

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) and may also be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

Stapleton/Lundstrom/
 Trujillo, CH/Romero/ **ORIGINAL DATE** 2/07/19
SPONSOR Gonzales **LAST UPDATED** 3/01/19 **HB** 5/aHEC/aHAFC

SHORT TITLE Public Education Changes **SB** _____

ANALYST Liu

APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY20	FY21		
	(\$0.0 - \$19,000.0)	Nonrecurring	K-3 Plus Fund
	\$0.0 - \$19,000.0	Nonrecurring	State-Support Reserve Fund

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

Factor	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	4 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
At-risk index	\$113,177.9				\$113,177.9	Recurring	General Fund
K-5 Plus	\$89,695.9 - \$161,453.6				\$89,695.9 - \$161,453.6	Recurring	General Fund
ELTP	\$0.0 - \$149,237.9				\$0.0 - \$149,237.9	Recurring	General Fund
Rural Population	\$8,674.0	\$8,674.0	\$8,674.0		\$26,021.9	Recurring	General Fund
Size Adjustment	(\$14,776.2)	(\$14,776.2)	(\$14,776.2)		(\$44,328.5)	Recurring	General Fund
School Age Limit	(\$0.0 - \$6,129.0)				(\$0.0 - \$6,129.0)	Recurring	General Fund
Minimum Salary Levels	\$98,169.4	\$49,386.6	\$51,886.2	\$52,888.1	\$252,330.3	Recurring	General Fund
Total	\$294,941.0 - \$509,807.6	\$43,284.4	\$45,784.0	\$52,888.1	\$436,897.5 - \$651,764.1	Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Relates to HB77, HB121, HB145, HB397, HB412, HB446, HB476, HB495, HB589, HB591, HB634, SB31, SB47, SB170, SB172, SB253, SB298, SB304, SB615, SB616

Companion to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act

Conflicts with HB171, HB455, SB1, SB554, SJR18

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) Files

Responses Received From

New Mexico Attorney General (NMAG)

Educational Retirement Board (ERB)

Indian Affairs Department (IAD)

Public Education Department (PED)

Public School Insurance Authority (PSIA)

SUMMARY

Synopsis of HAFC Amendment

The House Appropriations and Finance Committee amendment:

- Removes redundant reporting requirements for bilingual multicultural education programs;
- Increases the rural population factors from 0.0333, 0.0667, and 0.1 to 0.05, 0.1, and 0.15, respectively;
- Makes extended learning time program (ELTP) requirements for school districts four-day school week mandatory rather than optional;
- Replaces the three-year phase-in of the ELTP factor and ELTP afterschool factor with a simplified ELTP factor of 0.11; and
- Authorizes PED to establish rules on qualified membership in K-5 Plus programs.

The increases to the phased-in rural population factor will create an additional estimated operating budget impact of \$2.9 million annually; however, this cost is covered in the HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3. Simplification of the ELTP factor will increase unit generation per student in FY20. Given uncertainty about uptake levels for ELTPs, the actual statewide impacts are indeterminate but could be up to \$149 million in FY20. Language in the HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3, however, limits the fiscal impact of changes to the ELTP factor to the current \$62.5 million appropriation and authorizes PED to restrict the number of slots available for programming to prevent dilution of the unit value.

Synopsis of HEC Amendment

The House Education Committee amendment removes the statewide charter school membership cap of 27 thousand students, removes the requirement that all students at K-5 Plus elementary schools must participate in the program by FY23, replaces alternative salary minimums for teachers in K-5 Plus and ELTPs with language requiring those teachers to receive an additional salary commensurate with their extended teaching time, defines at-risk services, and establishes a gradual increase in minimum salaries over four years as follows:

- Level 1: \$40,000 (FY20), \$42,000 (FY21), \$44,000 (FY22), and \$46,000 (FY23);
- Level 2: \$50,000 (FY20), \$52,000 (FY21), \$54,000 (FY22), and \$56,000 (FY23); and
- Level 3-A: \$60,000 (FY20), \$62,000 (FY21), \$64,000 (FY22), and \$66,000 (FY23).

Synopsis of Original Bill

House Bill 5 amends the Public School Code, changing the public school funding formula and sections relating to school programs. The bill increases the at-risk index factor in the funding formula to 0.25, expands the K-3 Plus extended school year program to K-5 Plus, creates a K-5 Plus component in the funding formula, creates a new extended learning time program component in the funding formula, creates a rural population component in the funding formula, increases minimum salaries for teachers and principals, limits the ability of schools to claim K-12 education funding for adult students, limits size adjustment program units for public schools within the boundaries of large school districts, establishes educational reporting requirements for school districts and charter schools during budget submission, creates performance-based budgeting procedures for schools, and caps charter school membership at 27 thousand in FY20.

The bill creates a public education reform fund to address issues in response to the recent court decision in the consolidated *Yazzie v. State of New Mexico* and *Martinez v. State of New Mexico* education sufficiency lawsuit. This bill is endorsed by LFC.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The bill would make several changes to the public school funding formula that would allocate a larger share of formula funding to schools with at-risk students, K-5 Plus programs, extended learning time programs, and rural locations. The bill would reduce the share of funding attributable to small schools in large districts and adult students. The bill does not contain an appropriation for formula changes but is aligned with the HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3, which increases the program cost appropriation to public schools by \$493.2 million. Additionally, the bill establishes a public education reform fund (the HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 includes a \$40 million nonrecurring fund transfer to this fund) and transfers remaining balances at the end of FY20 in the K-3 Plus fund to the state-support reserve fund.

Attachment 1 provides a summary of program cost impacts to school districts and charter schools based on the HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3.

At-Risk Index. Provisions of the bill would increase the at-risk index cost differential from 0.13 to 0.25 and generate 27.1 thousand new program units in FY20, valued at \$113 million based on the FY19 preliminary unit value of \$4,159.23. At a cost differential of 0.25, the at-risk index would generate an estimated total of 56.6 thousand program units, valued at \$235.4 million, nearly twice the amount received from federal Title I dollars for at-risk interventions. The HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 appropriation for public schools includes \$113.2 million to increase the at-risk index.

K-5 Plus. Provisions of this bill would generate new K-5 Plus program units, determined by multiplying student membership (MEM) in approved K-5 Plus extended school year programs by the cost differential factor of 0.3. Actual costs of programming will vary depending on the number of schools that apply and are approved by PED. Preliminary FY19 data shows 153.6 thousand MEM in kindergarten through fifth grade, of which 90.7 thousand MEM are reported in schools with 80 percent of students eligible for free or reduced-fee lunch (FRL), D or F school grades, or existing K-3 Plus or K-5 Plus programs. According to PED, about 22.8 thousand students were budgeted to participate in K-5 Plus programs in summer 2018. Using the FY19 preliminary unit value of \$4,159.23, the estimated total cost range for K-5 Plus programs for

22.8 thousand MEM to 153.6 thousand MEM is between \$28.4 million and \$191.6 million.

The General Appropriation Act of 2018 included \$30.2 million for K-3 Plus and K-5 Plus programs, which was appropriated to PED as a special “below-the-line” program. Provisions of this bill would shift this appropriation to the funding formula. The estimated total cost for K-5 Plus programming for the prioritized 90.7 thousand MEM is \$119.9 million; however, the incremental cost would only be \$89.7 million, given the existing \$30.2 million PED special program appropriation. Likewise, the incremental cost of K-5 Plus programming for all 153.6 thousand MEM in kindergarten through fifth grade would be \$161.5 million. The HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 appropriation for public school support includes a \$119.9 million appropriation through the funding formula for K-5 Plus programs. The bill also includes a provision to transfer remaining balances in the K-3 Plus fund to the state-support reserve fund in FY20.

In 2018, 18.9 thousand students were enrolled in a K-3 Plus program. Using these figures about 5,655.3 units, or \$23.5 million, would be generated. However, incentives for teachers to enroll in the K-5 Plus program will likely grow the program. PED notes generating interest from teachers is a significant hurdle to program expansion. PED assumes the fourth grade and fifth grade pilot numbers will increase by about 6,178 MEM to about the same share of the population of the grades (4 and 5) in the more established K-3 Plus program. PED estimates about 25 thousand MEM will be enrolled in FY20, generating 7,508.9 units, or \$31.2 million.

Extended Learning Time Programs. Provisions of this bill would phase in up to 62 thousand program units over three years for schools operating approved extended learning time programs (ELTPs) that add instructional days, professional development days, and afterschool programming to the school year. A 2018 LFC evaluation estimated the cost of providing an additional 10 instructional days and afterschool programs similar to federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers would be about \$144 million statewide. Assuming all schools implemented qualifying ELTPs in FY20 at the FY19 preliminary unit value of \$4,159.23, the estimated total cost for ELTPs in FY20 could be up to \$68 million. Assuming all schools implement qualifying ELTPs by FY22, the total cost for implementation would be about \$258.4 million. However, it is unlikely that all schools will apply for ELTP units in FY20, and only 55.7 percent of school are projected to establish ELTPs by FY22. The HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 appropriation for public school support includes \$62.5 million for ELTPs.

According to the Afterschool Alliance, 90.6 thousand students are waiting for an available ELTP in New Mexico. This would represent about 27.7 percent of the total FY19 preliminary funded MEM enrolled in new after-school extended learning programs. Statewide, PED estimates the new program would generate 14 thousand units or \$58.2 million in FY20, 25 thousand units or \$104.2 million in FY21, and 36.1 thousand units or \$150.3 million in FY22.

In order for these estimates to materialize, PED notes revenues generated by new ELTP units must offset the additional costs incurred by school districts and charter schools for them to be incentivized to adopt the new requirements. For example, Bernalillo had 180 instructional days in FY19 and FY18 actual operational fund expenditures of \$24.4 million. Dividing these expenditures by 180 gives a daily cost of approximately \$135.5 thousand and a total cost to implement 10 additional instructional days of \$1.4 million. PED estimates that Bernalillo would receive approximately \$514 thousand in additional SEG funds under the bill’s provisions for both the extended school year and after school program portions of the new program funding,

which is less than half the cost. Until an informed cost analysis of how much each school district or charter school must generate in order to offset additional costs is complete, PED cannot guarantee that any or all school districts will participate. **The HAFC amendment changes the ELTP formula weight to a single 0.11 factor to address this issue.**

Rural Population Factor. Provisions of this bill would add about 1,400 program units for schools located in rural areas each fiscal year until FY22. Using the FY19 preliminary unit value of \$4,159.23, the estimated additional costs between FY20 and FY22 would amount to about \$5.8 million each fiscal year. The HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 includes \$8.7 million for a rural population factor, enough to increase the factor in this bill from 0.10 to 0.15. **The HAFC amendment increases the factor from 0.10 to 0.15.** PED notes the bill repeals Section 22-8-23.C NMSA 1978, formerly known as rural isolation units and a legacy component of the sparsity factor once given to many rural districts on the basis of membership, but eventually only granted to Gallup McKinley County Schools (GMCS) before expiring after a district-wide school reorganization disqualified GMCS from generating these funds. PED estimates the cost of implementing the rural factor would be \$5.7 million in FY20.

Small School Size Adjustment. Provisions of this bill would eliminate about 3,500 program units from schools in large districts (>2,000 MEM) each fiscal year until FY22. Using the FY19 preliminary unit value of \$4,159.23, the estimated cost savings in FY20 and each fiscal year until FY22 would amount to about \$14.8 million. This cost saving assumption is included in the HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3. PED estimates the cost savings in FY20 would be \$14.3 million.

School Age Limit. Provisions of the bill would limit the ability of school districts and charter schools to receive funding for adult students through the public school funding formula. For FY17, 766 students over the age of 22 were enrolled in public schools, generating approximately \$6.1 million in public education program cost funding. Contingent on enactment of related legislation, the HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 takes credit for \$6.1 million in program cost related to adult students. The bill would allow students currently enrolled to remain enrolled in future years; however, the dropout rate for adult students is relatively high.

Minimum Salary Levels. Provisions of the bill increase minimum salaries for teachers, level three-A counselors, and principals, with an estimated cost of \$92.4 million for teachers and counselors and \$5.7 million for principals in FY20. The HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 amount for public school support includes \$38.2 million to increase minimum salaries for teachers and \$2.2 million to increase minimum salaries for principals, the estimated cost of the changes after applying an across-the board salary increase of 6 percent for all school personnel. However, the HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 increases the minimum salary for level 1 teachers to \$41 thousand, higher than the minimum established in this bill for FY20.

The HEC amendment establishes a gradual increase in minimum salaries for teachers each year until FY23, bringing level 1 teachers to \$46 thousand, level 2 teachers to \$56 thousand, and level 3-A teachers to \$66 thousand. Because level 3-A counselor and level 3-B principal minimum salaries are indexed to the minimum salary level of a level 3-A teacher, these salary minimums would increase in conjunction with the scheduled raises each year until FY23.

Providing a significant increase in educator salaries will likely have a positive impact on the funded status of ERB over the long-term. Once pay is increased, the pension benefit promised to

individuals will increase significantly, thus increasing the unfunded liability. However, over time the increased contributions from higher salaries will be invested, and the assumed return on those investments will begin to reduce the unfunded liability, gradually providing a net gain to the fund. Based on prior analysis, a one-time increase of pay of 15 percent could improve the funding period by around 4.5 years, reducing the ERB funding period from the current 61 years to 56.5 years.

Raising minimum salary levels will likely result in compaction of salaries, which may affect staff retention. School districts indicate increasing salary minimums will flatten salary schedules if additional raises for teachers already over the new minimums are not appropriated, given the historical practice of some school districts increasing all teacher salaries uniformly.

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, lack of K-3 Plus extended school year programs, lack of extended learning time programs, low teacher salaries, large class sizes, limited department oversight, additional costs borne by schools in rural areas, and complex funding formula components susceptible to manipulation.

At-Risk Index. The bill would more than double the proportion of formula funding for the at-risk index. 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.

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.

The HEC amendment further defines at-risk student services as research- or evidence-based social, emotional, or academic interventions such as:

- Case management, tutoring, reading interventions, and after-school programs delivered by social workers, counselors, teachers, or other professional staff;
- Culturally relevant professional and curriculum development (including those necessary to support language acquisition), bilingual and multicultural education;
- Additional compensation strategies for high-need schools;
- Whole school interventions (including school-based health centers and community schools);
- Educational programming intended to improve career and college readiness of at-risk students, including dual or concurrent enrollment, career and technical education, guidance counseling services and coordination with post-secondary institutions; and
- Services to engage and support parents and families in the education of students.

K-5 Plus. The bill creates a new section establishing eligibility requirements for K-5 Plus funding formula units and department oversight and reporting requirements for K-5 Plus extended school year programs. The bill requires PED to approve schools for participation in K-5 Plus and prioritize low-performing elementary schools in which 80 percent or more of the students are eligible for free or reduced-fee lunch (FRL). Schools previously eligible under the 2018 K-3 Plus or K-5 Plus program and meet PED criteria are also prioritized.

The court ruling on the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case acknowledged evidence that quality K-3 Plus programs could improve the performance of at-risk students but noted that schools must apply for K-3 Plus funding and administrative burdens, timing of appropriations, and funding levels prevent all eligible students from participating in the program. Provisions of this bill would change the funding process from a reimbursement to a base increase in operational funding through the SEG (thus improving school cash flow).

The Legislature has significantly increased funding for K-3 Plus, an extended school year program for kindergarten through third grade that has been scientifically shown to improve student performance relative to peers when programs are executed correctly. When combined with prekindergarten programs, the achievement gap appears to close for economically disadvantaged students. The program extends the school year by 25 instructional days at high-poverty or low-performing elementary schools, and students who stay with the same teacher from the summer program show better outcomes. Nearly 65 thousand students, or 64 percent of all kindergarten through third grade students, are eligible to participate in K-3 Plus.

The Legislature increased appropriations for K-3 Plus from \$1 million in FY07 to \$30.2 million in FY19. PED estimates this will allow 22 thousand students to enroll in summer 2018 K-3 Plus programs. Despite the program's increasing popularity, K-3 Plus program implementation is inconsistent statewide. Due to the voluntary nature of the program, some schools assign students to different teachers during the school year, run the program as a summer school rather than an

extension of the school year, or operate K-3 Plus for only 20 days. Other sites, like Deming Public Schools, leverage K-3 Plus and federal funding to extend the school year for all elementary students, including fourth and fifth graders (i.e. K-5 Plus), effectively providing an additional 150 days of instruction for every student before fifth grade.

PED notes the bill requires the remaining balance of the K-3 Plus Fund to be transferred to the state-support reserve fund, if any balance remains after FY19 administration. The balance at the end of FY18 was approximately \$19 million; however, because of timing issues much of that is committed to summer programs that has not been paid.

Extended Learning Time Programs. The bill creates a new section in the Public School Finance Act, establishing eligibility requirements for extended learning time program (ELTP) formula units and phases in two ELTP formula factors as follows:

- For FY20, a factor of 0.04 for MEM and 0.01 for MEM in afterschool programs;
- For FY21, a factor of 0.06 for MEM and 0.06 for MEM in afterschool programs; and
- For FY22, a factor of 0.08 for MEM and 0.11 for MEM in afterschool programs.

For subsequent fiscal years, the factor will remain at 0.08 for MEM and 0.11 for MEM in afterschool programs. The bill allows a school district or charter school with a K-5 plus program to qualify for ELTP units by adding extra equivalent hours rather than adding extra days. Actual costs of programming will vary depending on the number of schools that apply and are approved.

The HAFC amendment changes the ELTP formula to a factor of 0.11 for MEM in ELTPs.

The court ruling on the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case acknowledged that afterschool programs, summer school, and ELTPs could reduce learning lost and close achievement gaps for at-risk students but noted that schools lacked funding for these programs. National research indicates that higher-income students will experience 6,000 more hours of learning than their lower-income peers by sixth grade, likely due to more high-quality learning opportunities outside of school. This learning gap is particularly harmful for New Mexico's at-risk students, who represent the majority of the state's student population.

The LFC's 2018 evaluation *Instructional Time and Extended Learning Opportunities in Public Schools* found students in New Mexico received fewer instructional days than a decade ago, and the number of schools on four-day week schedules increased by over 33 percent since FY10. Programs that extend learning time, like K-3 Plus and afterschool and summer enrichment, showed promise for closing learning gaps. Further, instructional time was only as effective as the quality of instruction. Key recommendations of the report included adding 10 days to the school year, extending the school year through statewide K-5 Plus programs, lengthening school days with afterschool programs, and providing additional professional development time.

Current law requires school districts and charter schools to have a minimum of 990 instructional hours for students in full-day kindergarten through sixth grade and 1,080 hours for seventh through 12th grade, based on 180 days with 5.5 hours for kindergarten through sixth grade and six hours for seventh through 12th grade. Most school districts and charter schools would need to add at least 190 school days and at least 5.5 hours for kindergarten through sixth grade and six hours for seventh through 12th grade, an increase of 10 instructional days. No school district or charter school currently meets this requirement. In FY18, school districts and charter schools operating a five-day school week provided between 153 and 185 instructional days, with most districts and charters having 177 or more instructional days. As such, most school districts

operating five-day school weeks would need to add 13 instructional days to meet ELTP approval requirements.

School districts operating a four-day school week in FY19 or a school district with fewer than 1,000 MEM operating a four-day school week could receive additional program units by providing at least 160 instructional days, with 6.5 hours for kindergarten through sixth grade and seven hours for seventh through 12th grade. Thirty-eight school districts met the eligibility requirements in FY18, providing between 144 and 156 instructional days. Most school districts operating a four-day week would need to add 10 instructional days to meet requirements of the program. Twenty-two charter schools currently operate four-day school weeks and would not be eligible for extended learning time programs without expanding their calendar to include 190 instructional days.

The bill would also require school districts and charter schools to include at least 80 non-instructional hours for professional development. Based on the number of non-instructional days reported by school districts and charter schools in FY18 and the number of hours in an instructional day, six school districts and 45 charter schools may already meet the non-instructional hour requirement. The bill would allow school districts and charter schools to spread professional development time throughout the school year, rather than requiring a school district or charter school to set aside one or more full days for teacher professional development.

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures's *No Time to Lose: How to Build a World-Class Education System State by State* report, most high-performing countries allocate a greater share of teacher's time working with other teachers to develop their own teaching skills and developing the skills of new and struggling teachers. School districts and charter schools participating in ELTPs could allocate additional time for high-performing, experienced teachers to build the skills of their colleagues, potentially leading to less turnover among new teachers who are given insufficient support to develop stronger teaching skills.

The bill would also require school districts and charter schools to offer afterschool programs that do not supplant federal grants, such as 21st Century Community Learning Center grants, currently offered to seven school districts, one regional education cooperative, and five non-profit organizations. According to PED, 10.8 thousand students participated in these programs during FY18, however most students had fewer than 60 days of programming. Only 23 percent of students had 90 or more days of programming. The bill would require PED to promulgate rules establishing standard requirements for after school programming, including content standards, hourly requirements, and membership calculations.

Minimum Salary Levels. The bill would increase minimum teacher salaries to \$40 thousand for level one teachers, \$50 thousand for level two teachers, and \$60 thousand for level three-A teachers and counselors, and index minimum salaries for principals and assistant principals to the minimum salary of a level three-A teacher in FY20. Current law provides a minimum salary of \$36 thousand for level one teachers, \$44 thousand for level two teachers, and \$54 thousand for level three-A teachers and counselors. Principal and assistant principal minimum salaries are \$50 thousand, times a responsibility factor, with principals having a higher responsibility factor than assistant principals and high schools have a higher responsibility factor than middle schools, which have a higher responsibility factor than elementary schools.

The HEC amendment establishes a gradual increase in minimum salaries for teachers each year

until FY23 as shown in the following chart:

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

Note: Licensees in ELTP or K-5 Plus schools would receive up to a 5.5 percent or 13.8 percent increase in base salary, respectively.

PED notes provisions of the bill do not appear to provide a hierarchy of which minimum salary governs in the instance of a teacher enrolled in both extended learning time programs and K-5 Plus programs. **The HEC amendment** addresses this issue by requiring teachers in an ELTP or K-5 Plus program to receive additional salary at the same rate as their base salary for the extended teaching time.

Approximately half of all new teachers leave the profession in the first five years, leaving school districts and charter school with significant challenges in finding qualified teachers for the classroom. National research finds that teachers are paid less than similarly educated professions. Increases to teacher compensation are an important tool in keeping experienced teachers in the education profession and attracting students to teacher preparation programs.

Rural Population Factor. The bill amends the Public School Code, creating a rural population formula factor that allows school districts and charter schools in geographically rural areas (as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau) to generate additional program units. Schools located within a school district boundary that is greater than 40 percent rural are eligible for these units, which are calculated based on the following formula:

- For FY20, the product of MEM, a formula factor of 0.0333, and the rural population rate;
- For FY21, the product of MEM, a formula factor of 0.0667, and the rural population rate;
- For FY22, the product of MEM, a formula factor of 0.1, and the rural population rate.

For subsequent fiscal years, the formula factor will remain at 0.1. According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2010 urban and rural population data, 63 out of 89 school districts in New Mexico are more than 40 percent rural and would be eligible for these units.

The HAFC amendment changes the formula factors to the following:

- For FY20, the product of MEM, a formula factor of 0.05, and the rural population rate;
- For FY21, the product of MEM, a formula factor of 0.1, and the rural population rate;
- For FY22, the product of MEM, a formula factor of 0.15, and the rural population rate.
- For subsequent fiscal years, the formula factor will remain at 0.15.

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

The court ruling on the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case credited testimony on the additional costs and challenges faced by schools and students living in rural and isolated areas. Rural school districts tend to provide longer transportation services, face higher delivery costs, and have greater difficulties recruiting teachers in hard-to-staff subjects.

IAD notes Indian nations, tribes, and pueblos face challenges, including aging school facilities, access to broadband, rural locations, recruiting and retaining teachers, and incorporation of native language and culture in the classroom. Almost all Indian nations, tribes, and pueblo students attend public schools in rural locations, so the rural population rate may provide additional funds to support tribal education.

Small School Size Adjustment. The bill amends the Public School Finance Act, phasing out small school size adjustment units for elementary-junior and senior high schools located within a large school district over three years. The bill does not change how small school size adjustment program units are calculated. Instead, the bill modifies how small school size adjustment units can be generated each year for elementary-junior high schools with less than 200 MEM or senior high schools with less than 400 MEM located in a district with over 2,000 MEM as follows:

- For FY20, 66 percent of the elementary-junior and senior high units;
- For FY21, 33 percent of the elementary-junior and senior high units; and
- For FY22 and subsequent fiscal years, no elementary-junior and senior high units.

Small school size adjustment units generated by small schools in districts with less than 2,000 MEM will continue to generate units with no modifications. Preliminary data shows elementary-junior and senior high schools generated 21.2 thousand units in FY19.

The bill will reduce small school size adjustment units by about 3,500 units each fiscal year. Charter schools will account for approximately 2,000 units in the reduction, given the majority of charter schools are located in large school districts. The court ruling on the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case found that charter schools take advantage of the small school size adjustment formula factor and effectively divert funding away from the needs of at-risk students in school districts.

The number of size adjustment program units has increased in recent years, but much of this growth has taken place in urban areas due to an increase in the number of charter schools and the incentive for large school districts to design schools in a way to maximize the number of size adjustment program units. A 2017 LFC and LESC joint progress report on the 2011 funding formula study noted examples of 15 schools that were adjacent to, or sharing a facility with, another school of the same grade level but generating small school size adjustment units (about 627 units) and \$2.5 million in program cost in FY18.

School Age Limit. The bill amends the definitions of “school-age person” and “qualified student” in the Public School Code to prohibit public schools from claiming funding for students over 21 years of age. The bill allows students over the age of 21 to remain if they have been

continuously enrolled at the same public school since the third reporting period of the 2018-2019 school year. Current state law prohibits enrollment and funding for students in special education over the age of 21 because the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) limits special education services to students who have not reached the age of 22. PED has issued legal guidance allowing schools to claim funding for adult students not identified as needing special education.

Under current law, New Mexico spends millions of dollars annually on adults who attend public high schools, many of whom never graduate. A 2014 LFC program evaluation found public schools received more funding per student to educate adult student than adult education programs but achieved similar completion rates. According to the Higher Education Department, the state spent \$408 per student in FY17 for those enrolled in adult education programs, while the statewide average for a student funded through the public school funding formula was \$7,577, leading to equity issues. The LFC recommendation includes an additional \$2 million for adult education programs, which support adult students in the higher education system.

Charter School Maximum Membership. The bill caps aggregate charter school membership at 27 thousand for FY20 and allows PED to set the maximum membership for each charter school based on the charter school's performance history. This cap could limit membership growth in low-performing charter schools in FY20, depending on how PED allocates membership limits and measures performance. The FY19 first reporting date count shows charter school enrollment is 26.4 thousand statewide, which may change by the second and third reporting date of the year. **The HEC amendment removes this cap.**

Under current law, the charter school authorization process has the effect of committing the state to new financial obligations outside of the legislative budget process. Between FY08 and FY18, 90 independent charter school authorizers created new entities with aggregate enrollment larger than the state's second largest school district, without consideration to the impact these new entities have on the state budget. The Legislature has typically not included additional funding in the public school support budget to fund charter school growth, leading to a dilution of funding for existing charter schools and traditional public schools. A cap on charter school membership would give the Legislature the ability to increase appropriations with increases to the charter school cap, making charter school authorization a part of the budget process.

The state's largest charter school, New Mexico Connections Academy, saw enrollment fall by more than 800 students between FY18 and FY19, following a recommendation from PED to close the school for poor performance.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

The court ruling on the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case found New Mexico failed to provide a sufficient education based on evidence of inadequate inputs (e.g. instructional materials, professional development, etc.) and poor educational outputs: low student reading and math proficiency test scores, 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 schools. On January 3, 2019, executive orders 2019-001 and 2019-002 directed PED to transition away from use of the PARCC test. As such, the bill's impact on student academic performance will depend on whether the PARCC test, or a comparable assessment, is administered in FY20.

The bill includes a provision requiring school districts and charter schools to submit educational plans with information on performance targets and measures determined by the Department of Finance and Administration, LFC, and LESC.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

The court ruling on the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case found PED failed to exercise its full authority over schools to ensure at-risk students receive a sufficient education. The bill requires school districts and charter schools to submit an educational plan when submitting the annual budget to PED for review and approval that explains:

- services offered to improve the academic success of at-risk students;
- services offered to students enrolled in bilingual and multicultural education programs;
- services offered through ELTPs;
- services offered through K-5 Plus programs;
- services offered to implement the Bilingual Multicultural Education Act, Indian Education Act, and Hispanic Education Act;
- services offered to students with disabilities, including information tying the amount spent on these services to the revenue generated for students with disabilities;
- class size and teaching load policies; and
- beginning teacher mentorship programs.

School districts and charter schools submitting educational plans may need additional technical assistance for new funding formula requirements and changes. As a result, PED and schools may need to increase administrative personnel or capacity to handle additional reporting and monitoring functions. The HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 includes a \$2 million appropriation for PED to comply with provisions of this bill. PED would be responsible for reviewing these plans and ensuring school districts and charter schools are meeting the requirements of state law. PED could also require school districts or charter schools to account for the costs of services related to funding formula components. While PED has broad statutory authority to oversee school district and charter school finances, provisions of this bill could help the state evaluate whether funding formula dollars are used efficiently and in line with legislative intent.

The bill further requires PED to provide data and information related to public school finances to the Department of Finance and Administration, LFC, or LESC within 10 business days after a request, similar to a provision in the Public School Finance Act which requires school districts and charter schools to provide PED with financial information within 10 business days. PED notes past legislative requests for education finance data are made without regard to availability of data. PED notes staff will likely be in noncompliance with this section of law simply due to a lack of data availability.

CONFLICT, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

The bill conflicts with House Bill 171, which establishes different teacher minimum salary levels; House Bill 455, which makes different funding formula changes; and Senate Bill 554 and Senate Joint Resolution 18, which increase the distribution from the permanent school fund to extend the school year and increase teacher salaries. The bill is a near duplicate of Senate Bill 1,

with the exception that this bill, as amended by HEC, incorporates a gradual minimum salary increase between FY20 and FY23. The HAFC amendment further adds to differences between this bill and Senate Bill 1 (See Synopsis).

This bill relates to House Bill 77, which limits school administrative expenses; House Bill 121, which requires social services in schools; House Bill 145, which makes an appropriation for afterschool programs; House Bill 397, which establishes a \$12 minimum salary level for all school personnel; House Bill 412, which includes other National Board certified employees in the funding formula component for teachers; House Bill 446, which includes instructional support personnel in the 3-tier licensure system; House Bill 476, which requires a school nurse in every school; House Bill 495, which appropriates funding for beginning teacher mentorship; House Bill 589, which redefines community schools; House Bill 591, which requires schools to educate teachers and students on mental and social health education standards; and Hours Bill 634, which removes local revenue credits from the SEG calculation.

This bill relates to Senate Bill 31, which requires social workers in high-poverty schools; Senate Bill 47, which establishes new teacher minimum salaries; 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; Senate Bill 304, which phases in elementary physical education program units; Senate Bill 615, which requires PED to conduct an equity assessment of at-risk student education; and Senate Bill 616, which allocates at-risk funding to schools rather than the district.

The bill is a companion to the state equalization guarantee (SEG) appropriation in the General Appropriation Act, which includes contingency appropriations for changes outlined in this bill. The HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 includes contingency language that appropriates additional funding to the SEG upon enactment of a bill that amends the Public School Code to increase the at-risk index to 0.25; establish funding formula components for K-5 Plus, ELTPs, and rural schools; remove size adjustment components in large school districts and adult student funding; and increase teacher and principal minimum salary levels.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

PED notes the sponsors may wish to consider changing the term “English language learners” to “English learners” to keep pace with federal changes in preferred nomenclature and as enacted in the Every Student Succeeds Act.

PED notes there is a spelling error in the definition for performance measure on page 11, line 9. The word “quantitive” most likely intends to read as “quantitative” and should be corrected. The HEC amendment makes this technical correction.

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

The 2016 LFC evaluation *Assessing “Time-on-Task” and Efforts to Extend Learning Time* found that 32 percent of instructional time, or 62 days, at New Mexico schools was lost or used on nonacademic activities. Factors impacting instructional time included late starts, teacher and student absences, discipline, truancy, test administration, re-teaching, recess, Breakfast After the Bell, and parent-teacher conferences. While the evaluation acknowledged the importance of

providing additional time for learning, the report stressed the quality of learning time (time-on-task) as the key factor for improving academic achievement.

PED notes 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.

PED notes other parts of the Charter School Act specifically reference that charter schools must meet the standards set by their chartering authority, the charter school performance framework, as outlined in Section 22-8B-9.1 NMSA 1978. PED notes the bill's proposed changes with respect to common performance targets in both the reporting and limiting of charter school membership for currently operating charter schools appear to be in conflict with the Charter School Act or would require the chartering authority and the school to potentially negotiate new and possibly difference academic, organization or financial performance expectations.

ALTERNATIVES

PED recommends a new sparsity factor be determined on the basis of data controlled at the state level and be based upon a measure of membership, school site or some other data linked to rural increased costs such as the percent mileage of unpaved roads that has been used in the transportation formula in the past. PED staff does not believe the methodology proposed to determine rural cost offsets is consistent with common perceptions of education stakeholders of what constitutes rural and urban school districts. The proposed calculation impacts seemingly rural school districts such as Zuni or Eunice, and disqualifies from these funds because of the percentage of the population living in rural areas (12.7 percent and 14.4 percent respectively) do not fall above the proposed 40 percent threshold. Conversely, calculations that define school districts like Bernalillo or Taos as rural and allow them to generate rural population units when those school districts serve some of the more populous urban centers in the state.

PED notes there is no prior year data for ELTPs, and the bill envisions a membership projection process to determine funding for FY20. This may be administratively burdensome on PED and school district and charter school personnel staff. PED highlights the issue of inaccurate membership projections, which can have a disproportionately large impact on school districts or charter schools that over project new program units. PED usually only claws back small amounts from new charter schools that over project membership in the first year of operations. If school districts or charter schools over-project units because a new program is later found non-compliant by the first reporting date, PED's reduction to SEG payments for the rest of the year could have a very significant impact on school district and charter school operations for the rest of the year. For this reason, PED notes the sponsors may want to consider whether or not this particular program would fit better as a related recurring appropriation, at least for a year to gather better data and better inform a cost estimate. Additionally, amounts for the program could be accounted for in a non-reverting section of the new Public Education Reform Fund.

PED staff strongly recommends either replacing language on after-school ELTPs with detailed

requirements on how schools will generate program units for after-school extended learning time or remove this section in its entirety, along with the afterschool program unit generation provision, and work to convene a work group to develop such requirements in the FY20 interim to be introduced in a later legislative session.

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

NMAG notes the bill attempts to address deficiencies laid forth by the court ruling on the *Yazzie* and *Martinez* case, and consequences of not enacting the bill could include court sanctions.

AMENDMENTS

The HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3 amount for program cost includes \$8.7 million for the rural population factor, which is sufficient funding to increase the rural population factor from 0.10 to 0.15. The sponsors may wish to consider amending the bill to increase the weight of the rural population factor to align with the HAFC Substitute for House Bills 2 and 3. **The HAFC amendment addresses this issue.**

SL/gb/al/sb

PROGRAM COST SUMMARY TABLE

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19		FY20			FY21			FY22			FY23			FY24		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		
			\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%	
STATEWIDE	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,139,580,217	\$522,872,244	20.0%	\$3,313,348,639	\$173,768,422	5.5%	\$3,495,693,041	\$182,344,402	5.5%	\$3,686,066,713	\$190,373,672	5.4%	\$3,888,798,048	\$202,731,335	5.5%	
1 ALAMOGORDO	\$41,532,029	\$50,063,358	\$8,531,329	20.5%	\$53,023,651	\$2,960,293	5.9%	\$56,160,309	\$3,136,658	5.9%	\$59,442,714	\$3,282,405	5.8%	\$62,712,026	\$3,269,312	5.5%	
2 ALBUQUERQUE	\$637,370,733	\$776,315,380	\$138,944,647	21.8%	\$821,021,576	\$44,706,196	5.8%	\$868,318,598	\$47,297,022	5.8%	\$917,064,930	\$48,746,332	5.6%	\$967,502,921	\$50,437,991	5.5%	
3 ACE LEADERSHIP	\$2,994,824	\$3,090,704	\$95,880	3.2%	\$3,090,704	\$0	0.0%	\$3,047,448	-\$43,256	-1.4%	\$3,125,927	\$78,479	2.6%	\$3,297,851	\$171,924	5.5%	
4 ALBUQUERQUE CHARTER ACADEMY	\$2,674,231	\$2,529,957	-\$144,274	-5.4%	\$2,421,027	-\$108,930	-4.3%	\$2,289,943	-\$131,084	-5.4%	\$2,404,962	\$115,019	5.0%	\$2,537,234	\$132,272	5.5%	
5 ALB TALENT DEV SECONDARY	\$1,756,938	\$1,821,270	\$64,332	3.7%	\$1,821,270	\$0	0.0%	\$1,717,907	-\$103,363	-5.7%	\$1,716,091	-\$1,816	-0.1%	\$1,810,475	\$94,384	5.5%	
6 ALICE KING COMMUNITY SCHOOL	\$3,531,773	\$4,100,628	\$568,855	16.1%	\$4,340,214	\$239,586	5.8%	\$4,593,898	\$253,684	5.8%	\$4,851,760	\$257,862	5.6%	\$5,118,603	\$266,843	5.5%	
7 CHRISTINE DUNCAN COMMUNITY	\$2,775,637	\$3,248,348	\$472,711	17.0%	\$3,457,268	\$208,920	6.4%	\$3,679,656	\$222,388	6.4%	\$3,907,718	\$228,062	6.2%	\$4,122,640	\$214,922	5.5%	
8 CIEN AGUAS INTERNATIONAL ST. CHARTER	\$3,447,906	\$3,883,562	\$435,656	12.6%	\$4,065,002	\$181,440	4.7%	\$4,254,329	\$189,327	4.7%	\$4,441,997	\$187,668	4.4%	\$4,686,304	\$244,307	5.5%	
9 CORRALES INTERNATIONAL	\$2,432,692	\$2,543,512	\$110,820	4.6%	\$2,498,218	-\$45,294	-1.8%	\$2,357,842	-\$140,376	-5.6%	\$2,408,469	\$50,627	2.1%	\$2,540,933	\$132,464	5.5%	
10 COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL ST. CHARTER	\$4,789,769	\$5,666,470	\$876,701	18.3%	\$6,947,395	\$280,925	5.0%	\$6,241,770	\$294,375	4.9%	\$6,535,725	\$293,955	4.7%	\$6,895,185	\$359,460	5.5%	
11 DIGITAL ARTS & TECH ACADEMY	\$2,505,820	\$2,713,472	\$207,652	8.3%	\$2,650,574	-\$62,898	-2.3%	\$2,570,397	-\$80,177	-3.0%	\$2,708,378	\$137,981	5.4%	\$2,857,337	\$148,959	5.5%	
12 EAST MOUNTAIN	\$2,952,987	\$3,316,745	\$363,758	12.3%	\$3,390,214	\$73,469	2.2%	\$3,460,622	\$70,408	2.1%	\$3,634,548	\$173,926	5.0%	\$3,834,446	\$199,898	5.5%	
13 EL CAMINO REAL	\$2,643,894	\$2,928,368	\$284,474	10.8%	\$2,928,368	\$0	0.0%	\$2,883,523	-\$44,845	-1.5%	\$2,966,785	\$83,262	2.9%	\$3,129,957	\$163,172	5.5%	
14 GORDON BERNELL	\$3,023,311	\$1,909,693	-\$1,405,819	-46.5%	\$1,617,492	-\$292,201	-15.3%	\$1,494,340	-\$123,152	-7.6%	\$1,424,880	-\$69,460	-4.6%	\$1,503,247	\$78,367	5.5%	
15 HEALTH LEADERSHIP CHARTER (APS)	\$2,051,940	\$2,091,319	\$39,379	1.9%	\$2,091,319	\$0	0.0%	\$1,979,812	-\$111,507	-5.3%	\$1,965,600	-\$14,212	-0.7%	\$2,073,706	\$108,106	5.5%	
16 INTL SCHOOL MESA DEL SOL ST. CHARTER	\$2,662,885	\$2,961,148	\$298,263	11.2%	\$2,965,386	\$4,238	0.1%	\$2,965,386	\$0	0.0%	\$3,130,509	\$165,123	5.6%	\$3,302,685	\$172,176	5.5%	
17 LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA	\$4,031,845	\$4,270,286	\$238,441	5.9%	\$4,270,286	\$0	0.0%	\$4,256,257	-\$14,029	-0.3%	\$4,440,339	\$184,082	4.3%	\$4,684,555	\$244,216	5.5%	
18 LA RESOLANA LEADERSHIP	\$823,952	\$846,452	\$22,500	2.7%	\$846,452	\$0	0.0%	\$821,442	-\$25,010	-3.0%	\$823,711	\$2,269	0.3%	\$869,014	\$45,303	5.5%	
19 LOS PUENTES	\$2,095,686	\$2,243,224	\$147,538	7.0%	\$2,243,224	\$0	0.0%	\$2,132,721	-\$110,503	-4.9%	\$2,149,224	\$16,503	0.8%	\$2,267,430	\$118,206	5.5%	
20 MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE	\$1,535,109	\$1,782,368	\$247,259	16.1%	\$1,866,989	\$84,621	4.7%	\$1,955,387	\$88,398	4.7%	\$2,023,195	\$87,808	4.5%	\$2,155,569	\$112,374	5.5%	
21 MOUNTAIN MAHOGANY	\$1,548,207	\$1,794,159	\$245,952	15.9%	\$1,872,336	\$78,177	4.4%	\$1,953,479	\$81,143	4.3%	\$2,066,343	\$112,864	5.8%	\$2,179,990	\$113,647	5.5%	
22 NATIVE AMERICAN COMM ACAD.	\$3,314,923	\$3,825,290	\$510,367	15.4%	\$4,005,586	\$180,296	4.7%	\$4,193,842	\$188,256	4.7%	\$4,380,663	\$186,821	4.5%	\$4,621,597	\$240,934	5.5%	
23 NEW MEXICO INTERNATIONAL	\$1,960,066	\$2,285,730	\$325,664	16.6%	\$2,418,552	\$132,822	5.8%	\$2,559,150	\$140,598	5.8%	\$2,701,984	\$142,834	5.6%	\$2,850,592	\$148,608	5.5%	
24 NUESTROS VALORES	\$1,766,887	\$1,813,392	\$46,505	2.6%	\$1,813,392	\$0	0.0%	\$1,638,072	-\$175,320	-9.7%	\$1,661,813	\$23,741	1.4%	\$1,753,212	\$91,399	5.5%	
25 PAPA	\$2,851,639	\$3,372,473	\$520,834	18.3%	\$3,570,677	\$198,204	5.9%	\$3,780,616	\$209,939	5.9%	\$4,051,610	\$270,994	7.2%	\$4,274,446	\$222,836	5.5%	
26 ROBERT F. KENNEDY	\$3,416,774	\$3,560,762	\$143,988	4.2%	\$3,539,169	-\$21,593	-0.6%	\$3,502,220	-\$36,949	-1.0%	\$3,713,865	\$211,645	6.0%	\$3,918,125	\$204,260	5.5%	
27 SIEMBRA LEADERSHIP HIGH SCHOOL	\$1,352,569	\$1,361,596	\$9,027	0.7%	\$1,361,596	\$0	0.0%	\$1,277,811	-\$83,785	-6.2%	\$1,239,782	-\$38,029	-3.0%	\$1,307,970	\$68,188	5.5%	
28 SOUTH VALLEY	\$4,993,829	\$5,660,761	\$666,932	13.4%	\$5,904,130	\$243,369	4.3%	\$6,156,455	\$252,325	4.3%	\$6,403,756	\$247,301	4.0%	\$6,755,959	\$352,203	5.5%	
29 TECHNOLOGY LEADERSHIP	\$2,121,315	\$2,168,160	\$46,845	2.2%	\$2,168,160	\$0	0.0%	\$2,038,675	-\$129,485	-6.0%	\$1,974,499	-\$64,176	-3.1%	\$2,083,095	\$108,596	5.5%	
30 TWENTY FIRST CENT.	\$2,226,111	\$2,505,907	\$279,796	12.6%	\$2,624,343	\$118,436	4.7%	\$2,748,028	\$123,685	4.7%	\$2,870,809	\$122,781	4.5%	\$3,028,702	\$157,893	5.5%	
31 WILLIAM W & JOSEPHINE DORN CHARTER	\$663,314	\$736,426	\$73,112	11.0%	\$736,426	\$0	0.0%	\$718,591	-\$17,835	-2.4%	\$736,184	\$17,593	2.4%	\$776,673	\$40,489	5.5%	
ALBUQUERQUE W/CHARTERS	\$712,317,566	\$857,347,562	\$144,737,795	20.3%	\$903,547,345	\$46,199,783	5.4%	\$951,588,217	\$48,040,872	5.3%	\$1,003,546,056	\$51,957,839	5.5%	\$1,058,740,453	\$55,194,397	5.5%	
32 ANIMAS	\$2,191,478	\$2,481,964	\$290,486	13.3%	\$2,641,717	\$159,753	6.4%	\$2,811,781	\$170,064	6.4%	\$2,941,964	\$130,183	4.6%	\$3,103,770	\$161,806	5.5%	
33 ARTESIA	\$27,808,096	\$32,611,609	\$4,803,513	17.3%	\$34,441,198	\$1,829,589	5.6%	\$36,373,802	\$1,932,604	5.6%	\$38,451,235	\$2,077,433	5.7%	\$40,566,029	\$2,114,794	5.5%	
34 AZTEC	\$20,883,939	\$26,326,074	\$5,442,135	26.1%	\$28,185,893	\$1,859,819	7.1%	\$30,174,887	\$1,988,994	7.1%	\$31,913,725	\$1,738,838	5.8%	\$33,668,960	\$1,755,235	5.5%	
MOSAIC ACADEMY CHARTER	\$1,386,051	\$1,585,970	\$199,919	14.4%	\$1,670,211	\$84,241	5.3%	\$1,758,892	\$88,681	5.3%	\$1,866,144	\$107,252	6.1%	\$1,968,780	\$102,636	5.5%	
AZTEC W/CHARTERS	\$22,269,990	\$27,912,044	\$5,642,054	25.3%	\$29,856,104	\$1,944,060	7.0%	\$31,933,779	\$2,077,675	7.0%	\$33,779,869	\$1,846,090	5.8%	\$35,637,740	\$1,857,871	5.5%	
35 BELEN	\$29,827,015	\$37,224,249	\$7,397,234	24.8%	\$39,231,957	\$2,007,708	5.4%	\$41,347,555	\$2,115,598	5.4%	\$43,510,816	\$2,163,261	5.2%	\$45,903,883	\$2,393,067	5.5%	
36 BERNALILLO	\$23,822,468	\$29,928,313	\$6,105,845	25.6%	\$31,758,204	\$1,829,891	6.1%	\$33,700,758	\$1,942,554	6.1%	\$35,679,961	\$1,979,203	5.9%	\$37,642,336	\$1,962,375	5.5%	
37 BLOOMFIELD	\$21,843,053	\$27,108,669	\$5,265,616	24.1%	\$28,947,598	\$1,838,929	6.8%	\$30,910,386	\$1,962,788	6.8%	\$32,591,467	\$1,681,081	5.4%	\$34,383,977	\$1,792,510	5.5%	
38 CAPITAN	\$4,712,861	\$5,552,892	\$840,031	17.8%	\$6,033,859	\$480,967	8.7%	\$6,552,735	\$518,876	8.6%	\$6,963,339	\$410,604	6.3%	\$7,346,318	\$382,979	5.5%	
39 CARLSBAD	\$55,493,778	\$61,290,763	\$5,796,985	10.4%	\$63,538,322	\$2,247,559	3.7%	\$65,836,346	\$2,298,024	3.6%	\$68,304,047	\$2,467,701	3.7%	\$72,060,726	\$3,756,679	5.5%	
40 JEFFERSON MONT. ACAD.	\$1,928,714	\$1,977,706	\$48,992	2.5%	\$1,977,706	\$0	0.0%	\$1,847,078	-\$130,628	-6.6%	\$1,793,702	-\$53,376	-2.9%	\$1,892,355	\$98,653	5.5%	
41 PECOS CONNECTIONS	\$5,225,311	\$5,890,808	\$665,497	12.7%	\$6,148,321	\$257,513	4.4%	\$6,415,671	\$267,350	4.3%	\$6,678,314	\$262,643	4.1%	\$7,045,617	\$367,303	5.5%	
CARLSBAD W/CHARTERS	\$62,647,803	\$69,159,277	\$6,511,474	10.4%	\$71,664,349	\$2,505,072	3.6%	\$74,099,095	\$2,434,746	3.4%	\$76,776,063	\$2,676,968	3.6%	\$80,998,698	\$4,222,635	5.5%	
42 CARRIZO	\$2,016,154	\$2,392,428	\$376,274	18.7%	\$2,565,990	\$173,562	7.3%	\$2,751,839	\$185,849	7.2%	\$2,904,313	\$152,474	5.5%	\$3,064,048	\$159,735	5.5%	
43 CENTRAL CONS.	\$4,402,986	\$5,948,952	\$1,545,966	35.1%	\$7,494,918	\$3,091,932	41.3%	\$9,586,849	\$2,091,931	27.8%	\$11,678,780	\$2,091,931	18.0%	\$13,770,711	\$2,091,931	15.3%	
44 CHAMA VALLEY	\$4,062,428	\$4,950,988	\$888,560	21.9%	\$5,357,612	\$406,624	8.2%	\$5,795,363	\$437,751	8.2%	\$6,155,741	\$360,378	6.2%	\$6,494,303	\$338,562	5.5%	
45 CIMARRON	\$4,272,182	\$4,875,038	\$602,856	14.1%	\$5,260,718	\$385,680	7.9%	\$5,675,285	\$414,567	7.9%	\$6,006,785	\$331,500	5.8%	\$6,337,155	\$330,370	5.5%	
46 MORENO VALLEY HIGH	\$696,867	\$793,985	\$97,118	13.9%	\$852,042	\$58,057	7.3%	\$914,227	\$62,185	7.3%	\$964,366	\$50,139	5.5%	\$1,017,406	\$53,040	5.5%	
CIMARRON W/CHARTERS	\$4,969,049	\$5,669,023	\$699,974	14.1%	\$6,112,760	\$443,737	7.8%	\$6,589,512	\$476,752	7.8%	\$6,971,151	\$381,639	5.8%	\$7,354,561	\$383,410	5.5%	
47 CLAYTON	\$4,741,668	\$5,498,858	\$757,190														

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19		FY20			FY21			FY22			FY23			FY24		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		
			\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%	
STATEWIDE	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,139,580,217	\$522,872,244	20.0%	\$3,313,348,639	\$173,768,422	5.5%	\$3,495,693,041	\$182,344,402	5.5%	\$3,686,066,713	\$190,373,672	5.4%	\$3,888,798,048	\$202,731,335	5.5%	
57 CUBA	\$6,327,690	\$7,719,605	\$1,391,915	22.0%	\$8,293,583	\$573,978	7.4%	\$8,908,875	\$615,292	7.4%	\$9,401,582	\$492,707	5.5%	\$9,918,663	\$517,081	5.5%	
58 DEMING	\$39,907,454	\$50,291,640	\$10,384,186	26.0%	\$53,486,237	\$3,194,597	6.4%	\$56,884,540	\$3,398,303	6.4%	\$59,854,183	\$2,969,643	5.2%	\$63,146,125	\$3,291,942	5.5%	
59 DEMING CESAR CHAVEZ	\$1,655,386	\$1,655,386	-\$179,237	-10.8%	\$1,476,149	-\$179,237	-10.8%	\$1,338,337	-\$137,812	-9.3%	\$1,230,137	-\$108,200	-8.1%	\$1,297,793	\$67,656	5.5%	
60 DEMING W/CHARTERS	\$41,562,840	\$51,947,026	\$10,204,949	24.6%	\$54,962,386	\$3,015,360	5.8%	\$58,222,877	\$3,260,491	5.9%	\$61,084,320	\$2,861,443	4.9%	\$64,443,918	\$3,359,598	5.5%	
61 DES MOINES	\$1,549,875	\$1,726,511	\$176,636	11.4%	\$1,842,879	\$116,368	6.7%	\$1,967,045	\$124,166	6.7%	\$2,070,782	\$103,737	5.3%	\$2,184,673	\$113,891	5.5%	
62 DEXTER	\$8,213,855	\$10,097,153	\$1,883,298	22.9%	\$10,869,205	\$772,052	7.6%	\$11,697,860	\$828,655	7.6%	\$12,309,115	\$611,255	5.2%	\$12,986,108	\$676,993	5.5%	
63 DORA	\$2,637,671	\$2,992,501	\$354,830	13.5%	\$3,219,445	\$226,944	7.6%	\$3,462,940	\$243,495	7.6%	\$3,652,234	\$189,294	5.5%	\$3,853,105	\$200,871	5.5%	
64 DULCE	\$6,790,434	\$8,331,076	\$1,540,642	22.7%	\$8,942,446	\$611,370	7.3%	\$9,597,437	\$654,991	7.3%	\$10,098,091	\$500,654	5.2%	\$10,653,479	\$555,388	5.5%	
65 ELIDA	\$1,780,113	\$2,035,703	\$255,590	14.4%	\$2,196,029	\$160,326	7.9%	\$2,368,328	\$172,299	7.8%	\$2,511,336	\$143,008	6.0%	\$2,649,458	\$138,122	5.5%	
66 ESPANOLA	\$30,190,412	\$36,566,634	\$6,376,222	21.1%	\$38,112,057	\$1,545,423	4.2%	\$39,712,167	\$1,600,110	4.2%	\$41,770,316	\$2,058,149	5.2%	\$44,067,657	\$2,297,341	5.5%	
67 ESTANCIA	\$6,625,845	\$8,055,381	\$1,429,536	21.6%	\$8,705,681	\$650,300	8.1%	\$9,405,263	\$699,582	8.0%	\$9,974,783	\$569,520	6.1%	\$10,523,389	\$548,606	5.5%	
68 EUNICE	\$6,677,507	\$8,152,061	\$1,474,554	22.1%	\$8,626,203	\$474,142	5.8%	\$9,128,115	\$501,912	5.8%	\$9,638,081	\$509,966	5.6%	\$10,168,169	\$530,088	5.5%	
69 FARMINGTON	\$78,837,914	\$94,224,660	\$15,386,746	19.5%	\$99,418,266	\$5,193,606	5.5%	\$104,898,379	\$5,480,113	5.5%	\$110,699,485	\$5,801,106	5.5%	\$116,787,887	\$6,088,402	5.5%	
70 NEW MEXICO VIRTUAL ACADEMY	\$3,297,766	\$3,879,908	\$582,142	17.7%	\$4,087,751	\$207,843	5.4%	\$4,306,674	\$218,923	5.4%	\$4,527,220	\$220,546	5.1%	\$4,776,214	\$248,994	5.5%	
71 FARMINGTON W/CHARTER	\$82,135,680	\$98,104,568	\$15,968,888	19.4%	\$103,506,017	\$5,401,449	5.5%	\$109,205,053	\$5,699,036	5.5%	\$115,226,705	\$6,021,652	5.5%	\$121,564,101	\$6,337,396	5.5%	
72 FLOYD	\$2,451,833	\$2,838,413	\$386,580	15.8%	\$3,068,308	\$229,895	8.1%	\$3,315,660	\$247,352	8.1%	\$3,517,151	\$201,491	6.1%	\$3,710,592	\$193,441	5.5%	
73 FT. SUMNER	\$3,002,598	\$3,537,140	\$534,542	17.8%	\$3,855,535	\$318,395	9.0%	\$4,199,526	\$343,991	8.9%	\$4,484,987	\$285,461	6.8%	\$4,731,658	\$246,671	5.5%	
74 GADSDEN	\$103,886,265	\$129,492,275	\$25,606,010	24.6%	\$136,576,138	\$7,083,863	5.5%	\$144,047,301	\$7,471,163	5.5%	\$151,869,893	\$7,822,592	5.4%	\$160,222,641	\$8,352,748	5.5%	
75 GALLUP	\$87,704,577	\$109,865,307	\$22,160,730	25.3%	\$116,384,246	\$6,518,939	5.9%	\$123,292,930	\$6,908,684	5.9%	\$130,135,053	\$6,842,123	5.5%	\$137,292,399	\$7,157,346	5.5%	
76 MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH	\$1,329,028	\$1,329,028	-\$1,072	-0.1%	\$1,327,956	-\$1,072	-0.1%	\$1,216,577	-\$111,379	-8.4%	\$1,129,542	-\$87,035	-7.2%	\$1,191,666	\$62,124	5.5%	
77 GALLUP W/CHARTER	\$89,033,605	\$111,194,335	\$22,159,658	24.9%	\$117,712,202	\$6,517,867	5.9%	\$124,509,507	\$6,797,305	5.8%	\$131,264,595	\$6,755,088	5.4%	\$138,484,065	\$7,219,470	5.5%	
78 GRADY	\$1,789,542	\$2,014,563	\$225,021	12.6%	\$2,167,762	\$153,199	7.6%	\$2,332,148	\$164,386	7.6%	\$2,468,351	\$136,203	5.8%	\$2,604,109	\$135,758	5.5%	
79 GRANTS	\$28,645,790	\$35,243,530	\$6,597,740	23.0%	\$37,113,148	\$1,869,618	5.3%	\$39,081,158	\$1,968,010	5.3%	\$41,135,554	\$2,054,396	5.3%	\$43,397,983	\$2,262,429	5.5%	
80 HAGERMAN	\$4,531,444	\$5,252,386	\$720,942	15.9%	\$5,619,820	\$367,434	7.0%	\$6,012,590	\$392,770	7.0%	\$6,306,043	\$293,453	4.9%	\$6,652,871	\$346,828	5.5%	
81 HATCH	\$9,746,361	\$12,577,972	\$2,831,611	29.1%	\$13,526,218	\$948,246	7.5%	\$14,543,352	\$1,017,134	7.5%	\$15,276,647	\$733,295	5.0%	\$16,116,853	\$840,206	5.5%	
82 HOBBS	\$70,738,404	\$83,695,968	\$12,957,564	18.3%	\$88,463,286	\$4,767,318	5.7%	\$93,503,607	\$5,040,321	5.7%	\$98,674,230	\$5,170,623	5.5%	\$104,101,250	\$5,427,020	5.5%	
83 HONDO	\$2,024,472	\$2,348,936	\$324,464	16.0%	\$2,514,837	\$165,901	7.1%	\$2,692,263	\$177,426	7.1%	\$2,840,929	\$148,666	5.5%	\$2,997,179	\$156,250	5.5%	
84 HOUSE	\$1,526,882	\$1,687,368	\$160,486	10.5%	\$1,801,432	\$114,064	6.8%	\$1,923,153	\$121,721	6.8%	\$2,028,782	\$105,629	5.5%	\$2,140,364	\$111,582	5.5%	
85 JAL	\$4,248,670	\$5,200,726	\$952,056	22.4%	\$5,562,671	\$361,945	7.0%	\$5,949,474	\$386,803	7.0%	\$6,242,494	\$293,020	4.6%	\$6,564,727	\$324,233	5.5%	
86 JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	\$2,451,625	\$2,979,654	\$528,029	21.5%	\$3,212,440	\$232,786	7.8%	\$3,462,520	\$250,080	7.8%	\$3,670,991	\$208,471	6.0%	\$3,872,893	\$201,902	5.5%	
87 LINDRITH AREA HERITAGE	\$249,421	\$293,912	\$44,491	17.8%	\$318,345	\$24,433	8.3%	\$344,667	\$26,322	8.3%	\$366,090	\$21,423	6.2%	\$386,824	\$20,134	5.5%	
88 JEMEZ MOUNTAIN W/CHARTERS	\$2,701,046	\$3,273,566	\$572,520	21.2%	\$3,530,785	\$257,219	7.9%	\$3,807,187	\$276,402	7.8%	\$4,037,081	\$229,894	6.0%	\$4,259,117	\$222,036	5.5%	
89 JEMEZ VALLEY	\$3,207,723	\$3,896,614	\$688,891	21.5%	\$4,162,411	\$265,797	6.8%	\$4,446,192	\$283,781	6.8%	\$4,668,781	\$222,589	5.0%	\$4,925,561	\$256,780	5.5%	
90 SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER	\$954,581	\$1,119,281	\$164,700	17.3%	\$1,207,427	\$88,146	7.9%	\$1,302,159	\$94,732	7.8%	\$1,378,383	\$76,224	5.9%	\$1,454,193	\$75,810	5.5%	
91 JEMEZ VALLEY W/CHARTER	\$4,162,304	\$5,015,895	\$853,591	20.5%	\$5,369,838	\$353,943	7.1%	\$5,748,351	\$378,513	7.0%	\$6,047,164	\$298,813	5.2%	\$6,379,754	\$332,590	5.5%	
92 LAKE ARTHUR	\$1,773,408	\$1,986,115	\$212,707	12.0%	\$2,129,083	\$142,968	7.2%	\$2,282,121	\$153,038	7.2%	\$2,415,355	\$133,234	5.8%	\$2,548,198	\$132,843	5.5%	
93 LAS CRUCES	\$184,563,964	\$223,069,890	\$38,505,926	20.9%	\$235,659,800	\$12,589,910	5.6%	\$248,963,382	\$13,303,582	5.6%	\$262,848,354	\$13,884,972	5.6%	\$277,304,847	\$14,456,493	5.5%	
94 LAS VEGAS CITY	\$13,427,883	\$15,895,666	\$2,467,783	18.4%	\$16,833,039	\$937,373	5.9%	\$17,826,107	\$993,068	5.9%	\$18,836,454	\$1,010,347	5.7%	\$19,872,448	\$1,035,994	5.5%	
95 LOGAN	\$3,400,141	\$3,622,176	\$222,035	6.5%	\$3,869,773	\$247,597	6.8%	\$4,134,151	\$264,378	6.8%	\$4,330,856	\$196,705	4.8%	\$4,569,050	\$238,194	5.5%	
96 LORDSBURG	\$4,587,510	\$5,658,774	\$1,071,264	23.4%	\$6,081,560	\$422,786	7.5%	\$6,534,873	\$453,313	7.5%	\$6,880,812	\$345,939	5.3%	\$7,259,252	\$378,440	5.5%	
97 LOS ALAMOS	\$29,015,803	\$32,031,352	\$3,015,549	10.4%	\$33,575,084	\$1,543,732	4.8%	\$35,189,558	\$1,614,474	4.8%	\$37,053,253	\$1,863,695	5.3%	\$39,091,159	\$2,037,906	5.5%	
98 LOS LUNAS	\$6,564,761	\$7,881,368	\$1,316,607	22.0%	\$8,519,177	\$4,637,809	6.3%	\$8,344,603	\$4,930,426	6.3%	\$8,849,106	\$5,045,503	6.0%	\$9,362,281	\$4,867,175	5.5%	
99 LOVING	\$5,143,903	\$6,190,522	\$1,046,619	20.3%	\$6,672,194	\$446,672	6.7%	\$7,051,758	\$444,564	6.7%	\$7,368,536	\$316,778	4.5%	\$7,773,800	\$405,264	5.5%	
100 LOVINGTON	\$31,636,318	\$35,169,786	\$3,533,468	11.2%	\$36,625,606	\$1,455,820	4.1%	\$38,130,345	\$1,504,739	4.1%	\$39,871,702	\$1,741,357	4.6%	\$42,064,621	\$2,192,919	5.5%	
101 MAGDALENA	\$3,659,707	\$4,454,938	\$795,231	21.7%	\$4,820,391	\$365,453	8.2%	\$5,213,795	\$393,404	8.2%	\$5,540,392	\$326,597	6.3%	\$5,845,110	\$304,718	5.5%	
102 MAXWELL	\$1,681,968	\$1,965,809	\$283,841	16.9%	\$2,114,780	\$148,971	7.2%	\$2,274,615	\$159,835	7.6%	\$2,411,138	\$136,523	6.0%	\$2,543,750	\$132,612	5.5%	
103 MELROSE	\$2,295,550	\$2,646,377	\$350,827	15.3%	\$2,842,445	\$196,068	7.4%	\$3,052,593	\$210,148	7.4%	\$3,210,313	\$157,720	5.2%	\$3,386,879	\$176,566	5.5%	
104 MESA VISTA	\$2,931,138	\$3,444,956	\$513,818	17.5%	\$3,705,040	\$260,084	7.5%	\$3,984,036	\$278,996	7.5%	\$4,211,176	\$227,140	5.7%	\$4,442,788	\$231,612	5.5%	
105 MORA	\$4,389,976	\$5,244,645	\$854,669	19.5%	\$5,619,574	\$374,929	7.1%	\$6,020,763	\$401,189	7.1%	\$6,325,928	\$305,165	5.1%	\$6,673,850	\$347,922	5.5%	
106 MORIARTY	\$17,948,492	\$22,075,426	\$4,126,934	23.0%	\$23,935,847	\$1,860,421	8.4%	\$25,940,749	\$2,004,902	8.4%	\$27,490,003	\$1,549,254	6.0%	\$29,001,936	\$1,511,933		

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19		FY20				FY21				FY22				FY23				FY24			
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change				
			\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%			
STATEWIDE	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,139,580,217	\$522,872,244	20.0%	\$3,313,348,639	\$173,768,422	5.5%	\$3,495,693,041	\$182,344,402	5.5%	\$3,686,066,713	\$190,373,672	5.4%	\$3,888,798,048	\$202,731,335	5.5%						
115 RATON	\$7,464,674	\$9,122,731	\$1,658,057	22.2%	\$9,654,296	\$531,565	5.8%	\$10,217,053	\$562,757	5.8%	\$10,788,937	\$571,884	5.6%	\$11,382,322	\$593,385	5.5%						
116 RESERVE	\$2,004,162	\$2,316,825	\$312,663	15.6%	\$2,495,960	\$179,135	7.7%	\$2,688,327	\$192,367	7.7%	\$2,854,829	\$166,502	6.2%	\$3,011,842	\$157,013	5.5%						
117 RIO RANCHO	\$130,719,159	\$149,196,957	\$18,477,798	14.1%	\$157,190,209	\$7,993,252	5.4%	\$165,609,430	\$8,419,221	5.4%	\$174,091,339	\$8,481,909	5.1%	\$183,666,253	\$9,574,914	5.5%						
118 ROSWELL	\$72,420,559	\$90,573,087	\$18,152,528	25.1%	\$95,961,012	\$5,387,925	5.9%	\$101,671,885	\$5,710,873	6.0%	\$107,752,918	\$6,081,033	6.0%	\$113,679,261	\$5,926,343	5.5%						
119 SIDNEY GUTIERREZ	\$704,054	\$724,474	\$20,420	2.9%	\$724,474	\$0	0.0%	\$696,904	-\$27,570	-3.8%	\$699,815	\$2,911	0.4%	\$738,304	\$38,489	5.5%						
120 ROSWELL W/CHARTER	\$73,124,613	\$91,297,561	\$18,172,948	24.9%	\$96,685,486	\$5,387,925	5.9%	\$102,368,789	\$5,683,303	5.9%	\$108,452,733	\$6,083,944	5.9%	\$114,417,565	\$5,964,832	5.5%						
121 ROY	\$1,221,657	\$1,342,898	\$121,241	9.9%	\$1,431,442	\$88,544	6.6%	\$1,525,816	\$94,374	6.6%	\$1,609,961	\$84,145	5.5%	\$1,698,508	\$88,547	5.5%						
122 RUIDOSO	\$15,017,886	\$18,738,865	\$3,720,979	24.8%	\$19,881,190	\$1,142,325	6.1%	\$21,093,649	\$1,212,459	6.1%	\$22,331,099	\$1,237,450	5.9%	\$23,559,295	\$1,228,196	5.5%						
123 SAN JON	\$1,929,409	\$2,163,370	\$233,961	12.1%	\$2,311,846	\$148,476	6.9%	\$2,470,414	\$158,568	6.9%	\$2,596,045	\$125,631	5.1%	\$2,738,826	\$142,781	5.5%						
124 SANTA FE	\$99,615,488	\$120,038,393	\$20,422,905	20.5%	\$126,054,409	\$6,016,016	5.0%	\$132,363,266	\$6,308,857	5.0%	\$139,457,853	\$7,094,587	5.4%	\$147,127,947	\$7,670,094	5.5%						
125 ACAD FOR TECH & CLASSICS	\$2,855,083	\$3,305,899	\$450,816	15.8%	\$3,452,644	\$146,745	4.4%	\$3,605,183	\$152,539	4.4%	\$3,810,301	\$205,118	5.7%	\$4,109,865	\$209,564	5.5%						
126 SANTA FE W/CHARTERS	\$102,470,571	\$123,344,292	\$20,873,721	20.4%	\$129,507,053	\$6,162,761	5.0%	\$135,968,449	\$6,461,396	5.0%	\$143,268,154	\$7,299,705	5.4%	\$151,147,812	\$7,879,658	5.5%						
127 SANTA ROSA	\$6,048,090	\$7,469,777	\$1,421,687	23.5%	\$7,996,065	\$526,288	7.0%	\$8,558,835	\$562,770	7.0%	\$9,070,521	\$511,686	6.0%	\$9,569,394	\$498,873	5.5%						
128 SILVER CITY CONS.	\$21,289,743	\$24,771,983	\$3,482,240	16.4%	\$26,095,521	\$1,323,538	5.3%	\$27,489,350	\$1,393,829	5.3%	\$28,996,440	\$1,507,090	5.5%	\$30,591,226	\$1,594,786	5.5%						
129 SOCORRO	\$11,886,010	\$14,826,815	\$2,940,805	24.7%	\$15,790,524	\$963,709	6.5%	\$16,816,921	\$1,026,397	6.5%	\$17,870,488	\$1,053,567	6.3%	\$18,853,354	\$982,866	5.5%						
130 COTTONWOOD VALLEY CHARTER	\$1,375,686	\$1,594,325	\$218,639	15.9%	\$1,682,034	\$87,709	5.5%	\$1,774,576	\$92,542	5.5%	\$1,868,067	\$93,491	5.3%	\$1,970,809	\$102,742	5.5%						
131 SOCORRO W/CHARTERS	\$13,261,696	\$16,421,140	\$3,159,444	23.8%	\$17,472,558	\$1,051,418	6.4%	\$18,591,497	\$1,118,939	6.4%	\$19,738,555	\$1,147,058	6.2%	\$20,824,163	\$1,085,608	5.5%						
132 SPRINGER	\$2,004,113	\$2,322,547	\$318,434	15.9%	\$2,491,808	\$169,261	7.3%	\$2,673,084	\$181,276	7.3%	\$2,824,461	\$151,377	5.7%	\$2,979,805	\$155,344	5.5%						
133 TAOS	\$17,858,765	\$22,092,270	\$4,233,505	23.7%	\$23,453,894	\$1,361,624	6.2%	\$24,899,994	\$1,446,100	6.2%	\$26,196,568	\$1,296,574	5.2%	\$27,637,362	\$1,440,794	5.5%						
134 ANANSI CHARTER	\$1,393,122	\$1,660,627	\$267,505	19.2%	\$1,768,257	\$107,630	6.5%	\$1,882,876	\$114,619	6.5%	\$1,995,586	\$112,710	6.0%	\$2,105,342	\$109,756	5.5%						
135 TAOS CHARTER	\$1,575,321	\$1,859,437	\$284,116	18.0%	\$1,996,317	\$136,880	7.4%	\$2,142,989	\$146,672	7.3%	\$2,269,434	\$126,445	5.9%	\$2,394,251	\$124,817	5.5%						
136 VISTA GRANDE	\$1,142,902	\$1,150,492	\$7,590	0.7%	\$1,073,228	-\$77,264	-6.7%	\$961,897	-\$111,331	-10.4%	\$1,006,546	\$44,649	4.6%	\$1,061,906	\$55,360	5.5%						
137 TAOS W/CHARTER	\$21,970,110	\$26,762,826	\$4,792,716	21.8%	\$28,291,696	\$1,528,870	5.7%	\$29,887,756	\$1,596,060	5.6%	\$31,468,134	\$1,580,378	5.3%	\$33,198,861	\$1,730,727	5.5%						
138 TATUM	\$3,638,087	\$4,058,442	\$420,355	11.6%	\$4,334,796	\$276,354	6.8%	\$4,629,818	\$295,022	6.8%	\$4,849,079	\$219,261	4.7%	\$5,115,776	\$266,697	5.5%						
139 TEXICO	\$5,141,524	\$5,916,970	\$775,446	15.1%	\$6,366,706	\$449,736	7.6%	\$6,849,288	\$482,582	7.6%	\$7,208,286	\$358,998	5.2%	\$7,604,738	\$396,452	5.5%						
140 TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	\$10,743,004	\$13,214,746	\$2,471,742	23.0%	\$14,006,792	\$792,046	6.0%	\$14,846,671	\$839,879	6.0%	\$15,702,502	\$855,831	5.8%	\$16,566,130	\$863,628	5.5%						
141 TUCUMCARI	\$8,590,470	\$10,411,095	\$1,820,625	21.2%	\$11,006,844	\$595,549	5.7%	\$11,636,452	\$629,808	5.7%	\$12,275,310	\$638,858	5.5%	\$12,950,444	\$675,134	5.5%						
142 TULAROSA	\$7,942,836	\$9,760,445	\$1,817,609	22.9%	\$10,420,819	\$660,374	6.8%	\$11,125,586	\$704,767	6.8%	\$11,699,132	\$573,546	5.2%	\$12,342,576	\$643,444	5.5%						
143 VAUGHN	\$1,531,291	\$1,718,953	\$187,662	12.3%	\$1,833,375	\$114,422	6.7%	\$1,955,387	\$122,012	6.7%	\$2,063,271	\$107,884	5.5%	\$2,176,749	\$113,478	5.5%						
144 WAGON MOUND	\$1,474,485	\$1,692,034	\$217,549	14.8%	\$1,799,037	\$107,003	6.3%	\$1,912,842	\$113,805	6.3%	\$2,012,955	\$100,113	5.2%	\$2,123,666	\$110,711	5.5%						
145 WEST LAS VEGAS	\$12,350,771	\$15,211,266	\$2,860,495	23.2%	\$16,251,943	\$1,040,677	7.8%	\$17,363,180	\$1,111,237	6.8%	\$18,335,112	\$971,932	5.6%	\$19,343,532	\$1,008,420	5.5%						
146 RIO GALLINAS CHARTER SCHOOL	\$766,051	\$911,930	\$145,879	19.0%	\$1,067,897	\$64,967	6.1%	\$1,106,404	\$69,507	7.1%	\$1,106,860	\$60,456	5.8%	\$1,167,737	\$60,877	5.5%						
147 WEST LAS VEGAS W/CHARTER	\$13,116,822	\$16,123,196	\$3,006,374	22.9%	\$17,228,840	\$1,105,644	6.9%	\$18,409,584	\$1,180,744	6.9%	\$19,441,972	\$1,032,388	5.6%	\$20,511,269	\$1,069,297	5.5%						
148 ZUNI	\$11,171,742	\$13,913,000	\$2,741,258	24.5%	\$14,558,218	\$645,218	4.6%	\$15,231,123	\$672,905	4.6%	\$15,897,489	\$666,366	4.4%	\$16,771,841	\$874,352	5.5%						
149 STATE CHARTERS																						
150 ALBUQUERQUE INSTI. MATH & SCI. (AIMS) ST. (APS)	\$3,118,013	\$3,403,180	\$285,167	9.1%	\$3,445,676	\$42,496	1.2%	\$3,481,078	\$35,402	1.0%	\$3,595,483	\$114,405	3.3%	\$3,793,232	\$197,749	5.5%						
151 ALBUQUERQUE COLLEGIATE (APS)	\$784,402	\$835,797	\$51,395	6.6%	\$835,797	\$0	0.0%	\$798,234	-\$37,563	-4.5%	\$785,647	-\$12,587	-1.6%	\$828,857	\$43,210	5.5%						
152 ALBUQUERQUE SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE ST. CHAR (APS)	\$3,891,787	\$4,632,724	\$740,937	19.0%	\$4,911,002	\$278,278	6.0%	\$5,206,123	\$295,121	6.0%	\$5,506,910	\$300,787	5.8%	\$5,809,787	\$302,877	5.5%						
153 ALBUQUERQUE SIGN LANGUAGE ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,122,588	\$2,169,800	\$47,212	2.2%	\$2,184,994	\$15,194	0.7%	\$2,194,242	\$9,248	0.4%	\$2,313,102	\$118,860	5.4%	\$2,440,321	\$127,219	5.5%						
154 ALDO LEOPOLD ST. CHARTER (SILVER CITY)	\$1,906,508	\$1,901,239	-\$5,269	-0.3%	\$1,772,608	-\$128,631	-6.8%	\$1,621,707	-\$150,901	-8.5%	\$1,695,015	\$73,308	4.5%	\$1,788,239	\$93,224	5.5%						
155 ALMA D' ARTE STATE CHARTER (LAS CRUCES)	\$1,972,099	\$1,991,476	\$19,377	1.0%	\$1,858,911	-\$132,565	-6.7%	\$1,704,604	-\$154,307	-8.3%	\$1,795,260	\$90,656	5.3%	\$1,893,998	\$98,738	5.5%						
156 ALURA PREPARATORY SCHOOL (APS)	\$879,735	\$953,821	\$74,086	8.4%	\$953,821	\$0	0.0%	\$921,761	-\$32,060	-3.4%	\$920,613	-\$1,148	-0.1%	\$971,247	\$50,634	5.5%						
157 AMY BIEHL ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,054,921	\$3,235,773	\$180,852	5.9%	\$3,212,923	-\$22,950	-0.7%	\$3,164,627	-\$48,196	-1.5%	\$3,288,322	\$123,695	3.9%	\$3,469,178	\$180,856	5.5%						
158 ASK ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (RIO RANCHO)	\$3,624,407	\$4,127,387	\$502,980	13.9%	\$4,351,839	\$224,452	5.4%	\$4,588,475	\$236,636	5.4%	\$4,827,256	\$238,781	5.2%	\$5,092,752	\$265,496	5.5%						
159 CESAR CHAVEZ COMM. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,165,657	\$2,283,101	\$117,444	5.4%	\$2,283,101	\$0	0.0%	\$2,139,952	-\$143,149	-6.3%	\$2,230,215	\$90,263	4.2%	\$2,352,876	\$122,661	5.5%						
160 CORAL COMMUNITY (APS)	\$1,392,523	\$1,721,355	\$328,832	23.6%	\$1,821,560	\$100,205	5.8%	\$1,927,640	\$106,080	5.8%	\$2,035,430	\$107,790	5.6%	\$2,147,377	\$111,947	5.5%						
161 DREAM DINE (CENTRAL)	\$245,994	\$300,235	\$54,241	22.0%	\$300,235	\$0	0.0%	\$294,731	-\$5,504	-1.8%	\$312,092	\$17,361	5.9%	\$329,257	\$17,165	5.5%						
162 DZIT DIT LOOL DEAP (GALLUP)	\$321,101	\$343,219	\$22,118	6.9%	\$331,562	-\$11,557	-3.4%	\$317,275	-\$14,287	-4.3%	\$335,605	\$18,330	5.8%	\$354,064	\$18,459	5.5%						
163 ESTANCIA VALLEY (MORIARTY)	\$3,270,086	\$3,995,148	\$725,062	22.2%	\$4,333,157	\$338,009	8.5%	\$4,697,471	\$364,314	8.4%												

DISTRICT/CHARTER	FY19		FY20			FY21			FY22			FY23			FY24		
	PRELIMINARY PROGRAM COST	ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		ESTIMATED PROGRAM COST	YOY Change		
			\$	%		\$	%		\$	%		\$	%				
STATEWIDE	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,139,580,217	\$522,872,244	20.0%	\$3,313,348,639	\$173,768,422	5.5%	\$3,495,693,041	\$182,344,402	5.5%	\$3,686,066,713	\$190,373,672	5.4%	\$3,888,798,048	\$202,731,335	5.5%	
174 MCCURDY CHARTER SCHOOL (ESPANOLA)	\$3,674,239	\$4,660,561	\$986,322	26.8%	\$4,897,625	\$237,064	5.1%	\$5,146,477	\$248,852	5.1%	\$5,395,727	\$249,250	4.8%	\$5,692,488	\$296,761	5.5%	
175 MEDIA ARTS COLLAB. ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,478,157	\$2,631,453	\$153,296	6.2%	\$2,543,614	-\$87,839	-3.3%	\$2,435,781	-\$107,833	-4.2%	\$2,574,116	\$138,335	5.7%	\$2,715,690	\$141,574	5.5%	
176 MISSION ACHIEVEMENT & SUCCESS-MAS (APS) ²	\$8,414,305	\$10,141,888	\$1,727,583	20.5%	\$10,751,092	\$609,204	6.0%	\$11,397,166	\$646,074	6.0%	\$12,055,644	\$658,478	5.8%	\$12,718,697	\$663,053	5.5%	
177 MONTE DEL SOL (SANTA FE)	\$3,164,434	\$3,425,104	\$260,670	8.2%	\$3,452,242	\$27,138	0.8%	\$3,470,367	\$18,125	0.5%	\$3,663,713	\$193,346	5.6%	\$3,865,215	\$201,502	5.5%	
178 MONTESSORI ELEMMENTARY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,465,795	\$3,006,319	\$540,524	21.9%	\$3,186,903	\$180,584	6.0%	\$3,378,416	\$191,513	6.0%	\$3,573,606	\$195,190	5.8%	\$3,770,152	\$196,546	5.5%	
179 NEW AMERICA CHARTER SCHOOL ST. CH. (APS)	\$2,486,671	\$2,288,712	-\$197,959	-8.0%	\$2,184,337	-\$104,375	-4.6%	\$2,059,221	-\$125,116	-5.7%	\$2,182,039	\$122,818	6.0%	\$2,302,050	\$120,011	5.5%	
180 NEW AMERICA SCHOOL (LAS CRUCES)	\$2,254,120	\$1,396,153	-\$857,967	-38.1%	\$1,248,198	-\$147,955	-10.6%	\$1,077,456	-\$170,742	-13.7%	\$1,122,534	-\$45,078	4.2%	\$1,184,273	\$61,739	5.5%	
181 NEW MEXICO CONNECTIONS VIRTUAL (SANTA FE)	\$12,287,018	\$14,915,768	\$2,628,750	21.4%	\$15,913,343	\$997,575	6.7%	\$16,977,356	\$1,064,013	6.7%	\$18,072,176	\$1,094,820	6.4%	\$19,066,134	\$993,958	5.5%	
182 NEW MEXICO SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS ST. CH (SANTA FE)	\$2,245,331	\$2,323,318	\$77,987	3.5%	\$2,204,390	-\$118,928	-5.1%	\$2,062,836	-\$141,554	-6.4%	\$2,172,250	\$109,414	5.3%	\$2,291,723	\$119,473	5.5%	
183 NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$3,258,353	\$3,900,540	\$642,187	19.7%	\$4,088,691	\$188,151	4.8%	\$4,285,472	\$196,781	4.8%	\$4,481,321	\$195,849	4.6%	\$4,727,791	\$246,470	5.5%	
184 RED RIVER VALLEY (QUESTA)	\$751,490	\$965,046	\$213,556	28.4%	\$1,043,497	\$78,451	8.1%	\$1,127,923	\$84,426	8.1%	\$1,194,742	\$66,819	5.9%	\$1,260,452	\$65,710	5.5%	
185 ROOTS & WINGS (QUESTA)	\$480,562	\$573,568	\$93,006	19.4%	\$625,854	\$52,286	9.1%	\$682,367	\$56,513	9.0%	\$728,540	\$46,173	6.8%	\$768,609	\$40,069	5.5%	
186 SANDOVAL ACADEMY OF BIL ED SABA (RIO RANCHO)	\$779,278	\$819,180	\$39,902	5.1%	\$783,014	-\$36,166	-4.4%	\$739,565	-\$43,449	-5.5%	\$774,666	\$35,101	4.7%	\$817,272	\$42,606	5.5%	
187 SCHOOL OF DREAMS ST. CHARTER (LOS LUNAS)	\$3,909,884	\$4,410,150	\$500,266	12.8%	\$4,677,714	\$267,564	6.1%	\$4,961,630	\$283,916	6.1%	\$5,251,268	\$289,638	5.8%	\$5,540,084	\$288,816	5.5%	
188 SIX DIRECTIONS (GALLUP)	\$884,943	\$961,000	\$76,057	8.6%	\$950,217	-\$10,783	-1.1%	\$934,693	-\$15,524	-1.6%	\$980,173	\$45,480	4.9%	\$1,034,081	\$53,908	5.5%	
189 SOUTH VALLEY PREP ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$1,335,321	\$1,472,334	\$137,013	10.3%	\$1,489,299	\$16,965	1.2%	\$1,503,026	\$13,727	0.9%	\$1,586,236	\$83,210	5.5%	\$1,673,478	\$87,242	5.5%	
190 SOUTHWEST AER.,MATH & SCIENCE-SAMS (APS)	\$2,502,605	\$2,632,915	\$130,310	5.2%	\$2,523,623	-\$109,292	-4.2%	\$2,391,764	-\$131,859	-5.2%	\$2,483,627	\$91,863	3.8%	\$2,620,225	\$136,598	5.5%	
191 SOUTHWEST PREPATORY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$1,554,525	\$1,797,140	\$242,615	15.6%	\$1,883,673	\$86,533	4.8%	\$1,974,166	\$90,493	4.8%	\$2,086,429	\$112,263	5.7%	\$2,201,181	\$114,752	5.5%	
192 SOUTHWEST SECONDARY LEARNING CENTER (APS)	\$2,409,180	\$2,564,429	\$155,249	6.4%	\$2,483,031	-\$81,398	-3.2%	\$2,382,655	-\$100,376	-4.0%	\$2,521,156	\$138,501	5.8%	\$2,659,818	\$138,662	5.5%	
193 STUDENT ATHLETE HEADQUARTERS (SHAQ) (APS)	\$927,313	\$900,624	-\$26,689	-2.9%	\$788,900	-\$111,724	-12.4%	\$660,519	-\$128,381	-16.3%	\$685,772	\$25,253	3.8%	\$723,489	\$37,717	5.5%	
194 TAOS ACADEMY ST. CHARTER (TAOS)	\$2,047,676	\$2,160,425	\$112,749	5.5%	\$2,082,606	-\$77,819	-3.6%	\$1,987,697	-\$94,909	-4.6%	\$2,126,919	\$139,222	7.0%	\$2,243,898	\$116,979	5.5%	
195 TAOS INTEGRATED SCHOOL OF ARTS ST. (TAOS)	\$1,261,166	\$1,534,907	\$273,741	21.7%	\$1,561,620	\$26,713	1.7%	\$1,586,048	\$24,428	1.6%	\$1,651,055	\$65,007	4.1%	\$1,741,862	\$90,807	5.5%	
196 TAOS INTERNATIONAL (TAOS)	\$1,544,443	\$1,982,082	\$437,639	28.3%	\$2,146,675	\$164,593	8.3%	\$2,323,945	\$177,270	8.3%	\$2,484,983	\$161,038	6.9%	\$2,621,656	\$136,673	5.5%	
197 THE GREAT ACADEMY (APS)	\$1,727,466	\$1,638,445	-\$89,021	-5.2%	\$1,482,119	-\$156,326	-9.5%	\$1,301,128	-\$180,991	-12.2%	\$1,362,683	\$61,555	4.7%	\$1,437,629	\$74,946	5.5%	
198 TIERRA ADENTRO ST. CHARTER (APS)	\$2,807,880	\$2,970,750	\$162,870	5.8%	\$2,884,217	-\$86,533	-2.9%	\$2,776,637	-\$107,580	-3.7%	\$2,900,674	\$124,037	4.5%	\$3,060,209	\$159,535	5.5%	
199 TIERRA ENCANTADA CHARTER (SANTA FE)	\$2,797,606	\$3,072,443	\$274,837	9.8%	\$3,063,112	-\$9,331	-0.3%	\$3,041,647	-\$21,465	-0.7%	\$3,217,380	\$175,733	5.8%	\$3,394,333	\$176,953	5.5%	
200 TURQUOISE TRAIL (SANTA FE)	\$3,900,522	\$4,586,736	\$686,214	17.6%	\$4,825,034	\$238,298	5.2%	\$5,075,534	\$250,500	5.2%	\$5,327,041	\$251,507	5.0%	\$5,620,025	\$292,984	5.5%	
201 WALATOWA CHARTER HIGH (JEMEZ VALLEY)	\$592,998	\$696,931	\$103,933	17.5%	\$756,589	\$59,658	8.6%	\$820,919	\$64,330	8.5%	\$876,829	\$55,910	6.8%	\$925,054	\$48,225	5.5%	
202 STATEWIDE	\$2,616,707,973	\$3,139,580,217	\$522,872,244	20.0%	\$3,313,348,639	\$173,768,422	5.5%	\$3,495,693,041	\$182,344,402	5.5%	\$3,686,066,713	\$190,373,672	5.4%	\$3,888,798,048	\$202,731,335	5.5%	

Note: Statewide estimated program cost is based on the HAFY20 public school program cost recommendation and outyear revenue projections. Variance in individual school district and charter school program cost will depend on actual participation rates in K-5 Plus and extended learning time programs. Actual program costs will vary significantly based on student enrollment. The analysis shown assumes all school districts and charter schools implement extended learning time programs, only school districts and charter schools prioritized in the bill for K-5 Plus programs (i.e. schools with 80 percent or higher free and reduced fee lunch participation rates, D or F school grades in 2018, or existing K-3 Plus or K-5 Plus pilot programs) implement K-5 Plus programs, and all students over the age of 22 exit the system in FY20. Estimated program cost is the net program cost change after all adjustments for FY20 are implemented as written in the bill (at-risk index, K-5 Plus, extended learning time programs, size adjustment, and rural population factor) and includes other projected changes (75% T&E phase out and 25% TCI phase in). The analysis does not include projected changes in enrollment growth units or membership declines for FY20.