaving Certificate programmes or who choose not to opt for those programmes. The Programme is administered and assessed by the State Examinations Commission.

7.5.7 Levels of Migrant Participation in the Certificate Programmes

There would be concerns, if migrant students were over-represented in any of the certificate programmes when compared to their native peers. Numbers of migrants and Irish students in certificate examinations from 2001 to 2008 are set out below in table 7.5.

---

\(^{63}\) \url{http://jcsp.slss.ie/about.html} on 7 April, 2009 supplemented by Inspectorate

\(^{64}\) Ibid.

\(^{65}\) Ibid.
### Table 7.5 - Numbers of Migrant Students in Certificate Programmes 2001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Leaving Certificate</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2212</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>2919</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>3994</td>
<td>4710</td>
<td>5389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate Vocational Programme</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>2184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Certificate</td>
<td>4149</td>
<td>5071</td>
<td>5770</td>
<td>6569</td>
<td>7634</td>
<td>9464</td>
<td>11751</td>
<td>13527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Certificate Schools Programme</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate Applied</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.6 - Numbers of Native Students in Certificate Programmes 2001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Leaving Certificate</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td>3561</td>
<td>3197</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>2337</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>2335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate</td>
<td>69108</td>
<td>67964</td>
<td>66508</td>
<td>62982</td>
<td>60167</td>
<td>60597</td>
<td>60661</td>
<td>60210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCVP</td>
<td>31347</td>
<td>32122</td>
<td>32259</td>
<td>32125</td>
<td>32185</td>
<td>32078</td>
<td>32808</td>
<td>33033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Certificate</td>
<td>168175</td>
<td>162859</td>
<td>159851</td>
<td>158978</td>
<td>156970</td>
<td>152829</td>
<td>148600</td>
<td>146649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Certificate Schools Programme</td>
<td>4203</td>
<td>4786</td>
<td>5329</td>
<td>5697</td>
<td>5906</td>
<td>6130</td>
<td>7041</td>
<td>8298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate Applied</td>
<td>7413</td>
<td>7860</td>
<td>7892</td>
<td>7497</td>
<td>7180</td>
<td>7178</td>
<td>7078</td>
<td>6687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning first to the Leaving Certificate, if these figures are converted into percentages, the outcomes are as set out below:

### Table 7.7 - Percentages of Irish National and Migrant Students in Leaving Certificate Programmes 2001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Leaving Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Nationals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Nationals</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate Vocational Programme</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Nationals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate Applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Nationals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 7 – Effectiveness of Expenditure
It is clear from the above tables that migrants are well represented in the established Leaving Certificate programme with higher proportions taking this programme as compared to their Irish peers. These tables appear to indicate that migrants are well represented in the more academically oriented Leaving Certificate programmes and that their initial lack of English competence does not appear to create particular difficulties or barriers to participation in State examinations. However, this trend is changing with increasing numbers of migrants opting for the LCVP and LCA.

At junior cycle, the picture is similar with percentages enrolling in the standard Junior Certificate Programme reflecting percentages within the native population.

Table 7.8 - Percentages of Irish National and Migrant Students in Junior Certificate Programmes 2001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Nationals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Certificate Schools Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Nationals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to the Junior Certificate Schools Programme, the percentages, which are comparable for Irish and migrant students, mask a significant increase in the absolute numbers of migrant students in the JCSP from 69 in 2001 to 871 in 2008.

In general, however, the developing patterns reflect the situation of their Irish peers. It could be concluded that they are, in fact, being mainstreamed successfully into the post-primary education system.

7.5.8 Performance in Certificate Examinations

Having established that migrants are going into the various certificate programmes in similar proportions to the native population, the question then arises as to how are they performing vis-à-vis their native peers.

Migrants who have had English language support are not tracked through the system. At a more general level the post-primary pupil database does record nationality (with the caveat that it is self-declared). The data from this database is used by the State Examinations Commission to develop its records but the SEC does not currently receive or use the data on nationality. There are currently, therefore, no records which rigorously track the performance of migrants in the State examinations.

Some of these students can be identified in other ways. EU migrants are entitled to sit a non-curricular language in their Leaving Certificate examinations. In other words, for example, Polish children can sit a Polish language examination although there is no Polish curriculum which they can study in Irish schools. Students must be nationals of an EU Member State to be eligible to sit these examinations and the language must be their mother tongue. It is reasonable to assume that all of the students sitting non-curricular languages are migrants overwhelmingly from the central and eastern European states.
Students who do not speak English or Irish as a first language are also allowed to bring bi-lingual dictionaries into examinations under the State Examination Commission’s scheme of “reasonable accommodations”. This measure was introduced in 2004 “in recognition of the increasing diversity in the range of cultures and languages amongst candidates” (SEC, 2005).

This report examines the results achieved by these “dictionary” candidates. However, as is clear from the Inspectorate’s evaluation, at post-primary level many teachers were not aware of the possibility of using bi-lingual dictionaries as a “reasonable accommodation” for students whose first language is neither Irish nor English. At best an analysis of these results gives indicative outcomes of a small sample of migrant students. It is not representative of the whole cohort of migrant students.

The numbers of dictionary candidates is somewhat lower than might be expected. For example, the post primary pupil database indicates that in 2007 there were 7749 migrant students enrolled in the Leaving Certificate and Leaving Certificate Vocational Programmes. Assuming that 70% of these need English language support, there is then a cohort of 5,424 students who do not speak English as a first language. Given that migrant students are more likely to be concentrated in the first year of the programme, it is being assumed that 60% of the cohort is in year one of the programme. That leaves approximately 2,000 EAL students who should have sat the Leaving Certificate in 2007. As Table 7.9 below shows, the total numbers of students using dictionaries in the Junior and Leaving Certificate in 2007 was 1,528. If the estimated figure of EAL students sitting the Leaving Certificate is of the right order then a proportion of EAL students are either unaware of the possibility of using bilingual dictionaries or opt not to use them.

The total numbers using bilingual dictionaries have been rising steadily with a sharp increase in 2008:

Table 7.9 - Numbers of Candidates who Applied to Use Bilingual Dictionaries in State Certificate Examinations (Junior and Leaving Certificate) 2004-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed tables in Appendix 12 give the data which support the findings in this section. They compare the Leaving and Junior Certificate higher level results of “dictionary candidates” with those of their native peers for 2007 and 2008 for all higher level subjects where there were more than 30 dictionary candidates. It must be emphasised that absolute numbers of such students can be very small. Tables in

---

66 “Very little use of bilingual dictionaries was observed, and in many cases mainstream teachers were unaware of the reasonable accommodations made for EAL students in certificate examinations.”

Section 5B 3.2

67 Source – State Examinations Commission, Annual Reports 2004 -2008
Appendix 13 give details of student take up at higher level and ordinary level for 2007 and 2008.

Given the small numbers of dictionary candidates at higher level, it is not clear how useful a proxy these figures can be for overall EAL student results. In fact, the numbers are so small that, particularly when compared to national trends, it is arguable that they are not very meaningful. Furthermore, it is not possible to make a correlation between an intervention and a result in an examination. In the case of these migrant students we do not know to what extent their results may be due, at least in part, to language support received. Indeed we do not know whether they even received language support. In addition language support is only one of the many factors which may or may not affect outcomes. The State Examination Commission itself points out that it reports results of a point in time examination and does not attempt to explain these results because of the range of variables involved. The data presented below need to be read with these very serious caveats in mind. In the absence of any better outcome data these figures are included for the value they may have, however limited.

Dictionary candidates appear to perform well across a range of subjects. Nevertheless, there may be concerns around the numbers of dictionary candidates who are failing certain subjects.

Dictionary candidates, who sat Leaving Certificate Higher Level examinations in 2008, perform reasonably well and get a higher proportion of A1/A2 grades than their native peers in some subjects. It is also true that others of these candidates get more grades E, F and NG than their native peers in most subjects. This is particularly true in applied mathematics, physics and chemistry in 2007 where more than a fifth of the dictionary candidates failed. This is of concern and may reflect high aspirations which are not realistic or insufficient proficiency in academic English. It must be emphasised that the absolute numbers of these students are small.

It is also significant that there are very small numbers of migrants taking Leaving Certificate Irish. At higher level in 2007 there were two candidates and in 2008, there were four. At Junior Certificate higher level, there were 22 candidates in 2007 and 16 in 2008. This may well be due to the tendency to withdraw children for English language support during time which is timetabled for Irish. Children who commence their Irish education after the age of 11 are not obliged to study Irish.68

At Junior Certificate level, the percentage of dictionary students failing at higher level is significantly lower than at Leaving Certificate. Generally dictionary students’ results are somewhat lower in subjects such as English, History and Geography but their performance is broadly equivalent in scientific/art subjects and exceeds that of their native peers in modern languages. The exception is in the case of Civic, Social and Political Education which is examined at a common level. In 2007, 63.3% of total candidates got an A or B grade but only 29.4% of dictionary students got As or Bs. In 2008, the figures are 65.8% and 31.8% respectively. This may be due to the fact that knowledge about life in Ireland is vital to CSPE and migrant students may not have the same basic knowledge of Irish life as their native peers.

---

68 Rule 46 of the “Rules and Programme for Secondary Schools” as amended
Also of interest is the take up by candidates at higher and ordinary level. Detailed tables in Appendix 13 give take up at Junior and Leaving Certificate level in 2007 and 2008. The take up rates are broadly similar for dictionary students and their native peers.

In languages (other than English where there is a significantly lower take up at higher level than for all other languages), dictionary candidates have a higher uptake at Leaving Certificate higher level than their English speaking peers. This pattern is also noted in mathematics, applied mathematics and physics. These candidates may well speak English as their second or third language and, therefore, may have an aptitude for languages. Like mathematics, applied mathematics and physics, foreign languages may be perceived as needing less fluency in English and therefore more attractive. Subjects such as English, geography and history require significant competence in academic English and may be more challenging for EAL students.

At Junior Certificate level, the situation is somewhat different. Uptake at higher level by dictionary students’ is lower than the level of their native peers, even in subjects where these students tend to outperform their native peers at higher level (modern languages). This may explain why failure rates at Junior Certificate are significantly lower than at Leaving Certificate. It may, however, also point to a worrying trend where students’ potential is not being realised due, perhaps, to a lack of English proficiency.

As is clear from the foregoing, the information which can be obtained by using the data on dictionary candidates is incomplete. This makes it difficult to comprehensively track the outcomes for migrant students with English language support needs. The data are, however, indicative and highlights some concerns, particularly relating to higher failure rates for migrant students in Leaving Certificate higher level subjects.

7.5.9 Recommendations on Outcome Data

The findings on student outcomes show that data on migrants are either not collected or not readily available. It fully supports the OECD finding that “There is a wealth of outcome data available at varying levels of the Irish schooling system, but rarely are migrant students made visible in them” (see chapter 4.2.3B). To enable proper assessment of outcomes for EAL students the measures set out below are recommended.

**Nama and NAER** should continue to gather background information on migrant students, and should seek to improve the quality of information on the performance of such students, including, if possible, their language proficiency in Irish and English. However, it is recognised that it may not be possible to generate reliable estimates of achievement for small subgroups such as migrant students in such assessments.

---

69 Students tend not to present for Irish as they are often exempt from taking the subject.

70 An exercise in matching nationality and results by the Department of Education and Skills using SEC and post-primary pupil database data for 2008 gave greater numbers of candidates in some cases but not all.
**PISA** data should also reflect the composition of the school population and efforts should be made to ensure that a representative sample of migrant students is included in future studies.

EAL students who have participated in **Transition Year** should be identified. These students’ results in the Leaving Certificate examination should be systematically compared to the results of EAL students who have not participated in Transition Year to determine whether participation in Transition Year improves EAL student performance in the Leaving Certificate examination.

Data on **retention rates** for EAL students should be made available annually and **absenteeism** rates for EAL students should be tracked. This is recommended as drop-out rates for migrants in other EU Member States are relatively high and trends need to be examined in this jurisdiction so that preventative measures can be put in place, if necessary.

EAL students should be identified in the **State Examinations** by ensuring that data on nationality are transferred from the post-primary pupil database to the State Examinations Commission.

Information on the progress of EAL students in English, as monitored by the **Assessment Kit, should be tracked** (as recommended in section 7.2.4).

Consideration should also be given to tracking the rates of **progression** of EAL students **to further and higher education** as a means of assessing their progress vis-à-vis their native English speaking peers.

### 7.6 Findings on Effectiveness

In the introduction to this chapter, the key question to be addressed was whether the programme was meeting its objectives and how efficiently it was doing so.

*Is the Department of Education and Skills effective in supporting and assessing the achievement of the main objective?*

The Department’s decision to weight the provision very strongly in favour of teachers with very limited funds made available for CPD for EAL teachers or the remainder of the teaching cohort or principals appears to create significant difficulties for capacity building. There are also administrative difficulties within schools associated with provision, particularly the division of hours amongst a number of teachers providing EAL support.

The question of assessment has been dealt with extensively. It is clear that, prior to the introduction of the assessment kit, standardised results which could be analysed at national level were not available. Unless the assessment kit is used for all EAL students and the results are made available centrally, this will continue to be the case.

At present EAL support is automatically given for two years (if the criteria in relation to student numbers are met) and support does not necessarily follow need. This is not the best use of available resources.
Chapter 7 – Effectiveness of Expenditure

Does school management effectively support achievement of the main objective?

The answer to this question is generally very positive. There is evidence from the ESRI (Smyth et al., 2009) and the Department’s Inspectorate that schools are coping well and supporting migrants effectively although there are some reservations about the whole school nature of support.

Primary schools seem to be more effective in that they take a whole school perspective and the class teachers engage with the EAL teachers. At post-primary the fragmentation of EAL support amongst a number of teachers can lead to a less coherent service for EAL students. There is less interaction between EAL and subject specialist teachers.

Are teachers and teaching methodologies effective in achieving the main objective?

The majority of migrant students are achieving but a minority are not. Those who are achieving may not be achieving to their full potential. There is not enough data available to have an emphatic view but some data suggest that they need additional support to enable them to gain proficiency in academic English to achieve on a par with their native peers. The evaluation by the Department’s Inspectorate and the research carried out by the OECD (OECD, 2009h) and the ESRI (Smyth et al., 2009) indicate that teacher qualifications in the field of EAL and teaching methodologies should be improved. There is a significant need for CPD and for a post-graduate qualification in EAL, so that teachers can upskill and thereby provide more effective support for their EAL students.

The quality of teaching and learning at primary level has been found, in the main, to be high. There could be more interaction between EAL teachers and class room teachers so that there is planning and collaboration to maximise EAL support. The capacity of both and that of principals and ancillary staff needs to be enhanced if high quality teaching and learning in EAL is to be achieved in all school settings. This requires CPD, sharing of good practice, better use of resources and, in particular, time should be allocated to enable EAL co-ordination to happen between EAL teachers and class/subject specialist teachers.

At post-primary, because of the specialisms and the specialist teachers, there is very little interaction between EAL teachers and specialist teachers, in fact, many specialist teachers do not see language as part of their remit. To provide EAL students with a quality, inclusive and relevant education at post-primary level all teachers must be provided with the CPD to realise that they are not only teachers of mathematics, English or music etc. but that they are also “language in subject” teachers. The Council of Europe (2009a) explains this concept as follows:

The learning of subject-specific knowledge as in physics, geography or mathematics cannot happen without linguistic mediation. It is only possible with the help of appropriate skills of language comprehension and use, which have to be acquired or activated simultaneously with subject learning. Language competence, therefore, is an integral part of subject competence – it is not an additional external element nor is it a luxury which can be ignored.
Such an approach would also heighten their awareness of literacy issues that other native English speaking students may be encountering. This is not within the remit of this review but it must be acknowledged that there are wider curricular links.

In conclusion, most EAL students, based on the limited data available, appear to access the school curriculum successfully. There are, however, significant percentages of “dictionary candidates” who are, for example, not gaining a grade D in physics, chemistry and applied mathematics in the Leaving Certificate Higher Level and their particular educational needs must be considered. Guidance teachers and class teachers have an important role to play in advising students of their options and the appropriate level to sit examinations. Their role is also important in advising students of the significance of subject choice and, particularly, the impact of not studying Irish.

Despite this it would appear that the language support which EAL students are receiving is helping them to access the academic curriculum. However, there is, in some cases, considerable progress to be made before some EAL students access the curriculum on the same basis as their native peers. Schools need to support EAL students in gaining academic language proficiency.

The data used to reach these conclusions, however, come with a number of serious caveats:

1. NAMA/NAER are not specifically designed to test migrant (and EAL subset) performance and accordingly have limitations.
2. The PISA sample probably contained too few migrants (and EAL subset) to be reliable. This needs to be addressed in future surveys.
3. All of the data from the post-primary pupil database on participation in certificate programmes relate to migrants in general and not EAL students (estimated to be 70% of the migrant cohort). This may skew the results and the position of students who do not speak English or Irish as a first language may not emerge clearly. The data need to be collected in a way that enables further disaggregation of migrant students who are also EAL students.
4. The data used here on performance in the State Examinations relate to migrants whose mother tongue is neither Irish nor English; it is based on figures for those who opt to use bilingual dictionaries. However, it is incomplete and does not cover all migrants with EAL needs. Nationality data need to be correlated with SEC results data to determine how EAL students, in particular, are achieving.

Furthermore, there is no link between EAL support and outcomes. It appears that at the very least current support does enable students to gain basic interpersonal communicative skills but more data are require to determine how effectively the students’ academic language proficiency is being developed. At best, it can be assumed that most, but not all, students who do not speak English or Irish will be provided with English language support. Tentatively, it can, therefore be said that the expenditure may be, to an extent, meeting the English language needs of the students it is intended to help judging on the outcomes achieved. Before any definitive conclusion could be drawn, more data linking outcomes to inputs need to be collected and analysed.
Chapter 8 – Performance Indicators for EAL Expenditure

8.1 Introduction

This chapter identifies potential performance indicators that could be used to better monitor the inputs, outputs and outcomes of the expenditure on EAL. This is in line with the term of reference which states that the review shall “Specify potential future performance indicators that might be used to better monitor the performance of the programme”.

Performance measurement and the use of performance indicators have increasingly been highlighted as a vital component of the strategic and operational management of public service organisations with the advent of initiatives such as the Strategic Management Initiative (SMI). As the Department of Finance states, the challenge at the heart of the SMI is to establish a clear link between our day-to-day work as Civil Servants and the impact of our work on society. Performance indicators are the means by which those links can be made. They can tell us what we are contributing as individuals and groups, what benefits we are getting from the resources we use and if those benefits are actually contributing to Ireland’s social and economic progress (Department of Finance 2002).

8.2 Potential Uses of Performance Indicators

Performance indicators can potentially fulfil a range of functions in relation to informing the policy process, promoting accountability of service providers, measuring progress towards goals and objectives, and comparing performance across levels of service.

Before going on to identify potential performance indicators, a number of points should be made. Firstly, it should be kept in mind that performance indicators are not ends in themselves. As the Audit Commission Report (2000, at p 7) states “all users of indicators should remember that indicators do not provide answers as to why differences exist but raise questions and suggest where problems may exist.” Viewing performance indicators in this way has a number of implications.

Firstly, it highlights the fact that performance indicators can be viewed as necessary but not sufficient in that the insights they provide should be used in conjunction with other relevant information and also with managerial inquiry and judgement. This can lead to problems of what weight to give to each element, particularly if they present divergent pictures.

---

71 The general contextual data in the chapter is adapted from chapter 8 of the Value for Money Review of Youthreach and Senior Traveller Training Centre Programmes funded by the Department of Education and Skills.
Secondly, it should lead managers to the recognition that performance indicators should be treated as guidance and not results. Therefore, interpretation is vital, and performance indicators should be developed in such a way as to avoid any possible ambiguity as regards interpretation. It should also be remembered that the above uses of performance indicators are potential uses – in order for performance indicators to fulfil these roles, they must be correctly designed and implemented. The complexity of properly designing and implementing a full set of performance indicators should not be underestimated, and there is no ‘magic formula’ in this regard.

The exercise of completing this review has afforded the Working Group the opportunity to engage in the thinking and analysis needed to produce performance indicators. This has allowed the group to suggest below the “potential performance indicators” which might be used to better monitor the performance of the expenditure to enhance language proficiency for EAL (or Irish) students in primary and post-primary schools.

8.3 Data for Performance Indicators

Performance indicators have not been chosen on the basis of whether the data necessary for them are currently available or not. In many cases, the necessary data are available from sources such as the Allocations and Governance Section, Teacher Education Section, Statistics, the Department’s Inspectorate and the State Examinations Commission. In some cases, the necessary data may not be currently retained or may not be available on an ongoing basis. For example, data that schools provide when seeking EAL support is not retained for the medium to longer term (see chapter 6.12) and some of the data provided by the Inspectorate’s evaluations are not available on an annual basis and so annual monitoring of certain areas is not currently feasible.

For other data, it is a matter of agreement being reached between different sections of the Department where data are required and these data being made available.

The Working Group recommends that data are collected and made available in the future to enable the input, output and outcome data to be monitored and analysed.

8.4 Choosing a Framework for Performance Indicators

A number of authors highlight the importance of employing a balanced framework in developing performance indicators. Boyle (1996, at p 25) states that the value of employing such a framework lies in the fact that “explicit attention is focused on the different dimensions of performance, ensuring that performance indicators are developed not only for inputs and processes/activities, but also for outputs and outcomes.” The importance of capturing performance data in relation to inputs, outputs and outcomes lies in the fact that “public sector programmes are instruments for achieving social goals; they are a means to an end. A complete performance measurement system tracks both the ‘instruments’ themselves and provides evidence of their impact (or lack of it!) on society.” (Schacter 1999, at p1).

Given that the central questions of this review revolve around efficiency and effectiveness, it is reasonable to use these two concepts as the framework for
identifying potential performance indicators. In so doing, the identification of the main inputs, outputs and outcomes which was undertaken through the use of the programme logic model for EAL expenditure serves now to identify the main areas for measurement. In attempting to measure not only the inputs, but also the outputs and the outcomes in this way this review is in line with the concepts underlying recent modernisation initiatives aimed at moving public sector management away from the traditional focus on inputs to concentrate more on the achievement of results.

8.5 Revised Objectives of EAL expenditure

Given that indicators should relate to the achievement of objectives, the objectives of the expenditure should be kept in mind when identifying potential future performance indicators. The proposed objectives for EAL expenditure into the future, based on detailed discussions by the Working Group who took on board research and consultation findings, are set out below. Clearly, these objectives must be achieved as efficiently, effectively and economically as possible and within available resources.

EAL resources are provided to primary and post-primary schools by the Department of Education and Skills:

- to meet the needs of EAL students so that they can
  - acquire the knowledge, skills, understanding, attitude and confidence to become proficient in communicative and academic English (or Irish)
  - participate fully in their educational experience in school (both social and academic) on a par with their peers
  - maintain a connection with their own culture and language through school life.
- to enable the whole school team, including Boards of Management, to build capacity so as to
  - create a quality, relevant, inclusive and respectful school environment for all students, including EAL students and their parents, irrespective of their nationality, language, religion, culture or other differences
  - promote sharing of expertise and good practice
  - engage in CPD that will
    - support the principal, class/subject specialist teachers, EAL teachers and guidance counsellors in meeting the particular needs of their EAL students; and
    - make all teachers aware of the language dimension of their subjects and of their role, among others, as teachers of language.

8.6 Efficiency and Economy Indicators

Based on the findings in chapters 5, 6 and 7 and the likely available data, the main efficiency performance indicators proposed are:

- the number of EAL teacher posts in primary and WTEs in post-primary sectors;
data gathered, compiled, analysed and made available on EAL expenditure within an agreed timeframe;
- the annual total and unit cost per learner of CPD and other supports for school leaders, classroom teachers at primary and subject specialist teachers at post primary and EAL teachers;
- the average total and unit annual cost of provision for EAL learners at primary and at post-primary levels.

8.7 Effectiveness Indicators

Following on from the structure of the discussion on effectiveness in chapter 7, performance indicators can be identified for each element of the revised objectives. Performance indicators in the context of effectiveness are taken from the perspective of the learners and the school staff. Some are annual, others not so frequent. They are:

Learners:
- Percentage of EAL students progressing from levels 0 to A1 to A2 and on to B1 (based on using the assessment tool kit and reported in the annual returns by schools seeking EAL support);
- Achievement of EAL students in the primary maths tests (National Assessment of Mathematical Achievement) and English tests (National Assessment of English Reading) - (periodic, most recent assessments have been in 2004 and 2009, the latter is to be published in 2010);
- Performance of EAL students compared to overall student cohort in studies such as PISA (whenever they happen);
- Comparison of EAL students results in the Junior Certificate and Leaving Certificate compared to their Irish peers and migrant students who are native English speakers (annual);
- Percentage of EAL students who progress from Junior Cycle to Senior Cycle compared to whole school average and from Senior Cycle to Further or Higher Education (annual);
- Numbers of migrants presenting for modern languages, including non-curricular/mother tongue languages in the Leaving Certificate and in Junior Certificate(annual);
- Percentage of EAL students gaining a grade D or higher in Leaving Certificate English (higher and ordinary levels);
- Number of migrant students using bilingual dictionaries in the state examinations (annual);
- Level of satisfaction of students and parents (to be measured by schools in their self-evaluation when looking at the school’s provision and support for students from minority groups" and survey data gathered by the Inspectorate and other groups).

72 “Looking at our school an aid to self-evaluation in second-level schools” published by the Department of Education and Science at page 36 and “Looking at our school an aid to self-evaluation in primary schools” published by the Department of Education and Science at page 36
Whole school teams:
- Percentage of principals, mainstream primary teachers, subject specialist teachers in post-primary, EAL teachers who participate in EAL/ intercultural/ diversity CPD (annual);
- Percentage of EAL teachers who participate in CPD that leads to certification and gaining a recognised EAL qualification (annual);
- Results of Inspectorate’s evaluations which have an EAL focus (when they happen);
- The extent to which the deployment of EAL and other teacher resources and CPD can be said to be building capacity within the school and a whole school commitment to EAL children is clearly evident (WSE inspections).

8.8 Conclusion

This chapter has identified a number of potential performance indicators which may be used to monitor the performance of the programme. In keeping with the central concerns of this review, these indicators have been structured around the key concepts of efficiency and effectiveness.
Chapter 9 – Conclusions, Recommendations and Implementation

9.1 Introduction

As outlined in chapter 2, the demographic context has changed considerably between 2000 and 2009. The changing economic circumstances since autumn 2008 mean that inward migration has slowed considerably. The 2006 census shows that the Irish migrant population stands at about 10%. This is more or less consistent with migrant populations in other western European countries. There is little evidence that it should decline significantly in the future. A significant increase is also unlikely based on currently available data.

Based on all available data, it is predicted that migrant students will be a key group within Irish primary and post-primary schools into the future. Approximately 30% will not require EAL support because they speak English as their mother tongue. About 70% of migrant students will require language support. It is important to emphasise that, into the future, migrant children born in Ireland, may not necessarily be proficient in English when they start school.

Migrant students bring with them their cultures, their languages, different religions and different ways of thinking. To cater for their needs it is important that all schools have a positive school climate with an inclusive approach which recognises the opportunity which a diverse school population brings and promotes an intercultural and inclusive school environment (as outlined in chapter 7.3). It is worth remembering, however, that schools do not operate in a vacuum. The values of the wider community have an effect on life in schools and they need the support of society at large in achieving their integration aims.

From a Department of Education and Skills administrative perspective, the current approach to EAL support has some drawbacks. The programme of expenditure developed in an ad hoc manner from a time when there were relatively few migrants in the system. It is argued that this approach is not suitable for a system where up to 10% of the school population may be migrants. Until recently, there was no formal tool in place to track the improvements students made in English through language support or their longer term progression through the education system. Although the primary and post-primary language assessment kits are now available, their use is not compulsory and the results are not recorded centrally.

There is no systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of EAL support. Resources are concentrated on providing EAL teachers and not on whole school capacity building which would enable all staff to have the opportunity to upskill and become key players in enabling their students to improve their language proficiency. Only providing dedicated EAL teachers is not sufficient. Classroom/subject teachers have an equally important role to play in supporting students in their acquisition of the level of conversational and academic English needed to access the curriculum on a par with their native peers.
In summary, continuing expenditure on EAL on the current model is neither efficient nor effective. The current approach was developed in response to a limited need at a particular point in time. The scaling up of the original intervention over the last 8 to 9 years (from about €10m to €140m) expanded what had been an initial ad hoc solution to a systemic solution. It is suggested that the current model no longer provides the most appropriate means to achieve the identified public policy objectives.

This chapter sets out the key overarching recommendations for an alternative approach based on the findings and the detailed recommendations outlined throughout the document and in line with the revised objectives set out in chapter 8.

### 9.2 Key Recommendations

The rationale for each of these recommendations is set out in section 9.3. This section gives the recommendations in summary form and indicates where more detailed recommendations can be found throughout the report. **To meet the needs of EAL students and to enable the whole school to build capacity, the following measures are recommended.**

**Recommendations for the Department of Education and Skills and Bodies under its Aegis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Relevant Background Chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> EAL allocation models at primary and post-primary levels should be reviewed to develop a more efficient and effective mechanism which reflects the differing needs of each sector and provides support to EAL students based on their assessed language needs (using the Assessment Kit).</td>
<td>Chapters 5 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> To allow for the building of whole school capacity on EAL and integration, EAL expenditure should be apportioned differently with a higher proportion of available funding allocated to CPD, not just for EAL teachers, but for all teachers, including guidance counsellors, and principals.</td>
<td>Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> The Department should issue guidelines on best practice for schools in supporting EAL students.</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Data should be available to provide evidence for the monitoring and analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of EAL expenditure and for regular research as to the performance of EAL students. The Inspectorate of the Department should continue to conduct evaluations of EAL provision, teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Chapters 6 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Post-graduate qualifications for EAL teaching should be identified.</td>
<td>Chapters 4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Initial teacher education should prepare teachers to work with a diverse student population, not all of whom will speak English (or Irish) as a mother tongue.</td>
<td>Chapters 4, 5 and 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations for Schools and Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Relevant Background Chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Schools, including their Boards of Management, should ensure, through the self-evaluation process, that a whole-school approach is adopted to create a positive school environment where all students, including migrants, can participate fully in their educational experience (both social and academic).</td>
<td>Chapters 4, 5 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assessment, both formative and summative, in EAL teaching and learning must be prioritised. The use of the Assessment Kit will provide information on whether EAL students are acquiring the knowledge, skills, understanding, attitude and confidence to become proficient in communicative and academic English (or Irish).</td>
<td>Chapters 4, 5 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers (of EAL, in particular) should give due cognisance to the importance of mother tongue. Migrant students should be encouraged to maintain a connection with their mother culture/language as enhancing their mother tongue proficiency also enhances their competence in English.</td>
<td>Chapters 4 and 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.3 Rationale for Recommendations

9.3.1 The Department and Bodies under its Aegis

Recommendation 1: Allocation Models

EAL allocation models at primary and post-primary levels should be reviewed to develop a more efficient and effective mechanism which reflects the differing needs of each sector and provides support to EAL students based on their assessed language needs (using the Assessment Kit).

This review, particularly in the context of the Inspectorate’s evaluation (chapter 5), finds that models of allocation and consequent deployment, particularly at post-primary, are not working well for EAL students. It is recommended that existing allocation models should be reviewed to address the problems identified, in particular, in chapter 5 of this report and that allocation should be based on identified language need.

The Inspectorate emphasised that financial considerations had been a significant consideration under previous allocation models. For example, the allocation model under circular M53/07 “did not lead to uniform good practice because it was in many ways a move made in isolation, preceding the availability of adequate CPD, assessment instruments and teaching materials, particularly in the post-primary sector”(chapter 5.2.2). The Inspectorate emphasised that “educational and pedagogical considerations...should henceforth inform the prudent allocation of
resources and the future direction of the Department’s EAL policy.” At post-primary level, for example, the Inspectorate underlined that the needs of certain senior cycle EAL students may be “acute given the curricular and examination challenges they face” (chapter 5.B 1.1). Recommendation 4 A below sets out what data should be collected (in relation to EAL) to support this review process and any future revised allocation models.

**Recommendation 2: Apportionment of EAL Expenditure**

To allow for the building of whole school capacity on EAL and integration, EAL expenditure should be apportioned differently with a higher proportion of available funding allocated to CPD, not just for EAL teachers, but for all teachers, including guidance counsellors, and principals.

A. Provision of CPD

This review demonstrated a serious deficit in availability of CPD for all school staff. Currently, the division of expenditure for EAL is of the order of 99% for EAL teaching posts in primary or whole time equivalent posts in post-primary, 0.7% for CPD and 0.3% for other costs. These findings are supported by the OECD findings (see chapter 4.2.3.B).

It is proposed that available funding should be apportioned differently, with more of the available funding allocated to CPD. This recommendation arises as very few teachers in the system have studied EAL either in initial teacher education or through CPD. EAL and the ensuing integration and interculturalism have become integral to life in Ireland over the past decade, and are now also an integral part of school life in the majority of schools.

EAL expenditure needs to include, therefore, not only EAL teachers but should also be used to enhance the whole school team’s capacity to cater for the language needs of EAL students. This takes the Council of Europe approach of “language as subject” as well as “language in subject”. Proficiency in English will assist EAL students, migrant students and Irish students to create an inclusive and respectful environment. If all staff are skilled as appropriate in this area, then, that will support EAL students in accessing the full curriculum in the most effective way possible.

Future CPD provision should be informed by the following principles. It should:

1. Directly support schools as learning organisations by helping them to build internal capacity to deliver effective EAL provision;
2. Include collaboration and on the job CPD for experienced teachers;
3. Be delivered through efficient structures that do not carry high administrative costs yet are effective and high quality;
4. Make optimal use of online access and digital media to disseminate good practice;
5. Not erode class contact time;
6. Not rely on substitution and supervision.

These principles are to be borne in mind when considering the recommendations below in relation to CPD and also in the implementation provisions in section 9.4.

Capacity is best enhanced through the provision of CPD for:

1. Principals, as school and curriculum leaders to provide them with an understanding of the needs of their EAL students;

2. In-school management teams to enable them to
   a. extend their roles with regard to the management of students to encompass the specific needs of EAL students;
   b. discharge particular responsibilities they may have with regard to the pastoral care of students, including EAL students
   c. co-ordinate the range of supports to EAL students in schools with very large numbers of EAL students

3. EAL teachers to enable them to
   a. co-ordinate the EAL and intercultural agenda in the school in co-operation with other staff
   b. take a lead in meeting the specialist language and socialisation needs of their EAL students; and
   c. interact with classroom/specialist teachers and guidance teachers to strengthen and maximise the benefit of EAL provision

4. All classroom teachers at primary and subject specialist teachers at post-primary to
   a. ensure that they are aware of their role in the language acquisition of their EAL students,
   b. interact with the EAL teachers to maximise the benefit for the EAL students seeking to maximise their proficiency in EAL
   c. enable them to respond to increased diversity in the school.

5. Boards of Management so that they understand the needs of EAL students and include them in whole school planning etc.

B. When can CPD happen?

The principles set out above provide that CPD should not erode class contact time. Nor should it rely on substitution. Money spent on supervision and substitution must be minimised so that these funds can be made available for CPD.

One model which facilitates the provision of whole school CPD in a more efficient and effective manner is the provision of “directed time” in Northern Ireland. This allows official school time to be spent on CPD, on co-ordination, collaboration and team planning, as well as teaching. In Northern Ireland:
“The position is that a teacher is under a contractual obligation to be available for work on 195 days a year and to be available to perform such duties at such times and places as may be reasonably specified by the principal for 1265 hours in any year, exclusive of time spent off school premises in preparing and marking lessons and time spent travelling to and from the place of work.”

This approach assists in creating a climate of evaluation, collaboration and team teaching as the norm, not just in EAL, but in all aspects of school life. It minimises disruption in school life when compared to our current model where teachers are usually absent from their classes when they attend CPD. Such an approach would enhance CPD as a normal part of in-school activities and could also involve the development of local school cluster networks.

It is recognised that the current arrangements are unsatisfactory. Towards 2016 (Part 2, section 31) deals with the question as follows:

“31.19 A particular issue of concern has been the disruption caused in schools by the delivery of in-service training during normal school time in the context of the needs of an individual school or in order to respond to the upskilling required arising from curriculum/syllabus change. In this context the parties have identified alternative means by which such training could be delivered that would reduce the impact on tuition time.

31.20 The parties have agreed to explore how any implications of such changes might be accommodated with particular regard to the upcoming work of the Public Service Benchmarking Body and the operation of this national agreement generally.”

The question is also addressed in the context of the Report of the Special Group on Public Service Numbers and Expenditure Programmes (also known as the McCarthy report). The report states that:

“A basic requirement of any revised contract for teachers would be that the total statutory working time be sufficiently increased to provide for activities such as school planning, parent teacher meetings, in-service training and development, supervision of students and middle-management duties where and when appropriate as defined by school management. This increased time would be subject to management scrutiny.” (Department of Finance, 2009, Volume 2 at page 63)

The report added:

“In particular, activities such as in-service training and school planning should be routinely scheduled so as not to erode school teaching time…” (Department of Finance, 2009, Volume 2 at page 63)

---

C. ELSTA

The English Language Support Teachers’ Association (ELSTA) should continue to be funded as an association which promotes the networking of professionals, provides support to teachers and an opportunity to share best practice outside of normal school hours and contracted time. It enables EAL teachers, in particular, to widen their expertise through attendance at conferences/seminars where key note speakers can provide up to date advice and guidance. Such expertise could be brought back to the school and shared with their colleagues. Mainstream class teachers and subject specialist teachers could also be attracted to ELSTA activities with programmes provided which relate to their needs and which stress the role of “language in subject”.

**Recommendation 3: Guidelines on EAL Provision and on Creating an Inclusive Intercultural School Environment**

*The Department should issue guidelines on best practice for schools in supporting EAL students.*

Arising from the Inspectorate’s evaluation of the quality of teaching and learning of EAL in schools, it is recommended that the Department should develop and publish guidelines on best practice in the area. These guidelines would provide advice to schools on co-ordination, effective management, the appropriate deployment of the resource provided, teaching methodologies (for both mainstream and EAL teachers), the appropriate use of language support, summative and formative assessment of proficiency, co-ordination across the school, planned programme delivery and developing learning plans, as well as exemplars of best practice. They would also outline the key role which guidance counsellors have to play in advising EAL students on many aspects of post-primary subject choices and the future consequences of such choices.

Such guidelines could be developed in a partnership between the Inspectorate, the NCCA and the Inclusion and Diversity Service, Northern Ireland. Such a North-South model would allow for sharing of best practice in an area of curricular interest to both jurisdictions.

**Recommendation 4: Monitoring, Analysis and Evaluation**

*Data should be available to provide evidence for the monitoring and analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of EAL expenditure and for regular research as to the performance of EAL students. The Inspectorate of the Department should continue to conduct evaluations of EAL provision, teaching and learning.*
A. EAL Teacher Allocation

A review of teacher allocation models has already been recommended. The recommendations below are in addition to that recommendation and supplement and support it.

The criteria for allocating teaching support posts/hours at primary and post-primary levels should be continually monitored to reflect the evolving needs of EAL students. The current practice at post-primary level of fragmenting available EAL hours between a number of teachers is not to be recommended. Deployment should be more focused.

At both levels, increased whole school EAL CPD will lead to enhanced capacity for all teachers. At post-primary level, it will enable mainstream teachers to fulfil their responsibilities as language in subject teachers for EAL students within their own curricular areas.

When planning future allocation criteria for language support posts/hours, the Department should use enrolment trends and known numbers/demographic trends. Data on EAL provision for students transferring from primary to post-primary should be available to assist in planning and allocations in the post-primary sector.

Schools should be required to use the assessment tool kits to carry out initial and ongoing formative assessment to monitor students’ proficiency in all four aspects of language. The two year limit, with some exceptions for three years, should be the norm in the primary sector. For those EAL students who arrive in Ireland at the end of primary education (e.g. in 5th or 6th class) or at any point during second level, it should be their proficiency levels that determine EAL resource provision, not a two/three year time limit. Their academic proficiency in particular, as well as their communicative proficiency, needs to be continually monitored. They need to have level B1\(^{74}\) proficiency to engage successfully with the post-primary curriculum. Evidence of progress should be collected and provided to the Department annually and on request. This approach should ensure that fewer EAL students are failing in the certificate examinations. This approach is strongly supported by the OECD, see chapter 4.2.3.B.

B. Learner Database

There is a pressing need for the proper collation of information on migrant students, so that their progress can be monitored. This will ensure that they are receiving the support they require, and that they are progressing on a par with their Irish peers. Again, this approach is strongly supported by the OECD, see chapter 4.2.3.B.

The following data should be recorded and stored in accessible, electronic format, for both primary and post-primary pupils:

\(^{74}\) As per the Council of Europe Common European Framework of Language, Council of Europe, 2001.
Name, date of birth, enrolment date in school, country of origin, years of school abroad and here in Ireland, year of arrival in Ireland, class in which enrolled, (English/Irish) language proficiency (based on evidence from assessment evaluations from the assessment tool kits), home language and any previous support received (in addition, the school programme code should be sought for post-primary).

For both primary and post-primary students, data, such as that now available on the post-primary pupil database, should be available. The information on the database should capture nationality, country of birth and home language to ensure that EAL students can be readily identified.

While the primary census provides data on a general system level, it does not provide the individual data which is necessary to assess the progress of EAL students who have benefited from language support and to analyse that data in aggregated format.

C. Outcome Data and Research

Data on achievements in the State examinations should provide anonymised information on how well EAL students of different nationalities achieve. This would assist with the evaluation of the outcomes of EAL expenditure and allow for more targeted intervention in future, if appropriate. This is also highlighted as an area for possible action by the OECD (see chapter 4.2.3.B).

In future surveys, e.g. NAMA, NAER and PISA etc, the sample should, insofar as possible and practicable, include a sufficient cohort of migrant and EAL students to allow their performance to be assessed vis-à-vis their native peers.

Arrangements should be made to monitor the progression of migrant and EAL students to third level and post-leaving certificate courses. Drop-out rates for EAL students should also be monitored.

In this way, it should be possible to monitor and evaluate whether the EAL support received by students is having its intended effect, namely, allowing students to access the curriculum on a par with their native peers.

D. Inspectorate

Despite past evaluation of teaching and learning provision in schools there had been no systematic inspection or overview of schools’ assessments of their EAL students’ abilities or their approach to this assessment until 2008.

The Department’s Inspectorate should continue to include EAL in its evaluations. This will assess the quality of teaching and learning of EAL in a school, and examine how the school incorporates EAL and EAL students into the life of the school.

Recommendation 5: EAL Qualification

Post-graduate qualifications for EAL teaching should be identified
Primary school teachers are qualified to teach English and Irish as part of a broad and balanced curriculum. Therefore, they have knowledge, understanding and skills related to language teaching. Most primary teachers have not followed courses specifically on EAL teaching and learning.

Post-primary teachers are qualified to teach specialist areas, e.g. music, chemistry, English. Most post-primary teachers, other than language specialists, would rarely have an understanding of the part which their teaching plays in upskilling EAL students or of their significant support role in relation to “language” in their subject.

Many teachers who are teaching EAL have a qualification in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) or TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). These qualifications are not sufficient to provide them with the knowledge, skills and understanding to enable their students to acquire academic language proficiency in English or Irish, which is required if they are to fully access the curriculum (particularly at second-level). TEFL and TESOL concentrate on communicative/conversational language.

The Teaching Council Act, 2001, provides that "The Council shall promote the continuing education and training and professional development of teachers". This section of the Teaching Council Act 2001 has not yet been commenced but is being considered in the context of the Council’s drafting of its Policy on the Continuum of Education. In the future, it is possible that the Teaching Council, like other similar professional bodies, may consider requiring that a minimum amount of CPD is completed prior to renewal of registration for teachers throughout their career.

In a context where many teachers have no academic qualifications in EAL and where the Teaching Council may in the future require CPD, there is a clear need for a formally recognised post-graduate qualification in EAL which would give teachers an opportunity to upskill themselves in this field. The Department of Education and Skills should consider formally recognising appropriate EAL post-graduate qualifications.

**Recommendation 6: Initial Teacher Education**

*Initial teacher education should prepare teachers to work with a diverse student population, not all of whom will speak English (or Irish) as a mother tongue.*

Initial teacher education should provide graduates with the knowledge, understanding, skills and attitudes to enable them to cater for the language needs of the EAL student in the subject specific/mainstream classroom as well as creating an inclusive and intercultural environment.

Recently qualified teachers are more likely to have completed some studies in this area as initial teacher education providers are incorporating courses on the topic, in response to Ireland’s changing demographics. This trend should be supported and promoted. The work of the Teaching Council, as outlined below, will facilitate this.
The Teaching Council has a statutory role in relation to the review of standards required for entry into the teaching profession, including the standards of knowledge, skill and competence required for the practice of teaching. The Teaching Council has begun its work in relation to this review and is preparing a Strategy for the Review and Accreditation of Programmes of Initial Teacher Education.

The review of initial teacher education will be informed by the need for all teachers to be able to respond to the increasingly diverse backgrounds of students. When the review of teacher education programmes in all relevant third level institutions is complete, the nature and extent of specific training provision for student teachers in this area will be much clearer.

The Teaching Council indicated that

“it intends to address the issue of teaching in a multicultural environment in its review of initial teacher education. This will require an explicit emphasis on ensuring that newly qualified teachers learn a culturally responsive pedagogy, using and building upon immigrant students’ previous experiences and knowledge, understanding the different social and educational experiences of immigrant students, and learning how to work with their families and communities” (OECD, 2009h at p 45)

9.3.2 Schools

**Recommendation 7: Whole school approach to creating a positive climate**

*Schools, including their Boards of Management, should ensure, through the self-evaluation process, that a whole-school approach is adopted to create a positive school environment where all students, including migrants, can participate fully in their educational experience (both social and academic).*

The report findings show that a whole school approach was clearly always one of the objectives of language support expenditure.

The ESRI report, *Adapting to Diversity: Irish Schools and Newcomer Students* (Smyth et al, 2009), outlines that several factors are required to combine to create a positive school climate, which impacts on students’ academic and social outcomes. A whole-school approach is necessary to create such a climate, with all staff having a role to play and school management in particular taking a proactive leadership role. Such an approach also entails working closely with parents to ensure the best possible outcomes for their children.

In relation to EAL students, it is essential that the EAL team co-ordinates and plans its work with classroom and subject specialist teachers and disseminates information and best practice throughout the school.

Responsibility for planning does not lie solely with EAL teachers. Learning and teaching plans, fully based on assessment, must be compiled in conjunction with mainstream class/subject teachers. Their aim is to increase EAL proficiency and
enhance social integration. Such collaboration must be an integral part of whole school planning. This can be particularly difficult at post-primary where the EAL teacher needs to interact with a number of subject specialist teachers.

Withdrawal should be kept to a minimum, and if it occurs, it must be properly scheduled and linked to mainstream classroom support and the needs of the particular student. It is often the case that withdrawal takes place when Irish is being taught; students need to be made aware by guidance counsellors of the consequences for third level education options of not studying Irish.

**Recommendation 8: Assessment**

*Assessment, both formative and summative, in EAL teaching and learning must be prioritised. It will provide information on whether EAL students are acquiring the knowledge, skills, understanding, attitude and confidence to become proficient in communicative and academic English (or Irish).*

The findings of the OECD review team, as outlined in chapter 4.2.3.B, and the findings of the Inspectorate, as outlined in chapter 5, both emphasise the importance of formative and summative assessment. For example at primary level, it was found that effective learning occurs where “[p]upils’ individual language programmes are based on their assessed competences in the four language skills” (chapter 5A 4.4). At post-primary level, the Inspectorate indicated that good practice is found where “[a]ssessment outcomes are used to inform appropriate progression to and within mainstream [and] [s]tudents’ progress is recorded systematically” (chapter 5B 3.3)

In-school management should ensure that the linguistic proficiency of EAL students is assessed formatively and summatively. The assessment should be such as to determine and record each EAL student’s proficiency in all four language aspects. The Assessment Toolkits for both primary and post-primary should provide the necessary advice and guidance to achieve this. The proposed use of the Assessment Kit for all EAL students from September 2010 should provide data for evaluation in relation to appeals to the Department of Education and Skills. A circular should issue in 2010 to update the provisions of 15/09, to underline this aspect of whole-school provision and to stipulate that the Assessment Kit should be used for all EAL students to show their EAL proficiency and, over time, to record their progression.

**Recommendation 9: Mother Tongue**

*Teachers (of EAL, in particular) should give due cognisance to the importance of mother tongue. Newcomer students should be encouraged to maintain a connection with their mother culture/language as enhancing their mother tongue proficiency also enhances their competence in English.*

---

75 Schools will need to record this information in any event to obtain their EAL allocation for the following year.
It is necessary that students become proficient in the language of instruction to participate fully in the Irish primary and post-primary curriculum. Migrant students should, at the same time, maintain a link with their mother tongue and culture. Whilst schools can encourage interculturalism and the use of home languages in the classroom, students encouraged by their parents and their community, must recognise their responsibilities in this regard. There is evidence that achieving proficiency in mother tongue should also enhance their overall achievement in English and/or Irish (see chapter 5B 2.1).

Interculturalism should be developed as a normal part of daily school life. Peer tutoring/interaction through the use of their mother tongue should be encouraged.

All students should engage with school staff to help increase their understanding of different cultures, and see how these can be incorporated in daily school life and teaching.

Migrant students, who comply with requirements such as nationality, mother tongue etc., should be encouraged also to sit Leaving Certificate non-curricular language examinations, where appropriate. EAL students should be made aware of, and trained in the use of bi-lingual dictionaries, to take advantage of the State Examinations Commission’s “reasonable accommodation” in relation to use of these dictionaries. This should help to enhance their overall achievement levels in the State examinations.

9.4 Implementation of the Recommendations

9.4.1 Preparatory phase – Short Term

The EAL allocation for schools for 2009/2010 is outlined in Circular M15/09. The proposed CPD arrangements for 09/10 are somewhat similar to those pertaining in 08/09 but are more limited.

A new circular should issue to schools outlining revised provision arrangements. As set out under recommendation 8 above, any EAL teacher allocation in the future should be directly linked to the assessed and documented EAL needs of a particular student based on assessments made on students using the primary and post-primary Assessment Kits. These data should be available to the Department as they will provide guidance on the progress being made by EAL students and on the efficiency and effectiveness of the expenditure dedicated to this area in the future.

To prepare schools to implement the recommendations of this review, the Inspectorate has recommended that it is necessary to develop guidelines (Recommendation 3). These guidelines should be developed jointly by the Inspectorate and the NCCA with a steering committee of experts including colleagues from Northern Ireland. An EAL expert should be engaged to lead the development of the guidelines as soon as possible.

The cost for development of the guidelines would be €50,000 - €70,000 for the development of the Guidelines.
9.4.2 Intensive phase – Medium Term - Year One and Year Two

A programme of CPD should be provided in line with the principles outlined in recommendation 2.

One possible model for this is set out in Appendix 14. This model could be planned in two phases – a two year intensive phase to be followed by a maintenance phase as is the practice currently in relation to the introduction or revision of curricula at both primary and post-primary. Clearly, the most appropriate approach will need to be determined based on current best practice and existing resources within the Department.

A. What would CPD address?

The programme of support should focus not only on the needs of teachers of EAL but also on those of the mainstream classroom teacher. In addition the programme should address the needs of others such as school leaders, guidance counsellors and Boards of Management.

The aim should be to adopt a whole school approach to EAL provision. This would enhance and continue to build EAL capacity in schools, not only for EAL teachers but, in particular, for principals and mainstream teachers. All programmes of CPD should promote a whole school approach to EAL provision. These should also underline the role and responsibilities of school leaders and the mainstream classroom teacher. All programmes of CPD in this area should be designed to support capacity building within the staff.

Funding for this phase would not be available from the general budget for CPD due to budgetary constraints. It is proposed that the CPD and other requirements be funded from monies currently allocated to the provision of EAL teachers. This means that to fund this CPD, EAL teaching posts will have to be reduced and the savings from this “ring fenced” for use in EAL CPD related measures outlined below. A table showing estimated costings for the measures is set out at 9.4.2 G below.

B. When could it happen?

If the principles that CPD should not erode class contact time or rely on substitution are maintained then, mainstream teachers would participate in CPD programmes during official school time but not during class contact time.

If all circa 28,000 primary teachers and 26,000 post-primary teachers received substitution costs for one day’s CPD, the cost would be of the order of €12.4m over the two year period. Such use of funding is not efficient. Changing this would require a change in teacher contracts which would provide principals with timetabled periods for planning meetings, CPD etc.

It is possible that, under current arrangements, CPD in EAL, could be provided during whole staff CPD days in schools. In this case substitution costs would not be paid.
This could, however, erode class contact time (for example, students might be given a half day while teachers received CPD in schools).

C. Post-graduate EAL Qualifications

The Department of Education and Skills could tender for the development and provision of a suitable post-graduate qualification in EAL for existing teachers. Given the range of existing courses, this might not be the most economical model.

A better potential model might be for colleges to charge a reduced rate to teachers on courses recognised for this purpose by the Department, with the Department covering the balance of the fees in a payment to the college. The level of fees and rate of subvention would be established through a competitive tender to ensure best value for money for the Department. This could cost of the order of €50,000 per annum.

Such a qualification could combine direct class teaching and on-line teaching.

D. Review

During the two year intensive period, the expenditure should be reviewed to monitor outcomes (using the improved data made available on foot of the recommendations in this review), to consider capacity and to determine the future need for significant numbers of EAL teachers. The Inspectorate will need to continue its focus on EAL and make recommendations on the appropriateness of EAL provision building on the work already carried out and discussed in detail in chapter 5. In view of the fact that schools with fewer EAL students (in particular, no schools with fewer than 14 students were evaluated) were not included in the Inspectorate’s sample of schools for the evaluation in chapter 5, this may be an appropriate area for consideration in future.

E. Research

A fund should be made available to allow for assessing the performance of EAL students, using the school reports on EAL students based on the assessment kits, and to monitor their progress in EAL, in the State examinations and also in international and national research and tests (e.g. PISA, NAER). Their results should be compared to their native peers and benchmarked to international best standards.

It is proposed that €100,000 should be made available for this work every three years. This would give a longitudinal perspective of migrant students and incorporate not just first generation but, as time goes on, increasing numbers of second generation students. Data will need to differentiate between first and second generation students.

F. ELSTA

The English Language Support Teachers’ Professional Network which provides professional peer development to members should continue to be funded. The current cost of this for 09/10 is €7,500 towards the cost of the national executive and €15,000 for activities.

G. Costings

Chapter 9 – Conclusions, Recommendations and Implementation
These costings are based on the CPD model set out in Appendix 14. They are included to give an indicative figure for costs associated with CPD using the model applied in 08/09.

Table 9.1 - Proposed Costs for Medium Term – Intensive CPD (other than EAL Teacher Salary Costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Full Time Professional Development Staff for two years</td>
<td>€3,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Associates for two years (at 20 days maximum per year)</td>
<td>€671,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution costs for 500 EAL teachers undertaking CPD for a period of 4 days*</td>
<td>€460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Facilitators for 2 years (at 3 days maximum per year)</td>
<td>€201,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Teachers studying for an EAL Qualification over two years</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar costs for 320 (seminars of 25 people - 4 seminars for each of the 1,500 EAL teachers)</td>
<td>€51,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for ELSTA over two years</td>
<td>€45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>€4,909,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Substitution costs are not paid at primary level as EAL teachers are not mainstream class teachers

If EAL teacher were to be suppressed to fund CPD. EAL teacher numbers would need to be reduced by approximately 80 – 85 to fund this model. This assumes that the average EAL teacher costs of the order of €60,000.

This model also assumes that whole school seminars will be provided for mainstream class teachers and no substitution will be required for these teachers. One day’s substitution costs for all teachers in the country would amount to €12.4 million and to cover this cost from existing resources would involve a further reduction of more than 200 EAL teachers.

Note that these costs represent about 5% of current costs for EAL support (approximately €100 million for 09/10). Experience in Northern Ireland and Scotland might suggest that it would be more appropriate to set aside up to 10 or 15 percent of expenditure for CPD with the subsequent future reduction of EAL teachers.

9.4.3 Maintenance Phase – Long Term - Year Three Onwards – Impact on Teacher Numbers

A possible model for this phase is outlined in Appendix 14. The aim of the intensive phase is to enhance whole school capacity to address the EAL needs of EAL students. The maintenance phase would aim to provide ongoing support to teachers and schools at a significantly lower level.

It would be expected that the numbers of EAL teachers should decrease as mainstream teacher knowledge, skills and understanding of EAL increase. The
The current model is a recommended preferred model where EAL is supported by class/subject specialist teachers who understand their role in language learning within the mainstream classroom or within their subject. However, there has been a significant reduction in numbers of EAL teachers for the 2009/10 school year. Future reductions in numbers are a matter for consideration in the context of the annual budget and based on the outcomes of the whole school capacity building process.

It is also expected that there may be different requirement for primary and post-primary and as, set out in recommendation 1; the allocation models for both levels need to be reviewed separately.

Information from the CSO (CSO, 200b) shows that the numbers of new migrants arriving in Ireland are falling (57,000 to April 2009) but also that minimal numbers (1,200) of those aged under 15 are emigrating. This combined with the birth rate to non-Irish mothers (see chapter 3.3) indicates that there are likely to be significant numbers of EAL students in the Irish education system into the future. It is true that the longer EAL students are in the system, the more their proficiency in English should increase. Their need for EAL support should therefore decrease but it is imperative that they are given support so that their language proficiency is achieved not only in communicative language but also in academic language.

**9.5 Summary**

This chapter draws together the conclusions from this review and makes recommendations and suggestions for their implementation. As Ireland has moved from a relatively homogenous population to a much more diverse one, the education system needs to support schools in developing provision which meets the needs of all students whatever their background. The measures outlined in this chapter suggest how to reposition available resources to meet their language needs. The Intercultural Education Strategy will address not only the importance of proficiency in English or Irish whichever is the language of instruction but also the importance of creating a whole school ethos which is inclusive, integrated and intercultural.

Schools are the starting point for the society of the future. The State can and should support schools in dealing with the challenges which may arise with a newly diverse school cohort. It must also support schools in recognising the opportunities which this new cohort presents to a population which has been largely monolingual and where diversity often had to be sought out abroad rather than found on the doorstep. A multicultural and intercultural society must be seen as a resource rather than a problem.

This review looks at how we spend the resources available to support the English language needs of migrant students. It suggests diverting existing resources to areas of greatest need with a view to improving whole school capacity and it recommends ongoing analysis and review with appropriate data. All the indications are that diversity will continue to be a feature of life in Irish schools, the challenge for policy makers is to help to ensure that the opportunities it presents are fully realised.

---

76 At drafting stage at the time of writing.
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Appendix 1 - List of Expenditure Review Initiatives Carried Out/Being Carried Out by the Department of Education and Skills

Completed reviews

Review of the Small Schools Scheme and the Permanent Accommodation Scheme
Review of the Supply Teacher Scheme for Primary Schools
Review of the ICT Undergraduate Skills Programme
Review of Youth Encounter Projects
Review of ICT Support Services for Schools.
Review of Programmes managed by the Teacher Education Section
Review of Youthreach and Senior Traveller Training Centres

Ongoing reviews

Review of the Summer Works Scheme
Review of School Insurance Arrangements
Review of Expenditure on the education of persons who do not have English or Irish as a first language
Review of Special Needs Assistants
Review of Grants to 1st and 2nd level schools (deferred as per agreement with Department of Finance)
Review of School Transport
Appendix 2 - Membership of the Working Group of this Value for Money Review

Breda Naughton, Integration Unit, Chair
Gary Hynds, Department of Finance (replaced by Ciarán Butler, Department of Finance, replaced by John Coughlan from September 2009)
Harold Hislop, Inspectorate (replaced by Gary O’Donnchadha, Inspectorate)
Kate O’Carroll, Inspectorate
Carmel O’Doherty, Inspectorate
Breeda Connaughton, Central Policy Unit
Lynda O’Toole, Teacher Education Section
Nicola Tickner, Statistics Section
Anne O’Mahony, Integration Unit
Sarah Miley, Integration Unit
Hubert Loftus/Josephine O’Connor, School Allocations
Anne Killian (replaced by Hubert Loftus following restructuring of Schools Division)

Independent Assessor: Raymond Burke
Appendix 3 - Data available from PPPDB

- Name, address, nationality etc.
- Date of birth
- Programme Code e.g. junior or senior cycle,
- Programme Year e.g. 1st, 5th, transition etc.
- Date of entry into post-primary education,
- Source e.g. from existing primary school or other source (Post-Primary School; Primary School; Private Preparatory; Northern Ireland; Outside Ireland; Other Source; Non-recognised Second Level School)
- Subjects and levels being studied
- Any previous primary or post-primary school,
- Examination entrants,
- Repeats,
- Exemptions,
- ESF locations and sources depending on which Programme student is following.
Appendix 4 - Glossary

Asylum seekers: Refers to those who are seeking asylum in Ireland and who are catered for in direct provision centres.

Immigrants: The OECD uses this term to refer to first generation migrants.

International students: A term commonly used in third level; usually to refer to students who have come from abroad to study in Ireland but intend to return to their countries of origin on completion of their studies. It also increasingly frequently used in second level schools to refer to students from non-Irish backgrounds.

Migrants: The OECD uses this term to include second generation migrants.

Non-nationals: This term was formerly frequently used but is now unpopular as it implies that migrants do not have a nationality.

Non-Irish nationals: This term refers to those who declared a nationality other than Irish in response to the 2006 Census question: “What is your nationality?”

Refugees: Those who have been granted refugee status in Ireland either through a successful asylum request or through a refugee resettlement programme.
Appendix 5 - Circular M53/07

(Objectives of the initiative are highlighted in the text)

CIRCULAR 0053/2007

TO: THE MANAGERIAL AUTHORITIES OF PRIMARY, SECONDARY, COMMUNITY AND COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS AND TO THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION COMMITTEES

MEETING THE NEEDS OF PUPILS FOR WHOM ENGLISH IS A SECOND LANGUAGE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Circular is to assist schools in providing an inclusive school environment to meet the needs of pupils for whom English is a second language and outline the resources that are available to assist schools in this task.

CREATING AN INCLUSIVE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

An inclusive school environment reflects values and affirms linguistic, ethnic and cultural, diversity. It is important that schools have policies and procedures in place that promote and facilitate the inclusion of all children. The school’s commitment to creating an inclusive school environment should be evident in the school plan, the promotion of parental involvement, the provision of equality of curriculum access, the facilitation of professional development opportunities and in whole-school and classroom practice. Pupils should also be encouraged and facilitated in maintaining a connection with their own culture and language through curricular activities and displays.

THE ROLE OF THE LANGUAGE SUPPORT TEACHER

Language support teachers are appointed to assist schools in providing additional language support teaching for pupils. In collaboration with parents and class teachers, language support teachers identify pupils requiring additional support, administer the assessment materials developed by Integrate Ireland Language and Training, devise appropriate language programmes, deliver the programmes and record and monitor pupils’ progress. It is important that expertise is shared and good practice is communicated and disseminated in order to optimise the opportunities pupils have for developing their proficiency in English.

ASSESSMENT OF PUPILS’ LEVELS OF LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY
In order to assist schools in assessing pupils’ levels of language proficiency, the Department of Education and Science has commissioned assessment packs to assist in determining language proficiency of pupils and these will be distributed to all schools shortly. The tests of English language proficiency contained in this pack were compiled by Integrate Ireland Language and Training (IILT), which is a campus company of Trinity College, Dublin, funded by the Department of Education and Science. The tests have been designed for use at primary level. The tests are being adapted to make them more age appropriate for use in post primary schools. However, the primary tests may be used by post primary schools in the interim.

The tests of English language proficiency are based on IILT’s English Language Proficiency Benchmarks (revised version, September 2003), and are structured with reference to three proficiency levels (1, 2 and 3) as set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor comprehension of English and very limited spoken English</td>
<td>Understands some English and can speak English sufficiently well for basic communication</td>
<td>Has competent communication skills in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English Language Proficiency Benchmarks specify what pupils should be able to achieve in English at each level and thus reflect the task-based approach to teaching and learning promoted by IILT. Tasks have been selected to reflect what pupils encounter daily in the classroom. Scoring procedures have been designed to achieve accurate results, provided the tests are administered strictly according to the instructions provided. All documentation in relation to the administration of tests must be retained by the school for audit/inspection purposes.

ALLOCATION OF ADDITIONAL TEACHER SUPPORT

The level of additional teacher support allocated to primary and post primary schools will continue to be determined by the number of enrolled pupils for whom English is a second language and the associated assessed levels of pupils’ language proficiency. It is necessary for schools to apply for the additional allocation certifying the number of such pupils enrolled on form NN1 for primary schools and form NN 07/08 for post primary schools as already notified to all schools.

The table under sets out the resources that can be accessed to cater for such pupils where the number of pupils in the school is 14 or more:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Posts</th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Posts</th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Posts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 to 27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42 to 64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91 to 120</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 to 41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65 to 90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>121 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools with less than 14 pupils will have their needs addressed as outlined in previous circulars.

It is a matter for the school authority to deploy this teacher allocation having regard to the proficiency levels of individual pupils involved and in line with their evolving
The allocation of additional language support teachers is based on allowing schools flexibility in the deployment of support. It is recommended that pupils receive additional language support teaching in the classroom or in small withdrawal groups in addition to the support they receive from the class teacher. It is intended that this revised allocation facilitates and provides for a high level of flexibility and will enable schools to successfully meet the needs of pupils who require additional language support teaching.

A defined whole-school policy in relation to the identification of pupils requiring support, assessment of pupils' levels of language proficiency, programme planning, recording and monitoring of pupils' progress and communication with parents are key features of effective language support provision. While duties and responsibilities vary in every school context, it is important that the roles of all school personnel in relation to meeting the needs of pupils for whom English is a second language are clearly defined and understood by all. It is important that expertise is shared and good practice is communicated and disseminated in order to optimise the opportunities pupils have for developing their proficiency in English.

Additional teaching hours are made available for schools catering for pupils with significant English language deficits assessed as having a language proficiency of either level 1 or 2. Should these extra resources be required for individual pupils for longer than two years, details of the assessed level of language competence and specific details of how the school has addressed the needs of these pupils in the previous two years must be outlined. Details must also be outlined of how it is proposed to optimise the opportunities of the pupils for whom an additional year is being sought.

The allocation is subject to confirmation by the school authority of actual attendance by the pupils through their inclusion in the school's certified October Returns.

Schools must retain a copy of all relevant documentation for audit purposes.

USEFUL MATERIALS AND RESOURCES

A wide range of materials and resources has been developed to assist schools in meeting the needs of pupils for whom English is a second language. The following is a list of materials that schools may find useful in responding to linguistic, cultural and ethnic diversity.


Development and Intercultural Education (2005) Global and Justice Perspectives in Education: A Literature Review, Dublin: Church of Ireland College.

Irish National Teachers Organisation (INTO) (2005) Intercultural Education in the Primary School, Dublin: INTO.


National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) (2005) Intercultural
As part of its continuing commitment to assisting teachers in creating inclusive school environments, the Department of Education and Science is currently involved in a North-South project with the Southern Education and Library Board and Integrate Ireland Language and Training to develop a practical toolkit for primary schools. The aim of the toolkit will be to support the inclusion of pupils for whom English is a second language in primary schools through incorporating best practice and providing suggestions, concrete ideas, exemplars and materials for use by all school staff. It is proposed to distribute this toolkit to all primary schools, both North and South, in the 2007/8 school year.

**AVAILABILITY OF SUPPORT**

The Regional Office Service of the Department of Education and Science will assist schools in relation to implementation of this circular.

Integrate Ireland Language and Training (IILT) provides training and materials to assist schools in meeting the needs of pupils for whom English is a second language. A wide range of teaching resources has been developed by IILT and is available at [www.iilt.ie](http://www.iilt.ie). IILT may be contacted directly at 126 Pembroke Street, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4; Telephone: 01 6677232/6677295; Fax: 01 6643726; E-mail: info@iilt.ie.
Appendix 6 - Circular 0015/09

To: The Managerial Authorities of Primary, Secondary, Community and Comprehensive Schools and to the Vocational Education Committees

Meeting the needs of pupils learning English as an Additional Language (EAL)

1. Introduction

Arising from the decisions made in Budget 2009 new arrangements are being put in place for the allocation of EAL support posts to schools. These new arrangements replace the current allocation arrangements that are set out in Circular 53/07 which is hereby rescinded.

The resources allocated to schools to meet the needs of pupils learning English as an Additional Language (EAL) are additional to the other supports and funding provided for schools. All pupils including migrant pupils (irrespective of their English language proficiency) are counted for the regular pupil teacher ratios in schools.

The budget measures will mean that the level of EAL support will generally be reduced to a maximum of two teachers per school, as was the case before 2007. However, there will be some alleviation for the position of those schools where there is a significant concentration of pupils learning English as an additional language as a proportion of the overall enrolment.

The new arrangements are outlined in Section 6.

2. Creating an inclusive school environment

An inclusive school environment reflects values and affirms linguistic, ethnic and cultural diversity. It is important that schools have policies and procedures in place that promote and facilitate the inclusion of all children. The school’s commitment to creating an inclusive school environment should be evident in the school plan, the promotion of parental involvement, the provision of equality of curriculum access, the facilitation of professional development opportunities and in whole-school and classroom practice. Pupils should also be encouraged and facilitated to maintain a connection with their own culture and language through curricular activities and displays.

3. The role of the EAL support teacher

EAL support teachers are appointed to assist schools in providing additional EAL support teaching for pupils. The EAL pupil remains the responsibility of the mainstream class teacher at primary level and the subject specialist teachers at post
primary level who will work closely with the EAL support teachers. In collaboration with parents and mainstream class teachers, EAL support teachers identify pupils requiring additional language support, assess pupils’ proficiency in English using the assessment materials, devise appropriate language programmes, deliver the programmes and record and monitor pupils’ progress.

They share their expertise with mainstream class teachers and assist in developing and disseminating good practice to support the development of students’ English language proficiency.

4. Deployment of EAL support teachers within schools

It is a matter for the school authority to deploy this teacher allocation having regard to the proficiency levels of individual pupils involved and in line with their evolving needs.

The allocation of EAL support teachers is based on allowing schools flexibility in the deployment of support. It is recommended that pupils receive additional EAL support teaching in the classroom or in timetabled EAL lessons for small groups in addition to the support they receive from the class teachers.

Clear and effective arrangements for the identification of pupils requiring support, the assessment of pupils’ levels of language proficiency, programme planning, the recording and monitoring of pupils’ progress and communication with parents are key features of effective EAL support provision. All of these features should be delineated in the school’s policy on EAL support. While duties and responsibilities vary in every school context, it is important that the roles of all school personnel in relation to meeting the needs of pupils learning English as a second language are clearly defined and understood by all. School policy and practice should promote the sharing of expertise and good practice, and encourages communication amongst staff in order to optimise the opportunities pupils have for developing their proficiency in English.

5. Primary and Post-Primary Assessment Kit

The Primary and Post-Primary Assessment Kits are a useful tool for schools to determine the initial language proficiency of each pupil and to evaluate how well pupils are progressing with their language skills in English. The tests will help to establish a pupil’s level of English on arrival in school, monitor progress over time in language support and identify the point at which a pupil no longer requires additional language support. Primary and Post-Primary EAL teachers are receiving training in the use of these kits during the current academic year, 08/09.

At this stage, it is not proposed to oblige schools to base all their applications for EAL support on the assessments carried out using the language assessment kit. However, schools will be asked to use the assessment kit if they are seeking EAL support for pupils for an additional year beyond the 2 year period.
The table below outlines the levels of proficiency that were used when assessing pupils’ language ability prior to the publication of the Primary/Post–Primary Assessment kits. The table also includes the nearest equivalent levels for those schools using the Primary/Post-Primary Assessment Kits.

N.B. Pupils with very little English may be initially assessed as at Level 0 (see Primary Assessment Kit, p.16 and Post-Primary Assessment Kit, p.12). Level A1 in the Assessment Kit should be their first learning target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency levels used prior to publication of Primary and Post–Primary Assessment Kits</th>
<th>Nearest equivalent levels using Primary and Post-Primary Assessment Kits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor comprehension of English and very limited spoken English</td>
<td>Understands some English and can speak English sufficiently well for basic communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td>Level A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of any English language proficiency</td>
<td>Can understand and use basic words and phrases in a social and school context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English Language Proficiency Levels specify what pupils should be able to achieve in English at each level and thus reflect the task-based approach to teaching and learning. Tasks have been selected to reflect what pupils encounter daily in the classroom. Scoring procedures have been designed to achieve accurate results, provided the tests are administered strictly according to the instructions provided.

EAL support resources are made available for schools catering for pupils with significant English language deficits assessed as having a language proficiency of either Level 1(0 or A1) or Level 2 (A2) based on the allocation thresholds outlined below.

All documentation in relation to the administration of tests must be retained by the school for audit/inspection purposes.

6. Allocation of resources for EAL support:

6.1. Schools with fewer than 14 pupils requiring EAL support

Grant aid is allocated at primary level to facilitate the Board of Management in funding the provision of part-time EAL support whilst at post primary level EAL support is allocated on the basis of part-time teaching hours.

New arrangements for allocation of full-time EAL support posts
(See Appendix for outline of examples of support)

The table below sets out the full-time resources that can be accessed to provide EAL support for pupils in the first two years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of posts</th>
<th>No. of pupils that require EAL support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 post</td>
<td>14 to 30 pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 posts</td>
<td>31 to 90 pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. Alleviation measures for schools with substantial number of pupils requiring EAL support

This will involve up to 2 additional EAL support posts being allocated on the following basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of posts</th>
<th>No. of pupils that require EAL support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 posts</td>
<td>91 to 120 pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 posts</td>
<td>121 and over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pupils for the 3rd and subsequent EAL support posts to be counted on the following basis:

one for one basis where pupil has less than 1 year of EAL support
two for one basis if a pupil has between 1 and 2 years EAL support (i.e., a weighting system will be applied so that every 2 of these pupils that have already had EAL support for between 1 and 2 years will be counted as 1 pupil for the purposes of meeting the allocation thresholds for EAL support posts).

Potential additional posts by appeal

Primary schools where at least 25% of their total enrolment is made up of pupils that require EAL support (pupils with less than B1 (Level 3) proficiency) can lodge an appeal to the Primary Staffing Appeals Board for a review of their proposed allocation for 2009/10 under the above rules. The following amendment will be made to the existing criteria for making appeals to the Staffing Appeals Board –

Where the Appeal Board is satisfied that having considered the circumstances outlined by the school and having regard to the high number of pupils requiring EAL support additional post(s) may be approved to support the educational needs of such pupils

Post-Primary or VEC schools where a significant number of the total enrolment is made up of EAL pupils with less than B1 (Level 3) proficiency can lodge an appeal for a review of their proposed allocation.

Post-Primary or VEC schools where a significant number of EAL pupils with less than B1 (Level 3) proficiency are in third year or in the senior cycle can lodge an appeal for a review of their proposed allocation.
Post-Primary and VEC schools can lodge an appeal to the Independent Appeals Board at Post-Primary level.

7. Important points to note when counting pupil numbers

In determining all allocations for EAL support those pupils that have had the least amount of EAL support must be counted first.

Schools must use 1 September 2009 as the reference date for determining how many years EAL support has already been given to pupils.

Schools must take into account any EAL support provided to pupils in previous school(s) attended

Pupils for 3rd and subsequent EAL support posts are counted on a one for one basis if they have had less than 1 year of EAL support and a two for one basis if they have between 1 and 2 years EAL support.

If the Department is satisfied that EAL support is required for an additional year beyond the 2 year period (see 8 below) then such pupils will be counted on a three for one basis for the purposes of meeting the allocation thresholds for all part-time and full-time EAL support posts.

Allocations of EAL support posts will be given on a provisional basis pending confirmation of actual enrolment on 30 September. In exceptional circumstances, if a significant number of students requiring EAL support are enrolled after 30 September, then the school may apply for additional resources.

8. Applications for EAL support for pupils beyond the 2 year period

All applications for EAL support for pupils for an additional year beyond the 2 year period will be dealt with on the following basis:

The application in respect of such pupils must include details of how the school has addressed the language needs of these pupils in the previous 2 years.

The application in respect of such pupils must outline how it is proposed to optimise the opportunities of the pupils for whom an additional year is being sought.

Each pupil for whom EAL support is sought beyond the 2 year period must have an assessment carried out using the Primary or Post Primary Assessment Kit. The assessment must have been carried out within 3 months of the date of submission of the application for EAL support to the Department and must show that the pupil has not attained Level B1 proficiency. The actual assessments do not need to be submitted to the Department but retained in the school and kept available for inspection.
If the Department is satisfied that EAL support is required for an additional year beyond the 2 year period then such pupils will be counted on a 3 for 1 basis for the purposes of meeting allocation thresholds for all part-time and full-time EAL support posts (i.e., a weighting system will be applied so that every 3 of these pupils that have already had EAL support for 2 years or more will only count as 1 pupil for the purposes of meeting the allocation thresholds for all part-time and full-time EAL support posts).

9. General

There is an option of additional language support through Irish for pupils in schools that provide instruction through the medium of Irish provided those pupils first language is neither English nor Irish. This option is only available for pupils who otherwise qualify under the terms of this circular and will not be provided for pupils whose first language is English.

10. Application forms

The same form should be used at primary level to apply for grant aid and for EAL support posts.

Please click here EALP1.doc to download Primary Application Form EAL/P1 and here Form NN09.10.doc for Post Primary Application form NN 09/10.

Please note that queries regarding the Circular may be E-Mailed to

Primary Schools - mailto:PrimaryAllocations@education.gov.ie and
Post-Primary Schools – mailto:Allocations@education.gov.ie

Hubert Loftus                                      Anne Killian
Principal Officer                                 Principal Officer
Primary Teacher Allocations                       Post Primary Teacher Allocations

March, 2009
Appendix to Circular 0015/09

The following sample cases help illustrate the new allocation arrangements for fulltime posts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample cases</th>
<th>Current position</th>
<th>Position for 2009/10 using above allocation method set out in this circular and below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School with 121 pupils that have had less than 1 year of language support</td>
<td>6 posts</td>
<td>Total 4 posts* calculated as follows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 posts automatically for first 90 pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd post for next 30 pupils (91-120 counted 1 for 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th post – 121 pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School with 121 pupils that have had between 1 and 2 years language support</td>
<td>6 posts</td>
<td>Total 3 posts* calculated as follows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 posts automatically for first 90 pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd post for remaining 31 pupils counted as 15.5 on 2 for 1 basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School with between 14 to 30 pupils that have had less than 2 years of language support</td>
<td>1 or 2 posts</td>
<td>1 post*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School with between 31 to 90 pupils that have had less than 2 years of language support</td>
<td>2 to 4 posts</td>
<td>2 posts*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School with 120 pupils (40 of whom have had less than 1 year of language support and the other 80 pupils have had language support for between 1 &amp; 2 years)</td>
<td>5 posts</td>
<td>3 posts* calculated as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 posts automatically for first 90 pupils (the 40 pupils that have had less than 1 year EAL support must be counted first)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd post for remaining 30 pupils counted as 15 pupils on 2 for 1 basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Potential additional posts by appeal set out in Section 6.3 of Circular and below. Primary schools where at least 25% of their total enrolment is made up of pupils that require EAL support (pupils with less than B1 (Level 3) proficiency) can lodge an appeal to the Primary Staffing Appeals Board for a review of their proposed allocation for 2009/10 under the above rules. The following amendment will be made to the existing criteria for making appeals to the Staffing Appeals Board –

Where the Appeal Board is satisfied that having considered the circumstances outlined by the school and having regard to the high number of pupils requiring EAL support additional post(s) may be approved to support the educational needs of such pupils
Post-Primary or VEC schools, where a significant number of their total enrolment is made up of EAL pupils with less than B1 (Level 3) proficiency can lodge an appeal for a review of their proposed allocation.

Post-Primary or VEC schools where a significant number of EAL pupils with less than B1 (Level 3) proficiency are in third year or in the senior cycle can lodge an appeal for a review of their proposed allocation.

Post-Primary and VEC schools can lodge an appeal to the Independent Appeals Board at Post-Primary level.
### Appendix 7 - Profile of the Primary Schools Evaluated by the Inspectorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Enrolment</th>
<th>Enrolment of EAL pupils</th>
<th>% of total population</th>
<th>Nationalities</th>
<th>Total number of teachers</th>
<th>Number of language support teachers</th>
<th>School context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Catholic boys’ school</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Urban primary school catering for boys from Infants to Sixth Class. Previously designated disadvantaged under the <em>Giving Children an Even Break</em> initiative but not included in DEIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Catholic co-educational school – senior school</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4 (one teaches in mainstream)</td>
<td>Situated in an urban area of extensive recent housing development and population increase. School’s enrolment and staffing has increased by over 60% in the last three years. Caters for girls from second to sixth class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Catholic girls’ school</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The school is situated in a large provincial town. There has been a steady increase in enrolment in the last few years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed senior school</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>One of four primary schools in an urban parish. Caters for boys and girls from second to sixth class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Church of Ireland co-ed school</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Long tradition of multiculturalism and diversity in the school. Large African community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Catholic boys’ school</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Located in a provincial town. Caters for boys from second to sixth class. Large migrant population in the local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Total Enrolment</td>
<td>Enrolment of EAL pupils</td>
<td>% of total population</td>
<td>Nation alities</td>
<td>Total number of teachers</td>
<td>Number of language support teachers</td>
<td>School context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed junior school</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Located in a large urban area and caters for pupils in infants and first class only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed junior school</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Located in a large urban area. Caters for pupils from infants to second class. Has experienced significant growth in the last decade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed junior school</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Previously designated disadvantaged under the Giving Children an Even Break initiative and part of the School Completion Programme. Not designated disadvantaged under DEIS. Serves pupils in infant and junior classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Located in a small provincial town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Educate Together co-ed school</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Situated in a large provincial town. Established in recent years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Situated in a large provincial town. Serves pupils from infants to sixth class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed senior school</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Located in a large urban area. Previously designated a disadvantaged school. Now included in the Giving Children an Even Break initiative and the School Completion Programme. Not designated disadvantaged under DEIS. Enrols pupils from second to sixth class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Total Enrolment</td>
<td>Enrolment of EAL pupils</td>
<td>% of total population</td>
<td>Nation alities</td>
<td>Total number of teachers</td>
<td>Number of language support teachers</td>
<td>School context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Catholic all girls' school</td>
<td>277 47</td>
<td>74 14</td>
<td>27% 14</td>
<td>18 3</td>
<td>Located in a large, urban area. Previously designated disadvantaged under the Giving Children an Even Break initiative. Not designated disadvantaged under DEIS. Enrols pupils from infants to sixth classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>478 48</td>
<td>48 14</td>
<td>10% 14</td>
<td>25 3</td>
<td>The school is located in a large, provincial town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Catholic boys’ school</td>
<td>197 65</td>
<td>65 13</td>
<td>33% 13</td>
<td>15 3</td>
<td>The school participates in the DEIS initiative (Band 2) and in the School Completion Programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Catholic boys’ school</td>
<td>235 50</td>
<td>50 8</td>
<td>21% 8</td>
<td>15 3 (2 teach in mainstream)</td>
<td>The school is located in a large provincial town. Pupils are enrolled from first to sixth classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>322 129</td>
<td>129 21</td>
<td>40% 21</td>
<td>20 4</td>
<td>The school is located in a large urban area. Enrolment is increasing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>306 40</td>
<td>40 9</td>
<td>13% 9</td>
<td>19 2</td>
<td>The school is located in a provincial town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>520 124</td>
<td>124 13</td>
<td>24% 13</td>
<td>29 3</td>
<td>Located in a suburban area in a provincial, industrial town. The school has a long tradition of enrolling pupils from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>632 131</td>
<td>131 19</td>
<td>21% 19</td>
<td>32 5</td>
<td>The school is located in a suburban area and has a long tradition of enrolling pupils from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Total Enrolment</td>
<td>Enrolment of EAL pupils</td>
<td>% of total population</td>
<td>Nationalities</td>
<td>Total number of teachers</td>
<td>Number of language support teachers</td>
<td>School context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Catholic school</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Located in a provincial town. Boys are enrolled from infants to first classes. The school serves girls from infants to sixth classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Educate Together co-ed school</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recently established primary school in a provincial town. Will become a full vertical school in the 2009-10 academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Located large primary school situated in an urban area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Located in a rapidly growing village and designated disadvantaged. Significant increase in the pupil population since 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Catholic boys’ school</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boys’ school located in an expanding area in a large provincial town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Catholic co-ed school</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large urban school catering for pupils in an area of educational disadvantage (DEIS Band 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Catholic school</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>It caters for both boys and girls up to first class and girls from second to sixth class. The school serves an area of educational disadvantage (DEIS Band 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Catholic co-educational school – junior school</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large junior school (infants to second class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Total Enrolment</td>
<td>Enrolment of EAL pupils</td>
<td>% of total population</td>
<td>Nationalties</td>
<td>Total number of teachers</td>
<td>Number of language support teachers</td>
<td>School context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Catholic co-educational school – junior school</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>The school is located in a large urban area and it caters for pupils from Junior Infants to Second Class. The school is a designated DEIS Band 1 school. It participates in the Giving Children an Even Break initiative and the School Completion Programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8 - Profile of the Post-Primary Schools Evaluated by the Inspectorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Gender and Enrolment</th>
<th>EAL</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Secondary All-male</td>
<td>457, 43</td>
<td>Middle-class suburb; numbers rising after drop in enrolments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Secondary All-female</td>
<td>315, 46</td>
<td>Middle-class suburb; numbers rising after drop in enrolments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Secondary All-male</td>
<td>322, 33</td>
<td>Mixed suburb; disadvantaged status under old scheme; numbers rising after drop in enrolments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Secondary Co-educational</td>
<td>235m, 246f</td>
<td>26m, 20f</td>
<td>Provincial town with 5 schools, 2 with large enrolment of EAL students. Over quota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Secondary All-female</td>
<td>271, 39</td>
<td>Provincial city, city centre. Smallest of 3 girls’ schools; DEIS; falling numbers; over quota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Secondary All-female</td>
<td>784, 45</td>
<td>Provincial town. Only all-girls school of 4; has more female EAL students than either of the town’s co-educational schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Secondary All-male</td>
<td>445, 36</td>
<td>Provincial city, city centre. 1 of 4 all-boys schools, 2 with high EAL intake; numbers rising after drop in enrolments; over quota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC Co-educational</td>
<td>401m, 176f, 61m, 42f</td>
<td>Satellite town; large migrant population. Only option for boys and only co-ed; only school with big EAL intake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC Co-educational</td>
<td>179m, 148f, 20m, 12f</td>
<td>Provincial county town. Only one of 4 schools with sizable EAL intake; participant in DEIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC Co-educational</td>
<td>276m, 131f, 15m, 21f</td>
<td>Provincial town; only co-educational school of 3 schools in town; only school with sizable EAL intake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC Co-educational</td>
<td>337m, 83f, 83m, 22f</td>
<td>Large provincial town; only VEC of 4 schools in town; other schools are single- sex; 1 girls school and this school have high EAL intake; DEIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Co-educational</td>
<td>624m, 463f, 40m, 34f</td>
<td>Large outer suburb, area of significant migrant settlement. Mixed intake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Co-educational</td>
<td>516m, 503f, 36m, 32f</td>
<td>Large outer suburb, area of significant migrant settlement. Mixed intake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
<td>Gender and Enrolment</td>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Co-educational</td>
<td>438m, 514f</td>
<td>22m, 23f</td>
<td>Satellite town. Only school in area; mixed intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Co-educational</td>
<td>116m, 49f</td>
<td>38m, 13f</td>
<td>Satellite town. Falling numbers in the school; over quota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 9 - Numbers of Candidates taking Non-Curricular Languages in the Leaving Certificate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>817**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A indicates that the language was not offered at this date. In 2004, only Danish and Portuguese were offered on a non-curricular basis. In 2009, Slovenian was added to the above list.

**The 2009 total includes 87 ‘sits’ in the languages with very small uptake.

Russian is a curricular language and was not taught in any of the schools visited. However, 14 candidates in these schools sat Russian as an additional subject studied outside the timetable.
### Uptake of the Non-Curricular Language Option in the Schools Visited

2008 figures from State Examinations Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School J</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School L</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School M</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School O</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 10 - List of 50 Languages into which the Questionnaires for Parents were Translated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Schools</th>
<th>Post-Primary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Bosnian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino (Tagalog)</td>
<td>Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Filipino (Tagalog)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igbo</td>
<td>Ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>Georgian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Igbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese (Brazil)</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese (Portugal)</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Bolivian</td>
<td>Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>Malayalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>Marathi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>Ndebele (Zimbabwe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urhobo</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>Portuguese (Brazil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>Portuguese (Portugal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sindhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urhobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xhosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yoruba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 11 - Detailed Information on NAER

### Language spoken at home and pupil achievement in reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st class</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>5th class</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%Total</td>
<td>%Av</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>%Total</td>
<td>%Av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>250.4</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaeilge</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>272.0</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>229.6</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>246.2</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td>Diff</td>
<td>SED</td>
<td>95% BCI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diff</td>
<td>SED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaeilge-English</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>-15.5</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-English</td>
<td>-20.8</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td><strong>-35.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>-6.6</strong></td>
<td>-25.7</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing-English</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>-23.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences in bold.


### Place of birth and pupil achievement in reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st class</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>5th class</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%Total</td>
<td>%Av</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>%Total</td>
<td>%Av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>249.2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>255.4</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>261.1</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td>Diff</td>
<td>SED</td>
<td>95% BCI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diff</td>
<td>SED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Ireland</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing-Ireland</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source Table 5.A.3 “The 2004 National Assessment of English reading” Emer Eivers, Gerry Shiel, Rachel Perkins and Judith Cosgrove. 2005 Dublin: Educational Research Centre*

Note that “due to its large standard error, the mean achievement score (224.8) of the 2.2% of Fifth class pupils who spoke a language other than Irish or English does not differ significantly from that of English speakers” (Eivers et al., 2005). The test samples were not designed to be representative of the newcomer population. A test designed to include a representative sample of EAL students would give more accurate results at fifth class level.
### Appendix 12 - Leaving and Junior Certificate Results

*Leaving Certificate 2007 – Higher Level Grade Percentages (excluding subjects where fewer than 30 dictionary candidates presented and non-curricular languages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 LC Subject</th>
<th>% Numbers of Students</th>
<th>% A1/A2</th>
<th>% B1/B2B3</th>
<th>% C1/C2/C3</th>
<th>% D1/D2/D3</th>
<th>% E/F/NG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31076</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8388</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7411</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17765</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13771</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4554</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 LC Subject</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Numbers of Students</td>
<td>% A1/A2</td>
<td>% B1/B2/B3</td>
<td>% C1/C2/C3</td>
<td>% D1/D2/D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7529</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5223</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5730</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17523</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4927</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 LC Subject</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Numbers of Students</td>
<td>% A1/A2</td>
<td>% B1/B2B3</td>
<td>% C1/C2/C3</td>
<td>% D1/D2/D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12670</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3493</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4369</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8349</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arabic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leaving Certificate 2008 – Higher Level Grade Percentages (excluding subjects where fewer than 30 dictionary candidates presented and non-curricular languages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 LC Subject</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
<th>A1/A2</th>
<th>B1/B2/B3</th>
<th>C1/C2/C3</th>
<th>D1/D2/D3</th>
<th>E/F/NG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31793</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8510</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7601</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18268</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14225</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4440</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 LC Subject</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>A1/A2</td>
<td>B1/B2/B3</td>
<td>C1/C2/C3</td>
<td>D1/D2/D3</td>
<td>E/F/NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7862</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4929</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemistry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5904</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18322</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6848</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 LC Subject</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>A1/A2</td>
<td>B1/B2/B3</td>
<td>C1/C2/C3</td>
<td>D1/D2/D3</td>
<td>E/F/NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4811</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12154</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3426</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4770</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Economics S&amp;S</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8754</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arabic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 LC Subject</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>A1/A2</td>
<td>B1/B2/B3</td>
<td>C1/C2/C3</td>
<td>D1/D2/D3</td>
<td>E/F/NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Junior Certificate 2007 – Higher Level Grade Percentages (excluding subjects where fewer than 30 dictionary candidates presented and non-curricular languages)

This table also shows CSPE results as this is examined at a common level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 JC Subject</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Number of Students</th>
<th>%A</th>
<th>%B</th>
<th>%C</th>
<th>%D</th>
<th>% E/F/N/G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37740</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23804</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34290</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39898</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24007</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7136</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2866</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 JC Subject</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>%A</td>
<td>%B</td>
<td>%C</td>
<td>%D</td>
<td>% E/F/N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Craft, Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14991</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23209</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7427</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Technology (Wood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11928</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7405</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14963</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5488</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 JC Subject</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>%A</td>
<td>%B</td>
<td>%C</td>
<td>%D</td>
<td>% E/F/N/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (Revised syllabus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34855</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18733</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.S.P.E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55857</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Junior Certificate 2008 – Higher Level Grade Percentages (excluding subjects where fewer than 30 dictionary candidates presented and non-curricular languages)
This table also shows CSPE results as this is examined at a common level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 JC Subject</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total Number of Students</th>
<th>% A</th>
<th>% B</th>
<th>% C</th>
<th>% D</th>
<th>% E/F/NG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36938</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23634</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32806</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40108</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23585</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6705</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3072</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Craft, Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14705</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 JC Subject</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>%A</td>
<td>%B</td>
<td>%C</td>
<td>%D</td>
<td>% E/F/NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22317</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7497</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Technology (Wood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11732</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7341</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14629</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5388</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (Revised syllabus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33566</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18905</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.S.P.E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>54492</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 13 - Percentage Take-up Rates (Higher and Ordinary Level) – Leaving and Junior Certificate

**Percentage Take Up Rates (Higher v Ordinary Level) - Leaving Certificate 2007 by Subject (excluding subjects where fewer than 30 dictionary candidates presented and non-curricular languages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 LC Subject</th>
<th>Higher Level</th>
<th>Ordinary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This table excludes take up of foundation level mathematics which was 9% for dictionary candidates and 11% for total candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 LC Subject</th>
<th>Higher Level</th>
<th>Ordinary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics S&amp;S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 LC Subject</td>
<td>Higher Level</td>
<td>Ordinary Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percentage Take Up Rates (Higher v Ordinary Level) - Leaving Certificate 2008 by Subject (excluding subjects where fewer than 30 dictionary candidates presented and non-curricular languages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 LC Subject</th>
<th>Higher Level</th>
<th>Ordinary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Mathematics** |              |                |
| Dictionary Candidates | 27 | 63 |
| Total Candidates                       | 17 | 71 |

| **History**   |              |                |
| Dictionary Candidates | 39 | 61 |
| Total Candidates                       | 64 | 36 |

| **Geography** |              |                |
| Dictionary Candidates | 52 | 48 |
| Total Candidates                       | 75 | 25 |

| **French**    |              |                |
| Dictionary Candidates | 53 | 47 |
| Total Candidates                       | 51 | 49 |

| **German**    |              |                |
| Dictionary Candidates | 84 | 16 |
| Total Candidates                       | 59 | 41 |

| **Spanish**   |              |                |
| Dictionary Candidates | 68 | 32 |
| Total Candidates                       | 54 | 46 |

| **Art**       |              |                |
| Dictionary Candidates | 66 | 34 |
| Total Candidates                       | 76 | 24 |

---

78 This table excludes take up of foundation level mathematics which was 10% for dictionary candidates and 12% for total candidates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 LC Subject</th>
<th>Higher Level</th>
<th>Ordinary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied mathematics</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics S&amp;S</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 LC Subject</td>
<td>Higher Level</td>
<td>Ordinary Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percentage Take Up Rates (Higher v Ordinary Level) - Junior Certificate 2007 by Subject (excluding subjects where fewer than 30 dictionary candidates presented)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 JC Subject</th>
<th>Higher Level</th>
<th>Ordinary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong>&lt;sup&gt;79&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong>&lt;sup&gt;80&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art, Craft, Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>79</sup> English is also taken at foundation level. 20% of dictionary candidates and 4% of total candidates took English at this level.

<sup>80</sup> Mathematics is also taken at foundation level. 14% of dictionary candidates and 10% of total candidates took mathematics at this level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 JC Subject</th>
<th>Higher Level</th>
<th>Ordinary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Technology (Wood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (Revised syllabus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percentage Take Up Rates (Higher v Ordinary Level) - Junior Certificate 2008 by Subject (excluding subjects where fewer than 30 dictionary candidates presented)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 JC Subject</th>
<th>Higher Level</th>
<th>Ordinary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong>&lt;sup&gt;81&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong>&lt;sup&gt;82&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art, Craft, Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>81</sup> English is also taken at foundation level. 15% of dictionary candidates and 4% of total candidates took English at this level.

<sup>82</sup> Mathematics is also taken at foundation level. 11% of dictionary candidates and 9% of total candidates took mathematics at this level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 JC Subject</th>
<th>Higher Level</th>
<th>Ordinary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Technology (Wood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (Revised syllabus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Candidates</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Candidates</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 14 - Possible CPD Model for EAL – Intensive Phase, Year One and Year Two and Maintenance Phase – Year Three Onwards

Intensive Phase - Year One and Year Two

At primary level a staff of 12 Regional Development Officers led by a national co-ordinator (NCO) would run the intensive phase. At post-primary level an NCO would work with a staff of 6 Regional Development Officers. The training staff at both levels would each be supported by a team of 20 Associate Trainers and 40 Local Facilitators.

National Co-ordinators and Regional Development Officers (RDOs)

The role of the national co-ordinator at both levels would include co-ordinating designing, planning, scheduling, monitoring and reviewing the general professional development programme for school personnel; assisting in the training of and support for teams of Regional Development Officers, Associate Trainers and Facilitators; preparing and providing resource materials for use in professional development and support activities; and delivering and facilitating CPD seminars.

RDOs, under the direction of the NCO and in conjunction with Education Centres, would, inter alia, provide and facilitate professional development courses and workshops at school, local and regional level; liaise effectively with the management and staff of schools in their assigned regions; liaise and collaborate with professional bodies, other agencies and support services as appropriate; promote and support capacity-building regionally and locally to develop sustainable supports for teachers in the holistic development of English language proficiency in their EAL students.

The cost of the full time professional staff which would be made up of seconded teachers is estimated to be of the order of €82,000 per staff member. This figure includes an average of €12,000 for travel and subsistence.

Associates

At each level, the teams would be assisted by 20 associate trainers.

An associate is a teacher who is engaged to work part-time with the CPD team to complement and extend the capacity of the service nationally, regionally or locally, as appropriate. Typically an associate would: participate in the design, planning, scheduling, monitoring and evaluation of the agreed programme of work; work with the full-time regional support service personnel in the provision of an identified programme of support; facilitate workshops as appropriate locally and regionally; liaise with the local education centre and other relevant bodies in the provision of the identified programme of support; undertake training and skills development as required; endeavour to build the capacity of innovative teachers at local and regional level; encourage networking and reflective practice among participants; assist in the identification, preparation and editing of appropriate resource materials.
would be released from schools for a maximum of 20 days per year, including training time.

At post-primary level, to facilitate the development of CPD for specialist teachers, associates should be teachers from a range of different curricular backgrounds.

**Local Facilitators**

At each level, the team would be assisted by 40 local facilitators.

A local facilitator is a teacher who volunteers to facilitate, or to collaborate on a limited number of locally organised events to complement and extend the work of a full time service or to enable delivery of a programme of a particular education centre, mostly outside of school hours.

Typically, local facilitators would contribute on a particular issue or theme and support the sharing of good practice locally; facilitate workshops or collaborate in the facilitation of workshops locally or regionally; encourage networking and reflective practice among participants.

As with associates, at post-primary level, facilitators should be drawn from across all curricular disciplines.

Local facilitators are only given substitution for a maximum of 3 school days per year which includes training days. They will, in general, be required to participate in EAL events in the evenings and at weekends.

**Maintenance phase - Year Three onwards**

At this point the national full-time EAL team of 20 and the team of associates can be significantly reduced. An NCO could be retained at both primary and post-primary levels. The NCOs would be expected to take responsibility for the management and organisation of provision nationally.

The teams of facilitators would remain in place to enable teachers to continue to organise CPD and network on EAL topics in their own time.

Teachers should continue to be able to participate in a recognised post-graduate qualification in EAL, at a reduced cost.

Research on the performance of EAL students compared to their native peers should also continue.