

LESC bill analyses are available on the New Mexico Legislature website ([www.nmlegis.gov](http://www.nmlegis.gov)). Bill analyses are prepared by LESC staff for standing education committees of the New Mexico Legislature. LESC does not assume any responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

**LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE**  
**BILL ANALYSIS**  
**54th Legislature, 1st Session, 2019**

**Bill Number** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI    **Sponsor** Stewart/Kernan/Soules

**Tracking Number** .211403.4    **Committee Referrals** SEC/SFC; HAFC

**Short Title** Public Education Changes

**Analyst** Simon    **Original Date** 1/20/2019  
**Last Updated** 3/13/2019

---

**FOR THE LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE**

**BILL SUMMARY**

Synopsis of SFI Amendment 1

The Senate Floor Amendment 1 to Senate Finance Committee Amendment to the Senate Education Committee Amendment to SB1 (SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI) would provide for the phase-in of rural population units over five years, rather than three years, aligning this program with the Senate Finance Committee amendment. The amendment also provides for a \$3 million transfer from the K-3 Plus fund to hold a school district or charter school that enrolls adult students and has a reduced program cost for FY20 harmless to the change.

Synopsis of SFC Amendment

The Senate Finance Committee Amendment to the Senate Education Committee Amendment to SB1 (SB1/aSEC/aSFC) would provide for the phase-out of size adjustment program units for schools within school districts of more than 2,000 student over five years, rather than three years; provide additional clarity on services for at-risk students; increase the cost differential factor for rural population program units from 0.1 to 0.15; simplify the calculation of extended learning time program units; provide that K-5 Plus program units be based on student enrollment on a date chosen by the Public Education Department (PED); and made technical corrections.

Synopsis of SEC Amendment

The Senate Education Committee Amendment to SB1 (SB1/aSEC) eliminated the statewide cap of 27,000 charter school students, eliminated the requirement that K-5 Plus be mandatory for all students in participating schools no later than FY23, and required teachers participating in a K-5 Plus or extended learning time program to be paid at the same rate as their base salary.

Synopsis of Original Bill

Senate Bill 1 (SB1) amends the Public School Code to make changes to the public school funding formula to provide for increased educational time, increased funding for services to at-risk

students, increased educator pay, and improved budgetary accountability for programs that serve at-risk students. The bill addresses funding formula issues in response to the recent decision in *Martinez v. State of New Mexico* and *Yazzie v. State of New Mexico*. SB1 would:

- Allow school districts and charter schools to receive formula funding if they choose to participate in programs to extend instructional time, including K-5 Plus and a new extended learning time program;
- Increase the multiplier used to calculate the at-risk index from 0.13 to 0.25 to provide additional funding for at-risk students;
- Amend the School Personnel Act to increase minimum salaries for teachers, level 3-A counselors, principals, and assistant principals;
- Set a maximum age of 21 for students to generate public school funding;
- Eliminate size adjustment program units over three years to public schools within the boundaries of school districts with more than 2,000 students and create a new funding formula factor for school districts and charter schools in rural areas;
- Clarify and expand upon the information school districts and charter schools must include in their annual budget submissions, including new requirements for performance-based budgeting; and
- Cap student membership in charter schools at 27 thousand for FY20.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would make several changes to the public school funding formula that would alter the allocation of funding formula program units. Staff estimate SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would allocate a larger share of formula funding for services designed to close the achievement gap, including extended learning opportunities. The bill would also eliminate inefficiencies in the funding formula by restricting funding for small schools in urban areas and setting a maximum increase minimum salaries for teachers, level 3-A counselors, principals, and assistant principals.

SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI does not contain an appropriation, but the Senate Finance Committee Amendment for House Appropriations and Finance Committee Substitute for HB2 (HB2/HAFCS/aSFC) includes a \$490.9 million increase for program cost, including \$326 million to implement the provisions of SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC contains language making the appropriation contingent on enactment of SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI or similar legislation.

**K-5 Plus.** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would establish a new funding formula factor for K-5 Plus program units for school districts and charter schools that choose to participate in an expanded K-5 Plus program. Previously, the K-3 Plus program was funded outside the funding formula. K-5 Plus program units would be determined by multiplying student membership (MEM) in approved K-5 Plus programs by the cost differential factor of 0.3, effectively the same as the current rate of reimbursement for the K-3 Plus program. To qualify for K-5 Plus program units, a school district or charter school would be required to add at least 25 days to the school year, keep students with the same teacher during both K-5 Plus and the regular school year, provide professional development in how young children learn to read, and implement the program school-wide. SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would give priority to students enrolled in schools with a current K-3 Plus program, with a high percentage of low-income students, or that are low performing. According to the Public Education Department (PED), 18,227 students participated in summer 2018 programs and there are a total of 156,078 students in kindergarten through fifth grade statewide. Using the FY19 preliminary unit value, the cost of funding 18,227 students would be \$22.7 million and the cost of funding all 156,078 students would be \$194.7 million.

HB2/HAFCS includes \$119.9 million for K-5 Plus, or sufficient funds to expand K-5 Plus to 90,714 students, or all kindergarten through fifth grade students in schools that are low-income or low performing and currently eligible for K-3 Plus. In FY19, the Legislature appropriated \$30.2 million to PED for K-3 Plus. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC increases funding by \$89.7 million. Language included in HB2/HAFCS/aSFC would require PED to allocate the \$119.9 million only for K-5 Plus units. If fewer than 90.7 thousand students participate in the program, remaining funding will revert to the public education reform fund. Should school districts and charter schools apply for more than 90.7 thousand students to participate in the program, PED would be required to prioritize funding to schools with more than 80 percent of students eligible for free or reduced-fee lunch, schools that are low performing, and schools that participated in the program in summer 2018 when determining which programs would be eligible for funding.

PED estimates a cost for K-5 Plus programs at \$31.2 million in FY20, or \$88.7 million less than the amount included in HB2/HAFCS/aSFC for K-5 Plus. PED based this estimate on 25,029 students participating in K-5 Plus in FY20, while HB2/HAFCS/aSFC attempts to make enough funding available so that all students currently eligible would be able to participate in FY20.

***Extended Learning Time Programs.*** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would establish a new funding formula factor for school districts and charter schools that choose to extend the number of school days, offer after-school programs, and include 80 non-instructional hours for professional development in their school calendars. Program units for extended learning time programs would be calculated by multiplying student member by a cost differential factor of 0.11.

To be eligible for program units, most school districts and charter schools would be required to have at least 190 school days with at least 5.5 hours for kindergarten through sixth grade and 6 hours for seventh through twelfth grade. School districts currently operating a four-day school week, or school districts with fewer than 1,000 students choosing to operate a four-day school week in the future, would be required to have at least 160 instructional days, with at least 6.5 hours for kindergarten through sixth grade and 7 hours for seventh through 12th grade. A school district or charter school that has an approved K-5 Plus program would not need to add school days to participate in an extended learning time program as long as the school added equivalent additional instruction time by extending the school day. All participating school districts and charter schools would need to have at least 80 non-instructional hours for professional development and offer after school programs.

If all schools implement qualifying extended learning time programs in FY20, the estimated total cost could be up to \$149 million; however, it is unlikely that all schools will apply for extended learning time units and HB2/HAFCS/aSFC includes \$62.5 million for extended learning time programs. Language included in HB2/HAFCS/aSFC would require PED to allocate the \$62.5 million only for extended learning time program units, if fewer students participate in the program, remaining funding will revert to the public education reform fund. Should school districts and charter schools apply for more than \$62.5 million in programs, language in HB2/HAFCS/aSFC allows PED to determine which programs would be funded in FY20.

***At-Risk Index.*** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would increase the at-risk multiplier to 0.25 for FY20 and subsequent years from the current multiplier of 0.13. A school district's at-risk index is based on the three-year average rate of three indicators: the percentage of student membership used to calculate a school district's Title I allocation, the percentage of students that are English learners, and student mobility. These indicators are added together and the number of program units is calculated by:

$$\text{Three-Year Average Rate} * \text{Student Membership} * \text{At-Risk Multiplier} = \text{At-Risk Index}$$

Legislative staff estimates this will create an additional 27,211 program units in FY20, valued at \$113.2 million at the FY19 preliminary unit value. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC includes \$113.2 million to increase the at-risk index. Legislative staff analysis indicates the bill would more than double the proportion of formula funding for the at-risk index between FY18 and FY20.

**Interventions for At-Risk Students.** In the consolidated *Martinez* and *Yazzie* lawsuit, the plaintiffs argued that funding for at-risk students should be 25 percent higher than for other students. Taken together, the at-risk index, extended learning time factor, and K-5 Plus factor would account for 14.6 percent of total formula funding and additional per student funding for at-risk students will be at least 25 percent higher than for non-at-risk students. This does not include funding for interventions serving at-risk students funded outside of the formula, including prekindergarten and programs supported through the Indian education fund or other special programs administered by the PED.

**Teacher, Counselor, and Principal Minimum Salaries.**

SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI increases minimum salaries to \$40 thousand for level 1 teachers, \$50 thousand for level 2 teachers, and \$60 thousand for level 3-A teachers and counselors, and indexes minimum salaries for principals and assistant principals to the minimum salary of a level 3-A teacher. Current law provides a minimum salary of \$36 thousand for level 1 teachers, \$44 thousand for level 2 teachers, and \$54 thousand for level 3-A teachers and counselors. Principal and assistant principal minimum salaries are \$50 thousand, multiplied by a responsibility factor, depending on the level of school they serve and whether they are a principal or assistant principal. SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would require school districts to increase pay for teachers participating in K-5 Plus or the extended learning time program, based on the same rate of pay included in their base salary.

Minimum Teacher and Principal Salaries in SB1

Job Description	Current Minimum Salary	Proposed Minimum Salary
Level 1 teacher	\$36,000	\$40,000
Level 2 teacher	\$44,000	\$50,000
Level 3-A teacher or counselor	\$54,000	\$60,000
Elementary assistant principal	\$55,000	\$66,000
Elementary principal	\$60,000	\$72,000
Middle school assistant principal	\$75,500	\$69,000
Middle school principal	\$70,000	\$84,000
High school assistant principal	\$62,500	\$75,000
High school principal	\$80,000	\$96,000

Source: LESC

Legislative staff estimate the cost of the salary increase at \$92.4 million for teachers and counselors and \$5.7 million for principals. This estimate was revised from prior estimates due to new certified data of FY19 salaries. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC appropriates a total of \$162.3 million to increase compensation for school district and charter school personnel, including \$40.4 million to increase minimum salaries, or the estimated cost of SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI after an across-the-board salary increase of 6 percent for all school employees.

Raising minimum salary levels will likely result in compaction of salaries, which may affect staff retention. School districts indicate increasing salary minimums will flatten salary schedules if additional raises for teachers already over the new minimums are not appropriated, given the historical practice of school districts increasing all teacher salaries uniformly.

**Small School Size Adjustment.** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI amends the Public School Finance Act to phase-out size adjustment program units for schools located within a large school district and to allow charter schools to generate size adjustment program units if they are located within small

school districts. School districts with more than 2,000 students and charter schools located within school districts with more than 2,000 students would see reduced size funding over the next three years, as follows:

- For FY20, 80 percent of size adjustment program units;
- For FY21, 60 percent of size adjustment program units;
- For FY22, 40 percent of size adjustment program units;
- For FY23, 20 percent of size adjustment program units; and
- For FY24 and subsequent years, no size adjustment program units.

Schools located in school districts with fewer than 2,000 students will continue to generate size adjustment program units with no modifications.

SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would eliminate about 2,173 program units from schools in large school districts each year for five years, eliminating about 10.5 thousand program units by FY22 and subsequent fiscal years. Using the FY19 preliminary unit value of \$4,159.23, the estimated cost savings in FY20 and each fiscal year until FY22 would amount to about \$9 million. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC assumes this cost savings.

***Rural Population Factor.*** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI amends the Public School Finance Act to create a rural population formula factor that allows school districts and charter schools in geographically rural areas, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, to generate additional program units. Schools located within a school district boundary that is greater than 40 percent rural would be eligible for these units, which are calculated based on the following formula:

- For FY20,  $MEM * 0.03 * \text{the rural population rate}$ ;
- For FY21,  $MEM * 0.06 * \text{the rural population rate}$ ;
- For FY22,  $MEM * 0.09 * \text{the rural population rate}$ ;
- For FY23,  $MEM * 0.12 * \text{the rural population rate}$ ; and
- For FY24 and subsequent fiscal years,  $MEM * 0.15 * \text{the rural population rate}$ .

According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2010 urban and rural population data, 63 out of 89 school districts in New Mexico are more than 40 percent rural and would be eligible for these units. Charter schools located within those school districts would also be eligible. This would add about 1,250 program units each year for five years, adding about 6,256 program units for FY22 and subsequent fiscal years. Using the FY19 preliminary unit value of \$4,159.23, the estimated additional costs between FY20 and FY22 would amount to about \$5.2 million each fiscal year. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC assumes this cost savings.

***Definition of School Age Person.*** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI amends the definitions of “school-age person” and “qualified student” in the Public School Code to prohibit public schools from claiming funding for newly enrolled students over 21 years of age. Students 22 years of age and older on the first day of school would not be included in funding formula counts for that school year, but a student who turns 22 years of age during the school year would be counted for that school year. The bill allows students over the age of 21 to remain eligible for funding if they have been continuously enrolled at the same public school since the third reporting period of the 2018-2019 school year. For FY18, 772 students over the age of 23 generated approximately \$6.4 million in public education program cost. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC takes credit for \$6.1 million in program cost related to adult students.

SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI includes a \$3 million transfer from the K-3 Plus fund to the PED to hold harmless a school district or charter school that has a reduction to program cost from FY19 to FY20 and is negatively impacted by the change to the definition of school age person.

**Public Education Reform Fund.** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would create a public education reform fund for the implementation of evidence-based public education initiatives. The fund would be administered by PED, but is subject to legislative appropriations. PED may not allocate money in the public education reform fund without an appropriation by the Legislature. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC does not appropriate from the public education reform fund and any amounts transferred to the fund could be appropriated by the Legislature in FY21 and subsequent fiscal years for “year two” reforms aimed at addressing the consolidated *Martinez* and *Yazzie* lawsuit.

## **SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

***Martinez and Yazzie Lawsuit.*** Provisions of SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI may help the state to resolve ongoing litigation regarding the sufficiency and uniformity of the public education system in New Mexico. On July 20, 2018, the First Judicial District Court issued an initial decision and order on the consolidated *Martinez v. New Mexico* and *Yazzie v. New Mexico* lawsuits. On December 20, 2018, the court issued its findings of facts and conclusions of law in the consolidated lawsuits. In both the initial decision and the findings and conclusions, the court cited evidence highlighting areas where funding levels, financing methods, and PED oversight were deficient. However, the court stopped short of prescribing specific remedies and deferred decisions on how to achieve education sufficiency to the Legislature and executive.

The decision in the consolidated *Martinez* and *Yazzie* lawsuit generally found the state had failed to provide a sufficient education for at-risk students, which the court defined as low-income students, English learners, Native American students, and students with disabilities, based on evidence of inadequate inputs and low educational outputs in the form of low reading and math proficiency rates, significant disparities in test score performance between student groups, low high school graduation rates, and high college remediation rates. Evidence of low student academic performance was based in large part on PARCC test results.

Provisions of SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI address issues mentioned in the court ruling, including a low at-risk index, lack of K-3 Plus extended school year programs in all high-poverty schools, lack of extended learning time programs, low teacher salaries, large class sizes, limited department oversight, additional costs borne by schools in rural areas, and complex funding formula components susceptible to manipulation.

***K-5 Plus.*** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI repeals the sections of law establishing K-3 Plus, an extended school year program for kindergarten through third grade students that has been scientifically shown to improve student performance, and enacts a new K-5 Plus Act within the Public School Code. The K-5 Plus Act establishes eligibility requirements for K-5 Plus funding through the public school funding formula as well as PED oversight and reporting requirements. Provisions of SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI largely mirror the current requirements for the K-3 Plus program, while expanding the program to fourth and fifth grade. The bill requires PED to approve schools for participation in K-5 Plus and prioritize low performing elementary schools or schools in which 80 percent or more of the students are eligible for free or reduced-fee lunch. Schools that were previously eligible under the 2018 K-3 Plus program or K-5 Plus pilot program and meet PED criteria are also prioritized.

The court ruling on the *Martinez* and *Yazzie* case acknowledged that quality K-3 Plus programs could improve the performance of at-risk students but noted that schools must apply for K-3 Plus funding and administrative burdens, timing of appropriations, and funding levels prevent all eligible students from participating in the program.

The Legislature has increased appropriations for K-3 Plus from \$1 million in FY07 to \$30.2 million in FY19. Despite the program's increasing popularity, K-3 Plus implementation is inconsistent statewide. Some schools assign students to different teachers during the school year, run the program as a summer school rather than an extension of the school year, or operate K-3 Plus for fewer than 25 days. Other sites, like Deming Public Schools, leverage K-3 Plus and federal funding to extend the school year for all elementary students, including fourth and fifth graders, effectively providing an additional 150 days of instruction for every student before fifth grade.

***Extended Learning Time.*** The court ruling on the *Martinez* and *Yazzie* case acknowledged that afterschool, summer school, and extended learning could reduce learning loss and close achievement gaps for at-risk students, but noted schools lacked funding for these programs. National research indicates higher-income students will experience 6,000 more hours of learning than their lower-income peers by sixth grade, likely due to more high-quality learning opportunities outside of school. This learning gap is particularly harmful for New Mexico's at-risk students, who represent the majority of the state's student population.

Current law requires school districts and charter schools to have a minimum of 990 instructional hours for students in full-day kindergarten through sixth grade and 1,080 hours for seventh through 12th grade, based on 180 days with 5.5 hours for kindergarten through sixth grade and 6 hours for seventh through 12th grade. SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would require school districts and charter schools that wish to participate to increase the number of school days to 190 for a five-day school week, or 160 for a four-day school week. No school district or charter school currently meets these requirements. In FY18, school districts and charter schools operating a five-day school week had between 165 and 185 instructional days, with the exception of Taos International School, which had 153 days. Most school districts and charter schools with a five-day schedule had 177 or more instructional days, meaning most school districts and charter schools operating five-day school weeks would need to add 13 instructional days. Thirty-eight school districts operate four-day school weeks, with between 144 and 156 instructional days in FY18. Most school districts operating a four-day week would need to add 10 instructional days to meet requirements of the program. Twenty-two charter schools that currently operate four-day school weeks would not be eligible for extended learning time programs without expanding their calendar to include 190 instructional days. PED notes the bill does not address schools that operate under both 4-day and 5-day calendars.

SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would allow school districts and charter schools to spread professional development time throughout the school year, rather than requiring a school district or charter school to set aside one or more full days for teacher professional development. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures' *No Time to Lose: How to Build a World-Class Education System State by State*, most high-performing countries allocate a greater share of teacher's time to working with other teachers to develop their own teaching skills and developing the skills of new and struggling teachers. School districts and charter schools participating in extended learning time programs could allocate additional time for high-performing, experienced teachers to build the skills of their colleagues, potentially leading to less turnover among new teachers who are often given insufficient support to develop stronger teaching skills.

SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would also require school districts and charter schools to offer after school programs that do not supplant federal grants, such as 21st Century Community Learning Center grants, currently offered by seven school districts, one regional education cooperative, and five non-profit organizations. According to PED, 10,823 students were served by 21st Century programs in FY18; however, most students had fewer than 60 days of programming. Only 23 percent of students had 90 or more days of programming. The bill would require PED to promulgate rules establishing standard requirements for after school programming, including standards, hourly requirements, and membership calculations.

***Increase to At-Risk Index.*** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI increases the multiplier used to calculate the funding formula's at-risk index from 0.13 in FY19 to 0.25 in FY20. Under current law, a scheduled increase would have raised the multiplier from 0.13 in FY19, to 0.14 in FY20, and 0.15 in FY21. The multiplier was increased from 0.0915 to 0.106 in FY15. The recent decision in the *Martinez* and *Yazzie* lawsuit did not consider the FY19 increase to the at-risk index.

The at-risk index allows school districts and charter schools to generate additional program units if they provide services to assist at-risk students to reach their full academic potential. School districts and charter schools have significant flexibility in allocating at-risk funding to tailor services to meet the individual needs of their schools, teachers, and students. Programs can include counseling, mental health, social work, and other wrap-around services; services for English learners; class size reduction programs; programs that provide teachers and other staff with additional compensation to serve at-risk students; and programs designed to combat habitual truancy and other factors that place students at-risk of academic failure.

***Minimum Teacher Salaries.*** According to data from PED, half of all new teachers leave the profession in the first five years of their career, leaving school districts and charter schools with significant challenges in finding qualified teachers for the classroom. National research has found that teachers are paid less than similarly educated professions. Increases to teacher compensation are an important tool in keeping experienced teachers in the education profession and attracting students to teacher preparation programs.

***Definition of School Age Person.*** Current state law prohibits enrollment and funding for students in special education over the age of 21 because the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) limits special education services to students who have not reached the age of 22. PED has issued legal guidance allowing schools to enroll and claim funding for adult students who are not identified as needing special education. As a result, New Mexico spends millions of dollars annually on adults who attend public high schools, many of whom never graduate, raising concerns about the cost effectiveness of adults in public schools. A 2014 LFC program evaluation found public schools received more funding per student to educate adult students than adult education programs received but the completion rates were similar across programs. According to the Higher Education Department (HED), in FY17, the state spent \$408 per student for those enrolled in adult education programs, while the statewide average for an adult student funded through the public school funding formula was \$7,577, leading to equity issues. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC includes an additional \$3 million for adult education in FY20, which would support adult students that would not have access to a public high school.

***School Size Adjustment Factor and Rural Population Factor.*** The public school funding formula has for many years recognized the rural nature of New Mexico by allowing school district-operated schools that are unable to take advantage of economies of scale to generate additional formula funding. The number of size adjustment program units has increased in recent years, although

much of this growth has taken place in urban areas, in part due to an increase in the number of charter schools and in part due to incentives for larger school districts to design schools in a way to maximize the number of size adjustment program units. For example, LESC and LFC research has found 15 schools generating size adjustment units that are adjacent to, or sharing a facility with another school of the same grade level, mostly in urban areas. When possible, funding formula data should be based on factors that are outside the control of school districts or charter schools. The new rural population factor is based on the percentage of the population that live within rural census tracts, as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau, making it difficult for school districts and charter schools to gain additional funding by redesigning schools to maximize funding.

SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI also allows charter schools to generate size adjustment program units. While current law states that a school district is entitled to size adjustment program units, PED has for many years allocated charter schools size adjustment program units as if they were school districts, which is inconsistent with statute.

While SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would restrict small school size adjustment program units for school districts with more than 2,000 students, a number of large-enrollment school districts cover large geographic areas and serve many students in rural areas, subjecting them to the same diseconomies of scale faced by small school districts. The court ruling on the *Martinez* and *Yazzie* case credited testimony on the additional costs and challenges faced by schools and students living in rural and isolated areas. Rural school districts tend to provide longer transportation services, face higher delivery costs, and have greater difficulties recruiting teachers in hard-to-staff subjects.

PED notes that rural population units for FY20 would be based on data determined in 2010 and that some school districts may have dropped below the 40 percent threshold. PED also raises concerns that rural population units are not based on data controlled at the state level. PED notes making the funding formula dependent on outside data sources would leave PED vulnerable

***First Year Program Funding.*** SB1/aSEC/aSFC/aSFI would amend the Public School Finance Act to allow school districts and charter schools to open new K-5 Plus programs, bilingual multicultural programs, elementary fine arts programs, or extended learning time programs and receive formula funding in the first year of operation. Currently, school districts and charter schools are unable to receive funding for these programs in the first year because the funding formula allocates program units based on prior year enrollment.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

The bill contains several provisions designed to bring programs for at-risk students to the forefront of the budget process at the school district and charter school level. For FY21 and subsequent years, the bill requires school districts and charter schools to submit additional information on these programs when submitting their annual budget to PED for review and approval. School districts would need to explain the following:

- Services offered to improve the academic success of at-risk students;
- Services offered through extended learning time programs;
- Services offered through K-5 Plus programs;
- Services offered to implement the Bilingual Multicultural Education Act, Indian Education Act, and Hispanic Education Act;
- Services offered to students with disabilities, including information tying the amount spent

on these services to the revenue generated for students with disabilities;

- Class size and teaching load policies; and
- Beginning teacher mentorship programs.

PED would be responsible for reviewing these plans and ensuring school districts and charter schools are meeting the requirements of state law. PED could also require school districts or charter schools to account for the costs of services related to funding formula programs. The bill would also require school districts and charter schools to report on their progress in meeting a common set of performance targets, set by PED in consultation with the Department of Finance and Administration (DFA), LESC, and LFC. Since the early 2000s, state government departments have been required to submit performance-based budgets using performance measures and performance targets developed by the agency, DFA, and LFC. Such performance measures provide policymakers with important information and can point to programs that need additional attention from policymakers, and potentially require additional resources.

The court ruling on the *Martinez* and *Yazzie* lawsuit found PED failed to exercise its full authority over schools to ensure at-risk students receive a sufficient education. The submission and review of these educational plans could help PED identify areas where school districts and charter schools may need additional technical assistance or other supports. The bill also requires PED to ensure that all school boards and charter schools are prioritizing resources to proven programs linked to student achievement, rather than only ensuring schools with a grade of D or F are prioritizing resources. As a result, PED, school districts, and charter schools may need to increase administrative personnel or capacity to handle additional reporting and monitoring functions. HB2/HAFCS/aSFC includes a \$2 million increase to the PED operating budget, which could help the department comply with the oversight requirements of this bill.

The bill would also require PED to provide data and information related to public school finances to the DFA, LFC, or LESC within 10 business days of the request, similar to a provision in the Public School Finance Act which requires school districts and charter schools to provide reports to PED within 10 business days after the end of a reporting period. PED notes past legislative requests for education finance data are made without regard to availability of data. PED staff will likely be in noncompliance with this section of law simply due to a lack of data availability.

## **OTHER SIGNIFICANT ISSUES**

***Extended Learning Time.*** The 2016 LFC evaluation *Assessing “Time-on-Task” and Efforts to Extend Learning Time*, found 32 percent of instructional time, or 62 days, at New Mexico schools was lost or used on nonacademic activities. Factors impacting instructional time included late starts, teacher and student absences, discipline, truancy, test administration, re-teaching, recess, breakfast after the bell, and parent-teacher conferences. While the evaluation acknowledged the importance of providing additional time for learning, the report stressed the quality of learning time (time-on-task) as the key factor for improving academic achievement.

The LFC’s 2018 evaluation, *Instructional Time and Extended Learning Opportunities in Public Schools*, found students in New Mexico received fewer instructional days than a decade ago, and the number of schools on four-day week schedules increased by over 33 percent since FY10. Programs that extend learning time, like K-3 Plus and afterschool and summer enrichment, showed promise for closing learning gaps. Further, instructional time was only as effective as the quality of instruction. Key recommendations of the report included adding 10 days to the school year,

extending the school year through statewide K-5 Plus programs, lengthening school days with afterschool programs, and providing additional professional development time.

***At-Risk.*** Previous LESC and LFC studies have noted that New Mexico’s funding formula allocates a relatively small share of funding for services for at-risk students when compared with other states. According to a 2016 brief from the Education Commission of the States, 24 states include at-risk funding within their public school funding formula, while other states provide this funding on a categorical basis. While the methods vary significantly from state to state, making comparisons difficult, many other states providing a weight of between 20 and 30 percent, in line with what staff estimates the funding formula will allocate to the at-risk index, extended learning time programs, and K-5 Plus.

Some advocates have argued for replacing the current poverty indicator – the percentage of membership used to determine the school district’s Title I allocation – with the number of students eligible for free or reduced-fee lunches under the National School Lunch Program. When the at-risk index was created in the late 1990s, the task force appointed to make recommendations to the Legislature considered using school lunch data as part of the at-risk index, but this option was rejected. In the task force’s final report, the school finance experts who designed the at-risk index recommended against using free and reduced-fee lunch eligibility on the basis of “excessive manipulability” and low high school participation rates.

Replacing Title I eligibility with free and reduced-fee lunch eligibility would change the allocation of program units within the funding formula. Staff estimate that one unintended result of the change would be to allocate a smaller share of total at-risk funding to school districts with a relatively high poverty rate, while school districts with relatively low poverty rates would receive a larger share.

Some scholars have raised concerns about the validity of school lunch eligibility as a measure of student socioeconomic status. According to a policy brief from the National Education Policy Center, a project of the University of Colorado Boulder School of Education, researchers agree free and reduced-fee lunch eligibility data is a poor measure for determining a student’s socioeconomic status with, on average, a 20 percent misclassification rate, although when aggregated to the school level the measure can be a “crude but useful” tool for determining economic need relative to other schools or school districts.

While previous LFC and LESC reports have proposed using free and reduced-fee lunch in lieu of Title I eligibility, recent changes at the federal level make school lunch data increasingly problematic for research purposes. The federal Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 increased the number of schools able to offer free lunches to all students by allowing schools or school districts with 40 percent or more of students eligible for free or reduced-fee lunches to stop collecting data on student’s household income while still receiving federal dollars for school lunches. A 2017 working paper from the U.S. Census Bureau notes the new law will present challenges for those who use school lunch data as a proxy for economic disadvantage.

## **RELATED BILLS**

SB1, as introduced, was identical to HB5, as introduced.

HB171 would increase minimum salaries for FY20 to \$45 thousand for level 1 teachers, \$55 thousand for level 2 teachers, and \$65 thousand for level 3-A teachers and counselors.

HB455 would make changes to the public school funding formula that conflict with the changes included in SB1/aSEC/aSFC/SFI.

SB47 would increase minimum salaries for teachers, level 3-A counselors, principals and assistant principals to the levels included in SB1/aSEC/aSFC/SFI, but would increase minimum salaries for teachers and level 3-A counselors by \$2,500 per year in FY21 and FY22.

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

- LESC Files
- Public Education Department (PED)
- Legislative Finance Committee (LFC)

**JWS/mc/mhg**

PROGRAM COST SUMMARY TABLE

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19		FY20				FY21				FY22				FY23				FY24			
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change				
			\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%			
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,140,650,826	\$523,942,853	20.0%	\$3,310,253,618	\$169,602,792	5.4%	\$3,492,256,771	\$182,003,153	5.5%	\$3,683,950,582	\$191,693,811	5.5%	\$3,886,564,195	\$202,613,613	5.5%						
1 ALAMOGORDO	\$41,532,029	\$49,812,841	\$8,280,812	19.9%	\$52,964,685	\$3,151,844	6.3%	\$56,082,101	\$3,117,416	5.9%	\$59,384,018	\$3,301,917	5.9%	\$62,676,003	\$3,291,985	5.5%						
2 ALBUQUERQUE	\$637,370,733	\$775,226,073	\$137,855,340	21.6%	\$819,638,436	\$44,412,363	5.7%	\$866,364,832	\$46,726,396	5.7%	\$915,766,906	\$49,402,074	5.7%	\$966,947,185	\$51,180,279	5.6%						
3 ACE LEADERSHIP	\$2,994,824	\$3,167,055	\$172,231	5.8%	\$3,198,431	\$31,376	1.0%	\$3,229,441	\$31,010	1.0%	\$3,252,989	\$23,548	0.7%	\$3,295,957	\$42,968	1.3%						
4 ALBUQUERQUE CHARTER ACADEMY	\$2,674,231	\$2,940,760	\$266,529	10.0%	\$2,611,330	-\$329,430	-11.2%	\$2,593,869	-\$17,461	-0.7%	\$2,565,245	-\$28,624	-1.1%	\$2,535,771	-\$29,474	-1.1%						
5 ALB TALENT DEV SECONDARY	\$1,756,938	\$1,918,260	\$161,322	9.2%	\$1,918,260	\$0	0.0%	\$1,903,886	-\$14,374	-0.7%	\$1,872,669	-\$31,217	-1.6%	\$1,809,430	-\$63,239	-3.4%						
6 ALICE KING COMMUNITY SCHOOL	\$3,531,773	\$4,089,927	\$558,154	15.8%	\$4,330,125	\$240,198	5.9%	\$4,579,147	\$249,022	5.8%	\$4,842,554	\$263,407	5.8%	\$5,115,663	\$273,109	5.6%						
7 CHRISTINE DUNCAN COMMUNITY	\$2,775,637	\$3,247,096	\$471,459	17.0%	\$3,449,232	\$202,136	6.2%	\$3,667,841	\$218,609	6.3%	\$3,900,304	\$232,463	6.3%	\$4,120,272	\$219,968	5.6%						
8 CIEN AGUAS INTERNATIONAL ST. CHARTER	\$3,447,906	\$3,872,138	\$424,232	12.3%	\$4,055,553	\$183,415	4.7%	\$4,240,668	\$185,115	4.6%	\$4,433,569	\$192,901	4.5%	\$4,683,612	\$250,043	5.6%						
9 CORRALES INTERNATIONAL	\$2,432,692	\$2,639,428	\$206,736	8.5%	\$2,639,428	\$0	0.0%	\$2,620,006	-\$19,422	-0.7%	\$2,565,975	-\$54,031	-2.1%	\$2,539,479	-\$26,496	-1.0%						
10 COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL ST. CHARTER	\$4,789,769	\$5,617,899	\$828,130	17.3%	\$5,933,571	\$315,672	5.6%	\$6,221,728	\$288,157	4.9%	\$6,523,324	\$301,596	4.8%	\$6,891,225	\$367,901	5.6%						
11 DIGITAL ARTS & TECH ACADEMY	\$2,505,820	\$2,791,473	\$285,653	11.4%	\$2,817,213	\$25,740	0.9%	\$2,836,674	\$19,461	0.7%	\$2,848,624	\$11,950	0.4%	\$2,855,690	\$7,066	0.2%						
12 EAST MOUNTAIN	\$2,952,987	\$3,345,571	\$392,584	13.3%	\$3,464,196	\$118,625	3.5%	\$3,579,565	\$115,369	3.3%	\$3,696,530	\$116,965	3.3%	\$3,832,249	\$135,719	3.7%						
13 EL CAMINO REAL	\$2,643,894	\$3,003,676	\$359,782	13.6%	\$3,039,412	\$35,736	1.2%	\$3,072,047	\$32,635	1.1%	\$3,097,955	\$25,908	0.8%	\$3,128,159	\$30,204	1.0%						
14 GORDON BERNELL	\$3,023,311	\$3,235,266	\$211,955	7.0%	\$1,711,838	-\$1,523,428	-47.1%	\$1,664,043	-\$47,795	-2.8%	\$1,567,878	-\$96,165	-5.8%	\$1,502,378	-\$65,500	-4.2%						
15 HEALTH LEADERSHIP CHARTER (APS)	\$2,051,940	\$2,197,267	\$145,327	7.1%	\$2,197,267	\$0	0.0%	\$2,172,620	-\$24,647	-1.1%	\$2,172,959	-\$44,661	-2.1%	\$2,072,504	-\$55,455	-2.6%						
16 INTL SCHOOL MESA DEL SOL ST. CHARTER	\$2,662,885	\$3,022,650	\$359,765	13.5%	\$3,097,078	\$74,428	2.5%	\$3,170,191	\$73,113	2.4%	\$3,241,173	\$70,982	2.2%	\$3,300,794	\$59,621	1.8%						
17 LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA	\$4,031,845	\$4,391,760	\$359,915	8.9%	\$4,441,121	\$49,361	1.1%	\$4,521,279	\$80,158	1.8%	\$4,595,465	\$74,186	1.6%	\$4,681,869	\$86,404	1.9%						
18 LA RESOLANA LEADERSHIP	\$823,952	\$875,207	\$51,255	6.2%	\$875,207	\$0	0.0%	\$871,288	-\$3,919	-0.4%	\$865,696	-\$5,592	-0.6%	\$868,521	\$2,825	0.3%						
19 LOS PUENTES	\$2,095,686	\$2,360,137	\$264,451	12.6%	\$2,360,137	\$0	0.0%	\$2,346,795	-\$13,342	-0.6%	\$2,329,428	-\$17,367	-0.7%	\$2,266,117	-\$63,311	-2.7%						
20 MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE	\$1,535,109	\$1,770,274	\$235,165	15.3%	\$1,862,649	\$92,375	5.2%	\$1,949,108	\$86,459	4.6%	\$2,039,318	\$90,210	4.6%	\$2,154,331	\$115,013	5.6%						
21 MOUNTAIN MAHOGANY	\$1,548,207	\$1,802,550	\$254,343	16.4%	\$1,891,605	\$89,055	4.9%	\$1,984,733	\$93,128	4.9%	\$2,082,296	\$97,563	4.9%	\$2,178,738	\$96,442	4.6%						
22 NATIVE AMERICAN COMM ACAD.	\$3,314,923	\$3,808,953	\$494,030	14.9%	\$3,996,275	\$187,322	4.9%	\$4,180,375	\$184,100	4.6%	\$4,372,952	\$191,977	4.6%	\$4,618,942	\$246,590	5.6%						
23 NEW MEXICO INTERNATIONAL	\$1,960,066	\$2,286,034	\$325,968	16.6%	\$2,412,930	\$126,896	5.6%	\$2,550,932	\$138,002	5.7%	\$2,696,858	\$145,926	5.7%	\$2,848,954	\$152,096	5.6%						
24 NUESTROS VALORES	\$1,766,887	\$1,909,126	\$142,239	8.1%	\$1,909,126	\$0	0.0%	\$1,880,473	-\$28,653	-1.5%	\$1,815,957	-\$64,516	-3.4%	\$1,752,199	-\$63,758	-3.5%						
25 PAPA	\$2,851,639	\$3,378,741	\$527,102	18.5%	\$3,603,284	\$224,543	6.6%	\$3,833,466	\$230,182	6.4%	\$4,078,341	\$244,875	6.4%	\$4,271,991	\$193,650	4.7%						
26 ROBERT F. KENNEDY	\$3,416,774	\$3,671,132	\$254,358	7.4%	\$3,725,506	\$54,374	1.5%	\$3,800,082	\$74,576	2.0%	\$3,870,517	\$70,435	1.9%	\$3,915,874	\$45,357	1.2%						
27 SIEMBRA LEADERSHIP HIGH SCHOOL	\$1,352,569	\$1,438,458	\$85,889	6.4%	\$1,438,458	\$0	0.0%	\$1,401,709	-\$36,749	-2.6%	\$1,344,173	-\$57,536	-4.1%	\$1,307,218	-\$36,955	-2.7%						
28 SOUTH VALLEY	\$4,993,829	\$5,644,131	\$650,302	13.0%	\$5,890,406	\$246,275	4.4%	\$6,136,686	\$246,280	4.2%	\$6,391,606	\$254,920	4.2%	\$6,752,078	\$360,472	5.6%						
29 TECHNOLOGY LEADERSHIP	\$2,121,315	\$2,271,907	\$150,592	7.1%	\$2,271,907	\$0	0.0%	\$2,226,765	-\$45,142	-2.0%	\$2,132,987	-\$93,778	-4.2%	\$2,081,887	-\$51,100	-2.4%						
30 TWENTY FIRST CENT.	\$2,226,111	\$2,507,023	\$280,912	12.6%	\$2,618,243	\$111,220	4.4%	\$2,739,204	\$120,964	4.6%	\$2,865,363	\$126,159	4.6%	\$3,026,962	\$161,599	5.6%						
31 WILLIAM W & JOSEPHINE DORN CHARTER	\$663,314	\$765,605	\$102,291	15.4%	\$766,642	\$857	0.1%	\$772,446	\$5,984	0.8%	\$776,469	\$4,023	0.5%	\$776,227	-\$242	0.0%						
32 <b>ALBUQUERQUE W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$712,317,566</b>	<b>\$859,195,577</b>	<b>\$146,878,011</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>\$904,164,686</b>	<b>\$44,969,109</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>\$953,111,899</b>	<b>\$48,947,213</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>\$1,004,560,480</b>	<b>\$51,448,581</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>\$1,058,132,276</b>	<b>\$53,571,796</b>	<b>5.3%</b>						
33 ANIMAS	\$2,191,478	\$2,489,649	\$298,171	13.6%	\$2,604,095	\$114,446	4.6%	\$2,752,736	\$148,641	5.7%	\$2,909,894	\$157,158	5.7%	\$3,101,987	\$192,093	6.6%						
34 ARTESIA	\$27,808,096	\$32,489,040	\$4,680,944	16.8%	\$34,447,217	\$1,958,177	6.0%	\$36,393,752	\$1,946,535	5.7%	\$38,450,761	\$2,056,949	5.7%	\$40,542,727	\$2,092,026	5.4%						
35 AZTEC	\$20,883,939	\$26,142,306	\$5,258,367	25.2%	\$27,894,898	\$1,752,592	6.7%	\$29,719,768	\$1,824,870	6.5%	\$31,649,660	\$1,943,696	6.5%	\$33,649,620	\$1,986,156	6.3%						
36 MOSAIC ACADEMY CHARTER	\$1,386,051	\$1,585,408	\$199,357	14.4%	\$1,679,138	\$93,730	5.9%	\$1,773,595	\$94,457	5.6%	\$1,873,383	\$99,788	5.6%	\$1,967,655	\$94,272	5.0%						
37 <b>AZTEC W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$22,269,990</b>	<b>\$27,727,714</b>	<b>\$5,457,724</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	<b>\$29,574,036</b>	<b>\$1,846,322</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>\$31,493,363</b>	<b>\$1,919,327</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>\$33,536,847</b>	<b>\$2,043,484</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>\$35,617,275</b>	<b>\$2,080,428</b>	<b>6.2%</b>						
38 BELEN	\$29,827,015	\$37,186,763	\$7,359,748	24.7%	\$39,162,378	\$1,975,615	5.3%	\$41,249,122	\$2,086,744	5.3%	\$43,446,449	\$2,197,327	5.3%	\$45,877,521	\$2,431,072	5.6%						
39 BERNALILLO	\$23,822,468	\$29,947,490	\$6,125,022	25.7%	\$31,681,577	\$1,734,087	5.8%	\$33,588,080	\$1,906,503	6.0%	\$35,609,891	\$2,021,811	6.0%	\$37,620,692	\$2,010,801	5.6%						
40 BLOOMFIELD	\$21,843,053	\$26,936,454	\$5,093,401	23.3%	\$28,637,669	\$1,701,215	6.3%	\$30,425,636	\$1,787,967	6.2%	\$32,325,471	\$1,899,835	6.2%	\$34,364,210	\$2,038,739	6.3%						
41 CAPITAN	\$4,712,861	\$5,520,186	\$807,325	17.1%	\$5,924,965	\$404,779	7.3%	\$6,380,974	\$456,009	7.7%	\$6,870,310	\$489,336	7.7%	\$7,342,104	\$471,794	6.9%						
42 CARLSBAD	\$55,493,778	\$61,260,842	\$5,767,064	10.4%	\$63,584,263	\$2,323,421	3.8%	\$65,932,565	\$2,348,302	3.7%	\$68,337,369	\$2,404,804	3.6%	\$72,019,339	\$3,681,970	5.4%						
43 JEFFERSON MONT. ACAD.	\$1,928,714	\$2,075,325	\$146,611	7.6%	\$2,075,325	\$0	0.0%	\$2,043,409	-\$31,916	-1.5%	\$1,959,095	-\$84,314	-4.1%	\$1,891,262	-\$67,833	-3.5%						
44 PECOS CONNECTIONS	\$5,225,311	\$5,904,453	\$679,142	13.0%	\$6,134,030	\$229,577	3.9%	\$6,395,070	\$261,040	4.3%	\$6,665,643	\$270,573	4.2%	\$7,041,570	\$375,927	5.6%						
45 <b>CARLSBAD W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$62,647,803</b>	<b>\$69,240,620</b>	<b>\$6,592,817</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>\$71,793,618</b>	<b>\$2,552,998</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>\$74,371,044</b>	<b>\$2,577,426</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>\$76,962,107</b>	<b>\$2,591,063</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>\$80,952,171</b>	<b>\$3,990,064</b>	<b>5.2%</b>						
46 CARRIZOZO	\$2,016,154	\$2,403,675	\$387,521	19.2%	\$2,531,561	\$127,886	5.3%	\$2,697,779	\$166,218	6.6%	\$2,874,853	\$177,074	6.6%	\$3,062,288	\$187,435	6.5%						
47 CENTRAL CONS.	\$44,207,986	\$54,715,363	\$10,507,377	23.8%	\$58,226,357	\$3,510,994	6.4%	\$61,958,537	\$3,732,180	6.4%	\$65,929,642	\$3,971,105	6.4%	\$69,931,973	\$4,002,331	6.1%						
48 CHAMA VALLEY	\$4,062,428	\$4,953,662	\$891,234	21.9%	\$5,276,163	\$322,501	6.5%	\$5,667,139	\$390,976	7.4%	\$6,086,012	\$418,873	7.4%	\$6,								

ATTACHMENT

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19		FY20				FY21				FY22				FY23				FY24			
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change				
			\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%			
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,140,650,826	\$523,942,853	20.0%	\$3,310,253,618	\$169,602,792	5.4%	\$3,492,256,771	\$182,003,153	5.5%	\$3,683,950,582	\$191,693,811	5.5%	\$3,886,564,195	\$202,613,613	5.5%						
62 DEXTER	\$8,213,855	\$10,026,266	\$1,812,411	22.1%	\$10,665,844	\$639,578	6.4%	\$11,377,350	\$711,506	6.7%	\$12,135,919	\$758,569	6.7%	\$12,978,655	\$842,736	6.9%						
63 DORA	\$2,637,671	\$2,986,697	\$349,026	13.2%	\$3,166,625	\$179,928	6.0%	\$3,379,792	\$213,167	6.7%	\$3,607,160	\$227,368	6.7%	\$3,850,892	\$243,732	6.8%						
64 DULCE	\$6,790,434	\$8,313,584	\$1,523,150	22.4%	\$8,794,792	\$481,208	5.8%	\$9,365,059	\$570,267	6.5%	\$9,972,189	\$607,130	6.5%	\$10,647,360	\$675,171	6.8%						
65 ELIDA	\$1,780,113	\$2,041,701	\$261,588	14.7%	\$2,164,957	\$123,256	6.0%	\$2,319,468	\$154,511	7.1%	\$2,484,726	\$165,258	7.1%	\$2,647,941	\$163,215	6.6%						
66 ESPANOLA	\$30,190,412	\$36,761,375	\$6,570,963	21.8%	\$38,374,959	\$1,613,584	4.4%	\$40,143,070	\$1,768,111	4.6%	\$41,986,800	\$1,843,730	4.6%	\$44,042,350	\$2,055,550	4.9%						
67 ESTANCIA	\$6,625,845	\$8,055,688	\$1,429,843	21.6%	\$8,571,207	\$515,519	6.4%	\$9,193,569	\$622,362	7.3%	\$9,859,741	\$666,172	7.2%	\$10,517,344	\$657,603	6.7%						
68 EUNICE	\$6,677,507	\$8,159,064	\$1,481,557	22.2%	\$8,606,153	\$447,089	5.5%	\$9,098,804	\$492,651	5.7%	\$9,619,794	\$520,990	5.7%	\$10,162,328	\$542,534	5.6%						
69 FARMINGTON	\$78,837,914	\$93,860,076	\$15,022,162	19.1%	\$99,374,662	\$5,514,586	5.9%	\$104,859,404	\$5,484,742	5.5%	\$110,647,194	\$5,787,790	5.5%	\$116,720,796	\$6,073,602	5.5%						
70 NEW MEXICO VIRTUAL ACADEMY	\$3,297,766	\$3,847,561	\$549,795	16.7%	\$4,078,250	\$230,689	6.0%	\$4,292,845	\$214,595	5.3%	\$4,518,630	\$225,785	5.3%	\$4,773,470	\$254,840	5.6%						
<b>FARMINGTON W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$82,135,680</b>	<b>\$97,707,637</b>	<b>\$15,571,957</b>	<b>19.0%</b>	<b>\$103,452,912</b>	<b>\$5,745,275</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>\$109,152,249</b>	<b>\$5,699,337</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$115,165,824</b>	<b>\$6,013,575</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$121,494,266</b>	<b>\$6,328,442</b>	<b>5.5%</b>						
71 FLOYD	\$2,451,833	\$2,838,339	\$386,506	15.8%	\$3,020,834	\$182,495	6.4%	\$3,240,922	\$220,088	7.3%	\$3,476,536	\$235,614	7.3%	\$3,708,461	\$231,925	6.7%						
72 FT. SUMNER	\$3,002,598	\$3,529,322	\$526,724	17.5%	\$3,792,517	\$263,195	7.5%	\$4,100,161	\$307,644	8.1%	\$4,430,999	\$330,838	8.1%	\$4,728,946	\$297,947	6.7%						
73 GADSDEN	\$103,886,265	\$129,507,642	\$25,621,377	24.7%	\$136,457,211	\$6,949,569	5.4%	\$143,900,165	\$7,442,954	5.5%	\$151,748,784	\$7,848,619	5.5%	\$160,130,601	\$8,381,817	5.5%						
74 GALLUP	\$87,704,577	\$109,754,581	\$22,050,004	25.1%	\$115,977,785	\$6,223,204	5.7%	\$122,681,060	\$6,703,275	5.8%	\$129,773,769	\$7,092,709	5.8%	\$137,213,525	\$7,439,756	5.7%						
75 MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH	\$1,329,028	\$1,404,613	\$75,585	5.7%	\$1,404,613	\$0	0.0%	\$1,351,843	-\$52,770	-3.8%	\$1,243,584	-\$108,259	-8.0%	\$1,190,976	-\$52,608	-4.2%						
<b>GALLUP W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$89,033,605</b>	<b>\$111,159,194</b>	<b>\$22,125,589</b>	<b>24.9%</b>	<b>\$117,382,398</b>	<b>\$6,223,204</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>\$124,032,903</b>	<b>\$6,650,505</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>\$131,017,353</b>	<b>\$6,984,450</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>\$138,404,501</b>	<b>\$7,387,148</b>	<b>5.6%</b>						
76 GRADY	\$1,789,542	\$2,022,644	\$233,102	13.0%	\$2,138,075	\$115,431	5.7%	\$2,285,500	\$147,425	6.9%	\$2,442,932	\$157,432	6.9%	\$2,602,618	\$159,686	6.5%						
77 GRANTS	\$28,645,790	\$35,280,595	\$6,634,805	23.2%	\$37,079,467	\$1,798,872	5.1%	\$39,039,209	\$1,959,742	5.3%	\$41,101,753	\$2,062,544	5.3%	\$43,373,061	\$2,271,308	5.5%						
78 HAGERMAN	\$4,531,444	\$5,241,665	\$710,221	15.7%	\$5,526,922	\$285,257	5.4%	\$5,866,448	\$339,526	6.1%	\$6,226,908	\$360,460	6.1%	\$6,649,050	\$422,142	6.8%						
79 HATCH	\$9,746,361	\$12,473,167	\$2,726,806	28.0%	\$13,264,840	\$791,673	6.3%	\$14,131,344	\$866,504	6.5%	\$15,053,203	\$922,859	6.5%	\$16,107,601	\$1,053,398	7.0%						
80 HOBBS	\$70,738,404	\$83,292,752	\$12,554,348	17.7%	\$88,300,435	\$5,007,683	6.0%	\$93,271,314	\$4,970,879	5.6%	\$98,522,997	\$5,251,683	5.6%	\$104,041,441	\$5,518,444	5.6%						
81 HONDO	\$2,024,472	\$2,366,616	\$342,144	16.9%	\$2,484,296	\$117,680	5.0%	\$2,644,384	\$160,088	6.4%	\$2,814,762	\$170,378	6.4%	\$2,995,457	\$180,695	6.4%						
82 HOUSE	\$1,526,882	\$1,707,615	\$180,733	11.8%	\$1,783,201	\$75,586	4.4%	\$1,894,665	\$111,464	6.3%	\$2,013,116	\$118,451	6.3%	\$2,139,134	\$126,018	6.3%						
83 JAL	\$4,248,670	\$5,168,011	\$919,341	21.6%	\$5,459,868	\$291,857	5.6%	\$5,787,586	\$327,718	6.0%	\$6,135,074	\$347,488	6.0%	\$6,560,962	\$425,888	6.9%						
84 JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	\$2,451,625	\$2,990,603	\$538,978	22.0%	\$3,168,024	\$177,421	5.9%	\$3,392,700	\$224,676	7.1%	\$3,632,939	\$240,239	7.1%	\$3,870,668	\$237,729	6.5%						
85 LINDRITH AREA HERITAGE	\$249,421	\$293,579	\$44,158	17.7%	\$313,269	\$19,690	6.7%	\$336,671	\$23,402	7.5%	\$361,747	\$25,076	7.4%	\$386,002	\$24,255	6.7%						
<b>JEMEZ MOUNTAIN W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$2,701,046</b>	<b>\$3,284,182</b>	<b>\$583,136</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>\$3,491,293</b>	<b>\$197,111</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>\$3,729,371</b>	<b>\$248,078</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>\$3,994,686</b>	<b>\$265,315</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>\$4,256,670</b>	<b>\$261,984</b>	<b>6.6%</b>						
86 JEMEZ VALLEY	\$3,207,723	\$3,901,466	\$693,743	21.6%	\$4,102,997	\$201,531	5.2%	\$4,352,894	\$249,897	6.1%	\$4,618,072	\$265,178	6.1%	\$4,922,726	\$304,654	6.6%						
87 SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER	\$954,583	\$1,116,982	\$162,401	17.0%	\$1,188,634	\$71,652	6.4%	\$1,272,581	\$83,947	7.1%	\$1,362,318	\$89,737	7.1%	\$1,453,358	\$91,040	6.7%						
<b>JEMEZ VALLEY W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$4,162,304</b>	<b>\$5,018,448</b>	<b>\$856,144</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>\$5,291,631</b>	<b>\$273,183</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>\$5,625,475</b>	<b>\$333,844</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>\$5,980,390</b>	<b>\$354,915</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>\$6,376,084</b>	<b>\$395,694</b>	<b>6.6%</b>						
88 LAKE ARTHUR	\$1,773,408	\$2,007,132	\$233,724	13.2%	\$2,106,226	\$99,094	4.9%	\$2,246,341	\$140,115	6.7%	\$2,395,704	\$149,363	6.6%	\$2,546,734	\$151,030	6.3%						
89 LAS CRUCES	\$184,563,964	\$222,614,004	\$38,050,040	20.6%	\$235,402,206	\$12,788,904	5.7%	\$248,626,059	\$13,223,155	5.6%	\$262,594,385	\$13,968,326	5.6%	\$277,145,570	\$14,551,185	5.5%						
90 LAS VEGAS CITY	\$13,427,883	\$15,906,555	\$2,478,672	18.5%	\$16,793,912	\$887,357	5.6%	\$17,768,866	\$974,954	5.8%	\$18,800,716	\$1,031,850	5.8%	\$19,861,032	\$1,060,316	5.6%						
91 LOGAN	\$3,400,141	\$3,617,016	\$216,875	6.4%	\$3,806,816	\$189,800	5.2%	\$4,035,145	\$228,329	6.0%	\$4,277,240	\$242,095	6.0%	\$4,566,431	\$289,191	6.8%						
92 LORDSBURG	\$4,587,510	\$5,641,839	\$1,054,329	23.0%	\$5,978,776	\$336,937	6.0%	\$6,373,052	\$394,276	6.6%	\$6,793,174	\$420,122	6.6%	\$7,255,088	\$461,914	6.8%						
93 LOS ALAMOS	\$29,015,803	\$31,973,775	\$2,957,972	10.2%	\$33,680,021	\$1,706,246	5.3%	\$35,367,265	\$1,687,244	5.0%	\$37,136,902	\$1,769,637	5.0%	\$39,068,699	\$1,931,797	5.2%						
94 LOS LUNAS	\$60,564,761	\$73,585,092	\$13,020,331	21.5%	\$78,336,666	\$4,751,574	6.5%	\$83,181,639	\$4,844,973	6.2%	\$88,327,203	\$5,145,564	6.2%	\$93,308,652	\$4,981,449	5.6%						
95 LOVING	\$5,143,903	\$6,165,238	\$1,021,335	19.9%	\$6,491,547	\$326,309	5.3%	\$6,869,783	\$378,236	5.8%	\$7,270,176	\$400,393	5.8%	\$7,769,335	\$499,159	6.9%						
96 LOVINGTON	\$31,636,318	\$35,249,291	\$3,612,973	11.4%	\$36,736,073	\$1,486,782	4.2%	\$38,318,661	\$1,582,588	4.3%	\$39,960,619	\$1,641,958	4.3%	\$42,040,447	\$2,079,828	5.2%						
97 MAGDALENA	\$3,659,707	\$4,461,511	\$801,804	21.9%	\$4,749,145	\$287,634	6.4%	\$5,101,664	\$352,519	7.4%	\$5,479,364	\$377,700	7.4%	\$5,841,753	\$362,389	6.6%						
98 MAXWELL	\$1,681,968	\$1,979,886	\$297,918	17.7%	\$2,088,845	\$108,959	5.5%	\$2,233,917	\$145,072	6.9%	\$2,388,879	\$154,962	6.9%	\$2,542,288	\$153,409	6.4%						
99 MELROSE	\$2,295,550	\$2,635,540	\$339,990	14.8%	\$2,792,951	\$157,411	6.0%	\$2,974,656	\$181,705	6.5%	\$3,168,139	\$193,483	6.5%	\$3,384,933	\$216,794	6.8%						
100 MESA VISTA	\$2,931,138	\$3,453,807	\$522,669	17.8%	\$3,651,845	\$198,038	5.7%	\$3,900,413	\$248,568	6.8%	\$4,165,675	\$265,262	6.8%	\$4,440,236	\$274,561	6.6%						
101 MORA	\$4,389,976	\$5,237,066	\$847,090	19.3%	\$5,528,327	\$291,261	5.6%	\$5,877,214	\$348,887	6.3%	\$6,248,146	\$370,932	6.3%	\$6,670,022	\$421,876	6.8%						
102 MORIARTY	\$17,948,492	\$21,809,046	\$3,860,554	21.5%	\$23,489,641	\$1,680,595	7.7%	\$25,236,944	\$1,747,303	7.4%	\$27,109,232	\$1,872,288	7.4%	\$28,985,271	\$1,876,039	6.9%						
103 MOSQUERO	\$1,174,396	\$1,311,495	\$137,099	11.7%	\$1,365,887	\$154,392	4.1%	\$1,453,695	\$87,808	6.4%	\$1,547,143	\$93,448	6.4%	\$1,640,682	\$93,539	6.0%						
104 MOUNTAINAIR	\$2,854,779	\$3,362,642	\$507,863	17.8%	\$3,553,560	\$190,918																

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19		FY20				FY21				FY22				FY23				FY24			
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change													
			\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%			
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,140,650,826	\$523,942,853	20.0%	\$3,310,253,618	\$169,602,792	5.4%	\$3,492,256,771	\$182,003,153	5.5%	\$3,683,950,582	\$191,693,811	5.5%	\$3,886,564,195	\$202,613,613	5.5%	\$3,886,564,195	\$202,613,613	5.5%			
126 <b>SANTA FE W/CHARTERS</b>	\$102,470,571	\$123,438,819	\$20,968,248	20.5%	\$129,805,022	\$6,366,203	5.2%	\$136,483,485	\$6,678,463	5.1%	\$143,500,305	\$7,016,820	5.1%	\$151,060,991	\$7,560,686	5.3%	\$151,060,991	\$7,560,686	5.3%			
127 SANTA ROSA	\$6,048,090	\$7,474,459	\$1,426,369	23.6%	\$7,927,787	\$453,328	6.1%	\$8,452,405	\$524,618	6.6%	\$9,011,502	\$559,097	6.6%	\$9,563,897	\$552,395	6.1%	\$9,563,897	\$552,395	6.1%			
128 SILVER CITY CONS.	\$21,289,743	\$24,776,347	\$3,486,604	16.4%	\$26,108,384	\$1,332,007	5.4%	\$27,517,882	\$1,409,498	5.4%	\$29,031,277	\$1,485,395	5.4%	\$30,573,643	\$1,570,366	5.4%	\$30,573,643	\$1,570,366	5.4%			
129 SOCORRO	\$11,886,010	\$14,824,890	\$2,938,880	24.7%	\$15,753,821	\$928,931	6.3%	\$16,762,920	\$1,009,099	6.4%	\$17,836,583	\$1,073,663	6.4%	\$18,842,524	\$1,005,941	5.6%	\$18,842,524	\$1,005,941	5.6%			
130 COTTONWOOD VALLEY CHARTER	\$1,375,686	\$1,590,708	\$215,022	15.6%	\$1,678,124	\$87,416	5.5%	\$1,768,878	\$90,754	5.4%	\$1,864,522	\$95,644	5.4%	\$1,969,677	\$105,155	5.6%	\$1,969,677	\$105,155	5.6%			
131 <b>SOCORRO W/CHARTERS</b>	\$13,261,696	\$16,415,598	\$3,153,902	23.8%	\$17,431,945	\$1,016,347	6.2%	\$18,531,798	\$1,099,853	6.3%	\$19,701,105	\$1,169,307	6.3%	\$20,812,201	\$1,111,096	5.6%	\$20,812,201	\$1,111,096	5.6%			
132 SPRINGER	\$2,004,113	\$2,336,963	\$332,850	16.6%	\$2,460,096	\$123,133	5.3%	\$2,623,320	\$163,224	6.6%	\$2,797,294	\$173,974	6.6%	\$2,978,093	\$180,799	6.5%	\$2,978,093	\$180,799	6.5%			
133 TAOS	\$17,858,765	\$22,017,104	\$4,158,339	23.3%	\$23,270,680	\$1,253,576	5.7%	\$24,615,573	\$1,344,893	5.8%	\$26,038,594	\$1,423,021	5.8%	\$27,621,509	\$1,582,915	6.1%	\$27,621,509	\$1,582,915	6.1%			
134 ANANSI CHARTER	\$1,393,122	\$1,650,340	\$257,218	18.5%	\$1,760,650	\$110,310	6.7%	\$1,871,275	\$110,625	6.3%	\$1,988,855	\$117,580	6.3%	\$2,104,127	\$115,272	5.8%	\$2,104,127	\$115,272	5.8%			
135 TAOS CHARTER	\$1,575,321	\$1,842,029	\$266,708	16.9%	\$1,973,447	\$131,418	7.1%	\$2,107,146	\$133,699	6.8%	\$2,249,791	\$142,645	6.8%	\$2,392,876	\$143,085	6.4%	\$2,392,876	\$143,085	6.4%			
136 VISTA GRANDE	\$1,142,902	\$1,219,527	\$76,625	6.7%	\$1,199,223	-\$20,304	-1.7%	\$1,162,944	-\$36,279	-3.0%	\$1,112,743	-\$50,201	-4.3%	\$1,061,296	-\$51,447	-4.6%	\$1,061,296	-\$51,447	-4.6%			
137 <b>TAOS W/CHARTER</b>	\$21,970,110	\$26,729,000	\$4,758,890	21.7%	\$28,204,000	\$1,475,000	5.5%	\$29,756,938	\$1,552,938	5.5%	\$31,389,983	\$1,633,045	5.5%	\$33,179,808	\$1,789,825	5.7%	\$33,179,808	\$1,789,825	5.7%			
138 TATUM	\$3,638,087	\$4,052,942	\$414,855	11.4%	\$4,264,396	\$211,454	5.2%	\$4,519,113	\$254,717	6.0%	\$4,789,125	\$270,012	6.0%	\$5,112,837	\$323,712	6.8%	\$5,112,837	\$323,712	6.8%			
139 TEXICO	\$5,141,524	\$5,881,449	\$739,925	14.4%	\$6,250,488	\$369,039	6.3%	\$6,666,167	\$415,679	6.7%	\$7,109,279	\$443,112	6.6%	\$7,600,369	\$491,090	6.9%	\$7,600,369	\$491,090	6.9%			
140 TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	\$10,743,004	\$13,238,501	\$2,495,497	23.2%	\$13,974,234	\$735,733	5.6%	\$14,798,997	\$824,763	5.9%	\$15,672,710	\$873,713	5.9%	\$16,556,614	\$883,904	5.6%	\$16,556,614	\$883,904	5.6%			
141 TUCUMCARI	\$8,590,470	\$10,433,607	\$1,843,137	21.5%	\$10,981,060	\$547,453	5.2%	\$11,599,086	\$618,026	5.6%	\$12,252,019	\$652,933	5.6%	\$12,943,005	\$690,986	5.6%	\$12,943,005	\$690,986	5.6%			
142 TULAROSA	\$7,942,836	\$9,745,214	\$1,802,378	22.7%	\$10,288,184	\$542,970	5.6%	\$10,917,622	\$629,438	6.1%	\$11,585,720	\$668,098	6.1%	\$12,335,487	\$749,767	6.5%	\$12,335,487	\$749,767	6.5%			
143 VAUGHN	\$1,531,291	\$1,743,197	\$211,906	13.8%	\$1,816,577	\$73,380	4.2%	\$1,929,192	\$112,615	6.2%	\$2,048,808	\$119,616	6.2%	\$2,175,499	\$126,691	6.2%	\$2,175,499	\$126,691	6.2%			
144 WAGON MOUND	\$1,474,485	\$1,717,231	\$242,746	16.5%	\$1,783,168	\$65,937	3.8%	\$1,888,131	\$104,963	5.9%	\$1,999,302	\$111,171	5.9%	\$2,122,446	\$123,144	6.2%	\$2,122,446	\$123,144	6.2%			
145 WEST LAS VEGAS	\$12,350,771	\$15,182,296	\$2,831,525	22.9%	\$16,090,597	\$908,301	6.0%	\$17,111,107	\$1,020,510	6.3%	\$18,196,363	\$1,085,256	6.3%	\$19,332,432	\$1,136,069	6.2%	\$19,332,432	\$1,136,069	6.2%			
146 RIO GALLINAS CHARTER SCHOOL	\$766,051	\$907,437	\$141,386	18.5%	\$966,492	\$99,055	6.5%	\$1,030,120	\$63,628	6.6%	\$1,097,914	\$67,794	6.6%	\$1,167,060	\$69,146	6.3%	\$1,167,060	\$69,146	6.3%			
147 <b>WEST LAS VEGAS W/CHARTER</b>	\$13,116,822	\$16,089,733	\$2,972,911	22.7%	\$17,057,089	\$967,356	6.0%	\$18,141,227	\$1,084,138	6.4%	\$19,294,277	\$1,155,050	6.4%	\$20,499,492	\$1,205,215	6.2%	\$20,499,492	\$1,205,215	6.2%			
148 ZUNI	\$11,171,742	\$13,944,175	\$2,772,433	24.8%	\$14,524,378	\$580,203	4.2%	\$15,182,215	\$657,837	4.5%	\$15,867,326	\$685,111	4.5%	\$16,762,207	\$894,881	5.6%	\$16,762,207	\$894,881	5.6%			
149 STATE CHARTERS																						
150 ALBUQUERQUE INSTI. MATH & SCI. (AIMS) ST. (APS)	\$3,118,013	\$3,428,267	\$310,254	10.0%	\$3,505,183	\$76,916	2.2%	\$3,577,164	\$71,981	2.1%	\$3,645,464	\$68,300	1.9%	\$3,791,047	\$145,583	4.0%	\$3,791,047	\$145,583	4.0%			
151 ALBUQUERQUE COLLEGIATE (APS)	\$784,402	\$863,905	\$79,503	10.1%	\$863,905	\$0	0.0%	\$858,587	-\$5,318	-0.6%	\$836,497	-\$22,090	-2.6%	\$828,381	-\$8,116	-1.0%	\$828,381	-\$8,116	-1.0%			
152 ALBUQUERQUE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE ST. CHAR (APS)	\$3,891,787	\$4,610,768	\$718,981	18.5%	\$4,899,587	\$288,819	6.3%	\$5,189,406	\$289,819	5.9%	\$5,496,462	\$307,056	5.9%	\$5,806,450	\$309,988	5.6%	\$5,806,450	\$309,988	5.6%			
153 ALBUQUERQUE SIGN LANGUAGE ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,122,588	\$2,246,091	\$123,503	5.8%	\$2,266,178	\$20,087	0.9%	\$2,324,245	\$58,067	2.6%	\$2,381,292	\$57,047	2.5%	\$2,438,919	\$57,627	2.4%	\$2,438,919	\$57,627	2.4%			
154 ALDO LEOPOLD ST. CHARTER (SILVER CITY)	\$1,906,508	\$1,997,412	\$90,904	4.8%	\$1,947,791	-\$49,621	-2.5%	\$1,901,364	-\$46,427	-2.4%	\$1,842,661	-\$58,703	-3.1%	\$1,787,218	-\$55,443	-3.0%	\$1,787,218	-\$55,443	-3.0%			
155 ALMA D'ARTE STATE CHARTER (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,972,099	\$2,093,157	\$121,058	6.1%	\$2,051,293	-\$41,864	-2.0%	\$2,011,638	-\$39,655	-1.9%	\$1,967,350	-\$44,288	-2.2%	\$1,892,904	-\$75,446	-3.3%	\$1,892,904	-\$75,446	-3.3%			
156 ALTURA PREPARATORY SCHOOL (APS)	\$879,735	\$979,486	\$99,751	11.3%	\$981,827	\$2,341	0.2%	\$981,827	\$0	0.0%	\$971,207	-\$10,620	-1.1%	\$970,689	-\$518	-0.1%	\$970,689	-\$518	-0.1%			
157 AMY BIEHL ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,054,921	\$3,324,602	\$269,681	8.8%	\$3,353,520	\$28,918	0.9%	\$3,391,258	\$37,738	1.1%	\$3,421,779	\$30,521	0.9%	\$3,467,190	\$45,411	1.3%	\$3,467,190	\$45,411	1.3%			
158 ASK ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (RIO RANCHO)	\$3,624,407	\$4,101,188	\$476,781	13.2%	\$4,341,724	\$240,536	5.9%	\$4,573,741	\$232,017	5.3%	\$4,818,097	\$244,356	5.3%	\$5,089,827	\$271,730	5.6%	\$5,089,827	\$271,730	5.6%			
159 CESAR CHAVEZ COMM. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,165,657	\$2,387,883	\$222,226	10.3%	\$2,388,447	\$564	0.0%	\$2,395,534	\$7,087	0.3%	\$2,395,144	-\$390	0.0%	\$2,351,518	-\$43,626	-1.8%	\$2,351,518	-\$43,626	-1.8%			
160 CORAL COMMUNITY (APS)	\$1,392,523	\$1,710,426	\$317,903	22.8%	\$1,817,326	\$106,900	6.2%	\$1,921,450	\$104,124	5.7%	\$2,031,568	\$110,118	5.7%	\$2,146,143	\$114,575	5.6%	\$2,146,143	\$114,575	5.6%			
161 DREAM DINE (CENTRAL)	\$245,994	\$313,663	\$67,669	27.5%	\$318,524	\$4,861	1.5%	\$325,455	\$6,931	2.2%	\$332,098	\$6,643	2.0%	\$329,074	-\$3,024	-0.9%	\$329,074	-\$3,024	-0.9%			
162 DZIT DIT LOOL DEAP (GALLUP)	\$321,101	\$357,929	\$36,828	11.5%	\$357,542	-\$1,387	-0.4%	\$357,167	-\$375	-0.1%	\$356,624	-\$543	-0.2%	\$353,838	-\$2,786	-0.8%	\$353,838	-\$2,786	-0.8%			
163 ESTANCIA VALLEY (MORIARTY)	\$3,270,086	\$3,929,400	\$659,314	20.2%	\$4,244,843	\$315,443	8.0%	\$4,558,082	\$313,239	7.4%	\$4,893,610	\$335,528	7.4%	\$5,239,138	\$345,528	7.1%	\$5,239,138	\$345,528	7.1%			
164 EXPLORE ACADEMY (ALBUQUERQUE)	\$3,249,353	\$3,580,820	\$331,467	10.2%	\$3,620,378	\$39,558	1.1%	\$3,695,813	\$75,435	2.1%	\$3,767,570	\$71,757	1.9%	\$3,806,345	\$38,775	1.0%	\$3,806,345	\$38,775	1.0%			
165 GILBERT L. SENA STATE CHARTER (APS)	\$1,873,039	\$1,985,595	\$112,556	6.0%	\$1,930,787	-\$54,808	-2.8%	\$1,875,013	-\$55,774	-2.9%	\$1,805,917	-\$69,096	-3.7%	\$1,740,666	-\$65,251	-3.6%	\$1,740,666	-\$65,251	-3.6%			
166 HORIZON ACADEMY WEST ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,019,006	\$3,578,390	\$559,384	18.5%	\$3,818,009	\$239,619	6.7%	\$4,043,851	\$225,842	5.9%	\$4,283,124	\$239,273	5.9%	\$4,524,683	\$241,559	5.6%	\$4,524,683	\$241,559	5.6%			
167 HOZHO ACADEMY (GALLUP)	\$1,359,490	\$1,688,325	\$328,835	24.2%	\$1,799,554	\$111,229	6.6%	\$1,902,282	\$102,728	5.7%	\$2,010,896	\$108,614	5.7%	\$2,147,942	\$137,046	6.8%	\$2,147,942	\$137,046	6.8%			
168 J. PAUL TAYLOR ACADEMY (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,457,324	\$1,664,821	\$207,497	14.2%	\$1,747,304	\$82,483	5.0%	\$1,825,163	\$77,859	4.5%	\$1,906,146	\$80,983	4.4%	\$2,013,648	\$107,502	5.6%	\$2,013,648	\$107,502	5.6%			
169 LA ACADEMIA DOLORES HUERTA (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,371,814	\$1,520,379	\$148,565	10.8%	\$1,558,542	\$38,163	2.5%	\$1,594,352	\$35,810	2.3%	\$1,628,974	\$34,622	2.2%	\$1,684,765	\$55,791	3.4%	\$1,684,765	\$55,791	3.4%			
170 LA PROMESA ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,675,059	\$3,499,999	\$824,940	30.8%	\$3,662,237	\$162,238	4.6%	\$3,837,349	\$175,112	4.8%	\$4,020,438	\$183,089	4.8%</									

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19	FY20			FY21			FY22			FY23			FY24		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change	
			\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,140,650,826	\$523,942,853	20.0%	\$3,310,253,618	\$169,602,792	5.4%	\$3,492,256,771	\$182,003,153	5.5%	\$3,683,950,582	\$191,693,811	5.5%	\$3,886,564,195	\$202,613,613	5.5%
191 SOUTHWEST PREPATORY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$1,554,525	\$1,799,620	\$245,095	15.8%	\$1,895,111	\$95,491	5.3%	\$1,992,954	\$97,843	5.2%	\$2,095,772	\$102,818	5.2%	\$2,199,906	\$104,134	5.0%
192 SOUTHWEST SECONDARY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$2,409,180	\$2,656,013	\$246,833	10.2%	\$2,665,772	\$9,759	0.4%	\$2,674,498	\$8,726	0.3%	\$2,674,981	\$483	0.0%	\$2,658,291	-\$16,690	-0.6%
193 STUDENT ATHLETE HEADQUARTERS (SHAQ) (APS)	\$927,313	\$963,777	\$36,464	3.9%	\$910,221	-\$53,556	-5.6%	\$854,058	-\$56,163	-6.2%	\$788,084	-\$65,974	-7.7%	\$723,063	-\$65,021	-8.3%
194 TAOS ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (TAOS)	\$2,047,676	\$2,251,268	\$203,592	9.9%	\$2,260,801	\$9,533	0.4%	\$2,272,108	\$11,307	0.5%	\$2,276,881	\$4,773	0.2%	\$2,242,604	-\$34,277	-1.5%
195 TAOS INTEGRATED SCHOOL OF ARTS ST. (TAOS)	\$1,261,166	\$1,550,463	\$289,297	22.9%	\$1,591,301	\$40,838	2.6%	\$1,633,876	\$42,575	2.7%	\$1,675,943	\$42,067	2.6%	\$1,740,850	\$64,907	3.9%
196 TAOS INTERNATIONAL (TAOS)	\$1,544,443	\$1,971,917	\$427,474	27.7%	\$2,124,398	\$152,481	7.7%	\$2,289,019	\$164,621	7.7%	\$2,465,724	\$176,705	7.7%	\$2,620,150	\$154,426	6.3%
197 THE GREAT ACADEMY (APS)	\$1,727,466	\$1,889,990	\$162,524	9.4%	\$1,672,304	-\$217,686	-11.5%	\$1,604,575	-\$67,729	-4.1%	\$1,523,014	-\$81,561	-5.1%	\$1,436,809	-\$86,205	-5.7%
198 TIERRA ADENTRO ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,807,880	\$3,065,514	\$257,634	9.2%	\$3,063,103	-\$2,411	-0.1%	\$3,062,573	-\$530	0.0%	\$3,051,314	-\$11,259	-0.4%	\$3,058,440	\$7,126	0.2%
199 TIERRA ENCANTADA CHARTER (SANTA FE)	\$2,797,606	\$3,149,287	\$351,681	12.6%	\$3,210,741	\$61,454	2.0%	\$3,277,734	\$66,993	2.1%	\$3,341,476	\$63,742	1.9%	\$3,392,384	\$50,908	1.5%
200 TURQUOISE TRAIL (SANTA FE)	\$3,900,522	\$4,584,705	\$684,183	17.5%	\$4,813,819	\$229,114	5.0%	\$5,059,236	\$245,417	5.1%	\$5,316,934	\$257,698	5.1%	\$5,616,797	\$299,863	5.6%
201 WALATOWA CHARTER HIGH (JEMEZ VALLEY)	\$592,998	\$699,388	\$106,390	17.9%	\$746,668	\$47,280	6.8%	\$805,315	\$58,647	7.9%	\$868,303	\$62,988	7.8%	\$924,534	\$56,231	6.5%
202 STATEWIDE	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,140,650,826	\$523,942,853	20.0%	\$3,310,253,618	\$169,602,792	5.4%	\$3,492,256,771	\$182,003,153	5.5%	\$3,683,950,582	\$191,693,811	5.5%	\$3,886,564,195	\$202,613,613	5.5%

Note: Statewide estimated program cost is based on the HAFc Substitute, as amended by SFC, for House Bills 2 and 3 appropriation (for FY20, this includes \$3 million to hold schools harmless from the age cap provision) and outyear growth projections for program cost. Variance in individual school district and charter school program cost is primarily attributable to participation rates in K-5 Plus and extended learning time programs. Actual program costs will vary significantly based on student enrollment. The analysis shown assumes 42 percent of students in all school districts and charter schools participate in extended learning time programs, only school districts and charter schools prioritized in the bill for K-5 Plus programs (i.e. schools with 80 percent or higher free and reduced fee lunch participation rates, D or F school grades in 2018, or existing K-3 Plus or K-5 Plus pilot programs) implement K-5 Plus programs, and all students over the age of 22 exit the system in FY20 (however, program costs for these schools are adjusted to reflect the hold harmless provision). Estimated program cost is the net program cost change after all adjustments for FY20 are implemented as written in the bill (i.e. changes to the at-risk index, K-5 Plus, extended learning time programs, size adjustment, and rural population factors) and includes other projected changes (75% T&E phase out and 25% TCI phase in). The analysis does not include projected changes in