

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>HB455</u>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<u>Martinez, R./Trujillo, L./Trujillo, C./Sarinana/Stapleton</u>
<b>Tracking Number</b>	<u>.212743.1</u>	<b>Committee Referrals</b>	<u>HEC/HAFC</u>
<b>Short Title</b>	<u>School Program Unit Changes</u>		
<b>Analyst</b>	<u>Simon</u>	<b>Original Date</b>	<u>2/15/19</u>
		<b>Last Updated</b>	<u></u>

---

---

**BILL SUMMARY**

Synopsis of Bill

House Bill 455 (HB455) would amend the Public School Finance Act to make changes to the public school funding formula to provide for increased funding for services to at-risk students, and increased funding for bilingual multicultural education programs. The bill would also replace the current rural isolation factor in the public school funding formula with a new factor based on the number of students in schools more than 25 miles away from the school district's central office. In addition, the bill would create a new supplemental funding distribution outside of the public school funding formula for "necessarily small school districts."

HB455 does not carry an effective date and, if enacted, would become law June 14, 2019.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

HB455 makes changes to the public school funding formula that would result in the creation of an estimated 115,866 program units, with an estimated value of \$481.9 million at the preliminary FY19 unit value of \$4,159.23. The bill appropriates \$452.5 million from the general fund to the state equalization guarantee distribution to account for the increase in program units related to changes to the at-risk index, bilingual multicultural education factor, and the rural isolation factor. The bill also appropriates \$10 million to the public school fund for supplemental distributions for "necessarily small school districts."

***At-Risk Index.*** HB455 would increase funding for services to at-risk students by 463 percent over FY18 funding, from \$100 million in FY18 to \$565 million in FY20. The bill would increase the multiplier used to calculate the at-risk index from the current 0.13 to 0.366 in FY20 and change the indicator that serves as a proxy for low-income students from the percentage of a school district's membership that is used to calculate its federal Title I distribution to the percentage of a school district's membership that qualifies for free or reduced-fee lunches under the National School Lunch Program.

Based on available data, LESC staff estimate the changes included in HB455 would create 106,330 program units, valued at \$442.3 million at the preliminary FY19 unit value of \$4,159.23. LESC staff estimate 74.7 percent of New Mexico’s students are eligible for free or reduced-fee lunches, based on the number of “economically disadvantaged” students reported on each school district’s and state-chartered charter school’s district report card for 2018. According to each report card, the number of economically disadvantaged students is determined by “eligibility for free or reduced price lunch program.” School district report card data is based on school district and charter school submissions from the third reporting date in FY18. For staff estimates, the number of students eligible for free or reduced-fee lunch in state-chartered charter schools was added to the number of students in the school district before calculating the free or reduced-fee eligibility percentage. Locally chartered charter schools are already included in school district report card data. Adding charter school data to school district data is consistent with the current methodology for how the Public Education Department (PED) determines the percent of English learners or student mobility.

Although HB455 would require PED to calculate the at-risk index using the three-year average of the school district’s free and reduced-fee lunch eligibility, staff estimates in this analysis are based only on one year of data for which staff have compiled economically disadvantaged students by school district and charter school. This may slightly overestimate the number of students eligible for free or reduced-fee lunches because the number of economically disadvantaged students statewide increased in both FY16 and FY17. According to 2017 school district report cards, 74.1 percent of students statewide were economically disadvantaged in FY17 and 71.6 percent of students statewide were economically disadvantaged in FY16.

***Bilingual Multicultural Education Programs.*** HB455 would increase the cost differential for bilingual multicultural education programs from the current 0.5 program units per FTE student enrolled in a bilingual multicultural education program to 1 program unit per FTE student. Based on preliminary FY19 funding for bilingual programs, HB455 would create 8,367 additional bilingual program units, valued at \$34.8 million at the FY19 preliminary unit value.

Since the 1970s, the public school funding formula has included a factor to provide increased funding to cover the additional costs of bilingual education. The current funding formula allocates an additional \$2,080 per FTE bilingual student. HB455 would increase per-FTE funding to \$4,159 per student, based on the FY19 preliminary unit value. HB455 would allocate additional funding for existing bilingual multicultural education programs, but would not necessarily increase the number of students with access to bilingual multicultural education programs. According to PED, 49,452 students participated in bilingual multicultural education programs in FY18. While additional funding could encourage some school districts to consider adding a bilingual education program, HB455 could have the effect of increasing funding for current bilingual programs without expanding the programs to students who currently do not have access.

A large percentage of Hispanic and Native American students do not have access to bilingual multicultural education programs. In its annual report, PED notes the number of schools implementing programs increased from 461 in FY17 to 484 in FY18 because of increased monitoring and improved technical assistance to schools that clarify program eligibility requirements needed to receive funding. Schools that are unable to offer these programs lack teachers certified to teach bilingual education or are unable to inform parents of the benefits of these programs to initiate a program or increase enrollment of existing programs. During the 2017-

2018 school year, 81 percent of bilingual multicultural programs were Spanish/English language programs and 19 percent were Native American/English language programs.

**Rural Isolation Program Units.** HB455 creates a new size adjustment factor that allocates additional program units to a school district with a school more than 25 “driving miles” away from the school district’s administrative offices, replacing an inactive factor in the funding formula which allocates additional program units to large school districts with high schools that do not receive small school size adjustment program. Since FY12, no school district has received these program units and prior to that only Gallup-McKinley County Schools (GMCS) received these program units. As more high schools within the GMCS fell below 400 students and began generating size adjustment program units, GMCS became ineligible for these program units.

Using FY19 enrollment on the first reporting date, staff estimate HB455 would create 1,168 rural isolation program units, with a value of \$4.9 million at the FY19 preliminary unit value of \$4,159.23. Staff estimate 13 school districts would be eligible for program units under the new rural isolation factor, with school districts generating between \$11 thousand and \$2.7 million and GMCS accounting for 55 percent of program units created by the rural isolation factor. As written, the revised rural isolation factor would create more program units for GMCS than the district generated through the rural isolation factor. From FY01 through FY10, GMCS generated an average of 376 rural isolation program units per fiscal year, but staff estimate the factor would create 647 program units for GMCS in FY20.

Staff estimate that under HB455, GMCS would generate a total of 1,575 size adjustment program units, or 478 size adjustment program units more than the school district generated in FY11. At the preliminary FY19 unit value, this represents \$2 million in additional funding over what was being generated by the rural isolation factor prior to FY11.

The rural isolation factor being eliminated by HB455 only allows school districts to generate rural isolation program units based on the number of senior high schools that were not generating size adjustment

**School Districts Eligible for Rural Isolation Units**

School District	Estimated Rural Isolation Funding
Artesia Public Schools	\$14,141
Bernalillo Public School	\$207,130
Central Consolidated Schools	\$629,707
Deming Public Schools	\$470,825
Espanola Public Schools	\$82,353
Gadsden Independent School	\$247,890
Gallup-McKinley County Schools	\$2,691,022
Grants-Cibola County Schools	\$33,274
Jemez Mountain Public Schools	\$44,088
Las Cruces Public Schools	\$232,085
Quemado Public School	\$11,646
Santa Rosa Public Schools	\$89,008
Silver Consolidated Schools	\$106,476

Source: LESC

**Gallup-McKinley County Schools Size Adjustment Program Units by Fiscal Year**

Fiscal Year	School Size	Rural Isolation	Total
FY02	275	273	548
FY03	381	319	700
FY04	440	326	766
FY05	442	324	766
FY06	520	382	902
FY07	582	403	985
FY08	579	460	1,039
FY09	608	489	1,097
FY10	596	501	1,097
FY11	658	29	687
FY12	783	0	783
FY13	874	0	874
FY14	983	0	983
FY15	1,007	0	1,007
FY16	1,065	0	1,065
FY17	1,031	0	1,031
FY18	1,054	0	1,054
FY19 (Preliminary)	928	0	928
HB455 Estimate	928	647	1,575

Average Number of Units FY02 to FY10	878
Average Number of Units FY11 to FY19	935
Average Units Per-Student FY02 to FY10	6.89
Average Units Per-Student FY11 to FY19	8.30

Source: LESC

program units for enrolling fewer than 400 students (see page 5, lines 5 and 6). The replacement included in HB455 would allow a school district to generate both size adjustment program units for small high schools and rural isolation units. Rural isolation program units were designed to allocate additional program units in lieu of small school size adjustment units. When GMCS stopped generating rural isolation units in FY12, the school district began to generate more size adjustment units for their high schools, with the number of program units for small schools rising from 658 in FY11 to 928 in FY19. On average, GMCS actually generated more size adjustment program units from FY11 through FY19, when the school districts were generating little or no rural isolation units, than the school district generated between FY02 and FY10, when the school district received rural isolation units. The increase is true both in the absolute number of program units and in the number of program units per student.

**New Supplemental Distribution.** HB455 creates a new supplemental distribution for school districts that are “necessarily small,” enroll fewer than 200 students, and have a SEG distribution that “is not sufficient without supplementation.” HB455 includes a \$10 million appropriation for supplemental distributions but does not specify how the PED should distribute the \$10 million. Unexpended or unencumbered balances from the \$10 million appropriation would revert to the general fund at the end of FY20.

Based on enrollment data from October 2018, the 19 school districts with fewer than 200 students enroll a total of 2,115 students. The \$10 million appropriation included in HB455 is sufficient to increase funding by \$4,729 per student, based on October 2018 enrollment. Under the current funding formula, small school districts generate more funding per student than other school districts to account for diseconomies of scale. On average, school districts with fewer than 200 students had a preliminary FY19 program cost of \$15,887 per student, about double the \$7,896 per student generated by larger school districts. Assuming PED allocates all \$10 million appropriated by the bill, per-student funding for school districts under 200 MEM would rise to \$20,616 per student, a 161 percent increase over per-student funding in larger school districts.

**Impact of Supplemental Funding for Small School Districts**

School Districts with Fewer than 200 Students	FY19 Preliminary Program Cost Per Student	Estimated Per Student Funding with Supplemental Distribution
Animas Public Schools	\$13,123	\$18,215
Carrizozo Municipal Schools	\$13,352	\$18,828
Corona Municipal Schools	\$22,272	\$27,532
Des Moines Municipal Schools	\$17,032	\$22,046
Elida Municipal Schools	\$12,923	\$16,557
Grady Municipal Schools	\$13,687	\$16,503
Hondo Valley Public Schools	\$15,454	\$19,036
House Municipal Schools	\$20,495	\$31,754
Jemez Mountain Public Schools	\$12,508	\$18,425
Lake Arthur Municipal Schools	\$18,667	\$25,113
Maxwell Municipal Schools	\$15,085	\$17,667
Mosquero Municipal Schools	\$31,317	\$45,936
Quemado Independent Schools	\$14,320	\$18,234
Reserve Public Schools	\$15,781	\$19,305
Roy Municipal Schools	\$25,189	\$31,001
San Jon Municipal Schools	\$13,492	\$19,291
Springer Municipal Schools	\$14,575	\$20,386
Vaughn Municipal Schools	\$23,027	\$26,922
Wagon Mound Public Schools	\$23,782	\$29,304
School Districts Under 200 MEM	\$15,887	\$20,616
School Districts Over 200 MEM	\$7,896	\$7,896
Difference in Per-Student Program Cost	\$7,990	\$12,720
Per-Student Program Cost Disparity	101.2%	161.1%

Source: LESC

For the purposes of this analysis, staff assumes PED will allocate the additional funding on a per-student basis to school districts with fewer than 200 students. Per student program cost for these

schools ranged between \$12,508 per student for Jemez Mountain Public Schools, with just under 200 students, to \$31,317 for Mosquero Municipal Schools, the state’s smallest school district with only 29 students. Because HB455 does not specify how PED must distribute these funds, PED could opt to use a different methodology when allocating funding. Under the flexibility provided in HB455, PED could determine that some school districts are not “necessarily small” and thus ineligible for a supplemental distribution or that some school districts with fewer than 200 students have a sufficient SEG distribution without supplementation. PED would be required to report payments made under this new supplemental distribution to the LESC, the LFC, and the governor.

Should PED decide that less than \$10 million is needed by school districts with fewer than 200 students, PED could use authority included in existing law to divert unused or unneeded appropriations for this distribution to make other supplemental distributions (see Subsection C of 22-8-30 NMSA 1978 on page 10, lines 10 to 13 of HB455). Section 22-8-30 NMSA 1978 authorizes supplemental distributions to pay out-of-state tuition, for emergency distributions to school districts or state chartered charter schools in financial need, to make “program enrichment” distributions to school districts and state-chartered charter schools, to make special distributions to approved vocational education programs, or to make emergency capital outlay distributions.

**SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

**Martinez and Yazzie Lawsuit.** Provisions of HB455 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.

**Targeting of At-Risk Funding.** HB455 would change the indicator that serves as a proxy for low-income students from the percentage of a school district’s membership that is used to calculate its Title I

Share of Total At-Risk Funding with Different Indicators For Low Income Students

School District	Title I Eligibility	Free and Reduced Lunch	Change
20 School Districts with Highest Poverty Rate	18.9%	17.2%	-1.8%
20 School Districts with Lowest Poverty Rate	10.8%	11.8%	1.0%

Note: Calculation include charter schools within the appropriate school district:

Source: LESC

distribution to the percentage of a school district’s membership that qualifies for free or reduced-fee lunches under the National School Lunch Program. This change is likely related to a desire to include students up to 180 percent of the federal poverty line when calculating the at-risk index; however, under current federal policies, utilizing free and reduced-fee lunch eligibility would

likely identify some students over 180 percent of the federal poverty line who become eligible for free or reduced-fee lunches due to the National School Lunch Program's Community Eligibility Provision. 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 lunches to stop collecting data on student's household income while still receiving federal dollars for school lunches. As a result, some student above 180 percent of the poverty line may be considered eligible for free lunches. The sponsor could specify that only those students at 180 percent of the poverty line or below are to be included in the calculation, but this could require school districts to return to an application-based system, rather than utilizing the Community Eligibility Provision.

While HB455 would increase the total amount of at-risk funding so that all schools benefit, staff analysis indicates this change would have the effect of directing a smaller share of total at-risk funding to school districts with relatively high poverty rates, while school districts with relatively low poverty rates would generate a larger share of at-risk funding. Under HB455, the 20 school districts with the highest poverty rates would generate 17.2 percent of total at-risk funding, down 1.8 percent from the current share of at-risk funding. At the funding levels proposed by HB455, 1.8 percent of at-risk funding represents \$10.2 million. In addition, many high-poverty school districts are already at 100 percent free and reduced lunch eligibility, while many low-poverty school districts are not incentivized by current law to enroll more students in the National School Lunch Program. As a result, there is more potential for funding to increase in relatively low-poverty school districts as HB455 is implemented.

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. A 2017 U.S. Census Bureau report notes the new law will present challenges for those who use school lunch data as a proxy for economic disadvantage.

In previous years the Legislature has chosen to allocate additional at-risk funding by increasing the at-risk multiplier, which could better target additional at-risk funding to school districts with higher concentrations of poverty. The at-risk multiplier is applied to the three year average of each of the at-risk indicators – currently percent of students eligible for Title I, percent of students that are English learners, and student mobility – to determine a school district's at-risk index. Increasing the at-risk multiplier effectively increases the at-risk index of every school district. In 2014, the Legislature increased the at-risk multiplier from 0.0915 to 0.106, and the Legislature appropriated \$15.2 million for at-risk services, although this appropriation was line-item vetoed by the governor. In 2018, the Legislature increased the at-risk multiplier from 0.106 to 0.13 in FY19 and appropriated \$22.5 million, with additional increases to 0.14 in FY20 and 0.15 in FY21. For FY20, LFC and the executive have recommended increasing the at-risk multiplier to 0.25 and included \$113 million in the recommendations to cover the cost of the increase.

***Funding Formula Manipulability.*** The new funding formula factors included in HB455 may be susceptible to manipulation at the school district level in an attempt to generate additional funding.

For example, some school districts have designed their schools in a way to maximize size adjustment funding. Some school districts have created two schools at the same site, with one or both schools generating size adjustment funding when a combined school would generate less or no size adjustment funding. The finding of facts and conclusions of law issued by the district court in the consolidated *Martinez* and *Yazzie* lawsuit acknowledged this with respect to the small school factor, noting the factor “has allowed some [school] districts and charter schools to take advantage of the factor when its application is questionable.”

The new funding formula factor for rural isolation could be susceptible to manipulation if school districts make decisions to locate schools or administrative offices on the basis of the ability of the school district to generate additional funding.

The inclusion of free and reduced-fee lunch data as part of the at-risk index was considered by the 1997 Public School Funding Formula Task Force that recommended including an at-risk factor in the funding formula. 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.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

Several key terms in HB455 are undefined and may require clarification PED. For the rural isolation factor, HB455 does not define the term “driving miles” and PED may need to issue clarifying rules to ensure this term is applied uniformly. Similarly, the Public School Code does not define the term “administrative offices” and PED may need to clarify the term to ensure uniform application across school districts.

HB455 also provides significant discretion to PED with regard to the supplemental distribution for “necessarily small” school districts. It is unclear if the department will issue formal guidance on how it will determine if a school district is “necessarily small” or how it will determine if a school district’s SEG distribution is sufficient without supplementation. PED could apply these provisions on a case-by-case basis, which could decrease transparency of school district operational funding.

## **TECHNICAL ISSUES**

HB455 does not contain an effective date and if enacted would become law June 14, 2019, before the end of FY19. Generally, the provisions of the bill specify that the bill should change the program cost calculation for FY20 and subsequent fiscal years, however some provisions, such as the change from the percentage of membership used to determine a school district’s Title I allocation to the percentage of membership that qualifies for free or reduced-fee lunch, do not note effective dates. The sponsor may wish to amend the bill to include an effective date or to clarify the bill is applicable to the FY20 program cost calculation.

On page 2, lines 22 through 25, the bill does not remove obsolete provisions to phased-in increases in the cost differential from FY90 through FY94. While this does not have a substantive impact on the bill, the sponsor should consider amending the bill to remove these obsolete provisions.

Section 6 of HB455, beginning on page 10, includes protection from program cost reductions attributable to the implementation of HB455. However, it does not appear that any of the bill’s provisions would cause a reduction in program cost. It is also unclear why the hold harmless

payments would begin in FY21, when it appears the bill is meant to be effective in FY20 and does not include any provisions that are phased-in over time.

**RELATED BILLS**

HB455 makes changes to the public school funding formula that conflict with House Bill 5 and Senate Bill 1.

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

- LESC Files

**JWS/mc**

### Schools Eligible for Rural Isolation Funding

School District	Estimated Number of Students	Estimated Value of Rural Isolation Units
<b>Gallup-McKinley County Schools</b>		
Crownpoint Elementary	291	\$242,067
Crownpoint Middle School	267	\$222,103
Crownpoint High School	174	\$144,741
Navajo Elementary School	245	\$203,802
Navajo Middle School	129	\$107,308
Navajo Pine High School	111	\$92,335
Ramah Elementary School	154	\$128,104
Ramah Middle/High School	162	\$134,759
Thoreau Elementary	263	\$218,775
Thoreau Middle School	375	\$311,942
Thoreau High School	245	\$203,802
Tohatchi Elementary	215	\$178,847
Tohatchi Middle School	313	\$260,368
Tohatchi High School	204	\$169,697
Tse Yi Gai High School	87	\$72,371
<b>Gallup-McKinley Total</b>		<b>\$2,691,022</b>
<b>Central Consolidated Schools</b>		
Naschitti Elementary School	85	\$70,707
Newcomb Elementary School	229	\$190,493
Newcomb Middle School	241	\$200,475
Newcomb High School	202	\$168,033
<b>Central Consolidated Total</b>		<b>\$629,707</b>
<b>Deming Public Schools</b>		
Columbus Elementary	566	\$470,825
<b>Gadsden Independent School</b>		
Mesquite Elementary School	298	\$247,890
<b>Las Cruces Public Schools</b>		
White Sands Elementary School	279	\$232,085

School District	Estimated Number of Students	Estimated Value of Rural Isolation Units
<b>Bernalillo Public School</b>		
Cochiti Elementary School	180	\$149,732
Cochiti Middle School	69	\$57,397
<b>Bernalillo Total</b>		<b>\$207,130</b>
<b>Silver Consolidated Schools</b>		
Cliff Elementary School	128	\$106,476
<b>Santa Rosa Public Schools</b>		
Rita M. Marquez Elementary School	69	\$57,397
Anton Chico Middle School	38	\$31,610
<b>Santa Rosa Total</b>		<b>\$89,008</b>
<b>Espanola Public Schools</b>		
Abiquiu Elementary	99	\$82,353
<b>Jemez Mountain Public Schools</b>		
Lybrook Elementary School	53	\$44,088
<b>Grants-Cibola County Schools</b>		
Seyboyeta Elementary School	40	\$33,274
<b>Artesia Public Schools</b>		
Penasco Elementary School	17	\$14,141
<b>Quemado Public School</b>		
Datil Elementary School	14	\$11,646

Source: LESC, LFC, PED, and Gallup-McKinley County Schools

Note: Some listed schools may be slightly less than 25 miles. Because actual impact will vary based on the methodology chosen by PED, schools that were on the verge of the 25 mile limit were included.

**PROGRAM COST SUMMARY TABLE**

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19	FY20		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change	
			\$	%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	<b>\$2,616,707,958</b>	<b>\$3,098,962,356</b>	<b>\$482,254,397.90</b>	<b>18.4%</b>
1 ALAMOGORDO	\$41,532,028.60	\$48,146,075.90	\$6,614,047.40	15.9%
2 ALBUQUERQUE	\$637,370,732.57	\$754,796,889.90	\$117,426,157.43	18.4%
3 ACE LEADERSHIP	\$2,994,824.45	\$3,423,451.00	\$428,626.55	14.3%
4 ALBUQUERQUE CHARTER ACADEMY	\$2,674,231.00	\$3,058,386.70	\$384,156.00	14.4%
5 ALB TALENT DEV SECONDARY	\$1,756,937.78	\$2,027,138.30	\$270,200.22	15.4%
6 ALICE KING COMMUNITY SCHOOL	\$3,531,772.72	\$4,121,161.10	\$589,388.28	16.7%
7 CHRISTINE DUNCAN COMMUNITY	\$2,775,637.19	\$3,561,890.50	\$786,253.81	28.3%
8 CIEN AGUAS INTERNATIONAL ST. CHARTER	\$3,447,906.01	\$4,352,655.10	\$904,748.99	26.2%
9 CORRALES INTERNATIONAL	\$2,432,692.03	\$2,939,627.60	\$506,935.97	20.8%
10 COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL ST. CHARTER	\$4,789,769.27	\$5,754,311.00	\$964,541.73	20.1%
11 DIGITAL ARTS & TECH ACADEMY	\$2,505,819.62	\$2,919,160.30	\$413,340.38	16.5%
12 EAST MOUNTAIN	\$2,952,986.75	\$3,429,331.40	\$476,344.25	16.1%
13 EL CAMINO REAL	\$2,643,893.57	\$3,062,845.70	\$418,952.43	15.8%
14 GORDON BERNELL	\$3,023,311.01	\$3,612,957.20	\$589,645.99	19.5%
15 HEALTH LEADERSHIP CHARTER (APS)	\$2,051,939.48	\$2,320,998.60	\$269,059.52	13.1%
16 INT'L SCHOOL MESA DEL SOL ST. CHARTER	\$2,662,884.62	\$3,128,287.60	\$465,403.38	17.5%
17 LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA	\$4,031,845.26	\$4,442,794.80	\$410,949.74	10.2%
18 LA RESOLANA LEADERSHIP	\$823,951.78	\$898,575.10	\$74,623.22	9.1%
19 LOS PUENTES	\$2,095,686.26	\$2,409,725.30	\$314,038.74	15.0%
20 MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE	\$1,535,109.40	\$1,804,392.90	\$269,283.60	17.5%
21 MOUNTAIN MAHOGANY	\$1,548,206.82	\$1,826,865.50	\$278,659.18	18.0%
22 NATIVE AMERICAN COMM ACAD.	\$3,314,922.95	\$3,929,137.80	\$614,215.05	18.5%
23 NEW MEXICO INTERNATIONAL	\$1,960,066.25	\$2,524,110.10	\$564,043.75	28.8%
24 NUESTROS VALORES	\$1,766,886.66	\$2,037,710.30	\$270,823.34	15.3%
25 PAPA	\$2,851,638.79	\$3,443,770.20	\$592,131.21	20.8%
26 ROBERT F. KENNEDY	\$3,416,774.17	\$3,922,821.60	\$506,047.83	14.8%
27 SIEMBRA LEADERSHIP HIGH SCHOOL	\$1,352,569.12	\$1,477,860.20	\$125,290.88	9.3%
28 SOUTH VALLEY	\$4,993,829.41	\$5,828,810.50	\$834,981.59	16.7%
29 TECHNOLOGY LEADERSHIP	\$2,121,315.44	\$2,367,932.00	\$246,616.56	11.6%
30 TWENTY FIRST CENT.	\$2,226,111.40	\$2,504,979.70	\$278,868.60	12.5%
31 WILLIAM W & JOSEPHINE DORN CHARTER	\$663,314.00	\$749,110.90	\$85,797.00	12.9%
<b>ALBUQUERQUE W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$712,317,565.78</b>	<b>\$842,677,688.90</b>	<b>\$130,360,125.22</b>	<b>18.3%</b>
33 ANIMAS	\$2,191,477.49	\$2,326,811.40	\$135,333.51	6.2%
34 ARTESIA	\$27,808,096.04	\$31,490,831.70	\$3,682,735.96	13.2%
35 AZTEC	\$20,883,938.87	\$24,919,010.80	\$4,035,072.13	19.3%
36 MOSAIC ACADEMY CHARTER	\$1,386,050.92	\$1,645,697.70	\$259,647.08	18.7%
<b>AZTEC W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$22,269,989.79</b>	<b>\$26,564,708.50</b>	<b>\$4,294,719.21</b>	<b>19.3%</b>
38 BELEN	\$29,827,015.39	\$36,261,132.20	\$6,434,116.61	21.6%
39 BERNALILLO	\$23,822,468.14	\$30,240,332.30	\$6,417,863.86	26.9%
40 BLOOMFIELD	\$21,843,053.15	\$26,894,337.90	\$5,051,284.85	23.1%
41 CAPITAN	\$4,712,860.95	\$5,256,873.80	\$544,013.05	11.5%
42 CARLSBAD	\$55,493,777.61	\$61,285,165.70	\$5,791,388.39	10.4%
43 JEFFERSON MONT. ACAD.	\$1,928,713.98	\$2,194,510.30	\$265,796.02	13.8%
44 PECOS CONNECTIONS	\$5,225,311.36	\$5,844,285.70	\$618,974.64	11.8%
<b>CARLSBAD W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$62,647,802.95</b>	<b>\$69,323,961.70</b>	<b>\$6,676,159.05</b>	<b>10.7%</b>
46 CARRIZOZO	\$2,016,153.47	\$2,245,619.20	\$229,465.53	11.4%
47 CENTRAL CONS.	\$44,207,985.68	\$56,387,289.60	\$12,179,304.32	27.6%
48 CHAMA VALLEY	\$4,062,428.08	\$4,879,794.80	\$817,366.92	20.1%
49 CIMARRON	\$4,272,182.21	\$4,643,516.10	\$371,333.79	8.7%
50 MORENO VALLEY HIGH	\$696,866.51	\$758,130.30	\$61,263.49	8.8%
<b>CIMARRON W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$4,969,048.72</b>	<b>\$5,401,646.40</b>	<b>\$432,597.28</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
52 CLAYTON	\$4,741,667.77	\$5,301,306.90	\$559,639.23	11.8%
53 CLOUDCROFT	\$3,925,015.44	\$4,243,731.90	\$318,716.56	8.1%
54 CLOVIS	\$58,555,178.86	\$70,945,016.60	\$12,389,838.14	21.2%
55 COBRE CONS.	\$12,190,183.23	\$14,706,438.20	\$2,516,254.77	20.6%
56 CORONA	\$1,436,552.29	\$1,544,588.20	\$108,035.71	7.5%
57 CUBA	\$6,327,690.31	\$7,412,712.90	\$1,085,022.69	17.1%
58 DEMING	\$39,907,454.16	\$51,328,141.90	\$11,420,687.84	28.6%
59 DEMING CESAR CHAVEZ	\$1,655,386.02	\$1,966,768.70	\$311,382.98	18.8%
<b>DEMING W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$41,562,840.18</b>	<b>\$53,294,910.60</b>	<b>\$11,732,070.82</b>	<b>28.2%</b>
61 DES MOINES	\$1,549,874.67	\$1,616,392.90	\$66,518.33	4.3%
62 DEXTER	\$8,213,855.37	\$9,773,106.20	\$1,559,250.63	19.0%
63 DORA	\$2,637,671.37	\$2,907,141.40	\$269,469.63	10.2%
64 DULCE	\$6,790,433.76	\$8,147,152.30	\$1,356,718.24	20.0%
65 ELIDA	\$1,780,113.01	\$1,976,350.90	\$196,237.99	11.0%
66 ESPANOLA	\$30,190,411.48	\$36,241,874.90	\$6,051,463.52	20.0%
67 ESTANCIA	\$6,625,844.71	\$7,717,788.40	\$1,091,943.29	16.5%
68 EUNICE	\$6,677,506.51	\$7,810,022.20	\$1,132,515.49	17.0%
69 FARMINGTON	\$78,837,913.50	\$95,986,297.90	\$17,148,384.50	21.8%

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19	FY20		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change	
			\$	%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,958	\$3,098,962,356	\$482,254,397.90	18.4%
70 NEW MEXICO VIRTUAL ACADEMY	\$3,297,766.12	\$4,045,612.40	\$747,845.88	22.7%
71 <b>FARMINGTON W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$82,135,679.62</b>	<b>\$100,031,910.30</b>	<b>\$17,896,230.38</b>	<b>21.8%</b>
72 FLOYD	\$2,451,832.81	\$2,813,769.60	\$361,937.19	14.8%
73 FT. SUMNER	\$3,002,598.05	\$3,406,592.40	\$403,993.95	13.5%
74 GADSDEN	\$103,886,264.77	\$130,539,552.30	\$26,653,287.23	25.7%
75 GALLUP	\$87,704,576.65	\$111,890,925.10	\$24,186,348.35	27.6%
76 MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH	\$1,329,027.88	\$1,495,260.40	\$166,232.12	12.5%
77 <b>GALLUP W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$89,033,604.53</b>	<b>\$113,386,185.50</b>	<b>\$24,352,580.47</b>	<b>27.4%</b>
78 GRADY	\$1,789,541.98	\$2,022,095.50	\$232,554.02	13.0%
79 GRANTS	\$28,645,789.91	\$34,006,747.30	\$5,360,957.09	18.7%
80 HAGERMAN	\$4,531,443.65	\$5,313,042.40	\$781,598.35	17.2%
81 HATCH	\$9,746,361.09	\$12,304,179.70	\$2,557,818.91	26.2%
82 HOBBS	\$70,738,403.69	\$83,810,180.20	\$13,071,776.31	18.5%
83 HONDO	\$2,024,471.93	\$2,266,391.10	\$241,919.07	11.9%
84 HOUSE	\$1,526,882.45	\$1,624,638.10	\$97,755.55	6.4%
85 JAL	\$4,248,670.08	\$4,738,372.80	\$489,702.92	11.5%
86 JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	\$2,451,624.85	\$2,879,224.20	\$427,599.15	17.4%
87 LINDRITH AREA HERITAGE	\$249,420.70	\$292,849.30	\$43,428.30	17.4%
88 <b>JEMEZ MOUNTAIN W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$2,701,045.55</b>	<b>\$3,172,073.50</b>	<b>\$471,027.45</b>	<b>17.4%</b>
89 JEMEZ VALLEY	\$3,207,722.95	\$3,632,717.90	\$424,995.05	13.2%
90 SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER	\$954,580.72	\$1,167,479.70	\$212,899.28	22.3%
91 <b>JEMEZ VALLEY W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$4,162,303.67</b>	<b>\$4,800,197.60</b>	<b>\$637,894.33</b>	<b>15.3%</b>
92 LAKE ARTHUR	\$1,773,408.33	\$1,926,160.00	\$152,751.67	8.6%
93 LAS CRUCES	\$184,563,963.76	\$217,961,471.30	\$33,397,507.24	18.1%
94 LAS VEGAS CITY	\$13,427,882.73	\$16,130,630.10	\$2,702,747.27	20.1%
95 LOGAN	\$3,400,141.41	\$3,618,786.80	\$218,645.59	6.4%
96 LORDSBURG	\$4,587,510.07	\$5,337,913.60	\$750,403.93	16.4%
97 LOS ALAMOS	\$29,015,803.33	\$29,684,162.80	\$668,359.67	2.3%
98 LOS LUNAS	\$60,564,760.74	\$71,463,382.20	\$10,898,621.26	18.0%
99 LOVING	\$5,143,902.75	\$6,102,520.90	\$958,618.25	18.6%
100 LOVINGTON	\$31,636,317.88	\$36,115,712.30	\$4,479,394.12	14.2%
101 MAGDALENA	\$3,659,706.48	\$4,199,561.10	\$539,854.52	14.8%
102 MAXWELL	\$1,681,967.66	\$1,885,817.70	\$203,850.34	12.1%
103 MELROSE	\$2,295,549.74	\$2,505,665.10	\$210,115.26	9.2%
104 MESA VISTA	\$2,931,138.32	\$3,453,711.90	\$522,573.68	17.8%
105 MORA	\$4,389,975.76	\$5,107,591.40	\$717,615.24	16.3%
106 MORIARTY	\$17,948,491.59	\$20,946,662.50	\$2,998,171.41	16.7%
107 MOSQUERO	\$1,174,396.02	\$1,227,933.80	\$53,537.98	4.6%
108 MOUNTAINAIR	\$2,854,779.01	\$3,166,586.50	\$311,807.99	10.9%
109 PECOS	\$5,683,637.71	\$6,843,911.00	\$1,160,273.29	20.4%
110 PEÑASCO	\$3,644,196.71	\$4,328,456.50	\$684,260.29	18.8%
111 POJOAQUE	\$14,605,319.15	\$17,415,299.40	\$2,809,979.85	19.2%
112 PORTALES	\$21,600,100.04	\$24,966,997.60	\$3,366,897.96	15.6%
113 QUEMADO	\$2,133,739.06	\$2,362,901.90	\$229,162.94	10.7%
114 QUESTA	\$4,354,547.44	\$4,972,206.30	\$617,658.56	14.2%
115 RATON	\$7,464,674.06	\$8,841,076.10	\$1,376,401.94	18.4%
116 RESERVE	\$2,004,162.41	\$2,209,824.80	\$205,662.59	10.3%
117 RIO RANCHO	\$130,719,158.63	\$143,870,682.30	\$13,151,523.37	10.1%
118 ROSWELL	\$72,420,558.51	\$89,602,494.00	\$17,181,935.49	23.7%
119 SIDNEY GUTIERREZ	\$704,053.66	\$801,175.90	\$97,122.34	13.8%
120 <b>ROSWELL W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$73,124,612.17</b>	<b>\$90,403,669.90</b>	<b>\$17,279,057.83</b>	<b>23.6%</b>
121 ROY	\$1,221,657.35	\$1,308,360.20	\$86,702.65	7.1%
122 RUIDOSO	\$15,017,885.65	\$18,567,083.90	\$3,549,198.35	23.6%
123 SAN JON	\$1,929,408.57	\$2,085,912.90	\$156,504.43	8.1%
124 SANTA FE	\$99,615,488.38	\$119,523,595.50	\$19,908,107.62	20.0%
125 ACAD FOR TECH & CLASSICS	\$2,855,082.64	\$3,422,537.20	\$567,454.36	19.9%
126 <b>SANTA FE W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$102,470,571.02</b>	<b>\$122,946,132.70</b>	<b>\$20,475,561.98</b>	<b>20.0%</b>
127 SANTA ROSA	\$6,048,090.23	\$7,449,268.80	\$1,401,178.77	23.2%
128 SILVER CITY CONS.	\$21,289,742.46	\$24,630,878.50	\$3,341,136.54	15.7%
129 SOCORRO	\$11,886,010.42	\$14,305,824.90	\$2,419,814.58	20.4%
130 COTTONWOOD VALLEY CHARTER	\$1,375,686.12	\$1,675,641.30	\$299,954.88	21.8%
131 <b>SOCORRO W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$13,261,696.54</b>	<b>\$15,981,466.20</b>	<b>\$2,719,769.46</b>	<b>20.5%</b>
132 SPRINGER	\$2,004,112.50	\$2,228,181.00	\$224,068.50	11.2%
133 TAOS	\$17,858,764.52	\$21,431,217.80	\$3,572,453.48	20.0%
134 ANANSI CHARTER	\$1,393,121.61	\$1,767,739.70	\$374,618.39	26.9%
135 TAOS CHARTER	\$1,575,320.84	\$1,954,322.60	\$379,001.16	24.1%
136 VISTA GRANDE	\$1,142,902.33	\$1,296,425.90	\$153,523.67	13.4%
137 <b>TAOS W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$21,970,109.30</b>	<b>\$26,449,706.00</b>	<b>\$4,479,597.70</b>	<b>20.4%</b>
138 TATUM	\$3,638,086.80	\$3,850,276.60	\$212,190.20	5.8%
139 TEXICO	\$5,141,523.67	\$5,562,799.60	\$421,276.33	8.2%

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19	FY20		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change	
			\$	%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,958	\$3,098,962,356	\$482,254,397.90	18.4%
140 TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	\$10,743,004.10	\$12,869,360.30	\$2,126,355.90	19.8%
141 TUCUMCARI	\$8,590,469.48	\$10,058,277.10	\$1,467,807.52	17.1%
142 TULAROSA	\$7,942,835.78	\$9,067,392.00	\$1,124,556.22	14.2%
143 VAUGHN	\$1,531,291.23	\$1,637,063.20	\$105,771.77	6.9%
144 WAGON MOUND	\$1,474,484.47	\$1,580,683.00	\$106,198.53	7.2%
145 WEST LAS VEGAS	\$12,350,771.10	\$15,205,339.20	\$2,854,567.90	23.1%
146 RIO GALLINAS CHARTER SCHOOL	\$766,051.14	\$936,036.40	\$169,984.86	22.2%
147 <b>WEST LAS VEGAS W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$13,116,822.24</b>	<b>\$16,141,375.60</b>	<b>\$3,024,552.76</b>	<b>23.1%</b>
148 ZUNI	\$11,171,741.69	\$13,568,288.70	\$2,396,547.31	21.5%
149 STATE CHARTERS				
150 ALBUQUERQUE INSTI. MATH & SCI. (AIMS) ST. (APS)	\$3,118,012.52	\$3,494,007.60	\$375,995.48	12.1%
151 ALBUQUERQUE COLLEGIATE (APS)	\$784,401.66	\$909,739.50	\$125,338.34	16.0%
152 ALBUQUERQUE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE ST. CHAR (APS)	\$3,891,787.35	\$4,673,286.20	\$781,498.65	20.1%
153 ALBUQUERQUE SIGN LANGUAGE ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,122,588.16	\$2,310,189.70	\$187,601.84	8.8%
154 ALDO LEOPOLD ST. CHARTER (SILVER CITY)	\$1,906,507.85	\$1,975,530.20	\$69,022.15	3.6%
155 ALMA D' ARTE STATE CHARTER (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,972,098.90	\$2,082,257.70	\$110,159.10	5.6%
156 ALTURA PREPARATORY SCHOOL (APS)	\$879,735.37	\$1,032,111.50	\$152,376.63	17.3%
157 AMY BIEHL ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,054,921.16	\$3,409,228.00	\$354,306.84	11.6%
158 ASK ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (RIO RANCHO)	\$3,624,407.09	\$3,785,841.60	\$161,434.91	4.5%
159 CESAR CHAVEZ COMM. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,165,656.99	\$2,495,643.00	\$329,986.01	15.2%
160 CORAL COMMUNITY (APS)	\$1,392,522.68	\$1,680,387.90	\$287,865.32	20.7%
161 DREAM DINE' (CENTRAL)	\$245,993.50	\$298,057.10	\$52,063.50	21.2%
162 DZIT DIT LOOL DEAP (GALLUP)	\$321,100.87	\$357,546.60	\$36,446.13	11.4%
163 ESTANCIA VALLEY (MORIARTY)	\$3,270,086.45	\$3,622,268.50	\$352,182.55	10.8%
164 EXPLORE ACADEMY (ALBUQUERQUE)	\$3,249,352.69	\$3,620,584.80	\$371,232.31	11.4%
165 GILBERT L. SENA STATE CHARTER (APS)	\$1,873,038.52	\$2,090,291.50	\$217,253.48	11.6%
166 HORIZON ACADEMY WEST ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,019,006.21	\$3,667,294.00	\$648,287.79	21.5%
167 HOZHO ACADEMY (GALLUP)	\$1,359,490.08	\$1,624,447.80	\$264,957.92	19.5%
168 J. PAUL TAYLOR ACADEMY (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,457,323.49	\$1,604,873.10	\$147,549.51	10.1%
169 LA ACADEMIA DOLORES HUERTA (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,371,813.88	\$1,580,001.90	\$208,188.12	15.2%
170 LA PROMESA ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,675,058.69	\$3,436,662.90	\$761,604.31	28.5%
171 LAS MONTANAS (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,896,288.62	\$1,970,800.40	\$74,511.38	3.9%
172 LA TIERRA MONTESSORI (ESPANOLA)	\$1,040,851.47	\$1,164,294.10	\$123,442.53	11.9%
173 MASTERS PROGRAM ST. CHARTER (SANTA FE)	\$2,067,553.23	\$2,196,257.50	\$128,704.77	6.2%
174 MCCURDY CHARTER SCHOOL (ESPANOLA)	\$3,674,238.83	\$4,070,915.20	\$396,676.17	10.8%
175 MEDIA ARTS COLLAB. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,478,156.58	\$2,843,260.60	\$365,104.42	14.7%
176 MISSION ACHIEVEMENT & SUCCESS-MAS (APS) <sup>2</sup>	\$8,414,305.30	\$9,870,767.70	\$1,456,462.70	17.3%
177 MONTE DEL SOL (SANTA FE)	\$3,164,433.69	\$3,436,722.10	\$272,288.31	8.6%
178 MONTESSORI ELEMETARY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,465,795.35	\$3,070,638.30	\$604,842.65	24.5%
179 NEW AMERICA CHARTER SCHOOL ST. CH. (APS)	\$2,486,670.52	\$2,948,444.00	\$461,773.48	18.6%
180 NEW AMERICA SCHOOL (LAS CRUCES)	\$2,254,119.65	\$2,411,100.30	\$156,980.35	7.0%
181 NEW MEXICO CONNECTIONS VIRTUAL (SANTA FE)	\$12,287,018.42	\$13,763,446.90	\$1,476,428.58	12.0%
182 NEW MEXICO SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS ST. CH (SANTA FE)	\$2,245,331.20	\$2,401,666.20	\$156,334.80	7.0%
183 NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,258,353.26	\$3,860,104.10	\$601,750.74	18.5%
184 RED RIVER VALLEY (QUESTA)	\$751,489.68	\$820,505.10	\$69,015.32	9.2%
185 ROOTS & WINGS (QUESTA)	\$480,561.59	\$528,455.40	\$47,893.41	10.0%
186 SANDOVAL ACADEMY OF BIL ED SABA (RIO RANCHO)	\$779,277.49	\$822,620.40	\$43,342.51	5.6%
187 SCHOOL OF DREAMS ST. CHARTER (LOS LUNAS)	\$3,909,884.16	\$4,168,462.50	\$258,578.84	6.6%
188 SIX DIRECTIONS (GALLUP)	\$884,942.73	\$974,563.70	\$89,621.27	10.1%
189 SOUTH VALLEY PREP ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$1,335,320.79	\$1,538,652.80	\$203,332.21	15.2%
190 SOUTHWEST AER.,MATH & SCIENCE-SAMS (APS)	\$2,502,604.53	\$2,839,694.20	\$337,089.47	13.5%
191 SOUTHWEST PREPARATORY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$1,554,524.69	\$1,824,813.60	\$270,289.31	17.4%
192 SOUTHWEST SECONDARY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$2,409,179.91	\$2,777,226.40	\$368,046.09	15.3%
193 STUDENT ATHLETE HEADQUARTERS (SHAQ) (APS)	\$927,312.81	\$1,033,482.20	\$106,169.19	11.4%
194 TAOS ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (TAOS)	\$2,047,676.27	\$2,228,346.00	\$180,669.73	8.8%
195 TAOS INTEGRATED SCHOOL OF ARTS ST. (TAOS)	\$1,261,165.88	\$1,343,012.40	\$81,846.12	6.5%
196 TAOS INTERNATIONAL (TAOS)	\$1,544,442.72	\$1,910,299.80	\$365,857.28	23.7%
197 THE GREAT ACADEMY (APS)	\$1,727,465.47	\$1,956,192.40	\$228,726.53	13.2%
198 TIERRA ADENTRO ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,807,879.54	\$3,279,169.10	\$471,289.46	16.8%
199 TIERRA ENCANTADA CHARTER (SANTA FE)	\$2,797,606.24	\$3,254,137.10	\$456,530.76	16.3%
200 TURQUOISE TRAIL (SANTA FE)	\$3,900,521.73	\$4,250,187.70	\$349,666.27	9.0%
201 WALATOWA CHARTER HIGH (JEMEZ VALLEY)	\$592,998.06	\$650,497.40	\$57,498.94	9.7%
202 STATEWIDE	\$2,616,707,958	\$3,098,962,355.90	\$482,254,397.90	18.4%