

*Report of a Survey of Maine School Superintendents:
Essential Programs and Services*

Prepared by:



**19 Commercial St.
Portland, Maine 04101
www.policyoneresearch.com**

March 2005

Introduction

The current debate about Maine school funding reform has evolved from that which has driven debate for decades in Maine: the desire to offer a strong education to every child in Maine, regardless of where that child lives. Embedded annually in every legislative session and every community budget process are school funding subsidy amounts and distribution methods. Realizing the importance of this policy debate, PolicyOne Research, Inc., a public policy analysis firm in Portland, Maine constructed a survey and, as a public service, made it available to each Maine school superintendent through PolicyOne's online survey capability.

The survey, constructed with the help of legislators, school administrators, school board members and Maine School Management Association, centered primarily on the Essential Programs and Services model of school funding currently before the Maine Legislature. Survey results are presented in this paper. It is PolicyOne's hope that this report will help to inform the current debate about Maine school funding policy.

About PolicyOne Research, Inc.

PolicyOne Research of Portland, Maine is owned by Jim Damicis and A. Mavourneen Thompson. Damicis and Thompson each have over 15 years' experience in public policy research and analysis. PolicyOne leverages the principals' broad experience in core research and analysis techniques to provide clients with a full range of services within the areas of economic and community development, education policy, science and technology policy, program and service evaluation, state and local fiscal analysis, demographic analysis, survey design and analysis, and research and analysis to support advocacy. The EPS Superintendent Survey was implemented using PolicyOne's custom Web survey system. Other recent Web survey clients of PolicyOne include the Maine Department of Economic and Community Development, the Maine Mental Health Funding Collaborative, and the Town of Scarborough.

For further information contact:

A. Mavourneen Thompson & Jim Damicis
19 Commercial Street
Portland, Maine 04010
207-756-8585
www.policyoneresearch.com

Summary of Findings

It would be a bold understatement to say that many people care about education in Maine. Rather, education policy and school funding debates generally dominate state and community governments each spring. The state’s legislative commitment to public K-12 education comprises the largest share of the state’s General Fund budget and, in many communities, the largest share of local budgets.

Maine school superintendents are leaders of the state’s commitment to public education, overseeing almost 700 schools of various configurations throughout the state. Therefore, in an effort to gather the concerns and opinions of superintendents and to enrich the current debate about school funding, PolicyOne Research, Inc. recently offered a survey about the Essential Programs and Services school funding program to each Maine school superintendent.

The respondents, numbering 48 out of 151 school superintendents, or 32 percent of superintendents in Maine, represented 59,502 students, or 29 percent of the total April 1, 2004 student population. Taken together, the respondents created a profile of financial data that showed them to be, in many ways, similar or typical of all superintendents and school units, although they were projected to gain slightly less state aid under the EPS formula than all units statewide. Following is a summary of the findings:

Superintendents were critical in their grading of EPS: over 60 percent graded EPS an 'F' for 'Failure' or 'D' for 'Poor' (see Table 1). Only forty percent gave the model a 'C' or better.

Table 1: Superintendents Grade Essential Programs and Services		
Grade	Percentage of Respondents Who Gave this Grade	Number of Respondents Who Gave this Grade
A = Excellent	4.2 %	2
B = Good	14.6%	7
C = Fair	20.8%	10
D = Poor	20.8%	10
F = Failure	39.6%	19
	Total Respondents	48
Source: PolicyOne Research, Inc. <i>Survey of Maine School Superintendents: Essential Programs and Services</i>		

More specifically, superintendents generally responded that they did not have enough information about EPS to adequately explain the program's implications to their communities, although they agreed that they understood its implications for their units. In terms of the adequacy of EPS to sufficiently predict each unit's costs for educating students, superintendents expressed little confidence, reporting that funding would be insufficient to meet the Learning Results. Respondents reported that teachers and administrators had too little input into the development of the funding model.

Furthermore, according to a majority of the responding superintendents, student and taxpayer equity would remain an elusive goal even with the implementation of EPS. While most superintendents disagreed that EPS would reduce taxpayer burdens throughout Maine, more than one-third of respondents reported that suburban and urban communities would fare better than rural communities.

The EPS model would negatively affect schools' attempts to meet the interrelated goals of hiring skilled teachers, providing quality instruction and meeting high learning standards, according to the respondents. Superintendents largely agreed, as well, that EPS would not provide sufficient allocations for special education, transportation, facilities, extra-curricular activities, at-risk students and students who are learning English as a second language. More than a majority of respondents reported that teacher-student ratios, as delineated in the EPS model, would be inadequate.

Finally, to the perennial question of how much money a community needs from the state in order to provide a strong education program for its students, the superintendents disagreed that property valuation was an accurate measure of community wealth. Instead, they generally agreed that income should be considered in the measure of wealth. Furthermore, would EPS distribute funds more equitably than the previous formula? Most superintendents said no.

The survey, answered by one-third of the state's school superintendents, clearly revealed questions and disagreement by superintendents that the EPS funding model would be an adequate vehicle for sharing state funds with communities as they work to educate their students.

Recommendations

The Essential Programs and Services model of school funding is the result of many years of effort by policymakers and other experts whose motivation has been to help clear up a debate that has faced Maine for decades: How shall the state provide adequate funding, both equitably distributed and sustainable, to communities so that all children, no matter where they live, shall be provided a strong K-12 education?

This effort has required the examination of many variables and factors that are incorporated into the funding model, making it a complex mix of equations that determine how the state's education dollars are distributed. A formula of such complexity should, and will undergo repeated examinations, and repeated scrutiny as to its accuracy and effectiveness. PolicyOne recommends that Maine State Government appoint a task force whose responsibility will be to regularly examine, monitor and review the EPS formula in order to advise policymakers of its effectiveness and validity. Furthermore, it is important that this task force be independent of the Board of Education, Department of Education, and Legislature's Education Committee.

***Report of a Survey of Maine School Superintendents:
Essential Programs and Services.***

Table 2 at the end of this section provides the statistics regarding the responses for each question. Below is an overview of the findings based on the responses.

Implications and Information

With approximately one-third of the 151 Maine school superintendents responding to the school funding survey provided by PolicyOne Research, Inc., the majority said they understood the implications of EPS on their school units, but a majority also said they doubted their ability to fully describe the implications of this new funding mechanism to their teachers, school board, community leaders and the public.

- Superintendents responded with 60 percent either agreeing or strongly agreeing that they knew the implications of EPS on their units. Slightly more than one fifth, 21 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- Slightly more than half of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that they have sufficient information to effectively articulate the intent and impacts of EPS to their staff.
- Fifty percent of superintendents disagreed or strongly disagreed that they have sufficient information to effectively articulate the intent and impacts of EPS to their school board members. Only 25 percent agreed while another 25 percent offered no opinion.
- Fifty percent of superintendents disagreed or strongly disagreed that they have sufficient information to effectively articulate the intent and impacts of EPS to their town/city councillors/selectpeople and the public. Almost a quarter (23 percent) agreed that they had enough information.

Testing, Development and Adequacy of EPS

A large majority of the responding superintendents had negative views concerning the testing, development and adequacy of EPS. For instance, 85 percent disagreed that the EPS model had been adequately tested in predicting school units' costs for educating students to meet the standards of Maine's Learning Results. Likewise, almost three-fourths of respondents predicted that the level of EPS funding would be insufficient to meet the Learning Results. In addition, more than three-fourths of respondents reported that the development of the EPS model lacked sufficient input from both administrators and teachers.

- No superintendent thought that the EPS model has been adequately tested as to its accuracy in predicting each school unit's costs for achieving Maine's learning results. In fact, 85 percent of respondents reported that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that EPS had been adequately tested.
- Will the EPS model of funding provide an adequate level of school funding to school units for achieving Maine's Learning Results? This question evoked considerable disagreement. Almost three-fourths (71 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that EPS would provide adequate funding to achieve the Learning Results.
- More than three-fourths (77 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the funding model had sufficient input of school administrators.
- Respondents (81 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the model adequately reflects the input of teachers.

Taxpayer and Student Equity

According to a majority of the responding superintendents, student and taxpayer equity would remain an elusive goal even with the imposition of EPS.

- More than half (54 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that EPS would improve taxpayer equity. Almost 30 percent had no opinion.
- More than half of respondents (58 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that EPS would improve student equity, while slightly more than one-fifth had no opinion.

Rural, Suburban, and Urban Taxpayers

While most superintendents disagreed that EPS would reduce taxpayer burdens throughout Maine, more than one-third of respondents thought that suburban and urban communities would fare better than rural communities.

- Almost three-fourths of respondents (73 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that EPS would help to reduce tax burdens in rural communities.
- While 42 percent had no opinion, 34 percent agreed or strongly agreed that EPS would help reduce suburban communities' tax burdens.
- While 42 percent of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed about whether the EPS model of funding would reduce the taxpayer burden in Maine's service center communities, more people agreed or strongly agreed (33 percent) than disagreed or strongly disagreed (25 percent).
- Would the EPS model of funding reduce the taxpayer burden in all Maine communities? This question elicited largely negative responses: three

superintendents (6 percent) agreed while 35 (73 percent) disagreed (25 percent) or strongly disagreed (48 percent).

Quality of Student Instruction, Skilled Teachers and Achievement of Learning Results

The EPS model would negatively affect schools' attempts to meet the interrelated goals of hiring skilled teachers, providing quality instruction and meeting high learning standards, according to almost two-thirds of the survey respondents.

- Only 13 percent (six) of respondents said that the EPS model of funding would help students achieve the standards of the Maine Learning Results. More than two-thirds reported that they either disagreed (23 percent) or strongly disagreed (44 percent) with this statement.
- Thirty-three superintendents, or 69 percent of respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed that the EPS model of funding would help to improve the quality of student instruction.
- Eighty percent of superintendents responded negatively to whether EPS would allow units to hire highly skilled teachers; 54 percent strongly disagreed and 25 percent disagreed.

Meeting the Costs of Special Education, Transportation, Facilities and Extra-curricular Activities

The superintendents largely agreed that EPS would not provide sufficient allocations for the costs of all education programs, including special education, transportation facilities, and extra-curricular activities.

- Would the EPS model of funding provide sufficient allocations for the cost of all education components and programs? Forty out of 48 superintendents (83 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- Superintendents did not believe that EPS would provide enough money to meet the costs of special education: 73 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that it would.
- Superintendents disagreed (31 percent) or strongly disagreed (38 percent) that the EPS model of funding would provide sufficient allocations for the cost of transportation; 25 percent neither agreed nor disagreed.
- Likewise, 29 percent of respondents disagreed and 35 percent strongly disagreed that the EPS model of funding would provide sufficient allocations for the cost of buildings and facilities. While 65 percent had a negative response, one-fifth neither agreed nor disagreed.
- Almost 71 percent of superintendents strongly disagreed that the EPS would provide sufficient allocations for the cost of extra-curricular and co-curricular activities; another 6 percent disagreed, making a total of 77 percent who had a negative response to the question.

Class Size and At-risk Students

Over half of respondents disagreed that the teacher-student ratios imposed by EPS were adequate. Similarly, more than 81 percent of respondents reported that the model would not meet the needs of at-risk students. Where the cost of educating limited English proficient students was concerned, 44 percent of respondents disagreed that EPS would provide sufficient financial support to school units.

- Respondents did not agree that the EPS model of funding is based on adequate teacher-student ratios. While one out of five had no opinion regarding this, 54 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. This exceeded those who either agreed or strongly agreed (25 percent).
- There were none who strongly agreed with this statement: the EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of educating students who are at-risk. More than 81 percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- Superintendents who disagreed (44 percent) that the EPS model of funding would provide sufficient allocations for educating students who are limited English proficient exceeded those who agreed (27 percent); almost one-third had no opinion.

Distribution of State School Subsidies, Property Valuation and Income

Respondents disagreed that EPS would distribute funds equitably or that it would be more equitable than the previous funding formula. Is property valuation an accurate determinant of each community's ability to pay for its schools? Almost 63 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed. Should community income be considered in the distribution of state school funds? Twice as many agreed (48 percent) as disagreed, while one-third did not offer an opinion.

- Few respondents (10 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that the EPS model of funding would distribute funds equitably among Maine's school units. Rather, the views of disagreement or strong disagreement equaled 67 percent.
- Those who strongly disagreed (40 percent) and those who disagreed (13 percent) that the EPS model of funding is more equitable than the previous

school funding formula comprised the largest percentage (52 percent). Almost one-third had no opinion and 17 percent agreed or strongly agreed.

- To the much debated claim that property valuation is an accurate determinant of each community's ability to pay for its education costs, 63 percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed; slightly more than one-fourth agreed.
- The largest percentage (48 percent) of superintendents agreed or strongly agreed that some form of community income, such as median family income or median household income, is an accurate determinant of each community's ability to pay for its education costs. Slightly fewer than one-third had no opinion and 23 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Superintendents Grade the Essential Programs and Services Model of School Funding

Superintendents were mostly critical in their grades of EPS: one fifth gave the model a “C” for “Fair” and one-fifth a “D” for “Poor”, while almost 40 percent graded EPS “F” for “Failure”. Superintendents were asked to rate the EPS model of funding through the traditional scale of A through F, where A equaled Excellent, B equaled Good, C equaled Fair, D equaled Poor, and F equated with Failure.

Table 2: Percent Distribution of Responses by Question						
Question	Percent Distribution of Responses: Total Responding=48					Mean (1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree)
	1	2	3	4	5	
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1a. I am aware of the implications of EPS on my school unit.	25.0	35.4	18.8	8.3	12.5	2.5
1b. I have sufficient information to effectively articulate the intent and impacts of EPS to my staff.	2.1	20.8	27.1	20.8	29.2	3.5
1c. I have sufficient information to effectively articulate the intent and impacts of EPS to my school board members.	2.1	22.9	25.0	25.0	25.0	3.5
1d. I have sufficient information to effectively articulate the intent and impacts of EPS to my town/city councillors/selectpeople and the public.	2.1	20.8	27.1	22.9	27.1	3.5
1e. The EPS model has been adequately tested as to its accuracy in predicting each school unit's costs for achieving Maine's learning results.	0.0	0.0	14.6	20.8	64.6	4.5
1f. The EPS model will provide an adequate level of school funding to school units for achieving Maine's learning results.	2.1	10.4	16.7	16.7	54.2	4.1
1g. The EPS model adequately reflects the input of school administrators.	0.0	8.3	14.6	22.9	54.2	4.2
1h. The EPS model adequately reflects the input of teachers.	0.0	2.1	16.7	18.8	62.5	4.4
1i. The EPS model of funding will improve taxpayer equity through the distribution of state monies to school units.	2.1	14.6	29.2	14.6	39.6	3.8
1j. The EPS model of funding will improve student equity through the distribution of state monies to school units.	4.2	16.7	20.8	20.8	37.5	3.7
1k. The EPS model of funding will reduce the taxpayer burden in Maine's rural communities.	0.0	6.3	20.8	22.9	50.0	4.2
1l. The EPS model of funding will reduce the taxpayer burden in Maine's suburban communities.	10.4	22.9	41.7	16.7	8.3	2.9

Table 2: Percent Distribution of Responses by Question- Con't						
Question	Percent Distribution of Responses: Total Responding=48					Mean (1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree)
	1	2	3	4	5	
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1m. The EPS model of funding will reduce the taxpayer burden in Maine's service center communities.	6.3	27.1	41.7	12.5	12.5	3.0
1n. The EPS model of funding will reduce the taxpayer burden in all Maine communities.	0.0	6.3	20.8	25.0	47.9	4.1
1o. The EPS model of funding will help students achieve the standards of the Maine Learning Results.	2.1	10.4	20.8	22.9	43.8	4.0
1p. The EPS model of funding will help to improve the quality of student instruction.	4.2	6.3	20.8	18.8	50.0	4.0
1q. The EPS model of funding will enable school units to hire highly skilled teachers.	0.0	4.2	16.7	25.0	54.2	4.3
2a. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of all education components and programs.	2.1	6.3	8.3	29.2	54.2	4.3
2b. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of special education.	2.1	8.3	16.7	29.2	43.8	4.0
2c. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of transportation.	2.1	4.2	25.0	31.3	37.5	4.0
2d. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of buildings and facilities.	2.1	12.5	20.8	29.2	35.4	3.8
2e. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of extra-curricular and co-curricular activities.	0.0	8.3	14.6	6.3	70.8	4.4
2f. The EPS model of funding is based on adequate teacher-student ratios.	6.3	18.8	20.8	29.2	25.0	3.5
2g. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of educating students who are at-risk.	0.0	8.3	10.4	39.6	41.7	4.1
2h. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for educating students who are limited English proficient.	0.0	27.1	29.2	27.1	16.7	3.3

Table 2: Percent Distribution of Responses by Question- Con't						
Question	Percent Distribution of Responses: Total Responding=48					Mean (1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree)
	1	2	3	4	5	
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
2i. The EPS model of funding will distribute funds equitably among Maine's school units.	2.1	8.3	22.9	18.8	47.9	4.0
2j. The EPS model of funding is more equitable than the previous school funding formula.	8.3	8.3	31.3	12.5	39.6	3.7
2k. Property valuation is an accurate determinant of each community's ability to pay for its education costs.	6.3	20.8	10.4	22.9	39.6	3.7
2l. Some form of community income, such as median family income or median household income, is an accurate determinant of each community's ability to pay for its education costs.	6.3	41.7	29.2	6.3	16.7	2.9
Grade	A	B	C	D	F	
3. The original goal of the EPS model was to provide adequate funding for each student to meet the Maine Learning Results. Keeping that goal in mind, indicate the grade you would give the EPS model. (A=Excellent to B=Failure)	4.2	14.6	20.8	20.8	39.6	3.8
Source: PolicyOne Research, Inc. <i>Survey of Maine School Superintendents: Essential Programs and Services</i>						

Appendix A: Methodology

PolicyOne Research, Inc., in an effort to add to the information available to legislators about Essential Programs and Services, constructed a survey that was submitted to each Maine school superintendent. Various legislators, school board members and administrators, as well as Maine School Management Association staff suggested survey questions. PolicyOne made the survey available to each school superintendent in Maine through the use of PolicyOne's online survey capability. Each superintendent was contacted three times by email. The results were tabulated and analyzed by PolicyOne Research, Inc., originators of the survey.

The respondents, numbering 48 out of 151 school superintendents, or 32 percent of superintendents in Maine, represented 59,502 students, or 29 percent of the total April 1, 2004 student population. Taken together, the respondents created a profile of financial data that showed them to be, in many ways, similar or typical of all superintendents and school units, although they were projected to gain slightly less under the EPS formula than all units statewide. While the responding districts were typical in many ways to all districts statewide, there is no definitive statistical evidence indicating that what the respondents reported conclusively represents that which all superintendents would report, had they participated. Appendix Tables A1 through A4 provide an overview of the responding districts as well as comparisons to the state as a whole.

As indicated in Table A1, in terms of 2004 enrollment, responding districts had an average enrollment of 708 students, similar to the state average of 715 students.

Table A2 summarizes the districts from which responses were received by county. All of Maine's 16 counties were represented in the survey, although more superintendents in Aroostook, Washington, and Penobscot Counties took the survey than in the other counties.

Data from the Maine Department of Education's School Budget Report of 5/17/04 showed that the average of all school units' budgets for 2003-2004 was \$6,389,000. The units whose superintendents took the survey had a similar total average budget: \$6,430,000 (see Table A4). In terms of subsidy amounts, the total average subsidy amount statewide for 2004-05 was \$2,445,000. The participating units had a similar total average subsidy of \$2,395,000 in 2004-05 (see Table A3).

Other financial data showed further similarities between all school units and those whose superintendents took the survey. As an example, in 2003-2004, one mill of valuation, on average statewide, raised \$325,000; school units represented in the survey raised, on average, a similar amount: \$326,000 with each mill of valuation. Further, mills raised for education by responding units, on average, was 10.78; this nearly matched the same computation, 10.80, for all units in the state (see Table A4).

However, further analysis of the most recent data available from the Maine Department of Education showed the responding units to gain relatively less from the amounts projected under the new formula. For instance, the total average subsidy increase statewide under EPS is projected to be \$316,000; for responding units, the average subsidy increase would be slightly less at \$303,000 (see Table A3). Looked at another way, responding units' projected average percentage gain would be 39 percent as opposed to the statewide overall average gain of 54 percent. In terms of per pupil subsidies, the units that answered the survey, as a whole, would on average earn more per pupil from the state (see Table A3).

Appendix Table A1: Overview of Responding Districts -County & Enrollment			
SAU Code	SAU Name	County	2004 Enrollment
002	Acton School Department	YORK	449
009	Alton School Department	PENOBSCOT	130
015	Arrowsic School Department	SAGADAHOC	67
031	Beals School Department	WASHINGTON	61
040	Biddeford School Department	YORK	2,874
051	Bradley School Department	PENOBSCOT	203
053	Brewer School Department	PENOBSCOT	1,390
077	Caribou School Department	AROOSTOOK	1,476
079	Carroll Plt School Department	PENOBSCOT	18
089	Charlotte School Department	WASHINGTON	63
101	Coplin Plt School Department	FRANKLIN	19
121	Dennistown Plt. School Department	SOMERSET	4
122	Dennysville School Department	WASHINGTON	57
129	Drew Plt School Department	PENOBSCOT	9
137	Easton School Department	AROOSTOOK	218
138	Eastport School Department	WASHINGTON	218
154	Fayette School Department	KENNEBEC	167
167	Georgetown School Department	SAGADAHOC	143
171	Gorham School Department	CUMBERLAND	2,760
174	Grand Isle School Department	AROOSTOOK	71
177	Greenbush School Department	PENOBSCOT	278
180	Greenville School Department	PISCATAQUIS	237
216	Jonesboro School Department	WASHINGTON	104
217	Jonesport School Department	WASHINGTON	132
222	Kingsbury Plt School Department	PISCATAQUIS	0
227	Lakeville School Department	PENOBSCOT	8
253	Machias School Department	WASHINGTON	246
255	Macwahoc Plt School Dept	AROOSTOOK	12
256	Madawaska School Department	AROOSTOOK	696
263	Marshfield School Department	WASHINGTON	75
276	Milford School Department	PENOBSCOT	472
310	Northfield School Department	WASHINGTON	10
321	Old Town School Department	PENOBSCOT	1,075
339	Pembroke School Department	WASHINGTON	151
342	Perry School Department	WASHINGTON	148
345	Phippsburg School Department	SAGADAHOC	311
353	Portland Public Schools	CUMBERLAND	7,470
364	Reed Plt School Department	AROOSTOOK	32
365	Richmond School Department	SAGADAHOC	600
371	Roque Bluffs School Department	WASHINGTON	27
381	Sanford School Department	YORK	3,636
392	Shirley School Department	PISCATAQUIS	17
411	Steuben School Department	WASHINGTON	130
426	The Forks Plt School Dept	SOMERSET	3

Appendix Table A1: Overview of Responding Districts -County & Enrollment – Con't

SAU Code	SAU Name	County	2004 Enrollment
463	Wesley School Department	WASHINGTON	14
464	West Bath School Department	SAGADAHOC	286
475	Whitneyville School Department	WASHINGTON	39
476	Willimantic School Department	PISCATAQUIS	15
486	Wiscasset School Department	LINCOLN	623
490	Woolwich School Department	SAGADAHOC	504
491	Yarmouth Schools	CUMBERLAND	1,441
492	York School Department	YORK	2,166
496	Carrabassett Valley School Dep	FRANKLIN	85
497	Beaver Cove School Department	PISCATAQUIS	5
504	MSAD 04	PISCATAQUIS	836
508	MSAD 08	KNOX	210
519	MSAD 19	WASHINGTON	178
523	MSAD 23	PENOBSCOT	950
524	MSAD 24	AROOSTOOK	444
530	MSAD 30	PENOBSCOT	297
533	MSAD 33	AROOSTOOK	334
538	MSAD 38	PENOBSCOT	403
539	MSAD 39	OXFORD	635
542	MSAD 42	AROOSTOOK	409
546	MSAD 46	PENOBSCOT	1,052
548	MSAD 48	PENOBSCOT	2,053
549	MSAD 49	SOMERSET	2,710
552	MSAD 52	ANDROSCOGGIN	2,245
556	MSAD 56	WALDO	819
558	MSAD 58	FRANKLIN	718
559	MSAD 59	SOMERSET	1,021
561	MSAD 61	CUMBERLAND	2,203
564	MSAD 64	PENOBSCOT	1,285
565	MSAD 65	KNOX	3
567	MSAD 67	PENOBSCOT	1,262
570	MSAD 70	AROOSTOOK	618
571	MSAD 71	YORK	2,416
575	MSAD 75	SAGADAHOC	3,324
577	MSAD 77	WASHINGTON	496
904	Flanders Bay CSD	HANCOCK	280
909	Southern Aroostook CSD	AROOSTOOK	415
911	Schoodic CSD	HANCOCK	161
917	Moosabec CSD	WASHINGTON	94
920	Peninsula CSD	HANCOCK	186
	Respondent Total		59,502
	Respondent Average		708
	State Total		204,588
	State Average		715

Appendix Table A1: Overview of Responding Districts -County & Enrollment – Con't			
SUMMARY			
	Total Districts Represented	84	
	% of all Districts Statewide	29.4%	
	Total Superintendents Responding	48	
	% of Superintendents Statewide	31.8%	
	Total Enrollment Represented	59,502	
	% of Statewide Enrollment	29.1%	
Sources: Enrollment from: ED 502- Maine Dept Education- <i>April 1 Census of Students Educated at Public Expense</i>			

Appendix Table A2: County Representation of Survey Respondents		
County	Number of School Units Responding	2004 Enrollment of Responding Units
ANDROSCOGGIN	1	2,245
AROOSTOOK	11	4,725
CUMBERLAND	4	13,874
FRANKLIN	3	822
HANCOCK	3	627
KENNEBEC	1	167
KNOX	2	213
LINCOLN	1	623
OXFORD	1	635
PENOBSCOT	16	10,885
PISCATAQUIS	6	1,110
SAGadahoc	7	5,235
SOMERSET	4	3,738
WALDO	1	819
WASHINGTON	18	2,243
YORK	5	11,541
Total	84	59,502
Sources: Enrollment from: ED 502- Maine Dept Education- April 1 Census of Students Educated at Public Expense		

Appendix Table A3: State Subsidy Data for Responding Districts

SAU Name	FY 06 Adjusted State Share Plus Adjustments	FY 05 State Share GPA	State Subsidy Change 05-06	% Change 05-06	2004 Enrollment	Per Pupil State Subsidy FY 06
Acton	539,298	574,777	(35,479)	-6.17%	449	1,201
Alton	791,563	770,988	20,575	2.67%	130	6,089
Arrowsic	20,201	18,247	1,954	10.71%	67	302
Beals	184,027	175,360	8,667	4.94%	61	3,017
Beaver Cove	1,795	1,415	380	26.86%	5	359
Biddeford	10,374,004	8,458,971	1,915,033	22.64%	2,874	3,610
Bradley	801,988	826,604	(24,616)	-2.98%	203	3,951
Brewer	5,613,918	4,271,554	1,342,364	31.43%	1,390	4,039
Caribou	7,553,479	7,255,646	297,833	4.10%	1,476	5,118
Carrabassett Valley	28,199	20,935	7,264	34.70%	85	332
Carroll Plt	23,816	34,119	(10,303)	-30.20%	18	1,323
Charlotte	341,969	325,685	16,284	5.00%	63	5,428
Coplin Plt	27,512	5,375	22,137	411.86%	19	1,448
Dennistown Plt	1,047	990	57	5.74%	4	262
Dennysville	285,067	259,281	25,786	9.95%	57	5,001
Drew Plt	15,535	15,535	0	0.00%	9	1,726
Easton	797,384	759,413	37,971	5.00%	218	3,658
Eastport	1,171,544	1,189,512	(17,968)	-1.51%	218	5,374
Fayette	630,886	600,843	30,043	5.00%	167	3,778
Flanders Bay CSD	543,583	503,814	39,769	7.89%	280	1,941
Georgetown	330,763	124,787	205,976	165.06%	143	2,313
Gorham	13,950,103	11,608,066	2,342,037	20.18%	2,760	5,054
Grand Isle	259,909	269,214	(9,305)	-3.46%	71	3,661
Greenbush	1,504,751	1,593,957	(89,206)	-5.60%	278	5,413
Greenville	584,619	460,503	124,116	26.95%	237	2,467
Jonesboro	329,766	383,461	(53,695)	-14.00%	104	3,171
Jonesport	529,985	517,752	12,233	2.36%	132	4,015
Lakeville	9,180	2,263	6,917	305.63%	8	1,147
Machias	1,259,526	1,199,549	59,977	5.00%	246	5,120
Macwahoc Plt	33,185	33,918	(733)	-2.16%	12	2,765
Madawaksa	2,339,209	1,897,619	441,590	23.27%	696	3,361
Marshfield	234,053	234,053	0	0.00%	75	3,121
Milford	2,430,747	2,356,285	74,462	3.16%	472	5,150
Moosabec CSD	347,732	288,054	59,678	20.72%	94	3,699
Northfield	9,720	2,688	7,032	261.62%	10	972
Old Town	4,350,840	4,085,768	265,072	6.49%	1,075	4,047
Pembroke	737,779	702,971	34,808	4.95%	151	4,886
Peninsula CSD	226,108	196,531	29,577	15.05%	186	1,216
Perry	601,009	583,316	17,693	3.03%	148	4,061
Phippsburg	473,525	329,881	143,644	43.54%	311	1,523
Portland	10,701,017	8,994,999	1,706,018	18.97%	7,470	1,433
Reed Plt	146,756	130,549	16,207	12.41%	32	4,586
Richmond	2,988,844	2,478,883	509,961	20.57%	600	4,981

Appendix Table A3: State Subsidy Data for Responding Districts – Con't

SAU Name	FY 06 Adjusted State Share Plus Adjustments	FY 05 State Share GPA	State Subsidy Change 05-06	% Change 05-06	2004 Enrollment	Per Pupil State Subsidy FY 06
Roque Bluffs	24,380	7,214	17,166	237.96%	27	903
SAD 04	3,529,377	3,428,832	100,545	2.93%	836	4,222
SAD 08	974,545	885,862	88,683	10.01%	210	4,641
SAD 19	788,600	744,457	44,143	5.93%	178	4,430
SAD 23	4,657,045	4,339,690	317,355	7.31%	950	4,902
SAD 24	2,772,678	2,504,169	268,509	10.72%	444	6,245
SAD 30	1,917,894	1,832,979	84,915	4.63%	297	6,458
SAD 33	1,901,688	1,585,558	316,130	19.94%	334	5,694
SAD 38	1,921,362	1,903,209	18,153	0.95%	403	4,768
SAD 39	3,685,333	3,516,849	168,484	4.79%	635	5,804
SAD 42	2,173,906	2,156,565	17,341	0.80%	409	5,315
SAD 46	5,316,701	5,239,172	77,529	1.48%	1,052	5,054
SAD 48	10,376,027	9,593,416	782,611	8.16%	2,053	5,054
SAD 49	14,147,723	12,082,274	2,065,449	17.09%	2,710	5,221
SAD 52	11,933,579	10,828,317	1,105,262	10.21%	2,245	5,316
SAD 56	4,021,661	3,765,651	256,010	6.80%	819	4,910
SAD 58	3,332,081	3,318,952	13,129	0.40%	718	4,641
SAD 59	4,585,417	4,267,434	317,983	7.45%	1,021	4,491
SAD 61	6,672,631	6,722,013	(49,382)	-0.73%	2,203	3,029
SAD 64	5,627,156	5,489,909	137,247	2.50%	1,285	4,379
SAD 65	6,268	566	5,702	1007.48%	3	2,089
SAD 67	5,119,264	5,002,292	116,972	2.34%	1,262	4,056
SAD 70	3,269,448	3,120,255	149,193	4.78%	618	5,290
SAD 71	3,900,488	2,708,282	1,192,206	44.02%	2,416	1,614
SAD 75	15,086,125	13,498,066	1,588,059	11.77%	3,324	4,539
SAD 77	2,423,343	2,481,227	(57,884)	-2.33%	496	4,886
Sanford	18,750,640	14,908,455	3,842,185	25.77%	3,636	5,157
Schoodic CSD	518,934	494,223	24,711	5.00%	161	3,223
Shirley	4,065	4,385	(320)	-7.30%	17	239
SO Aroostook CSD	1,898,558	1,808,151	90,407	5.00%	415	4,575
Steuben	390,967	376,597	14,370	3.82%	130	3,007
The Forks Plt	990	990	0	0.00%	3	330
Wesley	22,068	60,066	(37,998)	-63.26%	14	1,576
West Bath	432,462	411,869	20,593	5.00%	286	1,512
Whitneyville	161,298	154,921	6,377	4.12%	39	4,136
Willimantic	5,941	5,941	0	0.00%	15	396
Wiscasset	2,297,984	1,824,077	473,907	25.98%	623	3,689
Woolwich	1,770,750	1,686,429	84,321	5.00%	504	3,513
Yarmouth	1,439,203	905,267	533,936	58.98%	1,441	999
York	2,009,583	608,801	1,400,782	230.09%	2,166	928
Respondent Total	223,994,110	198,817,513	25,176,597	12.66%	59,502	3,764
Respondent Average	2,698,724	2,395,392	303,332	38.64%	717	3,462
State Total	780,609,311	691,885,704	88,723,607	12.82%	203,793	3,830
State Average	2,758,337	2,444,826	315,742	53.46%	728	3,280

Source: State Subsidy Amounts and Enrollment from Maine Department of Education. Enrollment based on April 2004 Enrollment Counts. FY 06 Subsidy based on February 2005, DOE Estimates

Appendix Table A4: Mills Raised for Education and Total Budget Data for Respondents

SAU Code	SAU Name	2004 One Mill of Valuation	2004 Mills Raised for Education	2004 Total School Budget
002	Acton	304,500.00	12.46	\$4,303,259
009	Alton	24,750.00	13.62	\$1,237,265
015	Arrowsic	49,250.00	8.60	\$497,360
031	Beals	23,855.56	10.65	\$613,269
497	Beaver Cove	32,850.00	1.17	\$73,953
040	Biddeford	1,563,700.00	8.27	\$22,071,080
051	Bradley	54,650.00	14.15	\$1,576,771
053	Brewer	498,600.00	11.90	\$13,976,611
077	Caribou	260,300.00	10.65	\$11,928,630
496	Carrabassett Vly	268,400.00	2.87	\$786,669
079	Carroll Plt	9,600.00	8.40	\$151,049
089	Charlotte	16,750.00	13.26	\$582,485
101	Coplin Plt	14,650.00	8.61	\$161,180
121	Dennistown Plt	5,600.00	4.60	\$23,075
122	Dennysville	9,250.00	12.15	\$423,879
129	Drew Plt	4,600.00	8.89	\$67,958
137	Easton	97,550.00	17.89	\$2,598,691
138	Eastport	72,000.00	10.37	\$3,342,833
154	Fayette	77,000.00	11.45	\$1,538,201
904	Flanders Bay CSD	180,810.10	11.87	\$3,062,950
167	Georgetown	202,700.00	7.87	\$1,940,248
171	Gorham	835,200.00	14.11	\$23,757,443
174	Grand Isle	13,000.00	9.25	\$384,412
177	Greenbush	41,650.00	16.95	\$2,336,304
180	Greenville	144,650.00	14.30	\$3,053,162
216	Jonesboro	39,200.00	12.69	\$977,956
217	Jonesport	52,569.30	10.48	\$1,229,437
222	Kingsbury Plt	6,850.00	0.19	\$1,465
227	Lakeville	26,250.00	1.88	\$66,295
253	Machias	84,550.00	14.25	\$4,035,279
255	Macwahoc Plt	6,350.00	8.56	\$102,039
256	Madawaska	359,150.00	12.95	\$6,942,833
263	Marshfield	22,650.00	16.59	\$669,218
276	Milford	120,750.00	15.44	\$4,775,079
917	Moosabec CSD	38,025.15	14.25	\$1,185,051
310	Northfield	17,400.00	4.73	\$130,125
321	Old Town	413,850.00	11.24	\$12,130,598
339	Pembroke	37,200.00	12.29	\$1,276,860
342	Perry	40,300.00	11.13	\$1,127,047
345	Phippsburg	264,800.00	9.57	\$2,922,333
353	Portland	4,944,650.00	11.21	\$69,923,600
364	Reed Plt	9,450.00	10.34	\$312,261
365	Richmond	153,250.00	11.93	\$4,601,224
371	Roque Bluffs	31,150.00	6.54	\$227,838

Appendix Table A4: Mills Raised for Education and Total Budget Data for Respondents – Con't

SAU Code	SAU Name	2004 One Mill of Valuation	2004 Mills Raised for Education	2004 Total School Budget
504	SAD 04	244,100.00	9.23	\$5,845,155
508	SAD 08	285,450.00	6.77	\$2,155,158
519	SAD 19	81,650.00	13.15	\$2,170,501
523	SAD 23	159,750.00	10.78	\$6,429,379
524	SAD 24	76,300.00	10.90	\$4,335,441
530	SAD 30	67,900.00	16.14	\$3,502,837
533	SAD 33	75,750.00	14.16	\$3,387,856
538	SAD 38	78,400.00	9.65	\$2,831,458
539	SAD 39	159,000.00	12.66	\$5,690,754
542	SAD 42	62,550.00	12.42	\$3,687,331
546	SAD 46	210,200.00	10.98	\$8,327,140
548	SAD 48	479,050.00	11.50	\$16,856,181
549	SAD 49	490,050.00	14.73	\$19,569,191
552	SAD 52	533,000.00	14.40	\$19,220,052
556	SAD 56	306,500.00	13.71	\$8,245,342
558	SAD 58	240,000.00	13.19	\$8,661,421
559	SAD 59	400,100.00	12.53	\$9,616,855
561	SAD 61	1,298,450.00	12.00	\$22,610,689
564	SAD 64	256,050.00	10.05	\$7,932,034
565	SAD 65	14,250.00	2.20	\$71,557
567	SAD 67	347,950.00	11.71	\$9,526,648
570	SAD 70	143,250.00	11.55	\$4,927,413
571	SAD 71	2,406,550.00	8.78	\$24,877,020
575	SAD 75	1,644,750.00	9.82	\$30,571,324
577	SAD 77	167,000.00	11.65	\$4,762,000
381	Sanford	971,800.00	9.20	\$25,198,464
911	Schoodic CSD	74,076.12	9.24	\$1,999,880
392	Shirley	14,750.00	9.82	\$195,861
909	So Aroostook CSD	108,950.00	14.59	\$3,547,152
411	Steuben	53,666.26	7.99	\$953,475
426	The Forks Plt	17,500.00	4.57	\$130,483
463	Wesley	12,250.00	11.62	\$252,768
464	West Bath	171,350.00	10.34	\$2,245,265
475	Whitneyville	7,350.00	17.52	\$354,880
476	Willimantic	26,300.00	3.84	\$162,593
486	Wiscasset	254,600.00	16.62	\$8,960,828
490	Woolwich	182,250.00	12.41	\$4,082,709
491	Yarmouth	1,043,100.00	14.20	\$16,198,891
492	York	2,444,500.00	7.88	\$20,482,273
	Respondent Average	326,321.72	10.78	\$6,430,139
	State Average	324,758.66	10.80	\$6,389,209
Notes: Excludes data for CSD 920, Peninsula CSD, for which data was not available. Includes mills for total allocation plus additional appropriations				
Source: Maine Department of Education ED 250: Mills Raised for Education and School Budget Report 2003-04				

Appendix B: Survey

The following is a copy of the survey as it was presented to each superintendent in Maine through PolicyOne's online survey capacity.

MAINE STATE SCHOOL FUNDING SURVEY - 2005

The following brief survey is an opportunity for you to indicate your opinions about the Essential Programs and Services (EPS) model of Maine school funding and related issues. PolicyOne Research, Inc., a public policy analysis firm located in Portland, Maine, is conducting this survey to improve and enhance the information that is available to school officials, policymakers, and the public as the EPS model is implemented. Survey results, *reported in the aggregate only*, will be provided to the Maine School Management Association (MSMA), Maine state legislators, all respondents, and other interested persons.

To access the survey, please navigate to **www.policyoneresearch.com** and click the survey link. You will be directed to a page that allows you to login to the survey.

Results will be reported in the aggregate only. PolicyOne will not release individual survey responses.

Answer on a scale of 1 to 5: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neither agree nor disagree; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree; NA=not applicable. For all questions EPS stands for Essential Programs and Services.

1. I am aware of the implications of EPS on my school unit.
2. I have sufficient information to effectively articulate the intent and impacts of EPS to my staff.
3. I have sufficient information to effectively articulate the intent and impacts of EPS to my school board members.
4. I have sufficient information to effectively articulate the intent and impacts of EPS to my town/city councillors/selectpeople and the public.

5. The EPS model has been adequately tested as to its accuracy in predicting each school units' costs for achieving Maine's learning results.
6. The EPS model will provide an adequate level of school funding to units for achieving Maine's learning results.
7. The EPS model adequately reflects the input of school administrators.
8. The EPS model adequately reflects the input of teachers.
9. The EPS model of funding will improve taxpayer equity through the distribution of state monies to school units.
10. The EPS model of funding will improve student equity through the distribution of state monies to school units.
11. The EPS model of funding will reduce the property taxpayer burden in Maine's rural communities.
12. The EPS model of funding will reduce the property taxpayer burden in Maine's suburban communities.
13. The EPS model of funding will reduce the property taxpayer burden in Maine's service center communities.
14. The EPS model of funding will reduce the property taxpayer burden in all Maine's communities.
15. The EPS model of funding will help students achieve the standards of the Maine Learning Results.
16. The EPS model of funding will help to improve the quality of student instruction.
17. The EPS model of funding will encourage school units to hire highly skilled teachers.
18. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of all education.
19. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of special education.
20. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of transportation.
21. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of buildings and facilities.

22. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of extra-curricular and co-curricular activities.
23. The EPS model of funding is based on adequate teacher-student ratios.
24. The EPS model of funding provides sufficient allocations for the cost of educating students who are at-risk.
25. The EPS model of funding will distribute subsidies equitably.
26. The EPS model of funding is more equitable than the previous school funding formula.
27. Property valuation is a fair way for the state to determine each community's financial ability to pay for its education costs.
28. Community income is a fair way for the state to determine each community's financial ability to pay for its education costs.
29. The original goal of the EPS model was to provide adequate funding for each student to meet the Maine Learning Results. Keeping that goal in mind, indicate the grade you would give the EPS model. (Options: A; B; C; D; F. with A being the highest and F being the lowest.)
30. Please provide any comments regarding Essential Programs and Services and related issues of school funding that you think will help to inform legislators about these issues.