

Fiscal impact reports (FIRs) are prepared by the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) for standing finance committees of the NM Legislature. The LFC does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

Current and previously issued FIRs are available on the NM Legislative Website ([www.nmlegis.gov](http://www.nmlegis.gov)) and may also be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

ORIGINAL DATE 2/03/2020  
 LAST UPDATED 2/12/2020 HB \_\_\_\_\_

SPONSOR Soules

SHORT TITLE Teacher Professional Development SB 213

ANALYST Liu

### APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY20	FY21		
	\$10,000.0	Recurring	Teacher Professional Development Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

### REVENUE (dollars in thousands)

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY20	FY21	FY22		
	(\$10,000.0)		Recurring	Public Education Reform Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Revenue Decreases)

Relates to HB62, HB90, HB92, HB102, HB177, SB36, SB38  
 Relates to Appropriations in the General Appropriation Act

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

Responses Received From  
 Public Education Department (PED)

### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of Bill

Senate Bill 213 appropriates \$10 million on July 1, 2020, from the public education reform fund to the teacher professional development fund for the purpose of providing professional development to teachers statewide.

### FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The appropriation of \$10 million contained in this bill will likely become a recurring expense,

given the need to provide continuous professional development for teachers. The amount will be initially funded through an appropriation from the public education reform fund (PERF).

**Currently, there are no balances in PERF; however, \$110 million from the SEG distribution is expected to revert to PERF at the end of FY20.** In FY20, the Legislature appropriated \$119.9 million for K-5 Plus programs and \$62.4 million for extended learning time programs (ELTP). According to preliminary PED data, schools applied for \$29 million in K-5 Plus funding and \$42.3 million of ELTP funding in FY20, resulting in a projected reversion of \$111 million to PERF. **On January 31, 2020, PED increased the final unit value by 0.81 percent, which decreased the estimated reversion to PERF by about \$575 thousand.**

In FY20, the Legislature appropriated \$119.9 million for K-5 Plus programs and \$62.4 million for extended learning time programs (ELTP). According to preliminary PED data, schools applied for \$29 million in K-5 Plus funding and \$42.3 million of ELTP funding in FY20, resulting in a projected reversion of \$111 million to PERF. On January 31, 2020, PED increased the final unit value by 0.81 percent, which decreased the estimated reversion to PERF by about \$575 thousand. The executive’s FY21 budget recommendation includes \$14 million from PERF for recurring special programs and \$4 million for nonrecurring, special appropriations. The LFC’s FY21 budget recommendation includes \$54.5 million from PERF for nonrecurring, special appropriations.

The LFC recommendation also includes a \$12 million general fund recurring appropriation to the state equalization guarantee (SEG) distribution for public schools to provide mentorship and professional development.

### SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

The teacher professional development fund (TPDF) was established in 2003 to provide funding for professional development programs and projects for public school teachers. The Legislature made multiple appropriations to the fund beginning in FY05 but ceased support in the period following the Great Recession and swept remaining balances in FY15.

**Teacher Professional Development Fund Appropriation History**  
(in millions)

FY03	FY04	FY05 <sup>1</sup>	FY06 <sup>1</sup>	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12 <sup>2</sup>	FY13 <sup>2</sup>	FY14 <sup>3</sup>	FY15 <sup>4</sup>
		\$2.4	\$2.0	\$2.5	\$2.0				\$2.0	\$3.6	\$2.5	(\$0.5)

1. In FY05 and FY06, TPDF was used to fund the following programs: Re: Learning, regional educational technology assistance, strengthening quality in schools, service learning, Golden Apple, closing the achievement gap, and leadership academy.
2. In FY12 and FY13, the Legislature transferred funds from the early reading initiative to TPDF to support training on effective reading instruction and data-driven decision making. The appropriation was also used to support reading and instructional coaches at the district level to support schools with the implementation of formative assessment tools and interventions.
3. In FY14, TPDF was used for professional develop and training on implementation of Common Core state standards. The Legislature earmarked funding from the appropriation contingency fund dedicated for educational reforms for this purpose.
4. In FY15, the Legislature swept remaining balances in TPDF to support after school and summer enrichment programs.

Although statute required PED to evaluate the success of each professional development program or project funded and report its findings to the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) each year, it is unclear if the department provided any evaluations of professional development programs funded through TPDF.

**PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS**

A 2019 LFC *Results First* report found the most effective professional development models are those that are content based, or focused on skills and concepts specific to a teacher’s discipline, and job-embedded. Mentoring and induction for new teachers is also effective. However, the most common form of professional development – one-off workshops and conferences – is generally not effective. Similarly, coaching of teachers by experienced teachers is an effective method to improve teaching practices and student outcomes, and targeted, content-focused coaching is more effective than coaching on generic topics. Schools should invest in sustained, targeted professional development and coaching, identifying skills and concepts to help teachers improve their teaching practice, but it is unclear whether they are, as the state has not required public schools to have updated plans for professional development that align with statute or best practices.

Intervention	Evidence of Positive Impact	Benefit to Cost Ratio	Chance Benefits Will Exceed Cost
Teacher performance pay	Strong	\$22	87%
Teacher experience	Strong	\$13	99%
Teacher professional development	Strong (depends on model)		
<i>Use of data to guide instruction</i>		\$132	98%
<i>Targeted</i>		\$38	79%
<i>Online, targeted</i>		\$9	61%
<i>Induction/mentoring</i>		\$0	38%
<i>Not targeted</i>		\$6	60%
Teacher coaches/consultant teachers	Strong (depends on model)		
<i>Content-focused coaching</i>		\$190	94%
<i>Online coaching</i>		\$93	92%
<i>Literacy collaborative</i>		\$32	99%
<i>Coaching</i>		\$28	81%
Incentives for hard to staff subjects/schools	Strong	Not in Results First Clearinghouse	
Teacher evaluation systems	Promising	Not in Results First Clearinghouse	
Teacher residency programs	Promising	Not in Results First Clearinghouse	
National Board Certification	Mixed or Inconclusive*	Not in Results First Clearinghouse	
Grow Your Own programs	Mixed or Inconclusive	Not in Results First Clearinghouse	
Teacher graduate degrees	No Effect	\$0	7%

Source: LFC Results First

Professional development programs must also be of sustained duration to be effective. A review by the Institute for Education Sciences found that programs with substantial professional development – an average of 49 hours annually – boosted students’ achievement. Programs with fewer than 14 hours of professional development had no statistically significant effects on student achievement.

**ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

Current statute allows PED to administer funding in TPDF and requires the department to evaluate the success of each professional development program or project funded and report its findings to the LESL each year.

## RELATIONSHIP

This bill relates to special appropriations to PED in the General Appropriation Act of 2020 for various professional development initiatives (e.g. STEAM initiatives, early literacy). The bill also relates to House Bill 62, which creates a fund to pay teachers to mentor new teachers; House Bill 90, which allows all National Board-certified licensed school employees (beyond just teachers) to generate program units in the public school funding formula; House Bill 92, which establishes teacher residency programs; House Bill 102, which appropriates funding for National Board certification scholarships; House Bill 177, which creates a teacher residency program in northern New Mexico; Senate Bill 36, which establishes a teacher preparation task force; and Senate Bill 38, which establishes a commission on equity in education.

## OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

PED provides limited guidance on the amount, structure, or content of professional development, and while statute (Section 22-10A-19.1 NMSA 1978) requires the department to develop a framework for professional development, the framework has not been updated since 2004. The framework requires that programs receiving funding adhere to standards from the National Staff Development Council, an educator professional development association (now called Learning Forward). The standards do not specifically refer to evidence-based practices. Given a lack of common standards or guidance for professional development, it is likely that there is wide variation in quality and effectiveness across schools and districts.

PED notes providing teachers with high quality professional development is key component of the department's goal of creating a vibrant educator ecosystem. The executive budget request included \$10 million for teacher development, including support for early career teachers.

More broadly, professional development is a key factor in attracting and retaining excellent teachers. According to a research brief published by the Learning Policy Institute, the quality of a professional development initiative's implementation has implications for its overall effectiveness in enhancing teacher practice and improving student learning. "Even the best-designed professional development may fail to produce desired outcomes if it is poorly implemented due to barriers such as:

- inadequate resources, including necessary curriculum materials;
- lack of a shared vision about what high-quality instruction entails;
- lack of time for implementing new instructional approaches during the school day or year;
- failure to align state and local policies toward a coherent set of instructional practices;
- dysfunctional school cultures; and
- inability to track and assess the quality of professional development.

Implementing professional development well also requires responsiveness to the specific needs of teachers and learners, and to the school and district contexts in which teaching and learning will take place. These types of common obstacles to professional development should be anticipated and planned for during both the design and implementation phases of professional development."