

State of New Mexico
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES

Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338
<http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lescl/lescldefault.asp>

SENATORS

Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY

Andrew J. Barreras
Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti



ADVISORY

Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Howie C. Morales
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director
Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

June 19, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public School District Superintendents

FR: D. Pauline Rindone *dp*

RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

In April, you received a memorandum from the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) inviting you to work with the committee to examine the potential impact of the new public school funding formula that was proposed during the 2008 legislative session. Attachment 1 is a table indicating the meeting at which your district is scheduled to discuss the proposed funding formula with the committee - a meeting agenda with the exact time and date for your presentation will be sent to you prior to that meeting.

At the LESC meeting for which you have been scheduled, LESC staff will present your district's calculator and you will discuss with the committee how the proposed funding formula would affect your school district's operations and its ability to accommodate the needs of your students, as well as other issues related to the proposed funding formula. Hard copies of the calculators for the districts in your group will be available for reference and discussion.

In order to facilitate the discussions, LESC staff, with the assistance of the Public Education Department (PED), have prepared the following questions, which will also be provided to the committee. The questions are a guide to assist you in preparing for your discussions with the committee. We understand that you may or may not be able to have complete answers to some of these questions prior to the meeting; however, it is important that we receive written responses to these questions from each of you. If you are not able to respond immediately, please send a copy of your responses to me as soon as you are able to gather the information, and please include the name of your district with the responses.

6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your district would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

Personnel	Elementary	Middle	High	Current FTE	Proposed FTE
Teachers					
Principals					
Counselors					
Nurses					
Physical Education Teachers					
Art and Music Teachers					
Social Workers					
Librarians					
Advanced Placement Teachers					
Gifted Education					
Intervention Specialists					
Bilingual Education					
Educational Assistants					
Special Education Teachers (excluding gifted)					
Ancillary and Support Staff					
Maintenance and Operations Staff (including custodians)					
Data Entry Clerks					
Other Central Office Staff					
Other School-based Staff					

Accountability:

The legislation introduced during the 2008 session to change the public school funding formula utilizes the Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) as the means of ensuring accountability with regard to districts providing a sufficient educational program for all students that includes not only the basic required academic programs, such as reading, writing, and math, but also programs such as bilingual-multicultural education, physical education, arts and music, and gifted programs. In short, PED is required to disapprove any budget for a district or charter school that cannot show in its EPSS that it is offering all required programs.

7. Do you believe that the EPSS is the appropriate mechanism to tie together budget approval and program delivery? If not, what means would you suggest be used as an alternative to ensure accountability?

Staff Salaries:

The proposed funding formula would replace the current Training and Experience (T&E) Index with the Index of Staff Qualifications (ISQ). Although both indexes are designed to distribute additional funding to districts and charter schools based on the composition of their instructional staff, they are not identical:

- The T&E calculation is based on years of service and academic degrees for all instructional staff but does not reflect the three-tiered licensure system for teachers.

 - The ISQ calculation recognizes not only experience and academic degrees but also licensure levels. It was calibrated on the average teacher salaries for each of the three levels and distributes additional dollars based on the proportion of teachers in each of those levels. In addition, there is a second calculation for those instructional staff, such as counselors, who are not included in the three-tiered system. Because the base per-student cost upon which the proposed formula is based already reflects the average salary by personnel category in the average district, the ISQ is applied only to salary costs in a district or charter school that are beyond the average.
8. If you have calculated your district's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (see Attachment 2), how would this factor impact funding for your district?

Special Education:

9. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as in need of special education, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent? **(Do not include gifted students.)**

Number: _____ Percentage: _____%

10. How will the proposed funding formula's use of a fixed special education identification rate of 16 percent impact special education funding for your district?

Gifted Education:

11. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as gifted, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent?

Number: _____ Percentage: _____%

12. Even though the bill as amended during the session does not require districts to consider students that have been identified as gifted to be in need of special education, it does require that these students be served. How will your district specifically address the needs of students identified as gifted?

Revenue Sources for Implementation:

13. What revenue sources for the additional dollars needed to reach sufficiency would your district support?

Potential Problems:

14. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise from the implementation of the proposed funding formula?

15. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise if the proposed funding formula is not implemented?

16. Please feel free to identify any other issues that have not been addressed in these questions that you feel the committee should be aware of.

xc: Legislative Education Study Committee

PROPOSED PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA: SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CHARTER SCHOOLS

<i>Location: Roswell</i> May 12-14		<i>Location: Albuquerque</i> June 9-11		<i>Location: Kirtland</i> August 6		<i>Location: Chama</i> September 8-10		<i>Location: Deming</i> October 8-10		<i>Location: Santa Fe</i> November 19-21	
District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM
Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1	
Artesia	3,548.5	Albuquerque	88,271.5	Central Consolidated	6,614.5	Española	4,309.0	Alamogordo	6,321.0	Albuquerque	88,271.5
Clovis	8,035.0	Los Lunas	8,561.0	Farmington	10,189.5	Taos	2,795.0	Carlsbad	5,905.5	Los Alamos	3,444.0
Hobbs	7,809.5	Rio Rancho	15,577.0	Gallup-McKinley	12,159.0	West Las Vegas	1,703.5	Deming	5,418.0	Pojoaque	2,019.5
Lovington	3,084.0							Gadsden	13,955.5	Raton	1,360.5
Portales	2,773.0							Las Cruces	23,559.5	Ruidoso	2,273.5
Roswell	9,373.5									Santa Fe	12,266.0
										Tucumancañi	1,045.0
Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2	
Capitan	536.5	Belen	4,749.5	Aztec	3,064.5	Chama	454.0	Cobre	1,396.5	Cimarron	450.0
Cloudcroft	461.0	Bernalillo	3,176.0	Bloomfield	3,096.5	Cuba	695.0	Hatch Valley	1,428.0	Clayton	539.5
Dexter	1,097.0	Estancia	1,005.0	Grants-Cibola	3,698.0	Mesa Vista	437.0	Las Vegas City	2,085.5	Jemez Mountain	343.0
Eunice	570.5	Moriarty	3,590.5	Zuni	1,505.0	Questa	434.5	Silver Consolidated	3,091.5	Logan	231.0
Hagerman	448.0	Socorro	1,722.5					Truth or Consequences	1,392.0	Mora	567.5
Jal	405.0									Pecos	714.0
Loving	570.5									Peñasco	547.5
Texico	526.0									Santa Rosa	654.0
Group 3		Group 3		Group 3				Group 3		Group 3	
Carrizozo	215.5	Corona	84.5	Dulce	691.0			Animas	257.0	Des Moines	94.0
Dora	225.5	Jemez Valley	326.5					Lordsburg	680.0	Maxwell	102.0
Elida	120.5	Magdalena	428.5					Reserve	185.0	Mosquero	38.0
Floyd	243.5	Mountainair	339.0					Tularosa	959.0	Roy	79.0
Fort Sumner	304.5	Quemado	186.0							San Jon	149.5
Grady	121.5									Springer	195.0
Hondo Valley	121.5	Group 4								Vaughn	103.5
House	107.0	Aldo Leopold, Silver City								Wagon Mound	148.5
Lake Arthur	148.0	Creative Ed. Prep. Inst. 1, Albuquerque									
Melrose	208.5	Deming Cesar Chavez, Deming									
Tatum	292.5	Digital Arts & Tech. Acad., Albuquerque									
		El Camino Real, Albuquerque									
		Middle College High School, Gallup									
		Mosaic Academy, Aztec									
		Nuestros Valores, Albuquerque									
		Rio Gallinas School, West Las Vegas									
		Sidney Gutierrez Middle School, Roswell									
		SW Secondary Learning, Albuquerque									
		Taos Charter School, Taos									
		Turquoise Trail, Santa Fe									
		Walatowa, Jemez Pueblo									

NOTE: The district groupings are based on 2007-2008 40-day membership.

**PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO
2007-2008 OPERATING BUDGET PROGRAM COST PLUS BUDGETED EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL
Deming, NM: Group 3**

	ANIMAS	LORDSBURG	RESERVE	TULAROSA	
1 Cost Factor Values					1
2 •Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	65.6%	73.9%	75.2%	51.8%	2
3 •Percent English Learners	9.4%	7.9%	0.0%	3.0%	3
4 •Percent Special Education (Census-based)	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	4
5 •Percent Mobility	17.2%	20.4%	18.9%	15.6%	5
6 •Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	26.8%	25.7%	27.1%	24.6%	6
7 •Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	37.9%	28.2%	30.1%	31.6%	7
8 •Total District Enrollment	261.0	709.0	181.0	1,009.5	8
9					9
10 Individual Formula Adjustments					10
11 <u>Student Needs</u>					11
12 •Free/Reduced Lunch	1.208	1.231	1.234	1.170	12
13 •English Learners	1.008	1.007	1.000	1.003	13
14 •Special Education	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	14
15 •Mobility	1.031	1.036	1.033	1.028	15
16 <u>Grade Composition</u>					16
17 •Grades 6-8	1.008	1.005	1.009	1.003	17
18 •Grades 9-12	1.025	0.980	0.989	0.996	18
19 <u>Scale (Enrollment)</u>					19
20 •Scale	1.603	1.277	1.767	1.195	20
21					21
22 Combined Adjustments					22
23 •Student Needs (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.622	1.658	1.647	1.557	23
24 •Grade Composition (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.033	0.985	0.997	0.998	24
25 •Scale	1.603	1.277	1.767	1.195	25
26 Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs x Grade Composition x Scale)	2.684	2.087	2.902	1.858	26
27					27
28 Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	28
29 x Overall Adjustment	2.684	2.087	2.902	1.858	29
30 Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$13,706	\$10,654	\$14,816	\$9,484	30
31					31
32 x ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.077	1.000	1.000	1.020	32
33 Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$14,763	\$10,654	\$14,816	\$9,673	33
34					34
35 x Total District Enrollment	261.0	709.0	181.0	1,009.5	35
36 Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost	\$3,853,087	\$7,553,831	\$2,681,709	\$9,764,522	36
37					37
38 Actual Program Cost (2007-2008 Operating Budget)	\$2,871,015	\$6,356,393	\$1,967,378	\$7,928,110	38
39 + Emergency Supplemental	\$0	\$0	\$120,288	\$0	39
40 2007-2008 Total Program Cost & Emergency Supplemental	\$2,871,015	\$6,356,393	\$2,087,666	\$7,928,110	40
41					41
42 Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost – Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost on line 36 – 2007-2008 Total on line 40	\$982,072	\$1,197,438	\$594,043	\$1,836,412	42
43					43
44 Percent Increase/Decrease	34.2%	18.8%	28.5%	23.2%	44

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
ANIMAS

User Input Cost Factors							
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment	
65.6%	9.4%	16.0%	17.2%	26.8%	37.9%	261	

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.656	1.094	1.160	1.172	1.268	1.379	261	2.80.E+13
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.208	1.008	1.291	1.031	1.008	1.025	1.603	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.622							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					1.033			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.603	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	2.684							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$13,706							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.077							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$14,763							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$3,853,087							
Actual Program Cost	\$2,871,015							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$982,072							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$3,853,087							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	34.2%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
LORDSBURG

User Input Cost Factors						
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
73.9%	7.9%	16.0%	20.4%	25.7%	28.2%	709

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.739	1.079	1.160	1.204	1.257	1.282	709	5.14.E+18
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.231	1.007	1.291	1.036	1.005	0.980	1.277	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.658							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.985			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.277	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	2.087							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$10,654							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$10,654							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$7,553,831							
Actual Program Cost	\$6,356,393							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,197,438							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$7,553,831							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	18.8%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
RESERVE

User Input Cost Factors						
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
75.2%	0.0%	16.0%	18.9%	27.1%	30.1%	181

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.752	1.000	1.160	1.189	1.271	1.301	181	5.45.E+11
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.234	1.000	1.291	1.033	1.009	0.989	1.767	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.647							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.997			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.767	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	2.902							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$14,816							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$14,816							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$2,681,709							
Actual Program Cost	\$1,967,378							
Emergency Supplemental	\$120,288							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$594,043							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$2,681,709							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	28.5%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
TULAROSA

User Input Cost Factors						
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
51.8%	3.0%	16.0%	15.6%	24.6%	31.6%	1010

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.518	1.030	1.160	1.156	1.246	1.316	1009.5	6.03.E+20
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.170	1.003	1.291	1.028	1.003	0.996	1.195	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.557							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.998			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.195	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)					1.858			
Base Per-Pupil Cost					\$5,106			
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$9,484			
ISQ Formula Adjustment					1.020			
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$9,673			
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$9,764,522			
Actual Program Cost					\$7,928,110			
Emergency Supplemental					\$0			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)					\$1,836,412			
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$9,764,522			
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					23.2%			

**PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO
2007-2008 OPERATING BUDGET PROGRAM COST PLUS BUDGETED EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL
Deming, NM: Group 2**

	COBRE	HATCH VALLEY	LAS VEGAS CITY	SILVER CONS.	TRUTH OR CONSEQ.
1 Cost Factor Values					
2 •Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	73.9%	95.4%	59.0%	55.7%	72.6%
3 •Percent English Learners	31.1%	51.2%	48.9%	3.9%	14.4%
4 •Percent Special Education (Census-based)	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%
5 •Percent Mobility	16.0%	19.0%	13.1%	19.5%	22.6%
6 •Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	22.4%	23.5%	22.0%	23.4%	23.7%
7 •Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	31.0%	31.1%	28.2%	28.5%	30.4%
8 •Total District Enrollment	1,433.5	1,411.5	2,043.0	3,127.0	1,439.5
9					
10 Individual Formula Adjustments					
11 <u>Student Needs</u>					
12 •Free/Reduced Lunch	1.231	1.286	1.190	1.181	1.227
13 •English Learners	1.026	1.040	1.038	1.004	1.013
14 •Special Education	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291
15 •Mobility	1.029	1.034	1.024	1.034	1.039
16 <u>Grade Composition</u>					
17 •Grades 6-8	0.998	1.000	0.996	1.000	1.001
18 •Grades 9-12	0.993	0.994	0.980	0.981	0.990
19 <u>Scale (Enrollment)</u>					
20 •Scale	1.127	1.129	1.069	1.013	1.126
21					
22 Combined Adjustments					
23 •Student Needs (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.677	1.784	1.633	1.583	1.668
24 •Grade Composition (all factors multiplied by each other)	0.990	0.994	0.977	0.981	0.991
25 •Scale	1.127	1.129	1.069	1.013	1.126
26 Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs x Grade Composition x Scale)	1.871	2.002	1.705	1.574	1.861
27					
28 Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106
29 x Overall Adjustment	1.871	2.002	1.705	1.574	1.861
30 Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$9,554	\$10,223	\$8,706	\$8,038	\$9,500
31					
32 x ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.028	1.002	1.009	1.049	1.000
33 Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$9,817	\$10,243	\$8,780	\$8,435	\$9,500
34					
35 x Total District Enrollment	1,433.5	1,411.5	2,043.0	3,127.0	1,439.5
36 Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost	\$14,073,287	\$14,457,908	\$17,937,842	\$26,376,171	\$13,674,833
37					
38 Actual Program Cost (2007-2008 Operating Budget)	\$13,617,049	\$10,063,156	\$16,050,535	\$22,923,052	\$10,811,181
39 + Emergency Supplemental	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
40 2007-2008 Total Program Cost & Emergency Supplemental	\$13,617,049	\$10,063,156	\$16,050,535	\$22,923,052	\$10,811,181
41					
42 Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost – Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost on line 36 – 2007-2008 Total on line 40	\$456,237	\$4,394,752	\$1,887,307	\$3,453,119	\$2,863,652
43					
44 Percent Increase/(Decrease)	3.4%	43.7%	11.8%	15.1%	26.5%

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
COBRE CONS.

User Input Cost Factors						
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
73.9%	31.1%	16.0%	16.0%	22.4%	31.0%	1434

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.739	1.311	1.160	1.160	1.224	1.310	1433.5	8.72.E+22
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.231	1.026	1.291	1.029	0.998	0.993	1.127	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.677							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.990			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.127	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	1.871							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$9,554							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.028							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$9,817							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$14,073,287							
Actual Program Cost	\$13,617,049							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$456,237							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$14,073,287							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	3.4%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
HATCH

User Input Cost Factors							
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment	
95.4%	51.2%	16.0%	19.0%	23.5%	31.1%	1412	

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.954	1.512	1.160	1.190	1.235	1.311	1411.5	6.96.E+22
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.286	1.040	1.291	1.034	1.000	0.994	1.129	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.784							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.994			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.129	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	2.002							

Base Per-Pupil Cost

\$5,106

Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost

\$10,223

ISQ Formula Adjustment

1.002

Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost

\$10,243

Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost

\$14,457,908

Actual Program Cost

\$10,063,156

Emergency Supplemental

\$0

Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost
(Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost -
Actual Program Cost -
Emergency Supplemental)

\$4,394,752

Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost

\$14,457,908

Percent Difference Between Actual Program
Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless
Projected Sufficient Total Cost

43.7%

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
 LAS VEGAS CITY

User Input Cost Factors						
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
59.0%	48.9%	16.0%	13.1%	22.0%	28.2%	2043

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.590	1.489	1.160	1.131	1.220	1.282	2043	1.70.E+25
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.190	1.038	1.291	1.024	0.996	0.980	1.069	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.633							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.977			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.069	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	1.705							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,706							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.009							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,780							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$17,937,842							
Actual Program Cost	\$16,050,535							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$1,887,307							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$17,937,842							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	11.8%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
SILVER CITY

User Input Cost Factors						
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
55.7%	3.9%	16.0%	19.5%	23.4%	28.5%	3127

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.557	1.039	1.160	1.195	1.234	1.285	3127	1.34.E+28
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.181	1.004	1.291	1.034	1.000	0.981	1.013	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.583							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.981			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.013	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/Grade Composition/Scale)	1.574							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,038							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.049							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,435							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$26,376,171							
Actual Program Cost	\$22,923,052							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$3,453,119							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$26,376,171							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	15.1%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
TRUTH OR CONS.

User Input Cost Factors						
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment
72.6%	14.4%	16.0%	22.6%	23.7%	30.4%	1440

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.726	1.144	1.160	1.226	1.237	1.304	1439.5	9.26.E+22
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.227	1.013	1.291	1.039	1.001	0.990	1.126	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.668							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.991			
Combined Scale Adjustment							1.126	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	1.861							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$9,500							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$9,500							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$13,674,833							
Actual Program Cost	\$10,811,181							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$2,863,652							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$13,674,833							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	26.5%							

PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO
 2007-2008 OPERATING BUDGET PROGRAM COST PLUS BUDGETED EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL
 Deming, NM: Group 1

	ALAMOGORDO	CARLSBAD	DEMING	GADSDEN	LAS CRUCES	
1 Cost Factor Values						1
2 •Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	52.2%	60.6%	78.9%	88.2%	58.0%	2
3 •Percent English Learners	2.4%	4.2%	35.2%	53.8%	12.4%	3
4 •Percent Special Education (Census based)	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%	4
5 •Percent Mobility	19.7%	18.8%	20.4%	20.9%	13.2%	5
6 •Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	22.5%	23.8%	24.0%	23.4%	23.2%	6
7 •Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	30.2%	28.4%	29.1%	29.3%	29.0%	7
8 •Total District Enrollment	6,449.5	5,914.0	5,392.0	13,876.5	23,370.0	8
9						9
10 Individual Formula Adjustments						10
11 <u>Student Needs</u>						11
12 •Free/Reduced Lunch	1.171	1.194	1.244	1.268	1.187	12
13 •English Learners	1.002	1.004	1.029	1.041	1.011	13
14 •Special Education	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	1.291	14
15 •Mobility	1.035	1.033	1.036	1.037	1.024	15
16 <u>Grade Composition</u>						16
17 •Grades 6-8	0.998	1.001	1.001	1.000	0.999	17
18 •Grades 9-12	0.989	0.981	0.984	0.985	0.984	18
19 <u>Scale (Enrollment)</u>						19
20 •Scale	0.948	0.954	0.961	0.912	0.906	20
21						21
22 Combined Adjustments						22
23 •Student Needs (all factors multiplied by each other)	1.568	1.600	1.712	1.767	1.587	23
24 •Grade Composition (all factors multiplied by each other)	0.987	0.982	0.985	0.985	0.983	24
25 •Scale	0.948	0.954	0.961	0.912	0.906	25
26 Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs x Grade Composition x Scale)	1.467	1.499	1.621	1.588	1.414	26
27						27
28 Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	\$5,106	28
29 x Overall Adjustment	1.467	1.499	1.621	1.588	1.414	29
30 Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$7,489	\$7,651	\$8,276	\$8,108	\$7,221	30
31						31
32 x ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000	1.095	1.000	1.000	1.000	32
33 Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$7,489	\$8,380	\$8,276	\$8,108	\$7,221	33
34						34
35 x Total District Enrollment	6,449.5	5,914.0	5,392.0	13,876.5	23,370.0	35
36 Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost	\$48,299,284	\$49,562,042	\$44,622,228	\$112,511,020	\$168,744,183	36
37						37
38 Actual Program Cost (2007-2008 Operating Budget)	\$41,475,515	\$45,866,517	\$34,142,899	\$92,053,487	\$158,472,890	38
39 + Emergency Supplemental	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	39
40 2007-2008 Total Program Cost & Emergency Supplemental	\$41,475,515	\$45,866,517	\$34,142,899	\$92,053,487	\$158,472,890	40
41						41
42 Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost = Final Projected Sufficient Total (Program) Cost on line 36 - 2007-2008 Total on line 40	\$6,823,768	\$3,695,525	\$10,479,329	\$20,457,533	\$10,271,293	42
43						43
44 Percent Increase/(Decrease)	16.5%	8.1%	30.7%	22.2%	6.5%	44

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
ALAMOGORDO

User Input Cost Factors							
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment	
52.2%	2.4%	16.0%	19.7%	22.5%	30.2%	6450	

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.522	1.024	1.160	1.197	1.225	1.302	6449.5	2.61.E+33
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.171	1.002	1.291	1.035	0.998	0.989	0.948	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.568							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.987			
Combined Scale Adjustment							0.948	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/Grade Composition/Scale)	1.467							
Base Per-Pupil Cost					\$5,106			
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$7,489			
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$7,489			
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$48,299,284			
Actual Program Cost					\$41,475,515			
Emergency Supplemental					\$0			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)					\$6,823,768			
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$48,299,284			
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					16.5%			

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
CARLSBAD

User Input Cost Factors							
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment	
60.6%	4.2%	16.0%	18.6%	23.8%	28.4%	5914	

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.606	1.042	1.160	1.188	1.238	1.284	5914	5.74 E+32
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.194	1.004	1.291	1.033	1.001	0.981	0.954	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.600							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.982			
Combined Scale Adjustment							0.954	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)					1.499			
Base Per-Pupil Cost					\$5,106			
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$7,651			
ISQ Formula Adjustment					1.095			
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost					\$8,380			
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$49,562,042			
Actual Program Cost					\$45,866,517			
Emergency Supplemental					\$0			
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)					\$3,695,525			
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					\$49,562,042			
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost					8.1%			

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
 DEMING

User Input Cost Factors							
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment	
78.9%	35.2%	16.0%	20.4%	24.0%	29.1%	5392	

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.789	1.352	1.160	1.204	1.240	1.291	5392	1.16.E+32
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.244	1.029	1.291	1.036	1.001	0.984	0.961	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.712							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.985			
Combined Scale Adjustment							0.961	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/Grade Composition/Scale)	1.621							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,276							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,276							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$44,622,228							
Actual Program Cost	\$34,142,899							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$10,479,329							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$44,622,228							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	30.7%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
GADSDEN

User Input Cost Factors							
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment	
88.2%	53.8%	16.0%	20.9%	23.4%	29.3%	13877	

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.882	1.538	1.160	1.209	1.234	1.293	13876.5	3.23E+39
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.268	1.041	1.291	1.037	1.000	0.985	0.912	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.767							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.985			
Combined Scale Adjustment							0.912	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/Grade Composition/Scale)	1.588							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,108							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$8,108							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$112,511,020							
Actual Program Cost	\$92,053,487							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$20,457,533							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$112,511,020							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	22.2%							

DISTRICT CALCULATOR 2007-08

1 - Choose District (Use Pull-Down Menu Below)
LAS CRUCES

User Input Cost Factors							
Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Total District Enrollment	
58.0%	12.4%	16.0%	13.2%	23.2%	29.0%	23370	

User Input Cost Factor Values

	Cost Factors							
	Student Needs				Grade Composition		Scale	
	Percent Free/Reduced Lunch	Percent English Learners	Percent Special Education	Percent Mobility	Enrollment Share in Grades 6-8	Enrollment Share in Grades 9-12	Enrollment-Linear	Enrollment-Quadratic
Coefficients	0.375	0.094	1.723	0.190	0.291	0.608	-0.575	0.029
Transformed Demographic Values	1.580	1.124	1.160	1.132	1.232	1.290	23370	8.82E+43
Individual Formula Adjustments	1.187	1.011	1.291	1.024	0.999	0.984	0.906	
Combined Student Needs Adjustment	1.587							
Combined Grade Composition Adjustment					0.983			
Combined Scale Adjustment							0.906	
Overall Adjustment (Combined Student Needs/ Grade Composition/Scale)	1.414							
Base Per-Pupil Cost	\$5,106							
Initial Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$7,221							
ISQ Formula Adjustment	1.000							
Final Projected Sufficient Per-Pupil Cost	\$7,221							
Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$168,744,183							
Actual Program Cost	\$158,472,890							
Emergency Supplemental	\$0							
Total Marginal Sufficiency Cost (Equals Final Projected Sufficient Total Cost - Actual Program Cost - Emergency Supplemental)	\$10,271,293							
Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	\$168,744,183							
Percent Difference Between Actual Program Cost/Emergency Supplemental and Hold-Harmless Projected Sufficient Total Cost	6.5%							