

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from electronic originals  
(may include minor formatting differences from printed original)

**Analysis of the Essential Programs and Services  
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)  
Cost Component**

**Report to the  
Maine Department of Education**

**Prepared by**

**Amy F. Johnson  
Director**

**Erika K. Stump  
Research Associate**

**Maine Education Policy Research Institute  
University of Southern Maine**

**June 2016**

## **Analysis of the Essential Programs and Services Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Cost Component**

Amy F. Johnson  
amyj@maine.edu

Erika K. Stump  
Erika.stump@maine.edu

### **Background**

The Essential Programs and Services (EPS) school funding model, which was first implemented in Maine beginning in the 2005-06 fiscal year, is intended to ensure that all schools have the basic programs and services to provide all students with the opportunity to achieve the Maine Learning Results. As an “adequacy-based” funding model, EPS determines the expected cost of providing pK-12 education to a pre-determined level given the characteristics of each school district.

In developing EPS, explicit recognition was given to the need for additional resources for children with specialized needs, including English Learner students (ELs). These children may, and in most cases do, require additional resources to attain equitable opportunities to learn. Prior to the EPS funding model, a small amount of additional funding was set aside for the support of EL students. Embedded in the goal of the EPS funding model is the assurance that the state provides adequate resources to meet the educational achievement goals of the student populations within any given school administration unit (SAU) and an equitable distribution across school administration units of those adequate resources. Thus, SAUs with EL student populations are given additional resources for serving EL students under the EPS model. This element of the EPS model is referred to as the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) component in keeping with the language that was in use at the time the model was established, although the term “LEP” has since fallen out of favor. In this report, the terms EL and LEP are used interchangeably.

The LEP cost model component is an additional weight provided in school district allocations for each student who is identified as needing supplemental English language instruction. The weight is an estimate of the added cost of educating EL students relative to their non-EL peers.

Based on the analysis when the EPS model was initially created, the costs of educating ELs were found to vary based on the total number of English-language learners

in the district. In essence, the costs of serving a moderate number of EL students was less than the costs for a very small number of students on a per-pupil basis, as districts can benefit from some economy of scale in serving additional students once the initial program infrastructure is established. As a result, the LEP component was designed with a different weight per LEP pupil depending on the total number of LEP students served, categorized into three groups. The three size groups are 1 to 15 students, 16 to 250 students, and more than 250 LEP students. In the initial model development, the weight for the largest size group was determined to be greater than that for the middle tier. At the time, this was understood to be the result of an increased cost of mounting a larger program, in which the efficiencies achieved in the moderate size group disappear and per-pupil costs increase. As the number of districts with large programs (over 250 EL students) has increased from one to three in subsequent reviews, the average costs in the largest group have decreased. The differences in per-pupil spending in the largest size group have become less marked in relation to the smaller group categories.

### **Methods for Review of the EPS Limited English Proficiency Cost Component**

By Maine statute, each component of the EPS model is scheduled for review on a three- year cycle. The first scheduled review of the LEP component was conducted in 2007-08, with an additional supplementary review conducted in 2008-09 per the request of the Maine Legislature's Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs. A second regularly scheduled review was completed in 2011, and this report provides the third iterative cycle of analyzing the LEP cost component.

In this analysis, the most recent year of expenditures in supporting EL students are summarized and described, and the LEP cost component was recalculated using the same basic methodology found to be most appropriate in earlier reviews. First, school district expenditures for ELs were analyzed within each of the three program size categories to describe average and overall spending in various areas. These data are provided in the section titled Descriptive Information. Then, the per pupil expenditure amount for EL supports was compared to the overall per-pupil cost of education in the state for the same fiscal year, providing a comparison of EL expenses to base (non-EL) expenses. Comparisons were made using two different base amounts. In the first assumption, EL

expenses are compared to a comprehensive per-pupil spending figure that includes all operating expenditure except for debt service and student transportation. In the second assumption, EL spending is compared to a more narrow pool of spending categories, and costs related to special education and Career and Technical Education (CTE) are also excluded. The resulting ratios provide a depiction of how district spending on EL students compares to overall per-pupil spending. This information is included in the Expenditure Analysis report section.

**Descriptive Information**

In 2014-15, the number of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students enrolled in Maine public PK-12 schools according to data reported to the Maine Department of Education was 5,256 or 3% of the total enrollment of 180,097 students. This count of LEP students includes students who are identified through assessment data as needing supplemental English language instruction (based on district screening processes and/or a score of 6 or less on an annual ACCESS standardized test). A total of 6,975 individuals are identified as “language minority” students, meaning they have a non-English home language. This indicates that there are an additional 1,719 “language minority” students who do not receive (or no longer receive) direct English language instruction, but may require services from the school district such as monitoring or translation services for family members. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on EL public school enrollment by size category across the state for 2014-15.

<b>Table 1. Descriptive Statistics from the 2014-15 LEP Attending Enrollment Data</b>				
	<b>LEP Enrollment Categories</b>			
	<b>1 - 15</b>	<b>16 - 250</b>	<b>251+</b>	<b>All Categories</b>
Number of Districts with Attending LEP Students	63	37	3	103
Total Number of LEP Students	330 (6.0%)	1678 (32.0%)	3248 (62.0%)	5256 (100%)
Range of # Unique Languages Per District	1 to 9	1 to 29	26 to 32	1 to 32

As reported in Table 1, a total of 103 of the SAUs within the state reported at least one English Language Learner in attendance. Of those, 63 SAUs (61% of the districts with ELs) have between 1 and 15 EL students. However, the total number of EL students represented by these districts is only 6.0% of the total LEP student population in Maine public schools. The three SAUs that are categorized as having more than 250 LEP students (Portland, Lewiston, and Westbrook) have 62% of the state LEP population, and the remaining third of LEP students (32%) attend districts with between 16 and 250 EL students. Statewide, there are 94 unique primary languages other than English reported as the home language, and individual SAUs have a range of 1 to 32 unique languages spoken at home among their students. Appendix A lists all of the unique languages spoken by Maine public school students and their families. The number of school districts with each language represented is also provided in Table A to provide a sense of how common each language is in the state.

As represented below in Table 2, out of all districts reporting attending students, only four did not report at least one LEP student. Of the 103 SAUs that reported enrolling LEP students in 2014-15, 78 of these SAUs also had LEP expenditures in 2014-15 as reported to the Maine Department of Education. There were 25 SAUs that reported attending EL students but did not have any EL program costs included in their annual expenditure data. An additional 6 districts reported FY15 LEP expenditures, but no attending LEP students in the October 1, 2014 student count. Appendix B lists all SAUs with their 2014-15 LEP student counts, number of languages represented, and per-LEP-pupil expenditures if any were reported.

Possible reasons for districts reporting expenditures without attending students (6 SAUs) include expenses incurred for resident students who attend other districts, for language minority students who are on monitor status or otherwise not identified as LEP, or for students who enroll in the district after the October 1 student count. Only two of these SAUs spent more than \$3500 total on LEP programs. Possible reasons for reporting attending LEP students but no expenses (25 SAUs) are less clear. Some districts may serve the needs of their LEP students within existing staff and may not have additional expenses to account in the 4100 program code (i.e. regular classroom teachers may support ELs without need of additional programs or supports). Of the 25 SAUs in this category, 17 have

five or fewer LEP students. It is also possible that some administrative errors are present in either expenditure or October student count data, though these data are reviewed by Department of Education staff and major discrepancies are rare.

<b>Table 2. LEP-related Data Reported by Maine SAUs, FY2015</b>	
<b>Data Type</b>	<b># of SAUs</b>
LEP Enrollment of One or More LEP students	103
LEP Attending Enrollment and Expenditure Data	78
LEP Attending Enrollment Data only	25
LEP Expenditure Data only (No LEP students reported to be enrolled)	6
No LEP expenditures or attending students reported	5

### **Expenditure Analysis**

To be included in the cost analysis, SAUs must have both valid LEP enrollment and LEP expenditure data. Table 3 below gives descriptive statistics on the LEP expenditure by LEP enrollment size for the 78 SAUs that meet this requirement. The per pupil LEP expenditure describes the total funds spent on LEP services by all SAUs in that category divided by the total number of LEP students reported as enrolled in those districts. The median SAU per pupil LEP expenditure identifies the per pupil LEP expenditure for the district in the middle of the category group. When the median is below the overall per pupil amount for the group, as in the smallest size category, this implies that there are a smaller number of districts with high per pupil amounts that pull the overall group average above what the majority of SAUs are spending. The range of per pupil spending seen in the districts in the group also provides a sense of the variation seen across SAUs in each size group.

**Table 3. Descriptive Statistics from the 2014-15 Total LEP Expenditure Data**

Characteristics	LEP Enrollment Categories			All Categories
	1 - 15	16 - 250	251+	
Number of Districts	40	35	3	77
Total Number of LEP Students	251	1557	3248	5055
Total LEP Expenditure	\$1,057,163	\$4,462,185	\$8,571,924	\$14,091,122
Per Pupil LEP Expenditure for Size Group	\$4,212	\$2,866	\$2,639	\$2,788
Median SAU Per Pupil LEP Expenditure	\$3,293	\$3,141	\$2,352	\$3,141
Range of SAU Per Pupil Total LEP Expenditure	(\$12 - \$24,935)	(\$22 - \$8,274)	(\$2,193 - \$3,007)	(\$12 - \$24,935)

As shown in Table 3, 40 SAUs categorized with 1 - 15 LEP students in 2014-15 were included in the study analysis. This category had the highest per pupil LEP expenditure as seen in both the overall expenditure of \$4,212 per LEP student and the median SAU spending of \$3,293. The median SAU per pupil LEP expenditure for the medium size category (16-250 LEP students) was \$3,141, and the size category as a whole spent \$2,866 per LEP student. The three SAUs in the largest LEP enrollment category had the lowest per pupil LEP total expenditures (median SAU expenditure of \$2,352 and overall \$2,639 per LEP pupil).

The LEP general fund expenditure data for the 78 SAUs with both expenditure data and enrolled students was also analyzed by expenditure type, as summarized below in Table 4. These figures only include data for the 78 districts reporting attending pupils; they do not include the \$99,503 in general fund expenditures for the six SAUs that did not report attending pupils.



<b>Table 4. General Fund Expenditure Data by Type of Cost</b>			
	<b>Total Expenditure Amount</b>	<b>Per LEP Pupil Amount (N = 5,056)</b>	<b>Percent of Total LEP Expenditures</b>
<b>Total LEP Expenditure</b>	<b>\$ 14,091,122</b>	<b>\$2,788</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Employed Personnel Costs (Salary, Benefits, and Stipends)</b>	<b>\$ 13,826,408</b>	<b>\$2,735</b>	<b>98.1%</b>
<i>Teachers &amp; Other Professionals</i>	<i>10,729,263</i>	<i>\$2,123</i>	<i>76.1%</i>
<i>Ed Techs</i>	<i>1,827,100</i>	<i>\$361</i>	<i>13.0%</i>
<i>Substitutes and Tutors</i>	<i>304,298</i>	<i>\$60</i>	<i>2.2%</i>
<i>Administrators</i>	<i>529,065</i>	<i>\$105</i>	<i>3.8%</i>
<i>Support Staff</i>	<i>436,682</i>	<i>\$86</i>	<i>3.1%</i>
<b>Contracted Services (Non-Employees)</b>	<b>\$ 144,080</b>	<b>\$29</b>	<b>1.0%</b>
<b>Textbooks and Instructional Materials</b>	<b>\$ 56,138</b>	<b>\$11</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
<b>Professional Development</b>	<b>\$ 27,726</b>	<b>\$5</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
<b>Supplies and Equipment</b>	<b>\$ 18,391</b>	<b>\$4</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>\$ 18,379</b>	<b>\$4</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

In addition to general funds, districts also reported spending \$281,774 in federal Title III grants, \$101,546 in federal refugee resettlement grants, and \$102,884 in other funds—equal to \$486,204 total costs reported outside of the general fund expenditures in non-general fund spending reports.

Almost all of the LEP program costs reported in the general fund were associated with personnel compensation. Salaries, benefits, and stipends paid to district employees account for 98.1% of spending, and contracts paid to professionals not employed in the district were an additional 1.0%.

It is also noteworthy that the vast majority of the expenditures for administrator salary and benefits (\$515,576 or 97%) and all of the expenditures for support staff (\$436,682) were borne by just two districts: Lewiston, with 1,211 EL students, and Portland, with 1,719 EL students. The district with the third highest number of EL students was Westbrook with 318 EL students, which reported no administrator costs for their LEP program.

This lends some credence to the commonly expressed belief described after prior EPS component reviews that the economy of scale achieved in instructional costs with a greater number of students is counterbalanced by a need to develop additional administrative infrastructure to support larger numbers of EL students, their families, and district staff. To further explore this position, MEPRI researchers conducted an interview with representatives from the Portland Public Schools' Multilingual Programs office. They described maintaining a cadre of three professionals to help manage their overall district program. These highly-trained individuals serve as instructional coaches and conduct ongoing professional development for all district staff—including regular classroom teachers and administrators. This professional development was seen as an integral component of preparing mainstream classroom educators, as EL students are present in the vast majority of regular classrooms throughout the district. All teachers provide teaching and supporting experiences to EL students, not just the 45 EL teachers with specialized training and credentials who are directly employed in the LEP instruction program. The Multilingual Program staff professionals also conduct centralized student enrollment for newly arriving EL students (reported as at least one family per week on average, with higher rates at certain times of the year), including language assessments in addition to other related duties. In addition to the three teacher leaders, this requires support staff and contracted translators as well as a social worker who assists with the social, economic and housing services guidance that many incoming families require. The need for these roles illustrates just some of the myriad examples cited by Portland staff regarding the districtwide professional staffing and expertise needed in larger districts providing services to thousands of EL students and language minority family members. While the overall per-pupil costs of the largest LEP enrollment category SAUs remained well below those of the districts operating programs for 1 to 15 students and slightly below districts with 16 to 250 students, it appeared that the nature of the costs borne by districts serving large populations of EL students was different. Only the two largest districts reported centralized administrative costs, indicating either that they are unique in the need for an additional level of district infrastructure to support large number of LEP program staff, or that smaller districts are not reporting these costs in the LEP program category.

Additionally, some of the costs described by Portland schools staff were not exclusively for LEP students. In FY2015, Portland had a total of 2,311 language minority students, though only 1,720 were actively identified as LEP by their language assessment scores. The 592 language minority students, many of whom were formerly identified as LEP, still require some supports from the LEP program and staff. For example, translation services are sometimes required for family members of language minority students for parent-teacher conferences, special education IEP meetings, and other school-to-home communications. The current EPS model does not provide additional funding for these supports for language minority students.

### **Update to LEP Category Weights**

As described earlier, the EPS model utilizes a weighting system to calculate the additional costs necessary to serve LEP students, and different weights are used for three different size categories based on the number of students in the LEP program. The LEP weight for each group is calculated two ways. First, Method A is the category's per-LEP-pupil expenses divided by the state average per-pupil operating expenses, excluding transportation and debt services. Secondly, Method B is the category's per-LEP-pupil expenses divided by a more restrictive state average per-pupil expense, excluding special education and Career and Technical Education (CTE) expenditures in addition to transportation and debt service. Each method provides a different depiction of LEP costs in relation to overall per pupil spending.

Table 5 below reflects the updated per-LEP-pupil amounts for each enrollment category (as reiterated from Table 3) and the per-LEP-pupil amounts from the most recent prior review of 2008-09 for comparison.

<b>Table 5: Per Pupil LEP Costs and Change in Per-Pupil Costs by LEP Pupil Count Category</b>					
<b>EPS Review</b>	<b>Per Pupil LEP Expenditure by LEP Enrollment Category</b>			<b>Overall State Per-Pupil Operating Cost</b>	
	<b>1 - 15</b>	<b>16 - 250</b>	<b>251+</b>	<b>Method A</b> (excluding transportation and debt services)	<b>Method B</b> (excluding transportation, debt services, special ed. & CTE)
2008-09	\$4,184	\$2,302	\$2,436	\$ 9,797	\$ 7,951
2014-15	\$4,212	\$2,866	\$2,639	\$ 11,105	\$ 8,897
% Change	1%	25%	8%	13%	12%

Table 6 provides the 2014-15 updated LEP weight calculated for the three different LEP student enrollment categories. As described above, Method A is the category's per-LEP-pupil expenses divided by the state average per-pupil operating expenses, excluding transportation and debt services, and Method B is the category's per-LEP-pupil expenses divided by a more restrictive state average per-pupil expenses, excluding transportation, debt service, special education, and CTE expenditures.

<b>Table 6. FY2015 Updated EPS LEP Weights</b>				
	Overall State Per-Pupil Operating Cost	FY2015 LEP Weight By Enrollment Category		
		1-15	16-249	250+
<b>Method A</b>	\$11,105	0.4	0.3	0.2
<b>Method B</b>	\$8,897	0.5	0.3	0.3

It is established practice when reviewing LEP student weights to compare district LEP expenditures to overall state expenditures. However, in practice the EPS weight is applied to each district's elementary and secondary per pupil EPS rates, not on total expenditures (which include optional local funds as well as the EPS allocations). Method B uses the state expenditure amount that is closest to the EPS per pupil rates, as it excludes spending that is not included in that base amount.

Because the updated weights based on FY2015 expenditures are lower than those in the current EPS formula, additional analysis was undertaken in this review to assess the

proportion of districts that are receiving more in their EPS LEP allocation than they are spending in practice. Each district’s FY15 spending was divided by its actual EPS per pupil weight, providing a spending ratio that is effectively the observed “weight” of each individual district’s expenditures. The EPS formula has separate per-pupil basic rates for elementary and secondary students. Because LEP expenditures span pK-12, a combined EPS LEP base weight was calculated for each district based on the number of resident LEP students at the elementary versus secondary grade level. This EPS rate is specific to this FY15 analysis as it is weighted by the proportion of *LEP* students at each level, not overall elementary and secondary enrollment. Using this process, the observed spending ratio was compared to the weight applied in the EPS formula based on the district’s resident size category. Most districts had a lower ratio of LEP spending to their EPS rate than they received in their allocation, as detailed in Table 7.

<b>Table 7. Proportion of SAUs Receiving EPS LEP Allocations Larger than Per-Pupil LEP Expenditures</b>				
	<b>LEP Enrollment Categories</b>			
	<b>1 - 15</b>	<b>16 - 250</b>	<b>251+</b>	<b>All Categories</b>
Number of Districts with Resident LEP Students	40	33	3	76
Percent of districts with LEP spending to EPS-rate ratio below EPS formula weight (i.e. spending less than allocated)	65%	55%	100%	62%

Because EPS allocations are based on resident enrollments and not attending enrollments, the total number of SAUs included in this analysis and their size categorization differ slightly from the prior tables in this report.

### **Historical Summary of Prior EPS LEP Component Review Results**

A summary of the weighted adjustments incorporated into the Maine EPS school funding formula in prior reviews of the LEP component appears in Table 8. As may be seen, after an initial increase from baseline weights for the two smaller enrollment categories implemented in response to the 2008 review, the LEP weights calculated in subsequent reviews in all enrollment categories have been below the weights implemented

in policy. The updated LEP weights for this 2016 EPS review analysis are very similar to the calculated LEP weights from the 2011 EPS review.

<b>Table 8: Summary of Weight Calculations from EPS Reviews and Subsequent Policy Changes</b>					
<b>EPS Review Year</b>	<b>Calculation/Policy Fiscal Year (FY) Data</b>	<b>LEP Enrollment Category</b>			<b>Result in EPS Policy Change?</b>
		<b>1 - 15</b>	<b>16 - 249</b>	<b>250+</b>	
<b>Baseline</b>	<i>Initial EPS Weight (Implemented FY2006)</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>(baseline)</i>
<b>2006</b>	LEP Weight Calculated (FY2004 & FY2005 data)	0.6	0.3	0.3	No
<b>2008</b>	LEP Weight Calculated (FY2006 & FY2007 data)	0.7	0.5	0.3	Yes
<b>2008</b>	<i>EPS LEP Weight Policy Adopted for FY 2009</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.525</i>	<i>(new policy)</i>
<b>2009</b>	LEP Weight Calculated (FY2007 & FY2008 data)	0.4 to 0.6	0.3	0.3	No
<b>2011</b>	LEP Weights Calculated (FY2008 & FY2009 data)	0.4 to 0.5	0.2 to 0.3	0.3	No
<b>2016</b>	LEP Weights Calculated (FY2015 data)	0.4 to 0.5	0.3	0.2 to 0.3	TBD

## **Policy Recommendations and Considerations**

### *LEP Weight Recommendation*

In the review of FY2015 expenditure data, it is apparent that districts are spending less in LEP programs than they are being allocated in the EPS funding formula. In large part, this can be explained by the fact that overall education spending has increased at a faster pace than LEP program expenditures (see Table 5). Because the LEP per-student weight is calculated as a proportion of per pupil LEP spending to total state per pupil spending, this means the relative amount spent on LEP services has shrunk over time.

It has been reported anecdotally that some of the policymaker resistance to lowering the EPS LEP weights in response to prior reviews of this component stems from

an understandable reluctance to cut district allocations, particularly in districts struggling to support a large influx of EL students. However, as district’s EPS rates have increased since the LEP weights were last updated in 2008, the amount of money being allocated through the weights has also increased. Spending on LEP students has not increased at the same pace. In order to maintain the intent of the EPS formula, it is appropriate to adjust the LEP weights so that they are a closer fit to districts’ current spending practices. Since EPS allocations are based on the EPS rate and not actual prior expenditures, if the EPS rates were reset to the calculated rates in Table 6, some districts would receive less allocation than they are currently spending. To an extent this is to be expected as total district spending includes optional local funds that are budgeted above and beyond the EPS base allocation amount. However, recognizing that this may have been a barrier to making adjustments in the past, We recommend a more conservative adjustment for the next iteration of formula revisions as shown in Table 9, which could be implemented at the earliest in FY2018.

<b>Table 9. Recommended EPS LEP Weights for FY2018</b>		
<b>LEP Enrollment Categories</b>		
<b>1 - 15</b>	<b>16 - 250</b>	<b>251+</b>
0.5	0.4	0.4

These weights, which are approximately halfway between the current EPS weight and the weight calculated with the most recent data, would minimize the numbers of districts that would receive allocations lower than their current spending level, and provide for transition if trends continue and the LEP weights remain lower than these levels in the next component review in 2019.

*Other considerations*

As has been noted in past reviews, the current weights in the EPS formula create an inadvertent penalty for SAUs with 16 to 20 LEP students. When a district reaches the second size category with 16 LEP students, its per pupil weight for all students drops from 0.7 to 0.5. This means that districts with 16 to 20 LEP students receive less allocation than a district with 15 students. At 21 LEP students, districts are on par with those enrolling 15 students (in other words, they receive no additional allocation although they have 6 more

students). In prior years there was an adjustment made to provide additional funds for districts in this category, but this practice appears to have been eliminated in both policy and practice. An approximate maximum size of this penalty, for a district with a conservatively high EPS per pupil rate of \$7,000, would be about \$17,500 for the 16<sup>th</sup> LEP student enrolled. There were 11 districts with 16 to 20 LEP students in FY2015. Because the proportion of LEP to non-LEP students is not large in these districts, this penalty is a small amount of their total EPS allocation. However, in principle this is an inequitable practice. Moreover, if in the future the weights for the largest size group (251 or more students) were to become lower than for the medium tier, this situation would be replicated. (It would also have far greater consequence for the 251<sup>st</sup> student enrolled because of the larger number of students included in the lower weight.) Thus it is recommended that this issue be considered for possible policy remedies, including re-implementing an adjustment for affected districts.

Lastly, there may be merit in further exploring the possibility of providing a modest per-pupil weight for language minority students. While these learners do not require all of the services provided to LEP students who are actively receiving supplemental English instruction, they do need some administrative support. Insufficient data currently exists to examine the costs associated with language minority students. However, if more reliable data were available about the number of students and the nature of services provided—particularly to students on monitor status for the two years after exiting a LEP program—then it may be feasible to estimate an appropriate weight. This addition could prove to provide a better EPS model fit to actual expenditures for districts, so that there are fewer districts receiving substantially more or less allocation than they are spending for LEP students.



## Appendix A: Languages Represented in Maine Districts

Unique Languages in Maine and Number of Districts with Each Language Represented					
Acoli	4	German	12	Oriya	1
Afrikaans	1	Greek, Modern	6	Panjabi	2
Albanian	4	Gujarati	6	Papiamento	1
American Sign Language	3	Hawaiian	1	Passamaquoddy	6
Amharic	7	Hebrew	2	Persian	7
Arabic	23	Hindi	6	Polish	4
Aramaic (Imperial)	1	Hungarian	1	Portuguese	17
Bengali	7	Icelandic	2	Pushto	3
Bulgarian	2	Igbo	1	Romanian	2
Burmese	4	Indic (Other)	1	Rundi	2
Cebuano	1	Indonesian	1	Russian	23
Chinese	59	Italian	10	Salishan (mult.)	1
Cree	1	Japanese	8	Serbo-Croatian (Cyrillic)	3
Creoles and Pidgins (Other)	4	Kannada	1	Serbo-Croatian (Roman)	4
Creoles and Pidgins, English	9	Khmer	18	Slovak	1
Creoles and Pidgins, French	6	Kinyarwanda	4	Somali	8
Creoles and Pidgins, Portuguese	1	Korean	10	Spanish	53
Czech	2	Kurdish	2	Sundanese	3
Danish	3	Kurukh	1	Swahili	6
Dinka	5	Lao	3	Swedish	4
Dutch	4	Latvian	2	Tagalog	20
English	58	Lingala	3	Tahitian	1
Estonian	1	Lithuanian	2	Tamil	6
Ethiopic	3	Madurese	1	Telugu	3
Ewe	2	Maliseet	1	Thai	17
Faroese	2	Marathi	2	Tigrinya	5
Finnish	2	Micmac	2	Turkish	2
French	27	Nepali	1	Twi	2
Fula	3	Niger-Kordofanian	2	Urdu	8
Galibi Carib	1	Norwegian	1	Vietnamese	29
Ganda	1	Nubian languages	1	Misc. / Other / Undetermined	1

## Appendix B: LEP Program Cost Information by District

SAU ID	SAU Name	Number of Home Languages	Number of Attending LEP Pupils	Total LEP Expenditure	Expend. Per Attending LEP Pupil	Combined pK-12 LEP EPS Rate	Ratio of Expend. to LEP EPS Rate***
	<b>State Total**</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>5,055</b>	<b>\$14,091,122</b>	<b>\$ 2,788</b>	--	--
1007	Auburn School Department	24	196	\$592,812	\$3,025	\$6,355	0.48
1008	Augusta Public Schools	10	59	\$191,228	\$3,241	\$6,356	0.51
1011	Bangor School Department	11	51	\$103,521	\$2,030	\$6,730	0.30
1012	Bar Harbor Public Schools	5	6	*	*	\$6,389	*
1016	Biddeford School Department	15	110	\$216,309	\$1,966	\$6,865	0.29
1017	Blue Hill Public Schools	1	1	*	*	\$6,029	*
1281	Boothbay-Boothbay Hbr CSD	5	10	*	*	\$6,900	*
1021	Brewer School Department	5	7	\$4,750	\$679	\$6,931	0.10
1023	Bristol Public Schools	*	*	*	*	\$7,072	*
1024	Brooklin School Department	1	1	\$19,500	\$19,500	\$6,021	3.24
1026	Brunswick School Department	10	20	\$165,482	\$8,274	\$7,213	1.15
1028	Calais Public Schools	2	3	*	*	\$6,702	*
1029	Cape Elizabeth School Dept	11	23	\$67,348	\$2,928	\$7,378	0.40
1032	Castine School Department	*	*	\$1,561	*	*	*
3230	Cherryfield Public Schools	1	3	*	*	\$5,484	*
1044	Dayton School Department	1	1	\$3,615	\$3,615	\$6,894	0.52
1289	Deer Isle-Stonington CSD	1	1	*	*	\$6,610	*
1053	Easton Public Schools	1	2	*	*	\$6,060	*
1054	Eastport Public Schools	1	6	*	*	*	*
1055	Edgecomb Public Schools	1	1	*	*	\$6,553	*

**Key:**

\* No data reported to Maine Department of Education for this category

\*\* State totals are based on 77 districts reporting both expenditures and attending pupils

\*\*\* Ratios in red are lower than the current EPS LEP Weight for the district's size category, based on resident LEP pupils

SAU ID	SAU Name	Number of Home Languages	Number of Attending LEP Pupils	Total LEP Expenditure	Expend. Per Attending LEP Pupil	Combined pK-12 LEP EPS Rate	Ratio of Expend. to LEP EPS Rate***
	<b>State Total**</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>5,055</b>	<b>\$14,091,122</b>	<b>\$ 2,788</b>	--	--
1056	Ellsworth School Department	9	17	\$53,399	\$3,141	\$6,303	0.50
1057	Falmouth School Department	12	44	\$162,284	\$3,688	\$7,395	0.50
1294	Five Town CSD	7	10	\$22,819	\$2,282	\$7,495	0.30
1063	Glenburn Public Schools	*	*	\$3,139	*	*	*
1065	Gorham School Department	12	43	\$159,923	\$3,719	\$7,276	0.51
1067	Grand Isle Public Schools	*	*	*	*	\$6,847	*
1290	Great Salt Bay CSD	1	1	*	*	*	*
1071	Hancock Public Schools	*	*	*	*	\$6,729	*
1074	Hermon School Department	*	*	\$275	*	*	*
1270	Indian Island	*	*	\$79,154	*	*	*
1271	Indian Township	1	68	\$96,304	\$1,416	\$5,791	0.24
1085	Kittery School Department	7	19	\$24,035	\$1,265	\$6,987	0.18
1087	Lamoine School Department	*	*	\$251	*	*	*
1088	Lewiston School Department	32	1211	\$2,655,244	\$2,193	\$6,034	0.36
1092	Lisbon School Department	1	3	\$4,900	\$1,633	\$6,794	0.24
1097	Madawaska Public Schools	2	46	*	*	\$6,904	*
1107	Millinocket School Department	6	10	\$20,454	\$2,045	\$5,760	0.36
1221	MSAD 27	4	9	*	*	\$6,441	*
1240	MSAD 46	2	6	\$18,584	\$3,097	\$5,968	0.52
1127	Pembroke Public Schools	*	*	*	*	\$6,506	*
1129	Perry Public Schools	1	1	*	*	\$5,744	*
1272	Pleasant Point	2	95	\$110,305	\$1,161	\$6,044	0.19
1134	Portland Public Schools	30	1719	\$5,168,755	\$3,007	\$6,948	0.43
3152	RSU 01	7	7	\$16,891	\$2,413	\$6,834	0.35
3156	RSU 02	4	8	\$41,217	\$5,152	\$6,415	0.80

SAU ID	SAU Name	Number of Home Languages	Number of Attending LEP Pupils	Total LEP Expenditure	Expend. Per Attending LEP Pupil	Combined pK-12 LEP EPS Rate	Ratio of Expend. to LEP EPS Rate***
	<b>State Total**</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>5,055</b>	<b>\$14,091,122</b>	<b>\$ 2,788</b>	--	--
1197	RSU 03/MSAD 03	5	5	\$748	\$150	\$6,284	0.02
3157	RSU 04	3	5	\$29,412	\$5,882	\$6,541	0.90
3158	RSU 05	3	19	\$55,713	\$2,932	\$7,142	0.41
1200	RSU 06/MSAD 06	7	15	\$49,398	\$3,293	\$6,839	0.48
3206	RSU 09	2	3	\$16,829	\$5,610	\$6,648	0.84
3159	RSU 10	4	20	\$60,226	\$3,011	\$6,240	0.48
1205	RSU 11/MSAD 11	1	1	\$150	\$150	\$6,306	0.02
3160	RSU 12	3	6	\$27,799	\$4,633	\$6,348	0.73
3161	RSU 13	3	6	\$73,821	\$12,304	\$6,688	1.84
3162	RSU 14	12	31	\$129,633	\$4,182	\$6,955	0.60
1209	RSU 15/MSAD 15	6	16	\$81,905	\$5,119	\$6,813	0.75
3163	RSU 16	7	8	\$20,395	\$2,549	\$6,594	0.39
1211	RSU 17/MSAD 17	6	17	\$33,044	\$1,944	\$6,368	0.31
3164	RSU 18	5	9	\$49,280	\$5,476	\$6,524	0.84
3165	RSU 19	2	3	\$9,772	\$3,257	\$6,092	0.53
3166	RSU 20	10	24	\$78,405	\$3,267	\$6,761	0.48
3167	RSU 21	6	32	\$31,119	\$972	\$7,182	0.14
3217	RSU 22	6	8	\$24,759	\$3,095	\$6,737	0.46
3168	RSU 23	8	12	\$49,607	\$4,134	\$6,896	0.60
3169	RSU 24	3	11	\$64,591	\$5,872	\$6,207	0.95
3170	RSU 25	2	2	\$35,405	\$17,702	\$6,554	2.70
3171	RSU 26	11	21	\$36,521	\$1,739	\$7,075	0.25
1222	RSU 28/MSAD 28	9	15	\$58,122	\$3,875	\$6,680	0.58
1223	RSU 29/MSAD 29	1	1	*	*	\$5,957	*

SAU ID	SAU Name	Number of Home Languages	Number of Attending LEP Pupils	Total LEP Expenditure	Expend. Per Attending LEP Pupil	Combined pK-12 LEP EPS Rate	Ratio of Expend. to LEP EPS Rate***
	<b>State Total**</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>5,055</b>	<b>\$14,091,122</b>	<b>\$ 2,788</b>	--	--
1225	RSU 31/MSAD 31	2	2	*	*	\$5,911	*
1227	RSU 33/MSAD 33	3	55	\$1,213	\$22	\$6,047	0.00
3172	RSU 34	5	6	\$30,572	\$5,095	\$6,577	0.77
1229	RSU 35/MSAD 35	3	16	\$61,735	\$3,858	\$7,241	0.53
1231	RSU 37/MSAD 37	3	34	\$107,567	\$3,164	\$6,040	0.52
3173	RSU 38	8	14	\$35,193	\$2,514	\$6,620	0.38
3174	RSU 39	11	41	\$59,109	\$1,442	\$6,112	0.24
1234	RSU 40/MSAD 40	5	10	\$25,548	\$2,555	\$6,524	0.39
1238	RSU 44/MSAD 44	*	*	\$14,972	*	*	*
1243	RSU 49/MSAD 49	4	8	\$12,315	\$1,539	\$6,587	0.23
1245	RSU 51/MSAD 51	11	28	\$50,290	\$1,796	\$7,483	0.24
1246	RSU 52/MSAD 52	4	20	\$113,279	\$5,664	\$6,448	0.88
1247	RSU 53/MSAD 53	1	5	*	*	\$6,007	*
1248	RSU 54/MSAD 54	7	16	\$107,789	\$6,737	\$6,588	1.02
1249	RSU 55/MSAD 55	3	9	\$37,273	\$4,141	\$6,108	0.68
1251	RSU 57/MSAD 57	3	8	*	*	\$6,806	*
1252	RSU 58/MSAD 58	1	1	\$27	\$27	\$6,763	0.00
1254	RSU 60/MSAD 60	7	25	\$52,732	\$2,109	\$6,716	0.31
1255	RSU 61/MSAD 61	1	2	\$874	\$437	\$6,439	0.07
3175	RSU 67	1	1	*	*	\$5,483	*
1261	RSU 68/MSAD 68	2	3	\$36	\$12	\$5,705	0.00
1264	RSU 72/MSAD 72	1	1	\$24,935	\$24,935	\$6,329	3.94
3198	RSU 73	2	2	*	*	\$6,472	*
1266	RSU 75/MSAD 75	6	8	\$78,024	\$9,753	\$6,959	1.40

SAU ID	SAU Name	Number of Home Languages	Number of Attending LEP Pupils	Total LEP Expenditure	Expend. Per Attending LEP Pupil	Combined pK-12 LEP EPS Rate	Ratio of Expend. to LEP EPS Rate***
	<b>State Total**</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>5,055</b>	<b>\$14,091,122</b>	<b>\$ 2,788</b>	--	--
3184	RSU 78	1	1	\$2,036	\$2,036	*	*
1196	RSU 79/MSAD 01	2	9	*	*	\$6,363	*
1198	RSU 80/MSAD 04	1	1	*	*	\$6,717	*
1206	RSU 82/MSAD 12	1	6	\$384	\$64	\$6,552	0.01
1214	RSU 86/MSAD 20	2	4	*	*	\$6,193	*
1218	RSU 88/MSAD 24	2	75	*	*	\$6,470	*
1146	Saco School Department	16	45	\$153,883	\$3,420	\$6,675	0.51
1148	Sanford School Department	7	39	\$168,818	\$4,329	\$6,683	0.65
1149	Scarborough School Dept	21	54	\$253,082	\$4,687	\$7,234	0.65
1155	South Portland School Dept	29	205	\$618,256	\$3,016	\$7,040	0.43
1156	Southwest Harbor Public Sch.	1	1	*	*	\$6,551	*
1159	Surry Public Schools	*	*	*	*	\$5,699	*
1167	Veazie Public Schools	2	2	\$2,966	\$1,483	\$6,678	0.22
1170	Waterville Public Schools	7	21	\$100,631	\$4,792	\$6,778	0.71
1293	Wells-Ogunquit CSD	3	10	\$61,241	\$6,124	\$7,225	0.85
1175	Westbrook School Department	26	318	\$747,925	\$2,352	\$6,781	0.35
1183	Winslow Schools	6	17	\$72,987	\$4,293	\$6,724	0.64
1185	Winthrop Public Schools	1	1	*	*	\$6,385	*
1186	Wiscasset School Department	2	4	\$19,304	\$4,826	\$6,955	0.69
1190	Yarmouth Schools	6	16	\$91,299	\$5,706	\$7,398	0.77
1191	York School Department	1	4	\$63,616	\$15,904	\$7,225	2.20