

### **Element Detail 4d**

**Element:** Revise funding formula weight for **Limited English Proficiency** students.

#### **Design Assumptions:**

1. Commission’s preliminary report recommends increasing support for at-risk students, including special education, low-income and LEP
2. Because most of LEP students also qualify for compensatory education funding, the compensatory education weight will provide for academic and social/emotional supports. Therefore, the LEP weight is only reflective of resources needed to specifically support language acquisition.
3. In addition to providing language acquisition resources for the student, the LEP weight should also be sufficient to provide LEP students the following services:
  - Family/Parent supports
  - Cost for translation and translation services
  - Bilingual liaisons
4. EL teachers must have specialized training, have proficiency in the other language(s), and cultural competency.

#### **Implementation Considerations:**

1. How does design align to requirements of State ESSA plan, particularly in terms of accountability, student exiting and services provided post-program exit?
2. Is there a cost impact if a school has many different non-English languages spoken versus just a few?

**Cost Savings:** Cost savings are not quantifiable for this particular element. It is anticipated that having a family liaison position will enable parents to be more involved in their child’s education.

# LEP

**Working Group 4 recommends:**

- **\$5,114 per LEP student to provide the resources identified by APA and resources sufficient to provide family liaison services**

LEP additional resources identified by Working

Family engagement

- Assuming 1.0 FTE family liaison

Additional resources

- Teachers (Instructional) – Elem. (1.3 FTE), Middle (2.0 FTE), High (3.4 FTE)
- Facilitators (Instructional) – Elem. (0.3 FTE), Middle (0.4 FTE), High (0.7 FTE)
- Supplies and district level support – \$200

LEP resource assumptions from APA report.

Blended evidence based and professional judgement panels

	Elementary (450 pupils)	Middle (720 pupils)	High (1,200 pupils)
Instructional	38.5 FTE (1:11.7)	46.4 FTE (1:15.5)	73 FTE (1:16.4)
Pupil Support	4 FTE (1:112.7)	7.9 FTE (1:91.1)	12.8 FTE (1:93.8)
Administrative	5 FTE (1:90)	7 FTE (1:102.9)	11 FTE (1:109.1)
Other	3 FTE (1:150)	4.5 FTE (1:266.7)	4 FTE (1:300)
Supplies/District Level	\$2,805 (\$6.23/pupil)	\$2,805 (\$3.90/pupil)	\$2,805 (\$2.34/pupil)

Per pupil base resource assumptions from APA report.

## Background Materials

### ***Limited English Proficient (LEP)***

#### **Resources**

The 2016 study recommended a weight of .35 for LEP students with the assumption that all LEP students would also receive the Compensatory Education weight for a total weight of .70. The resources and the weights for LEP from the EB and the PJ approaches were very different. The EB weight was 0.37, with 0.07 to address language services and 0.30 to provide support services. The EB model also used an unduplicated count; that is, LEP students who are also eligible for the compensatory education weight only receive the LEP weight. The PJ model identified an average weight of 0.64 to address both the instructional and support service needs of LEP students. The PJ model also applies the compensatory weight to LEP students who meet the income criteria, meaning a student who is low-income and identified as a LEP would receive both the compensatory education and the LEP weight.

To determine the appropriate blended weight, the study team first looked deeper into the resource allocations in the two models. The study team determined that support services needed for LEP students, as identified in the two approaches, were very similar to the services needed for compensatory education students, and in fact many of LEP students qualify for both programs. Therefore, the study team believes a weight of 0.40 would be appropriate to meet the support service needs for the LEP population outside of the specific language needs.

Next, looking specifically at the resources provided in each model to address student instructional needs, the study team found that the two models had very disparate recommendations, with the EB model recommending an LEP student-to-staff ratio of 100:1, and the PJ model recommending about 15:1. The case studies indicated that staff-to-student ratio from the PJ approach was a lower ratio than what is currently being utilized in successful schools, while the EB ratio was much higher.

The study team's analysis of student assessment performance indicates that there are significant achievement gaps for LEP students, even higher than that of other student populations. Based on this information, the study team determined that an adequate level of funding for language services would need to be closer to the resource estimates from the PJ approach to better address these persistent performance gaps. Therefore, the study team recommends a 0.40 weight to address the language needs of LEP students, which was reduced to 0.35 for the final recommendation given available federal resources. Students who are both LEP and eligible for compensatory education would also receive the compensatory education weight of 0.40 for necessary support services, for a combined weight of 0.80.

The blended model resources that support the recommended weight are shown below.

	Elementary School of 450 students 7% ELL (32 students)	Middle School of 720 students 7% ELL (50 students)	High School of 1,200 students 7% ELL (84 students)
<b>Personnel (FTE)</b>			
<b>Instructional Staff</b>			
Teachers	1.3	2.0	3.4
Instructional Facilitator (Coach)	0.3	0.4	0.7
<b>Other Costs (per student amounts)</b>			
Supplies, Materials and Equipment	\$100	\$100	\$100
District-level Support (Center Program, Contracted Translation Services)	\$100	\$100	\$100

### LEP Weight

The Working Group recommended that the LEP weight include resources for family engagement.

### Assumptions

- Family engagement (outreach, parent nights, coordinating with community language services) could be coordinated by a family liaison.
- Went back to the recommendations of the 2016 PJ panels which identified a 1.0 FTE family liaison position in every school.

### Cost/Adjustment

Adding a 1.0 FTE family liaison at each representative school increased the LEP weight from 0.35 to 0.47.

### Other States (Note, many states refer to LEP as ELL)

Forty-eight states provide additional resources to districts for LEP or English Language Learners (ELLs). States generally fall into 5 categories based on their funding mechanism: Flat Weight or Dollar Amount; Multiple Weights; Categorical Grants; Reimbursement; or Resource Allocation Model. Examples of state funding for ELL students in these categories follows.

#### Flat Weight or Dollar Amount

**Oklahoma:** The formula provides an additional 25% of base funding for each ELL student.

**Arkansas:** Each ELL student generates an additional \$338.

**Multiple Weight****Maine:** *Multiple Weights based on Concentration of ELL Students*

- Districts with less than 15 ELL students: 1.7
- Districts with more than 15, but less than 251 ELL students 1.5
- Districts with more than 251 ELL students: 1.525

**Hawaii:** *Multiple Weights based on Proficiency Level of ELL Students*

- Fully English Proficient: 1.0648
- Limited English Proficient: 1.1944
- Non-English Proficient: 1.3888

**Ohio:** *Multiple Weights based on Duration of Enrollment*

- Enrollment for less than 180 Days: \$1,515
- Enrollment for more than 180 Days: \$1,136

**Categorical Grant**

**Alabama:** Legislative appropriation that varies year-to-year: \$2,755,334 for FY18

**Nevada:** Separately funded program (Zoom Schools) outside of funding formula

**Reimbursement**

**Illinois:** Partial reimbursement for ELL expenses; must submit actual expenditures to the state

**Wisconsin:** Partial reimbursement for ELL expenses; must submit actual expenditures to the state

**Resource Allocation Model**

**Tennessee:** Funding formula provides districts with funding for an additional teaching position for every 20 ELL students and additional interpreter for every 200 ELL students.