

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

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

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR Martinez, R./Trujillo, L./Trujillo, CH./ Sarinana/Stapleton ORIGINAL DATE 2/15/19 HB 455  
 LAST UPDATED \_\_\_\_\_ SB \_\_\_\_\_  
 SHORT TITLE School Program Unit Changes SB \_\_\_\_\_  
 ANALYST Liu

### APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY20	FY21		
\$452,502.2	\$0.0	Recurring	General Fund
\$10,000.0	\$0.0	Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

### ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY19	FY20	FY21	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
<b>At-Risk Index</b>			\$421,489.9 - \$442,252.6	\$421,489.9 - \$442,252.6	Recurring	General Fund
<b>BMEP</b>			\$34,802.2	\$34,802.2	Recurring	General Fund
<b>Rural Isolation</b>			\$4,859.6	\$4,859.6	Recurring	General Fund
<b>Total</b>		\$8,649.5 - \$29,410.5	\$461,151.7 - \$481,914.4	\$461,151.7 - \$481,914.4	Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Relates to HB 121, HB 412, HB 476, SB 31, SB 170, SB 172, SB 253, SB 298, SB 304  
 Relates to Appropriations in the General Appropriation Act  
 Conflicts with HB 5, SB 1

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files  
 Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) Files

No Responses Received From  
 Public Education Department (PED)

### SUMMARY

Synopsis of Bill

House Bill 455 amends the public school funding formula to increase the at-risk index factor to 0.366, switch the at-risk index Title I component to a free and reduced-fee lunch (FRL) component, increase the bilingual multicultural education program factor to 1.0, and create a new rural isolation program factor based on distance of schools from central office. The bill includes a \$452.5 million appropriation to offset the funding formula adjustments and \$10 million appropriation to support small schools. The bill further includes a temporary hold harmless provision to mitigate reductions in school program costs between FY21 and FY23.

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

The bill makes a \$452.5 million appropriation from the general fund to the state equalization guarantee (SEG) distribution for expenditure in FY20 to offset costs of increasing the at-risk index and bilingual multicultural education program factor and costs of creating a new rural isolation program factor in the public school funding formula. Based on estimated costs of these formula changes, the \$452.2 million appropriation is estimated to be \$8.6 million to \$29.4 million short of the projected costs to make these changes, which would result in additional operating budget impacts in FY20. Additionally, the bill includes a \$10 million appropriation from the general fund to create a categorical appropriation for necessarily-small school districts and a temporary provision protecting schools from program cost reductions between FY21 and FY23.

***At-risk Index.*** Provisions of this bill would increase the at-risk index cost differential from 0.130 to 0.366 and change the poverty component of the index from Title I participation rates to free and reduced-fee lunch (FRL) participation rates. These adjustments would generate between 101 thousand and 106 thousand new program units in FY20, valued between \$421 million and \$442 million based on the FY19 preliminary unit value of \$4,159.23. This increase would generate a funding amount from the formula about five times the amount received from federal Title I dollars for at-risk interventions. The executive and LFC FY20 budget recommendations for public schools only include \$113.2 million to increase the at-risk index. Differences between the LFC and LESC analysis on at-risk costs and assumptions are due to differences between NSLP FRL reports and information derived from the economically disadvantaged rate .

***Bilingual multicultural education program (BMEP).*** Provisions of this bill would increase the formula factor for BMEPs from 0.5 to 1.0. This adjustment would generate about 8,367 new program units in FY20 for schools with BMEPs, valued at \$34.8 million. An increase in the BMEP factor may increase the incentive for school districts and charter schools to establish BMEPs. The executive FY20 budget recommendation includes \$7 million to increase the BMEP formula factor from 0.5 to 0.6.

***Rural Isolation.*** Provisions of this bill would replace rural isolation units based on large student membership (MEM) in senior high schools with a new rural isolation formula that provides school districts with at least one public school that is 25 miles or more of driving distance away from the school district's administrative offices. Assuming the bill is only considering public schools under the administration of the school district that are 25 driving miles away from the district's administrative offices, approximately 13 school districts and 5,842 MEM would be eligible to generate units under this new formula (see Technical Issues). The formula would

provide 0.2 units for each eligible MEM, thus generating an estimated 1,168 units valued at \$4.9 million.

***Small District Supplemental Distribution.*** The bill includes a \$10 million appropriation to make distributions to “necessarily small school districts with MEM fewer than 200 and whose SEG is not sufficient without supplementation.” Currently, 19 school districts in the state have less than 200 MEM. Including the \$452.2 million appropriation to SEG from this bill, the total estimated program cost of these districts would be \$36.8 million. As such, the \$10 million appropriation would be enough to supplement 27 percent of these school district budgets. Any unexpended or unencumbered balances would revert to the general fund at the end of FY20.

***Hold Harmless.*** The bill includes a temporary provision requiring PED to report to LFC and LESC the estimated funding needed to supplement school districts and charter schools receiving a program cost lower than the program cost from the previous fiscal year. This provision will effectively hold schools harmless from 100 percent of program cost reductions attributable to changes from this bill or a general decline in program cost (whichever is less) in FY21, 75 percent of program cost reductions in FY22, and 50 percent of program cost reductions in FY23. If the appropriation to hold these schools harmless is insufficient to fully supplant program cost reductions, then each eligible school district and charter school would receive a prorated share of the hold harmless appropriation.

Given the substantial appropriation in the bill and the greater unit generation from increasing the at-risk and BMEP factors, it is unlikely the hold harmless amount will be attributable to changes from the bill. Schools will most likely receive hold harmless supplements between FY21 and FY23 for enrollment declines or potential reductions to program cost by the Legislature.

## SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

On July 20, 2018, the 1st Judicial District Court issued an initial decision and order on the consolidated *Yazzie v. New Mexico* and *Martinez v. New Mexico* education sufficiency lawsuits, which found New Mexico’s public education system failed to provide a sufficient education for at-risk, English language learner (ELL), Native American, and special education students. On December 20, 2018, the court issued its final findings and conclusions of law in the consolidated lawsuits. In both the initial decision and final findings, the court cited evidence highlighting areas where funding levels, financing methods, and department oversight were deficient. However, the court stopped short of prescribing specific remedies and deferred decisions on how to achieve education sufficiency to the legislative and executive branch instead.

Provisions of this bill address issues mentioned in the court ruling, including a low at-risk index, funding for BMEPs, and additional costs borne by schools in rural areas.

***At-risk Index.*** The bill would increase the at-risk index weight from 0.130 to 0.366 and change the Title I component of the index. Currently, a school district’s at-risk index is based on the three-year average 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 multiplied by a cost differential factor to calculate program units. The bill 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.

From FY15 to FY18 the multiplier was 0.106 and from FY02 to FY14 the multiplier was 0.0915.

The court ruling in the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case did not consider the state's efforts to increase to the at-risk index in FY19, but noted an at-risk index factor between 0.25 and 0.50 would be reasonable. 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 Education Commission of the States (ECS) report, 24 states include at-risk funding within their public school funding formula, while other states provide this funding on a categorical basis. Other states use different indicators for at-risk students, which makes comparisons between state at-risk "indicies" difficult.

The court also suggested changing the at-risk index Title I poverty component to a component based on student eligibility for FRL under the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). Switching the at-risk index poverty component from Title I to FRL eligibility in FY20 would technically allow charter schools to generate individual at-risk indices (rather than using the at-risk index of a school district), however, this bill does not amend statute to allow this.

The validity of FRL data as a measure of student socioeconomic status is questionable. NSLP thresholds may obscure important variation in household resources at both the top and bottom of the income distribution. Recent changes to the legislation governing NSLP may limit the accuracy of the FRL measure. A series of provisions authorized by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 2002 make it possible for schools in which many students are enrolled in the free lunch program to renew students' program registration for up to four years without updating information on students' household incomes.

Further, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010's Community Eligibility Provision (CEP), implemented nationwide in FY15, aims to allow schools or districts with 40 percent or more students directly certified for enrollment in NSLP (based on their participation in other federal nutrition programs targeted at low-income families) to offer free lunch and breakfast to all students without collecting data on other students' household income. Essentially, this would allow a school with 40 percent or more FRL to simply claim a 100 percent FRL rate without additional verification, potentially reducing the accuracy of actual poverty rates. In 2016, more than 15 percent of U.S. students attended a school or district that participated in CEP. Increasing participation in CEP will likely create new challenges with using school-reported NSLP participation rates as a proxy for economic disadvantage.

LESC notes the inclusion of FRL 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 FRL eligibility on the basis of "excessive manipulability" and low high school participation rates.

The at-risk index allows school districts and charter schools to generate additional program units if they provide services to assist at-risk students in reaching their full academic potential. School districts and charter schools have significant flexibility to allocate at-risk funding for services that meet the individual needs of their schools, teachers, and students. Programs can include, but are not limited to: counseling, mental health, social work, and other wraparound services; services for English learners; class size reduction programs; programs that provide teachers and other staff with additional compensation to serve at-risk students; and programs designed to

combat habitual truancy and other factors that place students at-risk of academic failure.

***Bilingual Multicultural Education Programs.*** Provisions of this bill would increase the formula factor for BMEPs from 0.5 to 1.0. The court ruling in the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case found PED did not provide sufficient technical support to schools and failed to comply with provisions of Bilingual Multicultural Education Act. Testimony from the trial suggested that PED did not adequately monitor or take enforcement actions on schools or programs relating to bilingual, multicultural, Indian, and Hispanic education.

According to LESC, the public school funding formula has included a factor to provide increased funding to cover the additional costs for bilingual education since the 1970s. The bill would allocate additional funding for existing BMEPs, but would not necessarily increase the number of students with access to BMEPs. In FY18, PED reported 49.5 thousand students participated in BMEPs in FY18. While additional funding could encourage some school districts to consider adding a bilingual education program, LESC notes the bill 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 BMEPS. 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. LESC notes schools that are unable to offer BMEPs typically lack teachers certified to teach these programs and sufficient outreach to expand programming. In FY18, 81 percent of BMEPs were Spanish-English language programs and 19 percent were Native American-English language programs.

***Rural Isolation Program Units.*** The bill 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 many high schools. Since FY12, no school district has received these program units and prior to that only Gallup-McKinley County Schools (GMCS) received these program units.

Assuming the new rural isolation factor only applies to schools under the administration of the district, this component 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. Depending on how PED defines 25 driving miles, about 13 school districts would be eligible for program units under the new rural isolation factor, generating between \$11 thousand and \$2.7 million. GMCS accounts for 57 percent of program units created by the new rural isolation factor.

LESC notes, under provisions of this bill, GMCS would generate a total of 1,575 size adjustment program units, 478 more program units than what GMCS generated with small school size and rural isolation units 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.

LESC further notes 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.

***Hold Harmless.*** Due to overall declining trends in student membership statewide, schools may experience program cost reductions from enrollment declines in outyears or changes to the teacher cost index, which are currently being phased into the funding formula. The hold harmless provision of this bill will create a process for PED to request supplemental funding to offset program cost reductions between FY21 and FY23; however, this may result in supplemental funding to cover normal declines in student enrollment rather than reductions caused by provisions of this bill.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

Provisions of this bill would require PED to determine which schools were at least 25 driving miles away from administrative offices. Additionally, PED would need to increase monitoring and oversight for BMEPs and incorporate FRL reporting procedures. The court ruling in the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case noted PED failed to adequately monitor BMEPs and provide technical assistance on appropriate programming for ELLs.

LESC notes the bill 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.

## **CONFLICT, RELATIONSHIP**

This bill relates to House Bill 121, which requires social services in schools; House Bill 412, which allows National Board certified employees to generate program units; House Bill 476, which requires a school nurse in every school; Senate Bill 31, which requires social workers in high-poverty schools; Senate Bill 170, which phases out federal Impact Aid credits in the funding formula; Senate Bill 172, which removes federal Impact Aid credits in the funding formula; Senate Bill 253, which establishes new program unit calculations, Senate Bill 298, which integrates prekindergarten students into the funding formula; and Senate Bill 304, which phases in elementary physical education program units.

The bill relates to the state equalization guarantee (SEG) appropriation in the General Appropriation Act and conflicts with House Bill 5 and Senate Bill 1, which make different changes to the funding formula.

## **TECHNICAL ISSUES**

Provisions of this bill allow a school district with at least one public school that is 25 or more driving miles from the school district’s administrative offices to generate additional size adjustment units for rural isolation in FY20. The definition of “public school” in the Public School Code includes charter school, although no delineation is made between locally-chartered and state-chartered charter schools. As written, the bill could technically allow a school district to generate units for a state-chartered charter school within the district’s boundary not under the control or management of the school district.

LESC notes the bill 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.

#### **OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

Changes to the funding formula may impact the disparity analysis PED submits to the U.S. Department of Education Impact Aid Division yearly. In FY19, PED had to perform the disparity calculation twice and is currently only provisionally certified. Since only the provisions related to the at-risk units went into effect, it is unlikely that the federal range ration of 20 percent was not reached, and indeed may have improved. However, the movement of the new staffing cost multiplier up in the formula for FY20 likely will have distributional impacts and the proposed funding formula changes in this bill will need to be modeled together with previous reforms on FY19 data to ensure the state can still take credit for federal Impact Aid funds yearly.

**SL/sec**

## PROGRAM COST SUMMARY TABLE

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19	FY20		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change	
			\$	%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,098,970,070	\$482,262,097	18.4%
1 ALAMOGORDO	\$41,532,029	\$48,453,367	\$6,921,338	16.7%
2 ALBUQUERQUE	\$637,370,733	\$757,729,029	\$120,358,296	18.9%
3 ACE LEADERSHIP	\$2,994,824	\$3,438,479	\$443,655	14.8%
4 ALBUQUERQUE CHARTER ACADEMY	\$2,674,231	\$3,072,174	\$397,943	14.9%
5 ALB TALENT DEV SECONDARY	\$1,756,938	\$2,037,317	\$280,379	16.0%
6 ALICE KING COMMUNITY SCHOOL	\$3,531,773	\$4,137,266	\$605,493	17.1%
7 CHRISTINE DUNCAN COMMUNITY	\$2,775,637	\$3,578,221	\$802,584	28.9%
8 CIEN AGUAS INTERNATIONAL ST. CHARTER	\$3,447,906	\$4,371,534	\$923,628	26.8%
9 CORRALES INTERNATIONAL	\$2,432,692	\$2,954,156	\$521,464	21.4%
10 COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL ST. CHARTER	\$4,789,769	\$5,772,154	\$982,385	20.5%
11 DIGITAL ARTS & TECH ACADEMY	\$2,505,820	\$2,931,595	\$425,775	17.0%
12 EAST MOUNTAIN	\$2,952,987	\$3,442,831	\$489,844	16.6%
13 EL CAMINO REAL	\$2,643,894	\$3,075,924	\$432,030	16.3%
14 GORDON BERNELL	\$3,023,311	\$3,625,070	\$601,759	19.9%
15 HEALTH LEADERSHIP CHARTER (APS)	\$2,051,940	\$2,333,138	\$281,198	13.7%
16 INT'L SCHOOL MESA DEL SOL ST. CHARTER	\$2,662,885	\$3,141,473	\$478,588	18.0%
17 LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA	\$4,031,845	\$4,466,385	\$434,540	10.8%
18 LA RESOLANA LEADERSHIP	\$823,952	\$903,148	\$79,196	9.6%
19 LOS PUENTES	\$2,095,686	\$2,422,084	\$326,398	15.6%
20 MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE	\$1,535,109	\$1,810,421	\$275,312	17.9%
21 MOUNTAIN MAHOGANY	\$1,548,207	\$1,834,343	\$286,136	18.5%
22 NATIVE AMERICAN COMM ACAD.	\$3,314,923	\$3,943,955	\$629,032	19.0%
23 NEW MEXICO INTERNATIONAL	\$1,960,066	\$2,535,924	\$575,858	29.4%
24 NUESTROS VALORES	\$1,766,887	\$2,048,043	\$281,156	15.9%
25 PAPA	\$2,851,639	\$3,456,773	\$605,134	21.2%
26 ROBERT F. KENNEDY	\$3,416,774	\$3,942,171	\$525,397	15.4%
27 SIEMBRA LEADERSHIP HIGH SCHOOL	\$1,352,569	\$1,486,857	\$134,288	9.9%
28 SOUTH VALLEY	\$4,993,829	\$5,851,957	\$858,128	17.2%
29 TECHNOLOGY LEADERSHIP	\$2,121,315	\$2,380,320	\$259,005	12.2%
30 TWENTY FIRST CENT.	\$2,226,111	\$2,515,821	\$289,710	13.0%
31 WILLIAM W & JOSEPHINE DORN CHARTER	\$663,314	\$753,098	\$89,784	13.5%
<b>ALBUQUERQUE W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$712,317,566</b>	<b>\$845,991,661</b>	<b>\$133,674,095</b>	<b>18.8%</b>
33 ANIMAS	\$2,191,478	\$2,347,264	\$155,786	7.1%
34 ARTESIA	\$27,808,096	\$31,630,417	\$3,822,321	13.7%
35 AZTEC	\$20,883,939	\$24,777,052	\$3,893,113	18.6%
36 MOSAIC ACADEMY CHARTER	\$1,386,051	\$1,637,388	\$251,337	18.1%
<b>AZTEC W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$22,269,990</b>	<b>\$26,414,440</b>	<b>\$4,144,450</b>	<b>18.6%</b>
38 BELEN	\$29,827,015	\$35,551,756	\$5,724,741	19.2%
39 BERNALILLO	\$23,822,468	\$29,865,267	\$6,042,799	25.4%
40 BLOOMFIELD	\$21,843,053	\$26,462,327	\$4,619,274	21.1%
41 CAPITAN	\$4,712,861	\$5,314,351	\$601,490	12.8%
42 CARLSBAD	\$55,493,778	\$61,556,105	\$6,062,327	10.9%
43 JEFFERSON MONT. ACAD.	\$1,928,714	\$2,205,619	\$276,905	14.4%
44 PECOS CONNECTIONS	\$5,225,311	\$5,873,285	\$647,974	12.4%
<b>CARLSBAD W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$62,647,803</b>	<b>\$69,635,009</b>	<b>\$6,987,206</b>	<b>11.2%</b>
46 CARRIZOZO	\$2,016,154	\$2,259,516	\$243,362	12.1%
47 CENTRAL CONS.	\$44,207,986	\$54,929,201	\$10,721,215	24.3%
48 CHAMA VALLEY	\$4,062,428	\$4,830,626	\$768,198	18.9%
49 CIMARRON	\$4,272,182	\$4,691,003	\$418,821	9.8%
50 MORENO VALLEY HIGH	\$696,867	\$765,714	\$68,847	9.9%
<b>CIMARRON W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$4,969,049</b>	<b>\$5,456,717</b>	<b>\$487,668</b>	<b>9.8%</b>
52 CLAYTON	\$4,741,668	\$5,342,305	\$600,637	12.7%
53 CLOUDCROFT	\$3,925,015	\$4,271,884	\$346,869	8.8%
54 CLOVIS	\$58,555,179	\$69,944,972	\$11,389,793	19.5%
55 COBRE CONS.	\$12,190,183	\$14,502,581	\$2,312,398	19.0%
56 CORONA	\$1,436,552	\$1,513,112	\$76,560	5.3%



DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19	FY20		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change	
			\$	%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,098,970,070	\$482,262,097	18.4%
57 CUBA	\$6,327,690	\$7,480,292	\$1,152,602	18.2%
58 DEMING	\$39,907,454	\$50,975,788	\$11,068,334	27.7%
59 DEMING CESAR CHAVEZ	\$1,655,386	\$1,973,957	\$318,571	19.2%
60 <b>DEMING W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$41,562,840</b>	<b>\$52,949,745</b>	<b>\$11,386,905</b>	<b>27.4%</b>
61 DES MOINES	\$1,549,875	\$1,633,988	\$84,113	5.4%
62 DEXTER	\$8,213,855	\$9,771,372	\$1,557,517	19.0%
63 DORA	\$2,637,671	\$2,922,568	\$284,897	10.8%
64 DULCE	\$6,790,434	\$7,975,081	\$1,184,647	17.4%
65 ELIDA	\$1,780,113	\$1,997,230	\$217,117	12.2%
66 ESPAÑOLA	\$30,190,412	\$35,906,836	\$5,716,424	18.9%
67 ESTANCIA	\$6,625,845	\$7,612,624	\$986,779	14.9%
68 EUNICE	\$6,677,507	\$7,866,266	\$1,188,759	17.8%
69 FARMINGTON	\$78,837,914	\$97,542,911	\$18,704,997	23.7%
70 NEW MEXICO VIRTUAL ACADEMY	\$3,297,766	\$4,113,792	\$816,026	24.7%
71 <b>FARMINGTON W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$82,135,680</b>	<b>\$101,656,703</b>	<b>\$19,521,023</b>	<b>23.8%</b>
72 FLOYD	\$2,451,833	\$2,846,771	\$394,938	16.1%
73 FT. SUMNER	\$3,002,598	\$3,440,386	\$437,788	14.6%
74 GADSDEN	\$103,886,265	\$129,606,253	\$25,719,988	24.8%
75 GALLUP	\$87,704,577	\$108,246,092	\$20,541,515	23.4%
76 MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH	\$1,329,028	\$1,491,473	\$162,445	12.2%
77 <b>GALLUP W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$89,033,605</b>	<b>\$109,737,565</b>	<b>\$20,703,960</b>	<b>23.3%</b>
78 GRADY	\$1,789,542	\$1,975,100	\$185,558	10.4%
79 GRANTS	\$28,645,790	\$33,584,821	\$4,939,031	17.2%
80 HAGERMAN	\$4,531,444	\$5,224,411	\$692,967	15.3%
81 HATCH	\$9,746,361	\$12,314,890	\$2,568,529	26.4%
82 HOBBS	\$70,738,404	\$83,525,642	\$12,787,238	18.1%
83 HONDO	\$2,024,472	\$2,271,646	\$247,174	12.2%
84 HOUSE	\$1,526,882	\$1,626,343	\$99,461	6.5%
85 JAL	\$4,248,670	\$4,766,369	\$517,699	12.2%
86 JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	\$2,451,625	\$2,794,874	\$343,249	14.0%
87 LINDRITH AREA HERITAGE	\$249,421	\$287,876	\$38,455	15.4%
88 <b>JEMEZ MOUNTAIN W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$2,701,046</b>	<b>\$3,082,750</b>	<b>\$381,704</b>	<b>14.1%</b>
89 JEMEZ VALLEY	\$3,207,723	\$3,614,686	\$406,963	12.7%
90 SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER	\$954,581	\$1,161,684	\$207,103	21.7%
91 <b>JEMEZ VALLEY W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$4,162,304</b>	<b>\$4,776,370</b>	<b>\$614,066</b>	<b>14.8%</b>
92 LAKE ARTHUR	\$1,773,408	\$1,942,095	\$168,687	9.5%
93 LAS CRUCES	\$184,563,964	\$214,842,858	\$30,278,894	16.4%
94 LAS VEGAS CITY	\$13,427,883	\$15,972,820	\$2,544,937	19.0%
95 LOGAN	\$3,400,141	\$3,645,502	\$245,361	7.2%
96 LORDSBURG	\$4,587,510	\$5,290,912	\$703,402	15.3%
97 LOS ALAMOS	\$29,015,803	\$29,920,346	\$904,543	3.1%
98 LOS LUNAS	\$60,564,761	\$72,672,838	\$12,108,077	20.0%
99 LOVING	\$5,143,903	\$5,918,240	\$774,337	15.1%
100 LOVINGTON	\$31,636,318	\$36,361,840	\$4,725,522	14.9%
101 MAGDALENA	\$3,659,707	\$4,220,243	\$560,536	15.3%
102 MAXWELL	\$1,681,968	\$1,874,703	\$192,735	11.5%
103 MELROSE	\$2,295,550	\$2,522,071	\$226,521	9.9%
104 MESA VISTA	\$2,931,138	\$3,425,496	\$494,358	16.9%
105 MORA	\$4,389,976	\$5,064,216	\$674,240	15.4%
106 MORIARTY	\$17,948,492	\$21,374,565	\$3,426,073	19.1%
107 MOSQUERO	\$1,174,396	\$1,237,391	\$62,995	5.4%
108 MOUNTAINAIR	\$2,854,779	\$3,183,386	\$328,607	11.5%
109 PECOS	\$5,683,638	\$6,706,694	\$1,023,056	18.0%
110 PEÑASCO	\$3,644,197	\$4,299,616	\$655,419	18.0%
111 POJOAQUE	\$14,605,319	\$17,537,859	\$2,932,540	20.1%
112 PORTALES	\$21,600,100	\$24,974,591	\$3,374,491	15.6%
113 QUEMADO	\$2,133,739	\$2,375,452	\$241,713	11.3%

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19	FY20		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change	
			\$	%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,098,970,070	\$482,262,097	18.4%
114 QUESTA	\$4,354,547	\$5,032,845	\$678,298	15.6%
115 RATON	\$7,464,674	\$8,657,587	\$1,192,913	16.0%
116 RESERVE	\$2,004,162	\$2,161,927	\$157,765	7.9%
117 RIO RANCHO	\$130,719,159	\$145,382,763	\$14,663,604	11.2%
118 ROSWELL	\$72,420,559	\$88,013,658	\$15,593,099	21.5%
119 SIDNEY GUTIERREZ	\$704,054	\$792,605	\$88,551	12.6%
120 <b>ROSWELL W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$73,124,613</b>	<b>\$88,806,263</b>	<b>\$15,681,650</b>	<b>21.4%</b>
121 ROY	\$1,221,657	\$1,291,110	\$69,453	5.7%
122 RUIDOSO	\$15,017,886	\$18,498,390	\$3,480,504	23.2%
123 SAN JON	\$1,929,409	\$2,092,627	\$163,218	8.5%
124 SANTA FE	\$99,615,488	\$120,750,773	\$21,135,285	21.2%
125 ACAD FOR TECH & CLASSICS	\$2,855,083	\$3,458,117	\$603,034	21.1%
126 <b>SANTA FE W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$102,470,571</b>	<b>\$124,208,890</b>	<b>\$21,738,319</b>	<b>21.2%</b>
127 SANTA ROSA	\$6,048,090	\$7,208,100	\$1,160,010	19.2%
128 SILVER CITY CONS.	\$21,289,743	\$24,250,471	\$2,960,728	13.9%
129 SOCORRO	\$11,886,010	\$14,144,438	\$2,258,428	19.0%
130 COTTONWOOD VALLEY CHARTER	\$1,375,686	\$1,657,219	\$281,533	20.5%
131 <b>SOCORRO W/CHARTERS</b>	<b>\$13,261,696</b>	<b>\$15,801,657</b>	<b>\$2,539,961</b>	<b>19.2%</b>
132 SPRINGER	\$2,004,113	\$2,183,143	\$179,030	8.9%
133 TAOS	\$17,858,765	\$21,527,499	\$3,668,734	20.5%
134 ANANSI CHARTER	\$1,393,122	\$1,775,304	\$382,182	27.4%
135 TAOS CHARTER	\$1,575,321	\$1,962,724	\$387,403	24.6%
136 VISTA GRANDE	\$1,142,902	\$1,303,909	\$161,007	14.1%
137 <b>TAOS W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$21,970,110</b>	<b>\$26,569,436</b>	<b>\$4,599,326</b>	<b>20.9%</b>
138 TATUM	\$3,638,087	\$3,885,671	\$247,584	6.8%
139 TEXICO	\$5,141,524	\$5,616,878	\$475,354	9.2%
140 TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	\$10,743,004	\$12,884,405	\$2,141,401	19.9%
141 TUCUMCARI	\$8,590,470	\$10,070,443	\$1,479,973	17.2%
142 TULAROSA	\$7,942,836	\$8,847,839	\$905,003	11.4%
143 VAUGHN	\$1,531,291	\$1,629,389	\$98,098	6.4%
144 WAGON MOUND	\$1,474,485	\$1,594,093	\$119,608	8.1%
145 WEST LAS VEGAS	\$12,350,771	\$14,976,469	\$2,625,698	21.3%
146 RIO GALLINAS CHARTER SCHOOL	\$766,051	\$920,427	\$154,376	20.2%
147 <b>WEST LAS VEGAS W/CHARTER</b>	<b>\$13,116,822</b>	<b>\$15,896,896</b>	<b>\$2,780,074</b>	<b>21.2%</b>
148 ZUNI	\$11,171,742	\$13,623,727	\$2,451,985	21.9%
149 STATE CHARTERS				
150 ALBUQUERQUE INSTI. MATH & SCI. (AIMS) ST. (APS)	\$3,118,013	\$3,508,162	\$390,149	12.5%
151 ALBUQUERQUE COLLEGIATE (APS)	\$784,402	\$913,618	\$129,216	16.5%
152 ALBUQUERQUE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE ST. CHAR (APS)	\$3,891,787	\$4,690,193	\$798,406	20.5%
153 ALBUQUERQUE SIGN LANGUAGE ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,122,588	\$2,325,629	\$203,041	9.6%
154 ALDO LEOPOLD ST. CHARTER (SILVER CITY)	\$1,906,508	\$2,091,066	\$184,558	9.7%
155 ALMA D' ARTE STATE CHARTER (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,972,099	\$2,186,518	\$214,419	10.9%
156 ALTURA PREPARATORY SCHOOL (APS)	\$879,735	\$1,036,175	\$156,440	17.8%
157 AMY BIEHL ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,054,921	\$3,425,671	\$370,750	12.1%
158 ASK ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (RIO RANCHO)	\$3,624,407	\$4,042,948	\$418,541	11.5%
159 CESAR CHAVEZ COMM. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,165,657	\$2,508,154	\$342,497	15.8%
160 CORAL COMMUNITY (APS)	\$1,392,523	\$1,685,791	\$293,268	21.1%
161 DREAM DINE' (CENTRAL)	\$245,994	\$317,728	\$71,734	29.2%
162 DZIT DIT LOOL DEAP (GALLUP)	\$321,101	\$374,826	\$53,725	16.7%
163 ESTANCIA VALLEY (MORIARTY)	\$3,270,086	\$3,980,876	\$710,790	21.7%
164 EXPLORE ACADEMY (ALBUQUERQUE)	\$3,249,353	\$3,641,253	\$391,900	12.1%
165 GILBERT L. SENA STATE CHARTER (APS)	\$1,873,039	\$2,100,878	\$227,839	12.2%
166 HORIZON ACADEMY WEST ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,019,006	\$3,678,567	\$659,561	21.8%
167 HOZHO ACADEMY (GALLUP)	\$1,359,490	\$1,759,182	\$399,692	29.4%
168 J. PAUL TAYLOR ACADEMY (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,457,324	\$1,716,616	\$259,292	17.8%
169 LA ACADEMIA DOLORES HUERTA (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,371,814	\$1,673,380	\$301,566	22.0%
170 LA PROMESA ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,675,059	\$3,451,078	\$776,019	29.0%
171 LAS MONTANAS (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,896,289	\$2,068,228	\$171,939	9.1%

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19	FY20		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change	
			\$	%
<b>STATEWIDE</b>	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,098,970,070	\$482,262,097	18.4%
172 LA TIERRA MONTESSORI (ESPANOLA)	\$1,040,852	\$1,239,546	\$198,694	19.1%
173 MASTERS PROGRAM ST. CHARTER (SANTA FE)	\$2,067,553	\$2,372,905	\$305,352	14.8%
174 MCCURDY CHARTER SCHOOL (ESPANOLA)	\$3,674,239	\$4,454,990	\$780,751	21.2%
175 MEDIA ARTS COLLAB. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,478,157	\$2,856,908	\$378,751	15.3%
176 MISSION ACHIEVEMENT & SUCCESS-MAS (APS) <sup>2</sup>	\$8,414,305	\$9,912,760	\$1,498,455	17.8%
177 MONTE DEL SOL (SANTA FE)	\$3,164,434	\$3,724,060	\$559,626	17.7%
178 MONTESSORI ELEMENTARY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,465,795	\$3,078,791	\$612,996	24.9%
179 NEW AMERICA CHARTER SCHOOL ST. CH. (APS)	\$2,486,671	\$2,960,253	\$473,582	19.0%
180 NEW AMERICA SCHOOL (LAS CRUCES)	\$2,254,120	\$2,555,196	\$301,076	13.4%
181 NEW MEXICO CONNECTIONS VIRTUAL (SANTA FE)	\$12,287,018	\$15,320,981	\$3,033,963	24.7%
182 NEW MEXICO SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS ST. CH (SANTA FE)	\$2,245,331	\$2,591,703	\$346,372	15.4%
183 NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,258,353	\$3,872,842	\$614,489	18.9%
184 RED RIVER VALLEY (QUESTA)	\$751,490	\$900,963	\$149,473	19.9%
185 ROOTS & WINGS (QUESTA)	\$480,562	\$578,589	\$98,027	20.4%
186 SANDOVAL ACADEMY OF BIL ED SABE (RIO RANCHO)	\$779,278	\$872,788	\$93,510	12.0%
187 SCHOOL OF DREAMS ST. CHARTER (LOS LUNAS)	\$3,909,884	\$4,531,384	\$621,500	15.9%
188 SIX DIRECTIONS (GALLUP)	\$884,943	\$1,021,805	\$136,862	15.5%
189 SOUTH VALLEY PREP ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$1,335,321	\$1,545,115	\$209,794	15.7%
190 SOUTHWEST AER.,MATH & SCIENCE-SAMS (APS)	\$2,502,605	\$2,852,415	\$349,810	14.0%
191 SOUTHWEST PREPATORY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$1,554,525	\$1,831,954	\$277,429	17.8%
192 SOUTHWEST SECONDARY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$2,409,180	\$2,789,951	\$380,771	15.8%
193 STUDENT ATHLETE HEADQUARTERS (SHAQ) (APS)	\$927,313	\$1,038,922	\$111,609	12.0%
194 TAOS ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (TAOS)	\$2,047,676	\$2,404,830	\$357,154	17.4%
195 TAOS INTEGRATED SCHOOL OF ARTS ST. (TAOS)	\$1,261,166	\$1,471,357	\$210,191	16.7%
196 TAOS INTERNATIONAL (TAOS)	\$1,544,443	\$2,079,909	\$535,466	34.7%
197 THE GREAT ACADEMY (APS)	\$1,727,466	\$1,965,962	\$238,496	13.8%
198 TIERRA ADENTRO ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,807,880	\$3,294,936	\$487,056	17.3%
199 TIERRA ENCANTADA CHARTER (SANTA FE)	\$2,797,606	\$3,513,525	\$715,919	25.6%
200 TURQUOISE TRAIL (SANTA FE)	\$3,900,522	\$4,643,817	\$743,295	19.1%
201 WALATOWA CHARTER HIGH (JEMEZ VALLEY)	\$592,998	\$687,297	\$94,299	15.9%
202 STATEWIDE	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,098,970,070	\$482,262,097	18.4%

Note: Statewide estimated program cost is based on the sum of the FY19 program cost and the \$452.5 million appropriation.