

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**

<b>Bill Number</b>	<u>HB5/aHEC</u>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<u>Stapleton/Lundstrom/Trujillo, C./Romero, G. Andres/Gonzales</u>
<b>Tracking Number</b>	<u>.212362.1</u>	<b>Committee Referrals</b>	<u>HEC/HAFC</u>
<b>Short Title</b>	<u>Public Education Changes</u>		
<b>Analyst</b>	<u>Simon/Liu</u>	<b>Original Date</b>	<u>1/28/19</u>
		<b>Last Updated</b>	<u>2/12/19</u>

---

---

**FOR THE LEGISLATIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**BILL SUMMARY**

Synopsis of HEC Amendment

The House Education Committee Amendment to HB5 (HB5/aHEC) would phase-in increases to minimum teacher salaries over the next four years as follows:

- In FY21, to \$42 thousand for level 1 teachers, \$52 thousand for level 2 teachers, and \$62 thousand for level 3-A teachers and counselors;
- In FY22, to \$44 thousand for level 1 teachers, \$54 thousand for level 2 teachers, and \$64 thousand for level 3-A teachers and counselors;
- In FY23, to \$46 thousand for level 1 teachers, \$56 thousand for level 2 teachers, and \$66 thousand for level 3-A teachers and counselors.

The amendment would also provide additional clarity on services for at-risk students, removed the statewide cap of 27,000 charter school students, removed the requirement that K-5 Plus be mandatory for all students in participating schools no later than FY23, and would require teachers participating in a K-5 Plus or extended learning time program to be paid at the same rate as their base salary for the additional time.

Synopsis of Original Bill

House Bill 5 (HB5) 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*. HB5 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**

HB5/aHEC would make several changes to the public school funding formula that would alter the allocation of funding formula program units. Staff estimate HB5/aHEC would create 65 thousand program units, with the net effect of allocating 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 age of 21 for students not receiving special education services. HB5/aHEC would also increase minimum salaries for teachers, level 3-A counselors, principals, and assistant principals.

HB5/aHEC does not contain an appropriation, but the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) public school support budget recommendation for FY20 assumes an increase of \$470.6 million to program cost, including \$315.3 million to implement the provisions of the bill.

***K-5 Plus.*** HB5/aHEC 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, implement the program school-wide. HB5/aHEC 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 student 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.

Both the executive and LFC recommendations for public school support 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. The LFC's FY20 recommendation increases funding by \$89.7 million. Language included in the recommendation 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 state-support reserve fund, a public education reserve fund that provides PED with additional

funding to support the unit value in the event credits for state or local revenue do not reach projected levels. 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 the LFC and executive recommendations for K-5 Plus. PED based this estimate on 25,029 students participating in K-5 Plus in FY20, while the executive and LFC recommendations attempt to make enough funding available so that all students currently eligible would be able to participate in FY20.

***Extended Learning Time Programs.*** HB5/aHEC 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. The program would be phased in over three years, as follows:

- For FY20,  $(0.04 * MEM) + (0.01 * MEM \text{ in afterschool programs}) = \text{program units}$
- For FY21,  $(0.06 * MEM) + (0.06 * MEM \text{ in afterschool programs}) = \text{program units}; \text{ and}$
- For FY22 and subsequent years,  $(0.08 * MEM) + (0.11 * MEM \text{ in afterschool programs}) = \text{program units}.$

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.

HB5/aHEC would phase-in up to 62 thousand program units over three years for schools operating approved extended learning time programs. If all schools implement qualifying extended learning time programs in FY20, the estimated total cost could be up to \$68 million and if all schools implement qualifying programs in FY22, the total cost would be \$258.4 million; however, it is unlikely that all schools will apply for extended learning time units and the LFC recommendation for FY20 public school support includes \$62.5 million for extended learning time programs. Language included in the LFC recommendation 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 state-support reserve fund. Should school districts and charter schools apply for more than \$62.5 million in programs, language in the LFC recommendation allows PED to determine which programs would be funded in FY20. Statewide, PED estimates the new program would generate 14 thousand units or \$58.2 million in FY20, 25 thousand units or \$104.2 million in FY21, and 36.1 thousand units or \$150.3 million in FY22.

PED’s analysis indicates the additional funding may not be enough for school districts and charter schools to implement extended learning time programs. The PED analysis uses the example of Bernalillo Public Schools, which PED estimates would generate only \$514 thousand to cover \$1.4 million in additional expenses. However, as the phase-in of the programs continues, the school district would generate additional funding.

**At-Risk Index.** HB5/aHEC 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:

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

Staff estimates this will create an additional 27,211 program units in FY20, valued at \$113.2 million at the FY19 preliminary unit value. The LFC recommendation for public school support 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 PED.

**Teacher, Counselor, and Principal Minimum Salaries.** HB5/aHEC increases minimum salaries for teachers counselors and principals over four years. For FY20, minimum salaries would increase to \$40 thousand for level 1 teachers, \$50 thousand for level 2 teachers, and \$60 thousand for level 3-A teachers and counselors. The bill would also index minimum salaries for principals and assistant principals to the minimum salary of a level 3-A teacher. Principal and assistant principal minimum salaries are multiplied by a responsibility factor, depending on the level of school they serve and whether they are a principal or assistant principal.

Minimum Teacher and Principal Salaries in HB5/aHEC

Job Description	Current Minimum Salary	FY20 Minimum	FY21 Minimum	FY22 Minimum	FY23 Minimum
Level 1 teacher	\$36,000	\$40,000	\$42,000	\$44,000	\$46,000
Level 2 teacher	\$44,000	\$50,000	\$52,000	\$54,000	\$56,000
Level 3-A teacher or counselor	\$54,000	\$60,000	\$62,000	\$64,000	\$66,000
Elementary assistant principal	\$55,000	\$66,000	\$68,200	\$70,400	\$72,600
Elementary principal	\$60,000	\$72,000	\$74,400	\$76,800	\$79,200
Middle school assistant principal	\$57,500	\$69,000	\$71,300	\$73,600	\$75,900
Middle school principal	\$70,000	\$84,000	\$86,800	\$89,600	\$92,400
High school assistant principal	\$62,500	\$75,000	\$77,500	\$80,000	\$82,500
High school principal	\$80,000	\$96,000	\$99,200	\$102,400	\$105,600

Source: LESC

Based on the consensus methodology reached by PED, LESC, LFC, and the Department of Finance and administration, staff estimate the total four-year cost of the salary increase for teachers, counselors, and principals at \$252.3 million, with costs for FY20 at \$92.4 million for teachers and counselors and \$5.7 million for principals. These totals include the employer's share of increased benefits costs, estimated at 23 percent. The LFC recommendation for public school support includes a total of \$139.2 million to increase compensation for school district and charter school personnel. The LFC recommendation includes \$34.8 million to increase minimum salaries, or the estimated cost of HB5/aHEC after an across-the-board salary increase of 5.5 percent for teachers, 7.5 percent for principals and assistant principals, and 4 percent for all other school employees.

***Small School Size Adjustment.*** HB5/aHEC 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, 66 percent of size adjustment program units;
- For FY21, 33 percent of size adjustment program units; and
- For FY22 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.

HB5/aHEC would eliminate about 3,500 program units from schools in large school districts each year for three 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 \$14.8 million. This cost saving assumption is included in the FY20 LFC recommendation. PED estimates the cost savings in FY20 would be \$14.3 million.

***Rural Population Factor.*** HB5/aHEC 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,  $MEM * 0.0333 * \text{the rural population rate}$ ;
- For FY21,  $MEM * 0.0667 * \text{the rural population rate}$ ; and
- For FY22 and subsequent fiscal years,  $MEM * 0.1 * \text{the rural population rate}$ .

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 1,400 program units each year for three years, adding about 4,200 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 \$5.8 million each fiscal year. This cost assumption is included in the FY20 LFC recommendation. PED estimates the cost of implementing the rural population factor at \$5.7 million in FY20.

**Definition of School Age Person.** HB5/aHEC 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. The LFC recommendation for FY20 public school support takes credit for \$6.1 million in program cost related to adult students.

**Public Education Reform Fund.** HB5/aHEC would create a public education reform fund for the implementation of evidence-based public education initiatives. The fund would be subject to legislative appropriations. The FY20 LFC recommendation includes a \$50 million appropriation to the public education reform fund, which could be used 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 HB5/aHEC 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 HB5/aHEC 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.*** HB5/aHEC 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 HB5/aHEC 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. HB5/aHEC 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.

HB5/aHEC 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 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 given insufficient support to develop stronger teaching skills.

HB5/aHEC 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.*** HB5/aHEC 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, but HB5/aHEC contains additional guidelines to assist stakeholders in identifying appropriate uses of at-risk funding. HB5/aHEC would require that the services provided be evidence-based or research-based interventions that may include:

- tutoring and reading interventions or after-school programs;
- culturally relevant professional and curriculum development;
- additional compensation for those serving high-need schools;
- school-based health centers;
- community school programs;
- dual credit and career technical education programs, including guidance counseling services; and
- parent engagement strategies.

The services listed in HB5/aHEC are not prescriptive and school districts and charter schools retain flexibility to design programs that work best for their schools.

***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 school 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. The LFC recommendation for the HED budget includes an additional \$2 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. PED notes significant lag in data (10 years old) means that entities that are determined rural in 2010 may not be rural in 2019 due to expansion. The agency notes that linking funding to a dated funding source for a new sparsity factor may not be the most accurate representation of current rural population percentages and there is no established link between the resources generated under these units and the costs associated with being a rural school.

HB5/aHEC also allows charter schools to generate size adjustment program unit. 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 HB5/aHEC 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.

***First Year Program Funding.*** HB5/aHEC 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 to students enrolled in bilingual and multicultural education programs;
- 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 school 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. The FY20 LFC recommendation includes a \$3.3 million increase and the executive recommendation 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 were 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**

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

HB171/aHEC 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 HB5/aHEC.

## **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		
			\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%	
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,116,989,576	\$500,281,603	19.1%	\$3,289,508,991	\$172,519,415	5.5%	\$3,470,333,525	\$180,824,534	5.5%	\$3,659,556,598	\$189,223,073	5.5%	\$3,860,831,197	\$201,274,599	5.5%	
1 ALAMOGORDO	\$41,532,029	\$49,570,107	\$8,038,078	19.4%	\$52,783,958	\$3,213,851	6.5%	\$56,174,579	\$3,390,621	6.4%	\$59,451,105	\$3,276,526	5.8%	\$62,720,900	\$3,269,795	5.5%	
2 ALBUQUERQUE	\$637,370,733	\$771,486,781	\$134,116,048	21.0%	\$816,833,861	\$45,347,080	5.9%	\$864,675,451	\$47,841,590	5.9%	\$913,188,808	\$48,513,357	5.6%	\$963,413,941	\$50,225,133	5.5%	
3 ACE LEADERSHIP	\$2,994,824	\$3,075,963	\$81,139	2.7%	\$3,075,963	\$0	0.0%	\$3,032,162	-\$43,801	-1.4%	\$3,124,993	\$92,831	3.1%	\$3,296,867	\$171,874	5.5%	
4 ALBUQUERQUE CHARTER ACADEMY	\$2,674,231	\$2,459,893	-\$214,338	-8.0%	\$2,375,770	-\$84,123	-3.4%	\$2,287,045	-\$88,725	-3.7%	\$2,402,382	\$115,337	5.0%	\$2,534,512	\$132,130	5.5%	
5 ALB TALENT DEV SECONDARY	\$1,756,938	\$1,817,149	\$60,211	3.4%	\$1,817,149	\$0	0.0%	\$1,708,876	-\$108,273	-6.0%	\$1,713,824	\$4,948	0.3%	\$1,808,084	\$94,260	5.5%	
6 ALICE KING COMMUNITY SCHOOL	\$3,531,773	\$4,071,769	\$539,996	15.3%	\$4,318,634	\$246,865	6.1%	\$4,579,078	\$260,444	6.0%	\$4,835,965	\$256,887	5.6%	\$5,101,942	\$265,977	5.5%	
7 CHRISTINE DUNCAN COMMUNITY	\$2,775,637	\$3,232,221	\$456,584	16.4%	\$3,438,835	\$206,614	6.4%	\$3,656,813	\$217,978	6.3%	\$3,882,594	\$225,781	6.2%	\$4,096,136	\$213,542	5.5%	
8 CIEN AGUAS INTERNATIONAL ST. CHARTER	\$3,447,906	\$3,855,029	\$407,123	11.8%	\$4,045,213	\$190,184	4.9%	\$4,245,861	\$200,648	5.0%	\$4,434,991	\$189,130	4.5%	\$4,678,914	\$243,923	5.5%	
9 CORRALES INTERNATIONAL	\$2,432,692	\$2,533,856	\$101,164	4.2%	\$2,485,310	-\$48,546	-1.9%	\$2,356,826	-\$128,484	-5.2%	\$2,410,627	\$53,801	2.3%	\$2,543,211	\$132,584	5.5%	
10 COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL ST. CHARTER	\$4,789,769	\$5,595,094	\$805,325	16.8%	\$5,923,453	\$328,359	5.9%	\$6,269,870	\$346,417	5.8%	\$6,567,556	\$297,686	4.7%	\$6,928,770	\$361,214	5.5%	
11 DIGITAL ARTS & TECH ACADEMY	\$2,505,820	\$2,695,327	\$189,507	7.6%	\$2,638,288	-\$57,039	-2.1%	\$2,578,134	-\$60,154	-2.3%	\$2,716,749	\$138,615	5.4%	\$2,866,169	\$149,420	5.5%	
12 EAST MOUNTAIN	\$2,952,987	\$3,291,218	\$338,231	11.5%	\$3,374,305	\$83,087	2.5%	\$3,461,968	\$87,663	2.6%	\$3,636,701	\$174,733	5.0%	\$3,836,719	\$200,018	5.5%	
13 EL CAMINO REAL	\$2,643,894	\$2,911,352	\$267,458	10.1%	\$2,911,352	\$0	0.0%	\$2,869,600	-\$41,752	-1.4%	\$2,970,232	\$100,632	3.5%	\$3,133,594	\$163,362	5.5%	
14 GORDON BERNELL	\$3,023,311	\$1,499,670	-\$1,822,395	-60.3%	\$1,270,797	-\$228,873	-15.3%	\$1,344,522	\$73,725	5.8%	\$1,418,489	\$73,967	5.5%	\$1,496,506	\$78,017	5.5%	
15 HEALTH LEADERSHIP CHARTER (APS)	\$2,051,940	\$2,087,345	\$35,405	1.7%	\$2,087,345	\$0	0.0%	\$1,966,786	-\$120,559	-5.8%	\$1,956,728	-\$10,058	-0.5%	\$2,064,348	\$107,620	5.5%	
16 INT'L SCHOOL MESA DEL SOL ST. CHARTER	\$2,662,885	\$2,941,996	\$279,111	10.5%	\$2,951,157	\$9,161	0.3%	\$2,960,836	\$9,679	0.3%	\$3,131,627	\$170,791	5.8%	\$3,303,866	\$172,239	5.5%	
17 LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA	\$4,031,845	\$4,275,712	\$243,867	6.0%	\$4,253,236	-\$22,476	-0.5%	\$4,212,146	-\$41,090	-1.0%	\$4,395,782	\$183,636	4.4%	\$4,637,549	\$241,767	5.5%	
18 LA RESOLANA LEADERSHIP	\$823,952	\$845,890	\$21,938	2.7%	\$845,890	\$0	0.0%	\$816,789	-\$29,101	-3.4%	\$819,589	\$2,800	0.3%	\$864,666	\$45,077	5.5%	
19 LOS PUENTES	\$2,095,686	\$2,182,517	\$86,831	4.1%	\$2,182,517	\$0	0.0%	\$2,089,859	-\$92,658	-4.2%	\$2,138,442	\$48,583	2.3%	\$2,256,056	\$117,614	5.5%	
20 MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE	\$1,535,109	\$1,762,886	\$227,777	14.8%	\$1,858,987	\$96,101	5.5%	\$1,960,369	\$101,382	5.5%	\$2,049,298	\$88,929	4.5%	\$2,162,009	\$112,711	5.5%	
21 MOUNTAIN MAHOAGANY	\$1,548,207	\$1,783,006	\$234,799	15.2%	\$1,862,902	\$79,896	4.5%	\$1,947,195	\$84,293	4.5%	\$2,059,516	\$112,321	5.8%	\$2,172,789	\$113,273	5.5%	
22 NATIVE AMERICAN COMM ACAD.	\$3,314,923	\$3,792,442	\$477,519	14.4%	\$3,986,890	\$194,448	5.1%	\$4,192,036	\$205,146	5.1%	\$4,380,603	\$188,567	4.5%	\$4,621,534	\$240,931	5.5%	
23 NEW MEXICO INTERNATIONAL	\$1,960,066	\$2,275,487	\$315,421	16.1%	\$2,405,530	\$130,043	5.7%	\$2,542,732	\$137,202	5.7%	\$2,684,586	\$141,854	5.6%	\$2,832,237	\$147,651	5.5%	
24 NUESTROS VALORES	\$1,766,887	\$1,809,504	\$42,617	2.4%	\$1,803,389	-\$6,115	-0.3%	\$1,634,862	-\$168,527	-9.3%	\$1,661,124	\$26,262	1.6%	\$1,752,485	\$91,361	5.5%	
25 PAPA	\$2,851,639	\$3,344,232	\$492,593	17.3%	\$3,553,689	\$209,457	6.3%	\$3,774,667	\$220,978	6.2%	\$4,042,851	\$268,184	7.1%	\$4,265,207	\$222,356	5.5%	
26 ROBERT F. KENNEDY	\$3,416,774	\$3,508,236	\$91,462	2.7%	\$3,492,602	-\$15,634	-0.4%	\$3,476,128	-\$16,474	-0.5%	\$3,685,569	\$209,441	6.0%	\$3,888,274	\$202,705	5.5%	
27 SIEMBRA LEADERSHIP HIGH SCHOOL	\$1,352,569	\$1,369,444	\$16,875	1.2%	\$1,369,444	\$0	0.0%	\$1,269,253	-\$100,191	-7.3%	\$1,223,568	-\$45,685	-3.6%	\$1,290,864	\$67,296	5.5%	
28 SOUTH VALLEY	\$4,993,829	\$5,619,191	\$625,362	12.5%	\$5,875,487	\$256,296	4.6%	\$6,145,883	\$270,396	4.6%	\$6,396,375	\$250,492	4.1%	\$6,748,174	\$351,799	5.5%	
29 TECHNOLOGY LEADERSHIP	\$2,121,315	\$2,167,445	\$46,130	2.2%	\$2,167,445	\$0	0.0%	\$2,027,270	-\$140,175	-6.5%	\$1,968,324	-\$58,946	-2.9%	\$2,076,581	\$108,257	5.5%	
30 TWENTY FIRST CENT.	\$2,226,111	\$2,495,408	\$269,297	12.1%	\$2,610,207	\$114,799	4.6%	\$2,731,319	\$121,112	4.6%	\$2,854,333	\$123,014	4.5%	\$3,011,321	\$156,988	5.5%	
31 WILLIAM W & JOSEPHINE DORN CHARTER	\$663,314	\$737,770	\$74,456	11.2%	\$737,770	\$0	0.0%	\$714,191	-\$23,579	-3.2%	\$729,083	\$14,892	2.1%	\$769,182	\$40,099	5.5%	
32 <b>ALBUQUERQUE W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$712,317,566</b>	<b>\$851,523,833</b>	<b>\$138,907,513</b>	<b>19.5%</b>	<b>\$898,553,417</b>	<b>\$47,029,584</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$947,528,527</b>	<b>\$48,975,110</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$999,481,309</b>	<b>\$51,952,782</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$1,054,452,507</b>	<b>\$54,971,198</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
33 ANIMAS	\$2,191,478	\$2,479,298	\$287,820	13.1%	\$2,597,773	\$118,474	4.8%	\$2,722,773	\$125,000	4.8%	\$2,848,864	\$126,091	4.6%	\$3,005,550	\$156,686	5.5%	
34 ARTESIA	\$27,808,096	\$32,308,126	\$4,500,030	16.2%	\$34,282,971	\$1,974,845	6.1%	\$36,366,449	\$2,083,478	6.1%	\$38,441,072	\$2,074,623	5.7%	\$40,555,321	\$2,114,249	5.5%	
35 AZTEC	\$20,883,939	\$26,044,956	\$5,161,017	24.7%	\$27,858,574	\$1,813,618	7.0%	\$29,771,932	\$1,913,358	6.9%	\$31,484,925	\$1,712,993	5.8%	\$33,216,587	\$1,731,662	5.5%	
36 MOSAIC ACADEMY CHARTER	\$1,386,051	\$1,566,612	\$180,561	13.0%	\$1,650,619	\$84,007	5.4%	\$1,739,249	\$88,630	5.4%	\$1,844,978	\$105,729	6.1%	\$1,946,451	\$101,473	5.5%	
37 <b>AZTEC W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$22,269,990</b>	<b>\$27,611,568</b>	<b>\$5,341,578</b>	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>\$29,509,193</b>	<b>\$1,897,625</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>\$31,511,181</b>	<b>\$2,001,988</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>\$33,329,903</b>	<b>\$1,818,722</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>\$35,163,038</b>	<b>\$1,833,135</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
38 BELEN	\$29,827,015	\$37,008,088	\$7,181,073	24.1%	\$39,029,847	\$2,021,759	5.5%	\$41,162,841	\$2,132,994	5.5%	\$43,320,725	\$2,157,884	5.2%	\$45,703,353	\$2,382,628	5.5%	
39 BERNALILLO	\$23,822,468	\$29,706,485	\$5,884,017	24.7%	\$31,372,328	\$1,665,843	5.6%	\$33,129,811	\$1,757,483	5.6%	\$35,071,676	\$1,941,865	5.9%	\$37,000,608	\$1,928,932	5.5%	
40 BLOOMFIELD	\$21,843,053	\$26,827,931	\$4,984,878	22.8%	\$28,583,379	\$1,755,448	6.5%	\$30,435,375	\$1,851,996	6.5%	\$32,090,428	\$1,655,053	5.4%	\$33,855,393	\$1,764,965	5.5%	
41 CAPITAN	\$4,712,861	\$5,501,645	\$788,784	16.7%	\$6,320,178	\$418,533	7.6%	\$6,361,736	\$441,558	7.5%	\$6,759,427	\$397,691	6.3%	\$7,131,194	\$371,767	5.5%	
42 CARLSBAD	\$55,493,778	\$60,892,816	\$5,399,038	9.7%	\$63,223,040	\$2,330,224	3.8%	\$65,681,566	\$2,458,526	3.9%	\$68,188,113	\$2,506,547	3.8%	\$71,938,440	\$3,750,327	5.5%	
43 JEFFERSON MONT. ACAD.	\$1,928,714	\$1,968,619	\$39,905	2.1%	\$1,968,619	\$0	0.0%	\$1,838,241	-\$130,378	-6.6%	\$1,800,914	-\$37,327	-2.0%	\$1,899,964	\$99,050	5.5%	
44 PECOS CONNECTIONS	\$5,225,311	\$5,876,402	\$651,091	12.5%	\$6,113,535	\$237,133	4.0%	\$6,363,721	\$250,186	4.1%	\$6,627,130	\$263,409	4.1%	\$6,991,620	\$364,490	5.5%	
45 <b>CARLSBAD W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$62,647,803</b>	<b>\$68,737,837</b>	<b>\$6,090,034</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>\$71,305,194</b>	<b>\$2,567,357</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>\$73,883,528</b>	<b>\$2,578,334</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>\$76,616,157</b>	<b>\$2,732,629</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>\$80,830,024</b>	<b>\$4,213,867</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
46 CARRIZOZO	\$2,016,154	\$2,393,339	\$377,185	18.7%	\$2,524,524	\$131,185	5.5%	\$2,662,926	\$138,402	5.5%	\$2,810,280	\$147,354	5.5%	\$2,964,845	\$154,565	5.5%	
47 CENTRAL CONS.	\$44,207,986	\$54,384,813	\$10,176,827	23.0%	\$57,888,367	\$3,503,554	6.4%	\$61,584,627	\$3,696,260	6.4%	\$65,171,790	\$3,587,163	5.8%	\$68,756,220	\$3,584,430	5.5%	
48 CHAMA VALLEY	\$4,062,428	\$4,934,184	\$871,756	21.5%	\$5,265,503	\$331,319	6.7%	\$5,615,044	\$349,541	6.6%	\$5,963,456	\$348,412	6.2%	\$6,291,444	\$327,988	5.5%	
49 CINARRON	\$4,272,182	\$4,851,815	\$579,633	13.6%	\$5,168,079	\$316,264	6.5%	\$5,501,741	\$333,662	6.5%	\$5,822,562	\$320,821	5.8%	\$6,142,801	\$320,239	5.5%	
50 MORENO VALLEY HIGH	\$696,867	\$792,930	\$96,063	13.8%	\$837,853	\$44,923	5.7%	\$885,242	\$47,389	5.7%	\$933,734	\$48,492	5.5%	\$985,089	\$51,355	5.5%	
51 <b>CIMARRON W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$4,969,049</b>	<b>\$5,644,745</b>	<b>\$675,696</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>\$6,005,932</b>	<b>\$361,187</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>\$6,386,983</b>	<b>\$381,051</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>\$6,756,296</b>	<b>\$369,313</b>					

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>	<b>\$2,616,707,973</b>	<b>\$3,116,989,576</b>	<b>\$500,281,603</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>\$3,289,508,991</b>	<b>\$172,519,415</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,470,333,525</b>	<b>\$180,824,534</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,659,556,598</b>	<b>\$189,223,073</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,860,831,197</b>	<b>\$201,274,599</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
58 DEMING	\$39,907,454	\$49,867,002	\$9,959,548	25.0%	\$52,881,064	\$3,014,062	6.0%	\$56,060,925	\$3,179,861	6.0%	\$58,990,583	\$2,929,658	5.2%	\$62,235,049	\$3,244,466	5.5%	
59 DEMING CESAR CHAVEZ	\$1,655,386	\$1,655,386	-\$155,402	-9.4%	\$1,499,984	-\$155,402	-9.4%	\$1,339,256	-\$160,728	-10.7%	\$1,221,220	-\$118,036	-8.8%	\$1,288,386	\$67,166	5.5%	
60 <b>DEMING W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$41,562,840</b>	<b>\$51,522,388</b>	<b>\$9,804,146</b>	<b>23.6%</b>	<b>\$54,381,048</b>	<b>\$2,858,660</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$57,400,181</b>	<b>\$3,019,133</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>\$60,211,803</b>	<b>\$2,811,622</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>\$63,523,435</b>	<b>\$3,311,632</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
61 DES MOINES	\$1,549,875	\$1,733,445	\$183,570	11.8%	\$1,815,001	\$81,556	4.7%	\$1,901,046	\$86,045	4.7%	\$2,001,193	\$100,147	5.3%	\$2,111,258	\$110,065	5.5%	
62 DEXTER	\$8,213,855	\$9,993,609	\$1,779,754	21.7%	\$10,660,262	\$666,653	6.7%	\$11,363,586	\$703,324	6.6%	\$11,957,082	\$593,496	5.2%	\$12,614,718	\$657,636	5.5%	
63 DORA	\$2,637,671	\$2,975,611	\$337,940	12.8%	\$3,161,854	\$196,243	6.3%	\$3,358,341	\$196,487	6.2%	\$3,541,716	\$183,375	5.5%	\$3,736,510	\$194,794	5.5%	
64 DULCE	\$6,790,434	\$8,282,844	\$1,492,410	22.0%	\$8,781,924	\$499,080	6.0%	\$9,308,457	\$526,533	6.0%	\$9,793,726	\$485,269	5.2%	\$10,332,378	\$538,652	5.5%	
65 ELIDA	\$1,780,113	\$2,033,242	\$253,129	14.2%	\$2,159,609	\$126,367	6.2%	\$2,292,932	\$133,323	6.2%	\$2,431,124	\$138,192	6.0%	\$2,564,835	\$133,711	5.5%	
66 ESPAÑOLA	\$30,190,412	\$36,420,399	\$6,229,987	20.6%	\$37,906,364	\$1,485,965	4.1%	\$39,474,130	\$1,567,766	4.1%	\$41,524,406	\$2,050,276	5.2%	\$43,808,237	\$2,283,831	5.5%	
67 ESTANCIA	\$6,625,845	\$8,024,370	\$1,398,525	21.1%	\$8,554,780	\$530,410	6.6%	\$9,114,357	\$559,577	6.5%	\$9,665,175	\$550,818	6.0%	\$10,196,757	\$531,582	5.5%	
68 EUNICE	\$6,677,507	\$8,121,054	\$1,443,547	21.6%	\$8,578,810	\$457,756	5.6%	\$9,061,752	\$482,942	5.6%	\$9,567,750	\$505,998	5.6%	\$10,093,974	\$526,224	5.5%	
69 FARMINGTON	\$78,837,914	\$93,365,825	\$14,527,911	18.4%	\$98,958,923	\$5,593,098	6.0%	\$104,859,689	\$5,900,766	6.0%	\$110,659,343	\$5,799,654	5.5%	\$116,745,576	\$6,086,233	5.5%	
70 NEW MEXICO VIRTUAL ACADEMY	\$3,297,766	\$3,831,884	\$534,118	16.2%	\$4,071,062	\$239,178	6.2%	\$4,323,400	\$252,338	6.2%	\$4,545,653	\$222,253	5.1%	\$4,795,663	\$250,010	5.5%	
71 <b>FARMINGTON W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$82,135,680</b>	<b>\$97,197,709</b>	<b>\$15,062,029</b>	<b>18.3%</b>	<b>\$103,029,985</b>	<b>\$5,832,276</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>\$109,183,089</b>	<b>\$6,153,104</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>\$115,204,996</b>	<b>\$6,021,907</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$121,541,239</b>	<b>\$6,336,243</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
72 FLOYD	\$2,451,833	\$2,827,321	\$375,488	15.3%	\$3,015,074	\$187,753	6.6%	\$3,213,154	\$198,080	6.6%	\$3,408,026	\$194,872	6.1%	\$3,595,467	\$187,441	5.5%	
73 FT. SUMNER	\$3,002,598	\$3,516,305	\$513,707	17.1%	\$3,786,690	\$270,385	7.7%	\$4,071,952	\$285,262	7.5%	\$4,347,941	\$275,989	6.8%	\$4,587,077	\$239,136	5.5%	
74 GADSDEN	\$103,886,265	\$128,820,277	\$24,934,012	24.0%	\$135,858,412	\$7,038,135	5.5%	\$143,283,766	\$7,425,354	5.5%	\$151,069,171	\$7,785,405	5.4%	\$159,377,934	\$8,308,763	5.5%	
75 GALLUP	\$87,704,577	\$108,793,321	\$21,088,744	24.0%	\$114,689,442	\$5,896,121	5.4%	\$120,909,955	\$6,220,513	5.4%	\$127,614,579	\$6,704,624	5.5%	\$134,633,346	\$7,018,767	5.5%	
76 MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH	\$1,329,028	\$1,329,028	-\$3,067	-0.2%	\$1,325,961	-\$3,067	-0.2%	\$1,199,680	-\$126,281	-9.5%	\$1,108,494	-\$91,186	-7.6%	\$1,169,460	\$60,966	5.5%	
77 <b>GALLUP W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$89,033,605</b>	<b>\$110,122,349</b>	<b>\$21,085,677</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>\$116,015,403</b>	<b>\$5,893,054</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>\$122,109,635</b>	<b>\$6,094,232</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>\$128,723,073</b>	<b>\$6,613,438</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>\$135,802,806</b>	<b>\$7,079,733</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
78 GRADY	\$1,789,542	\$2,014,070	\$224,528	12.5%	\$2,132,375	\$118,305	5.9%	\$2,257,188	\$124,813	5.9%	\$2,388,793	\$131,605	5.8%	\$2,520,176	\$131,383	5.5%	
79 GRANTS	\$28,645,790	\$34,947,665	\$6,301,875	22.0%	\$36,616,734	\$1,669,069	4.8%	\$38,377,653	\$1,760,919	4.8%	\$40,396,067	\$2,018,414	5.3%	\$42,617,840	\$2,221,773	5.5%	
80 HAGERMAN	\$4,531,444	\$5,222,258	\$690,814	15.2%	\$5,618,885	\$296,627	5.7%	\$5,831,829	\$312,944	5.7%	\$6,116,474	\$284,645	4.9%	\$6,452,878	\$336,404	5.5%	
81 HATCH	\$9,746,361	\$12,434,007	\$2,687,646	27.6%	\$13,261,385	\$827,378	6.7%	\$14,134,272	\$872,887	6.6%	\$14,846,939	\$712,667	5.0%	\$15,663,516	\$816,577	5.5%	
82 HOBBS	\$70,738,404	\$82,915,231	\$12,176,827	17.2%	\$88,056,829	\$5,141,598	6.2%	\$93,481,238	\$5,424,409	6.2%	\$98,651,279	\$5,170,041	5.5%	\$104,077,072	\$5,425,793	5.5%	
83 HONDO	\$2,024,472	\$2,355,861	\$331,389	16.4%	\$2,476,057	\$120,196	6.2%	\$2,602,872	\$126,815	5.1%	\$2,746,411	\$143,539	5.5%	\$2,897,463	\$151,052	5.5%	
84 HOUSE	\$1,526,882	\$1,699,188	\$172,306	11.3%	\$1,775,759	\$76,571	4.5%	\$1,856,540	\$80,781	4.5%	\$1,958,370	\$101,830	5.5%	\$2,066,080	\$107,710	5.5%	
85 JAL	\$4,248,670	\$5,150,838	\$902,168	21.2%	\$5,456,474	\$305,636	5.9%	\$5,778,922	\$322,448	5.9%	\$6,044,405	\$265,483	4.6%	\$6,376,846	\$332,441	5.5%	
86 JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	\$2,451,625	\$2,978,017	\$526,392	21.5%	\$3,159,768	\$181,751	6.1%	\$3,351,511	\$191,743	6.1%	\$3,552,920	\$201,409	6.0%	\$3,748,330	\$195,410	5.5%	
87 LINDRITH AREA HERITAGE	\$249,421	\$292,471	\$43,050	17.3%	\$312,738	\$20,267	6.9%	\$334,125	\$21,387	6.8%	\$354,847	\$20,722	6.2%	\$374,364	\$19,517	5.5%	
88 <b>JEMEZ MOUNTAIN W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$2,701,046</b>	<b>\$3,270,488</b>	<b>\$569,442</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>\$3,472,506</b>	<b>\$202,018</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>\$3,685,636</b>	<b>\$213,130</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>\$3,907,767</b>	<b>\$222,131</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>\$4,122,694</b>	<b>\$214,927</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
89 JEMEZ VALLEY	\$3,207,723	\$3,885,723	\$678,000	21.1%	\$4,094,138	\$208,415	5.4%	\$4,314,028	\$219,890	5.4%	\$4,529,965	\$215,937	5.0%	\$4,779,112	\$249,147	5.5%	
90 SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER	\$954,581	\$1,112,797	\$158,216	16.6%	\$1,186,755	\$73,958	6.6%	\$1,264,786	\$78,031	6.6%	\$1,338,694	\$73,908	5.8%	\$1,412,322	\$73,628	5.5%	
91 <b>JEMEZ VALLEY W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$4,162,304</b>	<b>\$4,998,520</b>	<b>\$836,216</b>	<b>20.1%</b>	<b>\$5,280,893</b>	<b>\$282,373</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>\$5,578,814</b>	<b>\$297,921</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>\$5,868,659</b>	<b>\$289,845</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>\$6,191,434</b>	<b>\$322,775</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
92 LAKE ARTHUR	\$1,773,408	\$1,997,477	\$224,069	12.6%	\$2,097,989	\$100,512	5.0%	\$2,204,036	\$106,047	5.1%	\$2,332,499	\$128,463	5.8%	\$2,460,786	\$128,287	5.5%	
93 LAS CRUCES	\$184,563,964	\$221,485,728	\$36,921,764	20.0%	\$234,492,636	\$13,006,908	5.9%	\$248,215,045	\$13,722,409	5.9%	\$262,053,994	\$13,838,949	5.6%	\$276,466,891	\$14,412,897	5.5%	
94 LAS VEGAS CITY	\$13,427,883	\$15,832,625	\$2,404,742	17.9%	\$16,740,945	\$908,320	5.7%	\$17,699,243	\$958,298	5.7%	\$18,701,416	\$1,002,173	5.7%	\$19,729,989	\$1,028,573	5.5%	
95 LOGAN	\$3,400,141	\$3,603,426	\$203,285	6.0%	\$3,800,849	\$197,423	5.5%	\$4,009,144	\$208,295	5.5%	\$4,199,956	\$190,812	4.8%	\$4,430,952	\$230,996	5.5%	
96 LORDSBURG	\$4,587,510	\$5,621,428	\$1,033,918	22.5%	\$5,971,017	\$349,589	6.2%	\$6,339,834	\$368,817	6.2%	\$6,675,194	\$335,360	5.3%	\$7,042,328	\$367,134	5.5%	
97 LOS ALAMOS	\$29,015,803	\$31,747,181	\$2,731,378	9.4%	\$33,419,760	\$1,672,579	5.3%	\$35,184,368	\$1,764,608	5.3%	\$37,051,346	\$1,866,978	5.3%	\$39,089,159	\$2,037,813	5.5%	
98 LOS LUNAS	\$60,564,761	\$73,264,929	\$12,700,168	21.0%	\$78,143,754	\$4,878,825	6.7%	\$83,290,909	\$5,147,155	6.6%	\$88,310,525	\$5,019,616	6.0%	\$93,167,579	\$4,857,054	5.5%	
99 LOVING	\$5,143,903	\$6,143,533	\$999,630	19.4%	\$6,484,797	\$341,264	5.6%	\$6,844,836	\$360,039	5.6%	\$7,152,680	\$307,844	4.5%	\$7,546,076	\$393,396	5.5%	
100 LOVINGTON	\$31,636,318	\$34,993,248	\$3,356,930	10.6%	\$36,434,207	\$1,440,959	4.1%	\$37,954,488	\$1,520,281	4.2%	\$39,700,789	\$1,746,301	4.6%	\$41,884,322	\$2,183,533	5.5%	
101 MAGDALENA	\$3,659,707	\$4,443,602	\$783,895	21.4%	\$4,738,700	\$295,098	6.6%	\$5,050,022	\$311,322	6.6%	\$5,365,669	\$315,647	6.3%	\$5,660,779	\$295,110	5.5%	
102 MAXWELL	\$1,681,968	\$1,970,952	\$288,984	17.2%	\$2,082,024	\$111,072	5.6%	\$2,199,211	\$117,187	5.6%	\$2,330,969	\$131,758	6.0%	\$2,459,171	\$128,202	5.5%	
103 MELROSE	\$2,295,550	\$2,626,262	\$330,712	14.4%	\$2,789,937	\$163,675	6.2%	\$2,962,614	\$172,677	6.2%	\$3,115,614	\$153,000	5.2%	\$3,286,972	\$171,358	5.5%	
104 MESA VISTA	\$2,931,138	\$3,439,608	\$508,470	17.3%	\$3,643,152	\$203,544	5.9%	\$3,857,892	\$214,740	5.9%	\$4,077,510	\$219,618	5.7%	\$4,301,772	\$224,262	5.5%	
105 MORA	\$4,389,976	\$5,217,397	\$827,421	18.8%	\$5,519,586	\$302,189	5.8%	\$5,838,399	\$318,813	5.8%	\$6,134,210	\$295,811	5.1%	\$6,471,590	\$337,380	5.5%	
106 MORIARTY	\$17,948,492	\$21,745,239	\$3,796,747	21.2%	\$23,494,055	\$1,748,816	8.0%	\$25,339,031	\$1,844,976	7.9%	\$26,849,147	\$1,510,116	6.0%	\$28,325,843	\$1,476,696	5.5%	
107 MOSQUERO	\$1,174,396	\$1,304,370	\$129,974	11.1%	\$1,358,664	\$54,294	4.2%	\$1,415,942	\$57,278	4.2%	\$1,499,047	\$83,105	5.9%	\$1,581,494	\$82,447	5.5%	

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>	<b>\$2,616,707,973</b>	<b>\$3,116,989,576</b>	<b>\$500,281,603</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>\$3,289,508,991</b>	<b>\$172,519,415</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,470,333,525</b>	<b>\$180,824,534</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,659,556,598</b>	<b>\$189,223,073</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,860,831,197</b>	<b>\$201,274,599</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
116 RESERVE	\$2,004,162	\$2,324,424	\$320,262	16.0%	\$2,457,795	\$133,371	5.7%	\$2,598,508	\$140,713	5.7%	\$2,759,130	\$160,622	6.2%	\$2,910,881	\$151,751	5.5%	
117 RIO RANCHO	\$130,719,159	\$147,873,095	\$17,153,936	13.1%	\$156,458,959	\$8,585,864	5.8%	\$165,517,135	\$9,058,176	5.8%	\$174,022,222	\$8,505,087	5.1%	\$183,593,396	\$9,571,174	5.5%	
118 ROSWELL	\$72,420,559	\$89,867,927	\$17,447,368	24.1%	\$95,495,020	\$5,627,093	6.3%	\$101,431,624	\$5,936,604	6.2%	\$107,481,080	\$6,049,456	6.0%	\$113,392,510	\$5,911,430	5.5%	
119 SIDNEY GUTIERREZ	\$704,054	\$722,817	\$18,763	2.7%	\$722,817	\$0	0.0%	\$693,183	-\$29,634	-4.1%	\$698,247	\$5,064	0.7%	\$736,650	\$38,403	5.5%	
120 <b>ROSWELL W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$73,124,613</b>	<b>\$90,590,744</b>	<b>\$17,466,131</b>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>\$96,217,837</b>	<b>\$5,627,093</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>\$102,124,807</b>	<b>\$5,906,970</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>\$108,179,327</b>	<b>\$6,054,520</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>\$114,129,160</b>	<b>\$5,949,833</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
121 ROY	\$1,221,657	\$1,356,076	\$134,419	11.0%	\$1,412,215	\$56,139	4.1%	\$1,471,445	\$59,230	4.2%	\$1,552,475	\$81,030	5.5%	\$1,637,860	\$85,385	5.5%	
122 RUIDOSO	\$15,017,886	\$18,622,317	\$3,604,431	24.0%	\$19,779,488	\$1,157,171	6.2%	\$21,000,313	\$1,220,825	6.2%	\$22,229,677	\$1,229,364	5.9%	\$23,452,303	\$1,222,626	5.5%	
123 SAN JON	\$1,929,409	\$2,161,941	\$232,532	12.1%	\$2,273,733	\$111,792	5.2%	\$2,391,676	\$117,943	5.2%	\$2,513,227	\$121,551	5.1%	\$2,651,454	\$138,227	5.5%	
124 SANTA FE	\$99,615,488	\$119,317,564	\$19,702,076	19.8%	\$125,411,194	\$6,093,630	5.1%	\$131,840,123	\$6,428,929	5.1%	\$138,914,601	\$7,074,478	5.4%	\$146,554,866	\$7,640,265	5.5%	
125 ACAD FOR TECH & CLASSICS	\$2,855,083	\$3,275,208	\$420,125	14.7%	\$3,436,969	\$161,761	4.9%	\$3,607,636	\$170,667	5.0%	\$3,812,691	\$205,055	5.7%	\$4,022,388	\$209,697	5.5%	
126 <b>SANTA FE W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$102,470,571</b>	<b>\$122,592,772</b>	<b>\$20,122,201</b>	<b>19.6%</b>	<b>\$128,848,163</b>	<b>\$6,255,391</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>\$135,447,759</b>	<b>\$6,599,596</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>\$142,727,292</b>	<b>\$7,279,533</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>\$150,577,254</b>	<b>\$7,849,962</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
127 SANTA ROSA	\$6,048,090	\$7,442,267	\$1,394,177	23.1%	\$7,907,056	\$464,789	6.2%	\$8,397,415	\$490,359	6.2%	\$8,898,306	\$500,891	6.0%	\$9,387,711	\$489,405	5.5%	
128 SILVER CITY CONS.	\$21,289,743	\$24,549,875	\$3,260,132	15.3%	\$25,799,317	\$1,249,442	5.1%	\$27,117,513	\$1,318,196	5.1%	\$28,603,888	\$1,486,375	5.5%	\$30,177,094	\$1,573,206	5.5%	
129 SOCORRO	\$11,886,010	\$14,756,750	\$2,870,740	24.2%	\$15,705,680	\$948,930	6.4%	\$16,706,808	\$1,001,128	6.4%	\$17,749,169	\$1,042,361	6.2%	\$18,725,368	\$976,199	5.5%	
130 COTTONWOOD VALLEY CHARTER	\$1,375,686	\$1,583,610	\$207,924	15.1%	\$1,673,610	\$90,000	5.7%	\$1,768,567	\$94,957	5.7%	\$1,861,911	\$93,344	5.3%	\$1,964,316	\$102,405	5.5%	
131 <b>SOCORRO W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$13,261,696</b>	<b>\$16,340,360</b>	<b>\$3,078,664</b>	<b>23.2%</b>	<b>\$17,379,290</b>	<b>\$1,038,930</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>\$18,475,375</b>	<b>\$1,096,085</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>\$19,611,080</b>	<b>\$1,135,705</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>\$20,689,684</b>	<b>\$1,078,604</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
132 SPRINGER	\$2,004,113	\$2,326,606	\$322,493	16.1%	\$2,452,537	\$125,931	5.4%	\$2,585,392	\$132,855	5.4%	\$2,731,588	\$146,196	5.7%	\$2,881,824	\$150,236	5.5%	
133 TAOS	\$17,858,765	\$21,902,044	\$4,043,279	22.6%	\$23,172,069	\$1,270,025	5.8%	\$24,511,963	\$1,339,894	5.8%	\$25,789,582	\$1,277,619	5.2%	\$27,208,002	\$1,418,420	5.5%	
134 ANANSI CHARTER	\$1,393,122	\$1,638,306	\$245,184	17.6%	\$1,746,397	\$108,091	6.6%	\$1,860,438	\$114,041	6.5%	\$1,971,521	\$111,083	6.0%	\$2,079,954	\$108,433	5.5%	
135 TAOS CHARTER	\$1,575,321	\$1,835,569	\$260,248	16.5%	\$1,971,763	\$136,194	7.4%	\$2,115,452	\$143,689	7.3%	\$2,240,055	\$124,553	5.9%	\$2,363,205	\$123,200	5.5%	
136 VISTA GRANDE	\$1,142,902	\$1,148,129	\$5,227	0.5%	\$1,060,585	-\$87,544	-7.6%	\$948,413	-\$112,172	-10.6%	\$992,636	\$44,223	4.7%	\$1,047,231	\$54,595	5.5%	
137 <b>TAOS W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$21,970,110</b>	<b>\$26,524,048</b>	<b>\$4,553,938</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>\$27,950,814</b>	<b>\$1,426,766</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>\$29,436,266</b>	<b>\$1,485,452</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>\$30,993,744</b>	<b>\$1,557,478</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>\$32,698,392</b>	<b>\$1,704,648</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
138 TATUM	\$3,638,087	\$4,037,690	\$399,603	11.0%	\$4,257,668	\$219,978	5.4%	\$4,489,749	\$232,081	5.5%	\$4,702,448	\$212,699	4.7%	\$4,961,081	\$258,633	5.5%	
139 TEXICO	\$5,141,524	\$5,861,750	\$720,226	14.0%	\$6,245,996	\$384,246	6.6%	\$6,651,375	\$405,379	6.5%	\$6,998,805	\$348,430	5.2%	\$7,384,792	\$384,987	5.5%	
140 TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	\$10,743,004	\$13,176,047	\$2,433,043	22.6%	\$13,927,760	\$751,713	5.7%	\$14,720,831	\$793,071	5.7%	\$15,568,112	\$847,281	5.8%	\$16,424,354	\$856,242	5.5%	
141 TUCUMCARI	\$8,590,470	\$10,384,145	\$1,793,675	20.9%	\$10,944,050	\$559,905	5.4%	\$11,534,760	\$590,710	5.4%	\$12,168,026	\$633,266	5.5%	\$12,837,264	\$669,238	5.5%	
142 TULAROSA	\$7,942,836	\$9,706,806	\$1,763,970	22.2%	\$10,268,853	\$562,047	5.8%	\$10,861,828	\$592,975	5.8%	\$11,421,924	\$560,096	5.2%	\$12,050,127	\$628,203	5.5%	
143 VAUGHN	\$1,531,291	\$1,734,279	\$202,988	13.3%	\$1,808,270	\$73,991	4.3%	\$1,886,334	\$78,064	4.3%	\$1,990,259	\$103,925	5.5%	\$2,099,722	\$109,463	5.5%	
144 WAGON MOUND	\$1,474,485	\$1,708,327	\$233,842	15.9%	\$1,774,758	\$66,431	3.9%	\$1,844,851	\$70,093	3.9%	\$1,941,284	\$96,433	5.2%	\$2,048,055	\$106,771	5.5%	
145 WEST LAS VEGAS	\$12,350,771	\$15,120,482	\$2,769,711	22.4%	\$16,056,902	\$936,420	6.2%	\$17,044,830	\$987,928	6.2%	\$17,998,056	\$953,226	5.6%	\$18,987,944	\$989,888	5.5%	
146 RIO GALLINAS CHARTER SCHOOL	\$766,051	\$903,957	\$137,906	18.0%	\$964,963	\$61,006	6.7%	\$1,029,324	\$64,361	6.7%	\$1,088,698	\$59,374	5.8%	\$1,148,577	\$59,879	5.5%	
147 <b>WEST LAS VEGAS W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$13,116,822</b>	<b>\$16,024,439</b>	<b>\$2,907,617</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>\$17,021,865</b>	<b>\$997,426</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>\$18,074,154</b>	<b>\$1,052,289</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>\$19,086,754</b>	<b>\$1,012,600</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>\$20,136,521</b>	<b>\$1,049,767</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
148 ZUNI	\$11,171,742	\$13,878,002	\$2,706,260	24.2%	\$14,475,866	\$597,864	4.3%	\$15,106,642	\$630,776	4.4%	\$15,773,032	\$666,390	4.4%	\$16,640,544	\$867,512	5.5%	
149 STATE CHARTERS																	
150 ALBUQUERQUE INSTI. MATH & SCI. (AIMS) ST. (APS)	\$3,118,013	\$3,380,275	\$262,262	8.4%	\$3,429,110	\$48,835	1.4%	\$3,480,641	\$51,531	1.5%	\$3,598,194	\$117,553	3.4%	\$3,796,094	\$197,900	5.5%	
151 ALBUQUERQUE COLLEGIATE (APS)	\$784,402	\$829,939	\$45,537	5.8%	\$829,939	\$0	0.0%	\$794,672	-\$35,267	-4.2%	\$790,583	-\$4,089	-0.5%	\$834,065	\$43,482	5.5%	
152 ALBUQUERQUE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE ST. CHAR (APS)	\$3,891,787	\$4,590,922	\$699,135	18.0%	\$4,888,122	\$297,200	6.5%	\$5,201,669	\$313,547	6.4%	\$5,501,718	\$300,049	5.8%	\$5,804,311	\$302,593	5.5%	
153 ALBUQUERQUE SIGN LANGUAGE ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,122,588	\$2,191,811	\$69,223	3.3%	\$2,191,811	\$0	0.0%	\$2,168,282	-\$23,529	-1.1%	\$2,259,526	\$91,244	4.2%	\$2,383,799	\$124,273	5.5%	
154 ALDO LEOPOLD ST. CHARTER (SILVER CITY)	\$1,906,508	\$1,895,973	-\$10,535	-0.6%	\$1,752,754	-\$143,219	-7.6%	\$1,601,684	-\$151,070	-8.6%	\$1,674,509	\$72,825	4.5%	\$1,766,606	\$92,097	5.5%	
155 ALMA D' ARTE STATE CHARTER (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,972,099	\$1,987,891	\$15,792	0.8%	\$1,849,070	-\$138,821	-7.0%	\$1,703,908	-\$145,162	-7.9%	\$1,794,682	\$90,774	5.3%	\$1,893,389	\$98,707	5.5%	
156 ALTURA PREPARATORY SCHOOL (APS)	\$879,735	\$945,144	\$65,409	7.4%	\$945,144	\$0	0.0%	\$917,932	-\$27,212	-2.9%	\$928,243	\$10,311	1.1%	\$979,297	\$51,054	5.5%	
157 AMY BIEHL ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,054,921	\$3,228,385	\$173,464	5.7%	\$3,195,227	-\$33,158	-1.0%	\$3,149,810	-\$45,417	-1.4%	\$3,274,742	\$124,932	4.0%	\$3,454,852	\$180,110	5.5%	
158 ASK ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (RIO RANCHO)	\$3,624,407	\$4,083,957	\$459,550	12.7%	\$4,332,742	\$248,785	6.1%	\$4,595,212	\$262,470	6.1%	\$4,835,020	\$239,808	5.2%	\$5,100,945	\$265,925	5.5%	
159 CESAR CHAVEZ COMM. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,165,657	\$2,272,708	\$107,051	4.9%	\$2,272,708	\$0	0.0%	\$2,131,551	-\$141,157	-6.2%	\$2,222,477	\$90,926	4.3%	\$2,344,713	\$122,236	5.5%	
160 CORAL COMMUNITY (APS)	\$1,392,523	\$1,703,238	\$310,715	22.3%	\$1,813,532	\$110,294	6.5%	\$1,929,893	\$116,361	6.4%	\$2,037,779	\$107,886	5.6%	\$2,149,856	\$112,077	5.5%	
161 DREAM DINE' (CENTRAL)	\$245,994	\$299,251	\$53,257	21.6%	\$299,251	\$0	0.0%	\$290,912	-\$8,339	-2.8%	\$306,061	\$15,149	5.2%	\$322,894	\$16,833	5.5%	
162 DZIT DIT LOOL DEAP (GALLUP)	\$321,101	\$342,410	\$21,309	6.6%	\$326,982	-\$15,428	-4.5%	\$310,709	-\$16,273	-5.0%	\$328,632	\$17,923	5.8%	\$346,706	\$18,074	5.5%	
163 ESTANCIA VALLEY (MORIARTY)	\$3,270,086	\$3,919,424	\$649,338	19.9%	\$4,249,155	\$329,731	8.4%	\$4,597,015	\$347,860	8.2%	\$4,862,186	\$265,171	5.8%	\$5,129,605	\$267,419	5.5%	
164 EXPLORE ACADEMY (ALBUQUERQUE)	\$3,249,353	\$3,467,733	\$218,380	6.7%	\$3,410,511	-\$57,222	-1.7%	\$3,350,170	-\$60,341	-1.8%	\$3,560,256	\$210,086	6.3%	\$3,756,069	\$195,813	5.5%	
165 GILBERT L. SENA STATE CHARTER (APS)	\$1,873,039	\$1,885,057	\$12,018	0.6%	\$1,737,673	-\$147,384	-7.8%	\$1,582,205	-\$155,468	-8.9%	\$1,652,451	\$70,246	4.4%	\$1,743,336	\$90,885	5.5%	
166 HORIZON ACADEMY WEST ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,019,006	\$3,563,967	\$544,960	18.0%	\$3,811,398	\$247,492	6.9%	\$4,072,500	\$2								

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>	<b>\$2,616,707,973</b>	<b>\$3,116,989,576</b>	<b>\$500,281,603</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>\$3,289,508,991</b>	<b>\$172,519,415</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,470,333,525</b>	<b>\$180,824,534</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,659,556,598</b>	<b>\$189,223,073</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,860,831,197</b>	<b>\$201,274,599</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	
176 MEDIA ARTS COLLAB. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,478,157	\$2,623,360	\$145,203	5.9%	\$2,530,334	-\$93,026	-3.5%	\$2,432,207	-\$98,127	-3.9%	\$2,570,208	\$138,001	5.7%	\$2,711,568	\$141,360	5.5%	
176 MISSION ACHIEVEMENT & SUCCESS-MAS (APS) <sup>2</sup>	\$8,414,305	\$10,101,861	\$1,687,556	20.1%	\$10,692,193	\$590,332	5.8%	\$11,314,999	\$622,806	5.8%	\$11,967,686	\$652,687	5.8%	\$12,625,906	\$658,220	5.5%	
177 MONTE DEL SOL (SANTA FE)	\$3,164,434	\$3,411,028	\$246,594	7.8%	\$3,434,186	\$23,158	0.7%	\$3,458,633	\$24,447	0.7%	\$3,651,271	\$192,638	5.6%	\$3,852,089	\$200,818	5.5%	
178 MONTESSORI ELEMENTARY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,465,795	\$2,959,068	\$493,273	20.0%	\$3,175,499	\$216,431	7.3%	\$3,403,832	\$228,333	7.2%	\$3,600,177	\$196,345	5.8%	\$3,798,185	\$198,008	5.5%	
179 NEW AMERICA CHARTER SCHOOL ST. CH. (APS)	\$2,486,671	\$2,200,504	-\$286,167	-11.5%	\$2,134,943	-\$65,561	-3.0%	\$2,065,799	-\$69,144	-3.2%	\$2,188,652	\$122,853	5.9%	\$2,309,027	\$120,375	5.5%	
180 NEW AMERICA SCHOOL (LAS CRUCES)	\$2,254,120	\$1,432,463	-\$821,657	-36.5%	\$1,261,998	-\$170,465	-11.9%	\$1,082,178	-\$179,820	-14.2%	\$1,128,121	\$45,943	4.2%	\$1,190,167	\$62,046	5.5%	
181 NEW MEXICO CONNECTIONS VIRTUAL (SANTA FE)	\$12,287,018	\$14,743,341	\$2,456,323	20.0%	\$15,845,162	\$1,101,821	7.5%	\$17,007,572	\$1,162,410	7.3%	\$18,097,977	\$1,090,405	6.4%	\$19,093,361	\$995,384	5.5%	
182 NEW MEXICO SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS ST. CH (SANTA FE)	\$2,245,331	\$2,315,694	\$70,363	3.1%	\$2,193,149	-\$122,545	-5.3%	\$2,063,881	-\$129,268	-5.9%	\$2,173,559	\$109,678	5.3%	\$2,293,104	\$119,545	5.5%	
183 NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,258,353	\$3,859,813	\$601,460	18.5%	\$4,070,823	\$211,010	5.5%	\$4,293,438	\$222,615	5.5%	\$4,491,438	\$198,000	4.6%	\$4,738,465	\$247,027	5.5%	
184 RED RIVER VALLEY (QUESTA)	\$751,490	\$958,570	\$207,080	27.6%	\$1,024,548	\$65,978	6.9%	\$1,094,160	\$69,612	6.8%	\$1,158,861	\$64,701	5.9%	\$1,222,598	\$63,737	5.5%	
185 ROOTS & WINGS (QUESTA)	\$480,562	\$568,969	\$88,407	18.4%	\$614,306	\$45,337	8.0%	\$662,137	\$47,831	7.8%	\$706,807	\$44,670	6.7%	\$745,681	\$38,874	5.5%	
186 SANDOVAL ACADEMY OF BIL ED SABA (RIO RANCHO)	\$779,278	\$811,446	\$32,168	4.1%	\$779,858	-\$31,588	-3.9%	\$746,539	-\$33,319	-4.3%	\$782,282	\$35,743	4.8%	\$825,307	\$43,025	5.5%	
187 SCHOOL OF DREAMS ST. CHARTER (LOS LUNAS)	\$3,909,884	\$4,386,592	\$476,708	12.2%	\$4,653,129	\$266,537	6.1%	\$4,934,326	\$281,197	6.0%	\$5,221,812	\$287,486	5.8%	\$5,509,010	\$287,198	5.5%	
188 SIX DIRECTIONS (GALLUP)	\$884,943	\$959,281	\$74,338	8.4%	\$937,265	-\$22,016	-2.3%	\$914,046	-\$23,219	-2.5%	\$958,592	\$44,546	4.9%	\$1,011,314	\$52,722	5.5%	
189 SOUTH VALLEY PREP ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$1,335,321	\$1,463,121	\$127,800	9.6%	\$1,482,027	\$18,906	1.3%	\$1,501,979	\$19,952	1.3%	\$1,585,136	\$83,157	5.5%	\$1,672,318	\$87,182	5.5%	
190 SOUTHWEST AER.,MATH & SCIENCE-SAMS (APS)	\$2,502,605	\$2,619,114	\$116,509	4.7%	\$2,511,520	-\$107,594	-4.1%	\$2,398,035	-\$113,485	-4.5%	\$2,491,907	\$93,872	3.9%	\$2,628,961	\$137,054	5.5%	
191 SOUTHWEST PREPATORY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$1,554,525	\$1,784,003	\$229,478	14.8%	\$1,874,479	\$90,476	5.1%	\$1,969,934	\$95,455	5.1%	\$2,081,843	\$111,909	5.7%	\$2,196,343	\$114,500	5.5%	
192 SOUTHWEST SECONDARY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$2,409,180	\$2,552,509	\$143,329	5.9%	\$2,470,739	-\$81,770	-3.2%	\$2,384,486	-\$86,253	-3.5%	\$2,522,840	\$138,354	5.8%	\$2,661,595	\$138,755	5.5%	
193 STUDENT ATHLETE HEADQUARTERS (SHAQ) (APS)	\$927,313	\$899,501	-\$27,812	-3.0%	\$784,868	-\$114,633	-12.7%	\$663,944	-\$120,924	-15.4%	\$689,854	\$25,910	3.9%	\$727,795	\$37,941	5.5%	
194 TAOS ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (TAOS)	\$2,047,676	\$2,145,002	\$97,326	4.8%	\$2,057,348	-\$87,654	-4.1%	\$1,964,897	-\$92,451	-4.5%	\$2,101,638	\$136,741	7.0%	\$2,217,227	\$115,589	5.5%	
195 TAOS INTEGRATED SCHOOL OF ARTS ST. (TAOS)	\$1,261,166	\$1,521,926	\$260,760	20.7%	\$1,542,721	\$20,795	1.4%	\$1,564,671	\$21,950	1.4%	\$1,629,372	\$64,701	4.1%	\$1,718,987	\$89,615	5.5%	
196 TAOS INTERNATIONAL (TAOS)	\$1,544,443	\$1,964,355	\$419,912	27.2%	\$2,120,929	\$156,574	8.0%	\$2,286,112	\$165,183	7.8%	\$2,443,675	\$157,563	6.9%	\$2,578,076	\$134,401	5.5%	
197 THE GREAT ACADEMY (APS)	\$1,727,466	\$1,630,847	-\$96,619	-5.6%	\$1,471,871	-\$158,976	-9.7%	\$1,304,168	-\$167,703	-11.4%	\$1,366,328	\$62,160	4.8%	\$1,441,475	\$75,147	5.5%	
198 TIERRA ADENTRO ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,807,880	\$2,932,137	\$124,257	4.4%	\$2,854,219	-\$77,918	-2.7%	\$2,772,037	-\$82,182	-2.9%	\$2,897,019	\$124,982	4.5%	\$3,056,355	\$159,336	5.5%	
199 TIERRA ENCANTADA CHARTER (SANTA FE)	\$2,797,606	\$3,059,752	\$262,146	9.4%	\$3,047,253	-\$12,499	-0.4%	\$3,034,083	-\$13,170	-0.4%	\$3,209,099	\$175,016	5.8%	\$3,385,599	\$176,500	5.5%	
200 TURQUOISE TRAIL (SANTA FE)	\$3,900,522	\$4,563,722	\$663,200	17.0%	\$4,799,600	\$235,878	5.2%	\$5,048,455	\$248,855	5.2%	\$5,299,614	\$251,159	5.0%	\$5,591,092	\$291,478	5.5%	
201 WALATOWA CHARTER HIGH (JEMEZ VALLEY)	\$592,998	\$696,424	\$103,426	17.4%	\$744,667	\$48,243	6.9%	\$795,563	\$50,896	6.8%	\$849,592	\$54,029	6.8%	\$896,319	\$46,727	5.5%	
202 STATEWIDE	<b>\$2,616,707,973</b>	<b>\$3,116,989,576</b>	<b>\$500,281,603</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>\$3,289,508,991</b>	<b>\$172,519,415</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,470,333,525</b>	<b>\$180,824,534</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,659,556,598</b>	<b>\$189,223,073</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$3,860,831,197</b>	<b>\$201,274,599</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	

Note: Statewide estimated program cost is based on the LFC FY20 public school program cost recommendation and outyear projections. Variance in individual school district and charter school program cost will depend on actual participation rates in K-5 Plus and extended learning time programs. Actual program costs may vary significantly based on student enrollment. The analysis shown assumes all school districts and charter schools implement extended learning time programs, all currently-eligible school districts and charter schools implement K-5 Plus programs, and all students over the age of 22 exit the system in FY20.