A Review of Senate Bill 1560

Prepared for:

Idaho Association of School Administrators

Prepared by:

The Matrix Group, Inc.
424 Sherman Avenue, Suite 208
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

October, 1999

INTRODUCTION

Idaho education in the 1980s and early 1990s was marred by mistrust and frustration. Small districts feared funds being shifted to larger school districts and large districts felt the small districts had all the advantages and power. North Idaho school districts felt that the south and eastern part of the state had the edge on everything. All recognized that the funding level for Idaho public education was inadequate. Numerous pieces of legislation were advanced; most failed and very little was gained by those that passed. These frustrations led to lawsuits being filed in 1990. After four years of bitter feelings and lawsuits being bounced from District Court to the Idaho Supreme Court and back to District Court, the Governor, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and legislative leadership set the stage for the ultimate change in the public school funding formula.

The state leaders relied upon superintendents to set aside their differences and find a solution to the funding formula problems. In turn, they promised a substantial increase in public school funding. Leaders evolved from the superintendent ranks and from legislative leadership; both became active in creating solutions. The solutions came in the form of legislation; the final piece of legislation was Senate Bill 1560.

The resulting funding formula has been in place for five years. The superintendents' Finance Committee, along with cooperation from IASA leadership, has contracted with "The Matrix Group" to review the results of Senate Bill 1560. The findings of this study follow and have been review for accuracy and completeness by many of the original authors of Senate Bill 1560. Those reviewing this study included; Steve Norton, Bob Haley, Dave Peck, Ed Davis, Don Armstrong, Phil Homer, Mike Friend and Jerry Evans.

The approach used to analyze the data in this report is to compare percent of change. This is an approach commonly used by many researchers. After an extensive review of the available research on school finance and discussions with researchers it was determined that this was the best approach to use in this study. It is recognized that there are many different approaches that can be used to analyze data, including that of an actual dollar comparison. Increases or decreases in actual dollars are included in this report and you may want to make those comparisons to arrive at your own conclusions.

SENATE BILL 1560
HISTORY AND REVIEW

BACKGROUND

In 1990, two lawsuits were filed in district court against the State of Idaho over the issue of school funding. One suit, Fraizer v. The State of Idaho, was led by the Meridian School District and included 18 other districts from around the state. Fraizer was a parent of children in the Meridian School District. In this suit, the plaintiffs claimed that under Article 9 Section 1 of the Idaho Constitution, the State was required to provide a uniform and thorough system of public free common schools. In this behalf, the Fraizer group asked the court to require the Idaho State Legislature to put in place a formula that reduced or eliminated the inequities identified in the suit. The other suit, ISEEO v. The State of Idaho, included approximately 33 school districts from around the state. ISEEO stands for "Idaho Schools for Equal Educational Opportunity". In this suit, the plaintiffs also claimed that the State of Idaho was not meeting its constitutional obligation, but their focus was mainly on the issue of thoroughness and later included the issue of adequate school facilities. In addition, the ISEEO group contended that it was not the formula that was causing the inequities in educational opportunity in Idaho, but rather that not enough money was being appropriated by the Legislature and thus asked the court to ensure adequate funding in the future.

Upon review, the district court dismissed these suits. The position of the district court judge was that these issues had been resolved in Thompson v. Engleking, a 1975 ruling by the Idaho Supreme Court. In this ruling, the Supreme Court held that the Idaho Constitution does not establish education as a fundamental right. It further held that the uniform clause was being met through the present educational funding formula.

The two plaintiff groups then joined forces and appealed this decision to the Idaho Supreme Court. Individual plaintiffs from Blaine County, Boise School District and State Superintendent, Jerry Evans, also joined in this appeal to the Supreme Court. In March 1993, the Idaho Supreme Court held that the issue of uniformity had been resolved in Thompson v. Engleking. However, the Court found that the plaintiffs in the lawsuit "have stated a claim upon which relief may be granted based on the thoroughness provisions of Article 9, Section 1" and remanded it back to district court for trail. District Court Judge Schroeder made it clear that he would not set a trial date until after the 1994 Legislative Session, in order to provide an opportunity for the issue to be resolved in a non-judicial forum.

In March 1993, the State Legislature formed a "Select Committee on Thoroughness" to define thoroughness and look for solutions to the school funding problems. This committee was chaired by Senator John Hanson and Representative Ron Black. The committee held public hearings around the State of Idaho in the spring and summer of 1993. They developed a

definition of thoroughness (I.C. 33-1612) that became law during the 1994 Legislative Session. They were not successful in suggesting solutions to the school funding problems.

In the spring of 1993, Governor Cecil Andrus and State Superintendent Jerry Evans formed a committee of educational professionals and leaders to define thoroughness and to make a recommendation to them on how to resolve the lawsuits. This committee held meetings until October of 1993 and presented the Governor with a definition of thoroughness and some possible solutions to the funding formula.

In November 1993, Steve Norton, Superintendent of the Blackfoot School District and one of the co-chairs of the Fraizer group, was contacted by Speaker of the House, Mike Simpson and President Pro Tem, Jerry Twiggs and asked to attend a meeting with them. Both the Speaker and Pro Tem were legislative representatives of the Blackfoot School District. They asked that Steve and a couple of his trustees meet with them to talk about the lawsuits. In this meeting the Speaker and Pro Tem urged Steve to make an effort to get all plaintiffs to come together and agree on solutions to the school funding problems. If this could be done, the Speaker and Pro Tem would work to add $95 million to the 1994 education appropriation. In addition, if the majority of the superintendents across the state agreed on a plan, they would see that the plan would be voted on by legislators during the 1994 Legislative Session.

Steve Norton contacted the Fraizer group co-chairman Bob Haley and a plan was developed to bring all plaintiffs together at a central location. State Superintendent Jerry Evans was asked to facilitate the joint plaintiff meetings. The first meeting took place on December 20,1993 and some agreements were reached on how the formula should be changed. A number of meetings were held throughout December and early January to pull together a plan to change the public school funding formula. The funding formula for the State of Washington was used as a model for the change. Ultimately, the best of the Washington formula was merged with the best of the Idaho plan to formulate a new funding formula for the State of Idaho.

Once a proposal was formalized, it was presented to the Legislative Select Committee for suggestions. The proposal asked the legislature to commit approximately $96 million in new money to education. It was assumed that there would be no increase in local property tax. It was stated that to have a thorough system of education the legislature needed to commit to an appropriation of at least 50% of the annual state revenue. The select committee was informed that the plan would not include the areas of transportation, facilities or technology. After a number of minor revisions, the plan was presented at the Idaho School Superintendents Association annual meeting on January 31, 1994 for review and suggestions. Even though there were a few superintendents adamantly opposed to the plan, about 90% of the superintendents recommended taking the plan to the legislature for enactment.

PLAINTIFF AGREEMENTS:

1. All districts would receive at least an 8% increase in foundation funding for the 1994-95 school year.

2. A statewide salary and employee allocation system would be used. This allocation system would not include personnel from food service, transportation or federally funded programs. The allocation system was designed to reduce inequities in the average number of pupils per employee and salaries paid in districts.

3. Support units would be used as the basis of determining employee allocations. Support units would be used because they already take into account differences in district sizes.

4. To determine employee allocations the support units would be multiplied by 1.10 for instructional personnel, by .375 for classified employees and by .075 for administrative staff. The multipliers were determined by using the 1992-93 ratio of instructional, classified and administration to support units. It was recognized that these allocations might not provide enough instructional and administrative staff for districts with less than 40 support units. Therefore, these districts would be allowed an additional .5 instructional staff and an additional .5 administrative staff. Additionally, for any district with less than 20 support units another .5 instructional staff would be added.

5. A statewide salary allocation system would be used. Plaintiff members reviewed salary schedules from several districts in Idaho and found that no two were the same. The advantages and disadvantages of each were discussed and a compromise was reached to use the one in place today. The salary grid/index would have seven educational columns and 13 experience steps. Each column and step would increase by 3.75% and be progressive.

   When all 1993-94 state instructional staff were placed on this grid, the state experience and educational index was 1.4849. Each district index would be determined by placing all instructional staff on this same grid (See Idaho Code, 33-1004A). Because the cost was so great a three-year phase in would be necessary, due to the number of districts above the state average.

6. A state instructional salary schedule would be used, and the annual state average salary would be 82% of the national average teacher salary for the previous year. In 1993, Richard Slaughter Associates did a study of average salaries in Idaho as compared to national average salaries for other professional workers. It was a study of salaries from 1970 to 1992, using information taken from Labor Statistics and from the National Education Association comparative statistics. The study determined that average salaries

for other professionals in Idaho were about 85% of the national average salaries for other professional employees. It also revealed that over this same period of time the average teacher salary in Idaho was about 80% of the national average salary for teachers. The plaintiff group set an annual goal of 82% of the national average salary because there was not enough money available to reach the eighty-five percent level. Comparison to the previous year had to be used because data are not available for 12 to 18 months after the end of the fiscal year.

Eighty-two percent of the 1992-93 national average salary was $28,700 which was about $1,700 above the 1992-93 Idaho average instructional salary. By dividing $28,700 by the experience and educational index of 1.4849 a base salary of $19,328 was determined.

7. The administrative salary base would be set at 82% of the national average teachers salary for 1992-93 which was $28,700. The classified salary base was set at $15,000. Classified salaries from districts around Idaho were studied, compared and averaged. This was an area were some classified employees started at minimum wage and others received a much higher salary as a classified supervisor. The plaintiff group decided that a $15,000 base salary for classified employees best represented the wide range of classified salaries.

8. Salary allocation formulas for 1994-95 would be:

   Administrative salary allocation = support units * .075 * district average index * $28,700
   Instructional salary allocation = support units * 1.10 * district average index * $19,328
   Classified salary allocation = support units * .375 * $15,000

9. A "use it or lose it" clause for instructional and administrative staff would be included with the allocation of staff and salaries. In the administrative allocation, 20% could be used for non-certified administrators. An appeal process would be provided in case of hardship situations. The "use it or lose it" clause was provided to reduce inequities caused by districts not using salary allocation for salaries.

10. PERSI and FICA allocations would be made to each district, in direct relation to the total salary allocation. PERSI and FICA payments would no longer be taken off the top of the state appropriation.

11. After salary allocation and deduction for all other statutory requirements and program enhancements, the remaining appropriation and local property taxes would be divided by the total number of state support units to determine the allocation per support unit. These

are the discretionary funds or funds necessary to meet the other operational needs of the school district.

12. Local property taxes would be fully equalized. This has the same effect as collecting the .4% local property taxes at the state level and distributing it through the formula.

13. The unit divisor for grades 1-3 for districts over 300 elementary students would be moved from 23 to 20, phased in over three years.

14. Special education funding would no longer be taken off the top of the state appropriation as a separate line item, but instead, would become the responsibility of each district to provide from its allocation.

15. Funding of separate schools would be studied during the 1994-95 school year to see if it actually costs more to run separate schools. Legislation would be proposed to make corrections in this area, if the findings of the study warranted such action.

GOALS:

1. Increase Idaho teacher salaries to 82% of the previous year national average salary and maintain or improve that level over time.

2. Decrease inequities in per pupil spending across the state.

3. Decrease inequities in teacher salaries across the state.

4. Decrease the average number of students per teacher across the state.

LEGISLATION:

The plaintiff agreements were written into legislation that became Senate Bill 1451 and was presented in the Senate Education Committee. After lengthy debate Senate Bill 1451 was held in committee.

Two main reasons were given for holding the bill in committee. First, legislators could not agree to having average Idaho teacher salaries be 82% of the previous year national average teacher salary each year. They could agree to a starting point of 82% of the national average salary but did not want to commit to that on a long-term basis. Second, legislators did not want a statewide salary schedule. They felt that this would cause the legislature to have to negotiate with the IEA each year.

A few days after the bill was held in committee, President Pro Tem Twiggs and Senator John Hansen requested that the plaintiff leaders meet with them. In this meeting they asked that the statewide salary schedule be dropped and the average salaries not be tied to the national average. This was agreeable to the plaintiffs because the index included in the bill represented a salary schedule when a base salary was plugged into the first step of the index. In addition, they asked that the proposed legislation be expanded to include funding in support of the recent legislation defining thoroughness. They requested subsections h, I, j, k and l be added to I.C. 33-1002 (2) as follows:

h. For the support of provisions that provide a safe environment conducive to student learning and maintain classroom discipline, an allocation of $300 per support unit;

I. For programs to provide basic curriculum necessary to enable students to enter academic or vocational post secondary education programs, an allocation of $300 per support unit for the 1994-95 school year only;

j. For provision of teacher supplies to facilitate classroom instruction, an allocation of $200 per support unit for the 1994-95 school year only;

k. For expenditure as provided by the public school technology program, $10,400,000 for the 1994-95 year;

l. For additional school innovation pilot project grants based on recommendations of the Idaho school reform committee, $2,000,000 for the 1994-95 school year.

After much discussion and contact with other educational leaders, the plaintiff leaders

agreed to make these proposed changes to the legislation. The result was a new bill which became Senate Bill 1560. After many hours of meetings to educate legislators and others, SB 1560 was finally introduced and passed both the Idaho Senate and Idaho House of Representatives.

AMENDMENTS TO IDAHO CODE:

Everyone knew that the passage of any major legislation would require some adjustments to meet the needs of the majority of the school districts. The ISSA Finance Committee has monitored requested adjustments for the past five years. The following are the changes everyone agreed should be made to the statutes that were put in place with Senate Bill 1560:

1. An addition to 33-1004 in 1995 was subsection 5 (a) which reads: In determining the number of staff in subsections 2., 3. and 4. of this section, a district may contract separately for services to be rendered by nondistrict employees and such employees may be counted in the staff allowance. A "nondistrict employee" means a person for whom the school district does not pay the employer's obligations for employee benefits. When a district contracts for the services of a nondistrict employee, only the salary portion of the contract shall be allowable for computations.

2. An addition to 33-1004 in 1995 was subsection 6 which reads: In the event that the staff allowance in any category is insufficient to meet accreditation standards, a district may appeal to the State Board of Education, demonstrating the insufficiency, and the State Board may grant a waiver authorizing sufficient additional staff to be included within the staff allowance to meet accreditations standards. Such a waiver shall be limited to one year, but may be renewed upon showing of continuing justification.

3. The addition of 33-1003B in 1995 allowed in the application of the provisions of the education support program, that no district's distribution shall be less in any year than ninety percent (90%) of the distribution of state educational dollars less special program allocations received by that district in the immediately preceding year.

ANALYSIS OF DATA:

Goal 1. Increase Idaho teacher salaries to 82% of the previous year national average salary and maintain or improve that level over time.

Review of data taken from the Idaho School Profiles and the National Education Association's Comparative Statistics reveals that the average Idaho teacher salary in 1994-95 was $29,802 or 83.4% of the 1993-94 national average salary for teachers. This exceeds the plaintiff group goal by over one percent. Additionally, the average Idaho teacher salary in 1997-

98 was $32,831 which is 85.26% of the 1996-97 national average salary for teachers. The goal of maintaining or improving on the 82% level has been achieved.

Date	National Average Teacher Salary	Idaho Average Teacher Salary	Percent of National Average
1991-92	$34,063		
1992-93	$35,029	$27,011	79.30%
1993-94	$35,733	$27,756	79.24%
1994-95	$36,609	$29,802	83.40%
1995-96	$37,560	$30,891	84.38
1996-97	$38,509	$31,818	84.71%
1997-98		$32,831	85.26%

Goal 2. Decrease inequities in per pupil spending across the state.

Disparity exists in per pupil expenditure across the state. In the examination of per pupil spending, the districts were placed in rank order in terms of expenditure per average daily attendance (ADA) in 1993-94 and again in 1997-98. A comparison then was made between 10% of the districts with the highest expenditure per ADA and the 10% with the lowest expenditure per ADA in each of those years. The 11 districts with the highest expenditure per ADA in 1993-94 had an average expenditure of $5,880 per ADA. The 11 districts with the lowest expenditure per ADA in 1993-94 had an average expenditure of $2,692 per ADA. This means there was a disparity of 118%. In 1997-98 the 11 districts with the highest expenditure per ADA had an average expenditure of $7,141 per ADA and the districts with the lowest expenditure per ADA had an average expenditure of $3,842 per ADA. This is a disparity of 86%. In further review of the issue, a direct comparison of actual dollars reveals that a significant gap between the high average expenditure and the low average expenditure remains.

A note of interest is that in 1993-94 the 11 districts with the highest expenditure per ADA had a total of $851,761 in supplemental levies compared to $1,561,727 for the 11 districts with the lowest expenditure per ADA. In 1997-98 the 11 districts with the highest expenditure per ADA had supplemental levies of $3,361,937 and the 11 with the lowest expenditure per ADA had only $743,000 in supplemental levies. It would appear that after the passage of Senate Bill 1560 those districts with high levels of expenditure per ADA had to rely more

heavily upon supplemental levies.

Goal 3. Decrease inequities in teacher salaries across the state.

Disparity exists in teachers salaries across the state. To make a comparison of teacher salaries, the average teacher salary by district was placed in rank order for 1993-94 and 1997-98. The average salaries for 10% of the districts at each end of the rank order were compared. The 11 districts with the highest salaries had an average teacher salary of $31,696 in 1993-94 and the lowest 11 districts had an average of $21,757. This is a disparity of 45.68%. In 1997-98, the 11 districts with the highest salaries had an average teacher salary of $37,064 and the 11 districts with the lowest salaries had an average salary of $25,874. This is a disparity of 43.25%. A direct comparison of real dollars reveals that a significant gap between the high average salary and the low average salary remains.

Goal 4. Decrease the average number of students per teacher across the state.

Comparisons in this area are made using data taken from the Idaho School Profiles for 1993-94 and 1997-98. In 1993-94 the average number of elementary students per FTE was 18, per secondary FTE it was 15 and per total certified FTE it was 16. In 1997-98 the average number of elementary students per FTE was 18, per secondary FTE it was 17 and per total certified FTE it was 15. An analysis of these data would tell us that no gains were made in elementary students per FTE, an increase of two students per FTE occurred in secondary and a decrease of one student per FTE when compared to all certified staff. At the secondary level 48 districts had a decrease in students per FTE, 44 districts had an increase and 20 stayed the same. At the elementary level 56 districts had a decrease in students per FTE, 27 districts had a increase and 29 stayed the same. This means there is a considerable shift in average class sizes among school districts. This was caused by significant increases or decreases in student population by district and by the number of staff added as a result of SB 1560 in some school districts.

These results are not surprising considering that an index of 1.1 was determined by using a ratio of support units to teachers for the 1992-93 school year. In order to see a significant reduction in students per teacher, the index should have been larger than that determined for 1992-93.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Continue to emphasize the need to increase the base salary for teachers each year in order to have Idaho average teacher salaries remain at least 85% of the national average teacher

salary for the previous year.

2. The causes of disparity in school funding should be explored.

3. If decreasing class size remains a long-term goal or if state mandates increase the required number of certified employees, the teacher allocation index of 1.1 should be slowly increased over time. Consideration could be given to having a different index for secondary than for elementary or even a different index for grades K-3 in order to reduce class sizes at a specific level. Any change should be studied as to the impact on individual school districts, then phased in over time, if warranted.

   Many superintendents are also concerned that the salary allocation for classified personnel is not sufficient to meet the needs of their districts. This could also be corrected over time by increasing the classified index of .375. It should be increased over a three or four year period to become .400. Numbers of classified personnel have increased over the last five years by 24.86%. This is mostly due to an increased need for special education aides.

4. Consideration should be given to allowing districts with less than 20 support units to apply through the State Department of Education to waive the "use it or lose it" clause in relation to administration. This would require passage of legislation allowing the waiver upon approval of the State Department.

GENERAL INFORMATION:

* Increase in full term ADA from 1993-94 to 1997-98 was 2.89 %. This is an increase of 7,629 students. Four districts gained more than 20% in ADA while 52 districts lost more than one percent of their ADA.

* In 1993-94 there were 51 districts using supplemental levies and in 1997-98 forty-five districts had supplemental levies. However, the total dollars generated by these levies increased by 18.84%.

* From 1993 to 1997 the market values increased by 52.83%. Fifteen districts had an increase of more than 70% in market value.

* From 1993-94 to 1997-98 the certified FTE's increased by 11.39%, while classified FTE's increased by 24.86% (largely due to a big increase in special education aides) and

administrative FTE's increased by 14.01%. Administration did not increase more than the certified, but instead the reporting changed. For example, prior to Senate Bill 1560 employees such as athletic directors, curriculum coordinators and others who taught part time and had administrative duties part time were reported as full time teachers. After the passage of Senate Bill 1560 these people are now reported as part time teachers and part time administrators. Also, part of the increase in administrative FTE was due to the addition of 36 new school sites during the study period.

* In 1993-94 elementary and secondary counselors totaled 387 FTE's. This is a ratio of one FTE counselor to 612 students. One year later there were 478 FTE counselors and in 1997-98 there were 558 FTE counselors. The ratio for 1997-98 dropped to 438 students per counselor. Which means the ratio is now about 71% of what it was in 1993-94. At that time there were not very many counselors in the elementary schools and the districts were working to meet a state mandate of at least one counselor per building. This has also had an effect on class sizes because several of the instructional allocations went to hiring counselors.

CONCLUSIONS:

Senate Bill 1560 was good for school funding in the State of Idaho. Teacher salaries have increased by 4.29% (compound annual growth between the 1993-94 and 1997-98 school years) and are now at 85.26% of the previous year national average salary for teachers. This occurred because of the way the formula is designed, providing for full equalization of local property taxes, the 52.83% increase in market value provided the necessary revenue to increase salary levels. While Senate Bill 1560 decreased proportional disparities in per pupil spending and teacher salaries, significant disparities in actual dollars continue to exist.

Even though it did not result in a significant decrease in the number of students per teacher, the formula is designed to decrease class sizes by increasing the instructional staff allocation. The recommendations above should be studied and implemented over the next five years.

APPENDIX

The following pages contain the data used in this study. These data were provided by the State Department of Education as published in the Idaho School Profiles, the Financial Summaries, and the Tax Levies for School Purposes. Additional information was taken from the IBEDS report as prepared by school districts each year.

Definition of Terms:

1. **Elementary**

   Includes students in grades K-6 and teachers teaching in grades K-6.

2. **Secondary**

   Includes students in grades 7-12 and teachers teaching in grades 7-12.

3. **Administrator**

   Includes superintendents, assistant superintendents, directors, supervisors, coordinators, principals, assistant principals, and athletic directors.

4. **Other Certified**

   Includes counselors, nurses, social workers and psychologists.

5. **Certified**

   Includes all of the four categories above.

6. **Classified (Non-certified)**

   Includes support staff such as secretaries, custodians and classroom assistants.

TABLE 1

District #	District Name	93–94 Full Term A.D.A.	97–98 Full Term A.D.A	% of Change	93–94 M&O Expend Per A.D.A.	97–98 M&O Expend Per A.D.A.	% of Change
1	BOISE	24,859.64	25,260.38	1.61%	3,834	5,382	40.38%
2	MERIDIAN	16,194.27	19,876.64	22.74%	2,668	3,831	43.59%
3	KUNA	2,155.42	2,425.13	12.51%	2,833	3,901	37.70%
11	MEADOWS VALLEY	244.42	215.63	−11.78%	4,104	5,927	44.42%
13	COUNCIL	384.50	381.56	−0.76%	3,831	5,727	49.49%
21	MARSH VALLEY	1,601.09	1,533.95	−4.19%	3,304	4,428	34.02%
25	POCATELLO	13,122.16	12,399.49	−5.51%	2,970	4,244	42.90%
33	BEAR LAKE	1,632.16	1,624.98	−0.44%	3,250	4,351	33.88%
41	ST. MARIES	1,226.00	1,200.74	−2.06%	3,685	4,787	29.91%
44	PLUMMER/WORLEY JT.	465.35	462.31	−0.65%	5,054	5,869	16.13%
52	SNAKE RIVER	2,395.47	2,224.34	−7.14%	2,815	3,944	40.11%
55	BLACKFOOT	4,292.43	4,149.84	−3.32%	3,124	4,492	43.79%
58	ABERDEEN	912.52	918.81	0.69%	3,144	4,209	33.87%
59	FIRTH	1,037.10	986.20	−4.91%	2,772	4,189	51.12%
60	SHELLEY	2,282.31	2,087.33	−8.54%	2,605	3,940	51.25%
61	BLAINE CO.	2,507.05	2,682.70	7.01%	4,995	6,828	36.70%
71	GARDEN VALLEY	278.51	299.52	7.54%	3,842	5,370	39.77%
72	BASIN	265.18	446.70	68.45%	4,135	5,615	35.79%
73	HORSESHOE BEND	291.27	290.92	−0.12%	4,021	5,674	41.11%
82	BONNER CO.	5,502.98	5,551.13	0.87%	3,157	4,272	35.32%
91	IDAHO FALLS	10,664.83	10,246.56	−3.92%	3,289	4,400	33.78%
92	SWAN VALLEY	95.34	64.09	−32.78%	5,034	8,106	61.03%
93	BONNEVILLE	7,363.35	7,381.29	0.24%	2,745	3,890	41.71%
101	BOUNDARY CO.	1,641.39	1,545.58	−5.84%	3,426	4,837	41.19%
111	BUTTE CO.	705.94	636.71	−9.81%	3,712	4,913	32.35%
121	CAMAS CO.	174.68	186.34	6.68%	5,191	6,482	24.87%
131	NAMPA	7,784.62	8,753.68	12.45%	2,757	3,959	43.60%
132	CALDWELL	4,632.11	4,834.81	4.38%	2,753	4,117	49.55%
133	WILDER	458.06	503.03	9.82%	3,668	4,955	35.09%
134	MIDDLETON	1,804.63	1,960.35	8.63%	2,894	3,921	35.49%
135	NOTUS	333.89	358.56	7.39%	3,536	5,592	58.14%
136	MELBA	637.99	642.65	0.73%	3,092	4,809	55.53%
137	PARMA	891.72	944.02	5.87%	3,156	4,239	34.32%
139	VALLIVUE	2,718.75	3,016.85	10.96%	3,261	4,534	39.04%
148	GRACE	654.95	593.90	−9.32%	3,385	5,349	58.02%
149	NORTH GEM	213.09	197.87	−7.14%	4,601	6,184	34.41%
150	SODA SPRINGS	1,291.19	1,153.05	−10.70%	3,352	4,850	44.69%
151	CASSIA CO.	5,109.77	4,976.25	−2.61%	2,931	4,206	43.50%
161	CLARK CO.	208.07	196.09	−5.76%	4,109	5,789	40.89%
171	OROFINO	1,643.60	1,549.61	−5.72%	3,836	5,569	45.18%
181	CHALLIS	536.38	597.41	11.38%	4,336	5,534	27.63%
182	MACKAY	299.76	275.20	−8.19%	3,831	5,532	44.40%
191	PRAIRIE ELEM.	11.68	9.28	−20.55%	4,012	6,081	51.57%
192	GLENNS FERRY	624.25	615.26	−1.44%	3,232	5,118	58.35%
193	MOUNTIAN HOME	3,885.95	4,220.67	8.61%	3,290	4,262	29.54%
201	PRESTON	2,198.66	2,240.35	1.90%	2,587	3,609	39.51%
202	WEST SIDE	596.16	582.59	−2.28%	3,089	4,217	36.52%
215	FREMONT CO.	2,596.36	2,478.88	−4.52%	3,374	4,344	28.75%
221	EMMETT	2,578.84	2,833.97	9.89%	2,790	4,053	45.27%
231	GOODING	1,079.49	1,249.26	15.73%	3,008	4,160	38.30%
232	WENDELL	954.41	1,028.44	7.76%	3,031	4,265	40.71%
233	HAGERMAN	376.78	396.01	5.10%	3,059	4,716	54.17%
234	BLISS	195.14	167.22	−14.31%	3,761	6,019	60.04%
241	GRANGEVILLE	1,974.96	1,848.87	−6.38%	4,112	5,306	29.04%
242	COTTONWOOD	498.81	481.31	−3.51%	4,022	5,424	34.86%
251	JEFFERSON CO.	3,931.33	3,855.81	−1.92%	2,743	3,905	42.36%
252	RIRIE	703.54	718.78	2.17%	3,044	4,341	42.61%
253	W. JEFFERSON	754.28	707.53	−6.20%	3,218	4,504	39.96%

TABLE 1

District #	District Name	93–94 Full Term A.D.A.	97–98 Full Term A.D.A	% of Change	93–94 M&O Expend Per A.D.A.	97–98 M&O Expend Per A.D.A.	% of Change
261	JEROME	2,852.99	2,895.12	1.48%	2,783	3,815	37.08%
262	VALLEY	646.41	670.94	3.79%	3,353	4,325	28.99%
271	COEUR D'ALENE	7,741.50	8,382.99	8.29%	3,286	4,105	24.92%
272	LAKELAND	2,941.91	3,633.57	23.51%	2,848	3,726	30.83%
273	POST FALLS	3,416.32	3,885.26	13.73%	2,973	4,022	35.28%
274	KOOTENAI	278.81	290.68	4.26%	4,395	6,036	37.34%
281	MOSCOW	2,584.15	2,506.15	−3.02%	4,294	5,673	32.11%
282	GENESEE	289.09	318.57	10.20%	4,359	6,071	39.28%
283	KENDRICK	350.47	358.39	2.26%	3,893	5,625	44.49%
285	POTLATCH	584.08	587.12	0.52%	4,321	5,755	33.19%
286	WHITEPINE	650.38	642.79	−1.17%	4,312	6,649	54.20%
291	SALMON	1,177.67	1,273.69	8.15%	2,935	4,151	41.43%
292	SO. LEMHI	139.94	160.62	14.78%	5,321	6,085	14.36%
302	NEZPERCE	190.55	208.05	9.18%	5,941	7,148	20.32%
304	KAMIAH	623.92	607.20	−2.68%	3,405	5,162	51.60%
305	HIGHLAND	325.01	258.59	−20.44%	4,286	7,036	64.16%
312	SHOSHONE	403.37	420.76	4.31%	3,672	5,522	50.38%
314	DIETRICH	196.71	199.87	1.61%	3,696	5,611	51.81%
316	RICHFIELD	210.55	188.99	−10.24%	3,896	6,513	67.17%
321	MADISON	4,201.75	3,957.63	−5.81%	2,622	3,948	50.57%
322	SUGAR–SALEM	1,540.63	1,394.83	−9.46%	3,068	4,285	39.67%
331	MINIDOKA CO.	5,089.21	4,690.66	−7.83%	2,789	3,976	42.56%
340	LEWISTON	4,552.03	4,920.72	8.10%	4,290	5,682	32.45%
341	LAPWAI	494.54	481.75	−2.59%	5,294	7,133	34.74%
342	CULDESAC	196.04	224.11	14.32%	4,604	6,087	32.21%
343	TAMMANY	336.80		−100.00%	3,505		−100.00%
351	ONEIDA	957.33	980.25	2.39%	3,035	4,348	43.26%
363	MARSING	634.12	666.14	5.05%	3,441	4,705	36.73%
364	PLEASANT VALLY	26.58	25.41	−4.40%	8,874	10,082	13.61%
365	BRUNEAU GR–VIEW	587.56	557.39	−5.13%	4,074	5,537	35.91%
370	HOMEDALE	1,109.74	1,175.17	5.90%	2,774	4,190	51.05%
371	PAYETTE	1,701.76	1,811.90	6.47%	3,016	4,112	36.34%
372	NEW PLYMOUTH	859.95	944.33	9.81%	2,991	4,333	44.87%
373	FRUITLAND	1,194.26	1,287.33	7.79%	2,742	4,080	48.80%
381	AMERICAN FALLS	1,548.73	1,632.54	5.41%	4,064	5,016	23.43%
382	ROCKLAND	189.84	169.44	−10.75%	6,965	6,682	−4.06%
383	ARBON ELEM.	21.23	18.79	−11.49%	5,902	8,165	38.34%
391	KELLOGG	1,525.32	1,427.94	−6.38%	3,921	5,279	34.63%
392	MULLAN	199.54	161.97	−18.83%	5,552	8,627	55.39%
393	WALLACE	790.24	725.74	−8.16%	4,546	6,652	46.33%
394	AVERY	41.04	31.18	−24.03%	9,949	18,039	81.31%
401	TETON CO.	971.73	1,194.77	22.95%	3,244	3,767	16.12%
411	TWIN FALLS	6,611.09	6,746.15	2.04%	2,635	3,950	49.91%
412	BUHL	1,473.63	1,359.72	−7.73%	2,996	4,590	53.20%
413	FILER	1,101.36	1,274.73	15.74%	3,065	4,016	31.03%
414	KIMBERLY	1,057.40	1,201.81	13.66%	2,754	4,221	53.27%
415	HANSEN	358.73	351.50	−2.02%	3,326	4,900	47.32%
416	THREE CREEK	7.95	5.99	−24.65%	7,813	6,000	−23.20%
417	CASTLEFORD	282.98	328.03	15.92%	3,867	4,740	22.58%
418	MURTAUGH	309.08	264.09	−14.56%	3,443	5,967	73.31%
421	MCCALL DONNELLY	1,129.52	1,071.75	−5.11%	4,285	5,936	38.53%
422	CASCADE	366.37	380.51	3.86%	3,960	6,014	51.87%
431	WEISER	1,562.47	1,544.99	−1.12%	2,891	4,317	49.33%
432	CAMBRIDGE	274.60	264.17	−3.80%	3,854	6,290	63.21%
433	MIDVALE	95.48	118.52	24.13%	6,654	8,927	34.16%
STATEWIDE TOTALS/AVERAGES		223,479.04	229,947.73	2.89%	3,234	4,493	38.92%

TABLE 2

District #	District Name	93-94 Supplemental Levy	97-98 Supplemental Levy	% of Change	93-94 Market Value	97-98 Market Value	% of Change
1	BOISE	7,707,996	10,707,999	38.92%	5,575,662,439	9,001,601,753	61.44%
2	MERIDIAN	0	0	0.00%	1,945,344,797	3,696,887,343	90.04%
3	KUNA	0	0	0.00%	174,034,280	315,119,037	81.07%
11	MEADOWS VALLEY	0	0	0.00%	69,735,815	113,263,690	62.42%
13	COUNCIL	0	0	0.00%	60,538,526	88,089,271	45.51%
21	MARSH VALLEY	0	0	0.00%	165,809,361	232,388,015	40.15%
25	POCATELLO	3,357,000	3,357,000	0.00%	1,108,967,917	1,533,866,188	38.31%
33	BEAR LAKE	200,000	0	-100.00%	187,417,482	246,367,756	31.45%
41	ST. MARIES	395,000	335,000	-15.19%	205,326,325	316,081,506	53.94%
44	PLUMMER/WORLEY JT.	0	0	0.00%	183,751,325	292,170,547	59.00%
52	SNAKE RIVER	325,000	0	-100.00%	161,404,637	191,036,816	18.36%
55	BLACKFOOT	975,000	975,000	0.00%	332,101,322	362,906,510	9.28%
58	ABERDEEN	225,000	225,000	0.00%	140,982,595	162,467,797	15.24%
59	FIRTH	150,000	0	-100.00%	86,178,746	105,897,786	22.88%
60	SHELLEY	279,179	0	-100.00%	146,098,604	177,443,672	21.45%
61	BLAINE CO.	2,599,999	2,599,999	0.00%	2,343,530,487	3,906,412,354	66.69%
71	GARDEN VALLEY	0	0	0.00%	89,017,403	125,281,906	40.74%
72	BASIN	0	0	0.00%	81,977,283	120,467,920	46.95%
73	HORSESHOE BEND	0	0	0.00%	44,016,532	78,009,817	77.23%
82	BONNER CO.	0	964,919	0.00%	1,456,271,134	2,483,129,329	70.51%
91	IDAHO FALLS	4,950,001	5,850,000	18.18%	1,192,230,553	1,469,378,036	23.25%
92	SWAN VALLEY	0	0	0.00%	29,969,994	44,303,109	47.82%
93	BONNEVILLE	0	0	0.00%	509,722,532	701,919,860	37.71%
101	BOUNDARY CO.	295,000	439,000	48.81%	303,091,914	465,573,000	53.61%
111	BUTTE CO.	70,000	90,000	28.57%	91,609,307	100,997,264	10.25%
121	CAMAS CO.	75,801	50,000	-34.04%	42,841,087	75,562,829	76.38%
131	NAMPA	600,000	0	-100.00%	843,398,999	1,337,680,045	58.61%
132	CALDWELL	682,548	682,000	-0.08%	467,173,899	674,941,721	44.47%
133	WILDER	126,251	175,847	39.28%	66,833,201	101,954,794	52.55%
134	MIDDLETON	0	0	0.00%	129,467,051	232,034,286	79.22%
135	NOTUS	25,000	0	-100.00%	32,115,781	41,580,321	29.47%
136	MELBA	0	0	0.00%	72,702,263	102,955,521	41.61%
137	PARMA	180,000	150,000	-16.67%	99,549,715	137,819,819	38.44%
139	VALLIVUE	600,000	750,000	25.00%	443,851,289	627,743,387	41.43%
148	GRACE	0	0	0.00%	76,967,738	82,238,749	6.85%
149	NORTH GEM	75,000	75,000	0.00%	70,237,189	75,651,520	7.71%
150	SODA SPRINGS	0	400,000	0.00%	391,203,621	373,657,040	-4.49%
151	CASSIA CO.	625,000	623,435	-0.25%	590,022,555	797,826,703	35.22%
161	CLARK CO.	0	0	0.00%	68,020,772	86,135,357	26.63%
171	OROFINO	820,085	820,085	0.00%	269,945,299	455,197,179	68.63%
181	CHALLIS	0	0	0.00%	173,706,961	350,612,140	101.84%
182	MACKAY	0	0	0.00%	39,798,061	62,741,957	57.65%
191	PRAIRIE ELEM.	0	0	0.00%	4,717,227	5,666,978	20.13%
192	GLENNS FERRY	0	0	0.00%	126,474,066	174,756,898	38.18%
193	MOUNTIAN HOME	0	0	0.00%	323,172,189	462,491,570	43.11%
201	PRESTON	0	0	0.00%	158,825,951	191,900,029	20.82%
202	WEST SIDE	97,000	97,000	0.00%	49,281,287	56,253,048	14.15%
215	FREMONT CO.	300,000	0	-100.00%	332,524,920	558,100,860	67.84%
221	EMMETT	0	0	0.00%	273,220,883	436,444,974	59.74%
231	GOODING	0	0	0.00%	122,239,536	189,324,181	54.88%
232	WENDELL	0	0	0.00%	95,955,349	148,036,967	54.28%
233	HAGERMAN	0	0	0.00%	60,463,141	90,547,668	49.76%
234	BLISS	0	0	0.00%	30,834,945	41,636,464	35.03%
241	GRANGEVILLE	0	0	0.00%	338,271,795	511,494,131	51.21%
242	COTTONWOOD	0	0	0.00%	69,979,033	100,532,209	43.66%
251	JEFFERSON CO.	0	0	0.00%	256,001,826	333,121,517	30.12%
252	RIRIE	0	0	0.00%	50,325,809	65,432,785	30.02%
253	W. JEFFERSON	0	0	0.00%	101,444,286	115,508,393	13.86%

TABLE 2

District #	District Name	93–94 Supplemental Levy	97–98 Supplemental Levy	% of Change	93–94 Market Value	97–98 Market Value	% of Change
261	JEROME	0	0	0.00%	320,753,568	459,669,932	43.31%
262	VALLEY	0	0	0.00%	105,308,214	130,356,700	23.79%
271	COEUR D'ALENE	2,476,001	2,975,998	20.19%	1,958,721,793	2,975,462,532	51.91%
272	LAKELAND	18,000	743,000	4027.78%	448,651,741	873,858,624	94.77%
273	POST FALLS	450,000	500,000	11.11%	496,431,533	880,958,174	77.46%
274	KOOTENAI	196,000	175,000	−10.71%	112,858,916	211,632,891	87.52%
281	MOSCOW	3,796,000	4,546,000	19.76%	462,140,977	658,618,851	42.51%
282	GENESEE	238,016	253,829	6.64%	82,446,787	107,405,983	30.27%
283	KENDRICK	160,000	220,000	37.50%	61,388,645	86,132,198	40.31%
285	POTLATCH	430,000	320,000	−25.58%	99,274,750	154,544,699	55.67%
286	WHITEPINE	450,000	475,000	5.56%	117,405,482	232,816,494	98.30%
291	SALMON	0	0	0.00%	197,740,422	383,613,924	94.00%
292	SO. LEMHI	0	0	0.00%	35,267,574	51,006,050	44.63%
302	NEZPERCE	258,960	200,000	−22.77%	72,177,499	89,719,540	24.30%
304	KAMIAH	0	0	0.00%	70,152,304	116,674,148	66.32%
305	HIGHLAND	128,558	137,938	7.30%	82,903,754	112,713,043	35.96%
312	SHOSHONE	200,000	200,000	0.00%	58,575,046	78,838,567	34.59%
314	DIETRICH	0	0	0.00%	18,995,542	24,091,957	26.83%
316	RICHFIELD	0	0	0.00%	27,564,452	39,842,962	44.54%
321	MADISON	0	0	0.00%	331,428,818	454,979,432	37.28%
322	SUGAR–SALEM	90,000	0	−100.00%	103,482,173	132,439,599	27.98%
331	MINIDOKA CO.	0	0	0.00%	470,845,259	720,297,256	52.98%
340	LEWISTON	5,688,791	8,430,593	48.20%	1,354,151,662	1,729,707,167	27.73%
341	LAPWAI	0	0	0.00%	61,818,321	87,668,754	41.82%
342	CULDESAC	110,000	113,000	2.73%	29,575,321	41,320,675	39.71%
343	TAMMANY	0		0.00%	56,772,812		−100%
351	ONEIDA	0	0	0.00%	100,667,894	142,154,164	41.21%
363	MARSING	0	0	0.00%	53,501,356	81,404,753	52.15%
364	PLEASANT VALLY	0	0	0.00%	26,465,822	35,275,778	33.29%
365	BRUNEAU GR–VIEW	80,000	150,000	87.50%	117,182,765	157,915,652	34.76%
370	HOMEDALE	0	0	0.00%	80,565,602	115,177,379	42.96%
371	PAYETTE	117,500	0	−100.00%	145,818,470	224,719,041	54.11%
372	NEW PLYMOUTH	110,000	130,000	18.18%	80,567,258	116,235,117	44.27%
373	FRUITLAND	0	0	0.00%	139,869,278	210,374,551	50.41%
381	AMERICAN FALLS	978,000	981,000	0.31%	469,952,185	610,015,192	29.80%
382	ROCKLAND	217,000	184,000	−15.21%	23,286,358	25,749,493	10.58%
383	ARBON ELEM.	0	0	0.00%	18,077,140	18,963,696	4.90%
391	KELLOGG	772,362	842,500	9.08%	197,688,589	296,535,689	50.00%
392	MULLAN	300,000	240,000	−20.00%	35,846,457	36,648,281	2.24%
393	WALLACE	788,870	950,000	20.43%	117,514,863	147,282,243	25.33%
394	AVERY	0	0	0.00%	61,025,249	133,420,538	118.63%
401	TETON CO.	0	0	0.00%	175,864,113	348,353,718	98.08%
411	TWIN FALLS	0	0	0.00%	861,333,722	1,259,935,353	46.28%
412	BUHL	0	400,000	0.00%	214,647,710	310,165,506	44.50%
413	FILER	75,000	275,000	266.67%	126,943,601	195,181,449	53.75%
414	KIMBERLY	0	0	0.00%	79,030,786	122,242,856	54.68%
415	HANSEN	0	0	0.00%	51,978,459	73,376,680	41.17%
416	THREE CREEK	0	0	0.00%	6,462,402	7,319,386	13.26%
417	CASTLEFORD	0	0	0.00%	48,516,576	73,450,293	51.39%
418	MURTAUGH	76,000	0	−100.00%	44,427,611	67,758,527	52.51%
421	MCCALL DONNELLY	690,000	0	−100.00%	601,223,040	1,031,283,872	71.53%
422	CASCADE	0	0	0.00%	165,274,610	254,483,151	53.98%
431	WEISER	0	190,222	ERR	175,929,262	263,116,069	49.56%
432	CAMBRIDGE	0	0	0.00%	63,680,793	83,326,149	30.85%
433	MIDVALE	0	0	0.00%	55,862,281	70,432,492	26.08%
STATEWIDE TOTALS/AVERAGES		44,630,918	53,040,656	18.84%	34,532,396,651	52,775,309,542	52.83%

TABLE 3

District #	District Name	93 – 94 Certified FTE	97 – 98 Certified FTE	% of Change	Q 93 – 94 Certified FTE/ADA	97 – 98 Certified FTE/ADA	% of Change
1	BOISE	1,578.69	1,667.98	5.66%	16	15	–6.25%
2	MERIDIAN	926.79	1,205.92	30.12%	17	16	–5.88%
3	KUNA	123.18	147.45	19.70%	17	16	–5.88%
11	MEADOWS VALLEY	19.71	20.41	3.55%	12	11	–8.33%
13	COUNCIL	30.76	32.55	5.82%	13	12	–7.69%
21	MARSH VALLEY	103.62	111.00	7.12%	15	14	–6.67%
25	POCATELLO	756.96	788.53	4.17%	17	16	–5.88%
33	BEAR LAKE	94.59	111.91	18.31%	17	15	–11.76%
41	ST. MARIES	83.50	82.68	–0.98%	15	15	0.00%
44	PLUMMER/WORLEY JT.	42.00	42.80	1.90%	11	11	0.00%
52	SNAKE RIVER	132.50	138.35	4.42%	18	16	–11.11%
55	BLACKFOOT	261.47	273.57	4.63%	16	15	–6.25%
58	ABERDEEN	58.64	64.22	9.52%	16	14	–12.50%
59	FIRTH	60.07	65.12	8.41%	17	15	–11.76%
60	SHELLEY	119.47	129.97	8.79%	19	16	–15.79%
61	BLAINE CO.	190.90	222.80	16.71%	13	12	–7.69%
71	GARDEN VALLEY	20.30	25.31	24.68%	14	12	–14.29%
72	BASIN	16.89	41.90	148.08%	16	11	–31.25%
73	HORSESHOE BEND	26.40	27.70	4.92%	11	11	0.00%
82	BONNER CO.	347.66	361.87	4.09%	16	15	–6.25%
91	IDAHO FALLS	600.78	641.62	6.80%	18	16	–11.11%
92	SWAN VALLEY	5.15	6.00	16.50%	19	11	–42.11%
93	BONNEVILLE	423.93	465.73	9.86%	17	16	–5.88%
101	BOUNDARY CO.	100.90	111.18	10.19%	16	14	–12.50%
111	BUTTE CO.	45.13	48.33	7.09%	16	13	–18.75%
121	CAMAS CO.	18.50	19.30	4.32%	9	10	11.11%
131	NAMPA	455.06	541.01	18.89%	17	16	–5.88%
132	CALDWELL	284.03	312.19	9.91%	16	15	–6.25%
133	WILDER	33.80	44.60	31.95%	14	11	–21.43%
134	MIDDLETON	114.81	123.76	7.80%	16	16	0.00%
135	NOTUS	26.73	31.71	18.63%	12	11	–8.33%
136	MELBA	43.78	50.41	15.14%	15	13	–13.33%
137	PARMA	58.67	63.13	7.60%	15	15	0.00%
139	VALLIVUE	173.57	208.89	20.35%	16	14	–12.50%
148	GRACE	39.00	46.20	18.46%	17	13	–23.53%
149	NORTH GEM	18.07	18.25	1.00%	12	10	–16.67%
150	SODA SPRINGS	69.00	74.58	8.09%	19	15	–21.05%
151	CASSIA CO.	313.14	333.06	6.36%	16	15	–6.25%
161	CLARK CO.	17.31	20.00	15.54%	12	10	–16.67%
171	OROFINO	118.23	119.11	0.74%	14	13	–7.14%
181	CHALLIS	38.12	47.63	24.95%	14	13	–7.14%
182	MACKAY	20.73	24.30	17.22%	14	11	–21.43%
191	PRAIRIE ELEM.	1.00	1.00	0.00%	12	9	–25.00%
192	GLENNS FERRY	44.89	49.00	9.16%	14	13	–7.14%
193	MOUNTIAN HOME	252.34	286.22	13.43%	15	15	0.00%
201	PRESTON	112.21	124.21	10.69%	20	18	–10.00%
202	WEST SIDE	34.08	40.70	19.42%	17	14	–17.65%
215	FREMONT CO.	159.39	165.22	3.66%	16	15	–6.25%
221	EMMETT	143.99	177.69	23.40%	18	16	–11.11%
231	GOODING	70.84	86.51	22.12%	15	14	–6.67%
232	WENDELL	56.14	69.70	24.15%	17	15	–11.76%
233	HAGERMAN	25.17	32.43	28.84%	15	12	–20.00%
234	BLISS	17.80	18.76	5.39%	11	9	–18.18%
241	GRANGEVILLE	143.09	143.57	0.34%	14	13	–7.14%
242	COTTONWOOD	38.20	38.17	–0.08%	13	13	0.00%
251	JEFFERSON CO.	212.09	230.71	8.78%	19	17	–10.53%
252	RIRIE	39.19	51.82	32.23%	18	14	–22.22%
253	W. JEFFERSON	45.30	51.85	14.46%	17	14	–17.65%

TABLE 3

District #	District Name	93-94 Certified FTE	97-98 Certified FTE	% of Change	93-94 Certified FTE/ADA	97-98 Certified FTE/ADA	% of Change
261	JEROME	153.16	183.05	19.52%	19	16	-15.79%
262	VALLEY	39.17	48.00	22.54%	17	14	-17.65%
271	COEUR D'ALENE	459.86	514.52	11.89%	17	16	-5.88%
272	LAKELAND	167.99	220.01	30.97%	18	17	-5.56%
273	POST FALLS	191.81	237.78	23.97%	18	16	-11.11%
274	KOOTENAI	22.72	25.70	13.12%	12	11	-8.33%
281	MOSCOW	184.75	192.07	3.96%	14	13	-7.14%
282	GENESEE	23.80	29.00	21.85%	12	11	-8.33%
283	KENDRICK	25.35	30.29	19.49%	14	12	-14.29%
285	POTLATCH	44.57	45.42	1.91%	13	13	0.00%
286	WHITEPINE	52.01	59.85	15.07%	13	11	-15.38%
291	SALMON	71.21	87.52	22.90%	17	15	-11.76%
292	SO. LEMHI	14.00	17.17	22.64%	10	9	-10.00%
302	NEZPERCE	20.53	21.16	3.07%	9	10	11.11%
304	KAMIAH	43.04	48.50	12.69%	14	13	-7.14%
305	HIGHLAND	23.49	25.49	8.51%	14	10	-28.57%
312	SHOSHONE	29.49	37.75	28.01%	14	11	-21.43%
314	DIETRICH	17.29	21.51	24.41%	11	9	-18.18%
316	RICHFIELD	20.50	21.50	4.88%	10	9	-10.00%
321	MADISON	220.90	254.13	15.04%	19	16	-15.79%
322	SUGAR-SALEM	84.25	96.12	14.09%	18	15	-16.67%
331	MINIDOKA CO.	309.16	306.34	-0.91%	16	15	-6.25%
340	LEWISTON	302.84	344.14	13.64%	15	14	-6.67%
341	LAPWAI	45.19	47.06	4.14%	11	10	-9.09%
342	CULDESAC	17.50	19.65	12.29%	11	11	0.00%
343	TAMMANY	18.47		-100%	18		-100%
351	ONEIDA	58.17	66.85	14.92%	16	15	-6.25%
363	MARSING	44.09	48.20	9.32%	14	14	0.00%
364	PLEASANT VALLY	2.00	2.00	0.00%	13	13	0.00%
365	BRUNEAU GR-VIEW	43.00	42.74	-0.60%	14	13	-7.14%
370	HOMEDALE	71.31	81.34	14.07%	16	14	-12.50%
371	PAYETTE	99.68	122.92	23.31%	17	15	-11.76%
372	NEW PLYMOUTH	56.83	67.62	18.99%	15	14	-6.67%
373	FRUITLAND	74.30	80.57	8.44%	16	16	0.00%
381	AMERICAN FALLS	109.20	113.80	4.21%	14	14	0.00%
382	ROCKLAND	15.60	17.50	12.18%	12	10	-16.67%
383	ARBON ELEM.	2.00	2.00	0.00%	11	9	-18.18%
391	KELLOGG	106.49	112.70	5.83%	14	13	-7.14%
392	MULLAN	20.50	20.67	0.83%	10	8	-20.00%
393	WALLACE	71.00	71.70	0.99%	11	10	-9.09%
394	AVERY	4.10	4.00	-2.44%	10	8	-20.00%
401	TETON CO.	66.40	73.77	11.10%	15	16	6.67%
411	TWIN FALLS	396.68	427.06	7.66%	17	16	-5.88%
412	BUHL	90.80	95.34	5.00%	16	14	-12.50%
413	FILER	69.88	85.47	22.31%	16	15	-6.25%
414	KIMBERLY	73.55	82.68	12.41%	14	15	7.14%
415	HANSEN	28.38	30.66	8.03%	13	11	-15.38%
416	THREE CREEK	1.00	1.00	0.00%	8	6	-25.00%
417	CASTLEFORD	25.81	25.46	-1.36%	11	13	18.18%
418	MURTAUGH	23.24	24.56	5.68%	13	11	-15.38%
421	MCCALL DONNELLY	78.21	80.60	3.06%	14	13	-7.14%
422	CASCADE	26.11	33.80	29.45%	14	11	-21.43%
431	WEISER	98.00	102.75	4.85%	16	15	-6.25%
432	CAMBRIDGE	22.60	26.44	16.99%	12	10	-16.67%
433	MIDVALE	12.50	16.99	35.92%	8	7	-12.50%
STATEWIDE TOTALS/AVERAGES		13,802.74	15,375.51	11.39%	1,655	1,466	-11.42%

TABLE 4

District #	District Name	93–94 Classified FTE	97–98 Classified FTE	% of Change	93–94 Classified FTE/ADA	97–98 Classified FTE/ADA	% of Change
1	BOISE	694.20	855.58	23.25%	36	30	−16.67%
2	MERIDIAN	302.76	624.02	106.11%	53	32	−39.62%
3	KUNA	58.37	73.66	26.19%	37	33	−10.81%
11	MEADOWS VALLEY	7.00	8.07	15.29%	35	27	−22.86%
13	COUNCIL	10.57	12.08	14.29%	36	32	−11.11%
21	MARSH VALLEY	43.13	48.28	11.94%	37	32	−13.51%
25	POCATELLO	396.17	389.29	−1.74%	33	32	−3.03%
33	BEAR LAKE	42.14	55.97	32.82%	39	29	−25.64%
41	ST. MARIES	49.79	39.65	−20.37%	25	30	20.00%
44	PLUMMER/WORLEY JT.	23.86	24.67	3.39%	20	19	−5.00%
52	SNAKE RIVER	62.55	76.69	22.61%	38	29	−23.68%
55	BLACKFOOT	106.47	130.77	22.82%	40	32	−20.00%
58	ABERDEEN	21.71	29.34	35.15%	42	31	−26.19%
59	FIRTH	27.22	28.59	5.03%	38	34	−10.53%
60	SHELLEY	49.96	71.62	43.35%	46	29	−36.96%
61	BLAINE CO.	74.54	100.79	35.22%	34	27	−20.59%
71	GARDEN VALLEY	10.83	13.17	21.61%	26	23	−11.54%
72	BASIN	13.28	19.51	46.91%	20	23	15.00%
73	HORSESHOE BEND	10.31	12.28	19.11%	28	24	−14.29%
82	BONNER CO.	169.74	182.24	7.36%	32	30	−6.25%
91	IDAHO FALLS	336.02	353.30	5.14%	32	29	−9.38%
92	SWAN VALLEY	4.89	4.24	−13.29%	19	15	−21.05%
93	BONNEVILLE	164.09	231.82	41.28%	45	32	−28.89%
101	BOUNDARY CO.	55.54	60.08	8.17%	30	26	−13.33%
111	BUTTE CO.	25.16	27.62	9.78%	28	23	−17.86%
121	CAMAS CO.	6.91	7.80	12.88%	25	24	−4.00%
131	NAMPA	242.08	326.05	34.69%	32	27	−15.63%
132	CALDWELL	122.87	149.01	21.27%	38	32	−15.79%
133	WILDER	17.41	20.79	19.41%	26	24	−7.69%
134	MIDDLETON	44.04	62.24	41.33%	41	31	−24.39%
135	NOTUS	13.89	18.51	33.26%	24	19	−20.83%
136	MELBA	17.31	21.86	26.29%	37	29	−21.62%
137	PARMA	34.69	40.42	16.52%	26	23	−11.54%
139	VALLIVUE	67.68	102.91	52.05%	40	29	−27.50%
148	GRACE	22.01	25.79	17.17%	30	23	−23.33%
149	NORTH GEM	9.38	10.23	9.06%	23	19	−17.39%
150	SODA SPRINGS	24.16	38.18	58.03%	53	30	−43.40%
151	CASSIA CO.	147.73	164.10	11.08%	35	30	−14.29%
161	CLARK CO.	7.46	5.45	−26.94%	28	36	28.57%
171	OROFINO	57.59	66.78	15.96%	29	23	−20.69%
181	CHALLIS	24.92	27.29	9.51%	22	22	0.00%
182	MACKAY	13.73	13.80	0.51%	22	20	−9.09%
191	PRAIRIE ELEM.	0.00	0.00	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
192	GLENNS FERRY	24.10	24.70	2.49%	26	25	−3.85%
193	MOUNTIAN HOME	81.47	111.24	36.54%	48	38	−20.83%
201	PRESTON	38.37	63.30	64.97%	57	35	−38.60%
202	WEST SIDE	16.44	22.58	37.35%	36	26	−27.78%
215	FREMONT CO.	84.25	89.20	5.88%	31	28	−9.68%
221	EMMETT	67.50	86.79	28.58%	38	33	−13.16%
231	GOODING	26.03	39.91	53.32%	41	31	−24.39%
232	WENDELL	23.56	34.43	46.14%	41	30	−26.83%
233	HAGERMAN	9.08	11.59	27.64%	41	34	−17.07%
234	BLISS	7.81	9.03	15.62%	25	19	−24.00%
241	GRANGEVILLE	60.49	70.58	16.68%	33	26	−21.21%
242	COTTONWOOD	15.51	19.20	23.79%	32	25	−21.88%
251	JEFFERSON CO.	93.74	122.55	30.73%	42	31	−26.19%
252	RIRIE	21.65	24.48	13.07%	32	29	−9.38%
253	W. JEFFERSON	25.08	28.34	13.00%	30	25	−16.67%

TABLE 4

District #	District Name	93–94 Classified FTE	97–98 Classified FTE	% of Change	93–94 Classified FTE/ADA	97–98 Classified FTE/ADA	% of Change
261	JEROME	82.26	93.26	13.37%	35	31	–11.43%
262	VALLEY	15.52	17.63	13.60%	42	38	–9.52%
271	COEUR D'ALENE	191.27	245.88	28.55%	40	34	–15.00%
272	LAKELAND	52.21	85.38	63.53%	56	43	–23.21%
273	POST FALLS	74.20	131.21	76.83%	46	30	–34.78%
274	KOOTENAI	11.47	13.30	15.95%	24	22	–8.33%
281	MOSCOW	75.09	90.76	20.87%	34	28	–17.65%
282	GENESEE	10.85	13.35	23.04%	27	24	–11.11%
283	KENDRICK	14.10	14.94	5.96%	25	24	–4.00%
285	POTLATCH	19.84	21.28	7.26%	29	28	–3.45%
286	WHITEPINE	26.41	32.79	24.16%	25	20	–20.00%
291	SALMON	42.88	48.68	13.53%	27	26	–3.70%
292	SO. LEMHI	9.21	9.30	0.98%	15	17	13.33%
302	NEZPERCE	7.16	8.72	21.79%	27	24	–11.11%
304	KAMIAH	24.43	26.95	10.32%	26	23	–11.54%
305	HIGHLAND	8.11	7.62	–6.04%	40	34	–15.00%
312	SHOSHONE	11.21	16.98	51.47%	36	25	–30.56%
314	DIETRICH	6.90	9.25	34.06%	29	22	–24.14%
316	RICHFIELD	7.47	8.32	11.38%	28	23	–17.86%
321	MADISON	113.24	123.83	9.35%	37	32	–13.51%
322	SUGAR–SALEM	42.02	48.28	14.90%	37	29	–21.62%
331	MINIDOKA CO.	144.57	150.22	3.91%	35	31	–11.43%
340	LEWISTON	151.58	190.28	25.53%	30	26	–13.33%
341	LAPWAI	29.06	27.85	–4.16%	17	17	0.00%
342	CULDESAC	7.41	9.66	30.36%	26	23	–11.54%
343	TAMMANY	8.26		–100%	41		–100%
351	ONEIDA	20.82	32.79	57.49%	46	30	–34.78%
363	MARSING	23.56	35.55	50.89%	27	19	–29.63%
364	PLEASANT VALLY	1.92	2.03	5.73%	14	13	–7.14%
365	BRUNEAU GR–VIEW	22.90	27.05	18.12%	26	21	–19.23%
370	HOMEDALE	32.08	38.58	20.26%	35	30	–14.29%
371	PAYETTE	51.70	56.24	8.78%	33	32	–3.03%
372	NEW PLYMOUTH	28.13	34.19	21.54%	31	28	–9.68%
373	FRUITLAND	26.37	47.23	79.11%	45	27	–40.00%
381	AMERICAN FALLS	47.98	52.52	9.46%	32	31	–3.13%
382	ROCKLAND	6.25	7.18	14.88%	30	24	–20.00%
383	ARBON ELEM.	1.78	1.79	0.56%	12	10	–16.67%
391	KELLOGG	58.01	58.04	0.05%	26	25	–3.85%
392	MULLAN	8.58	9.42	9.79%	23	17	–26.09%
393	WALLACE	34.51	37.53	8.75%	23	19	–17.39%
394	AVERY	4.80	5.01	4.37%	9	6	–33.33%
401	TETON CO.	21.23	34.14	60.81%	46	35	–23.91%
411	TWIN FALLS	147.73	191.01	29.30%	45	35	–22.22%
412	BUHL	37.90	36.14	–4.64%	39	38	–2.56%
413	FILER	27.56	37.92	37.59%	40	34	–15.00%
414	KIMBERLY	29.97	36.34	21.25%	35	33	–5.71%
415	HANSEN	9.73	13.79	41.73%	37	25	–32.43%
416	THREE CREEK	0.26	0.00	–100%	31	0	–100%
417	CASTLEFORD	9.00	10.42	15.78%	33	31	–6.06%
418	MURTAUGH	10.13	10.93	7.90%	31	24	–22.58%
421	MCCALL DONNELLY	28.23	34.45	22.03%	40	30	–25.00%
422	CASCADE	11.91	14.41	20.99%	31	26	–16.13%
431	WEISER	44.39	56.36	26.97%	35	27	–22.86%
432	CAMBRIDGE	11.33	11.47	1.24%	24	23	–4.17%
433	MIDVALE	4.84	5.32	9.92%	20	22	10.00%
STATEWIDE TOTALS/AVERAGES		6,179.57	7,716.03	24.86%			

TABLE 5

District #	District Name	93-94 Admin. FTE	97-98 Admin. FTE	% of Change	93-94 Admin. FTE/ADA	97-98 Admin. FTE/ADA	% of Change
1	BOISE	87.14	96.14	10.33%	385	263	-31.69%
2	MERIDIAN	53.18	76.21	43.31%	414	261	-36.96%
3	KUNA	8.80	11.97	36.02%	269	203	-24.54%
11	MEADOWS VALLEY	1.42	2.06	45.07%	244	105	-56.97%
13	COUNCIL	1.84	2.48	34.78%	229	154	-32.75%
21	MARSH VALLEY	7.70	9.80	27.27%	246	157	-36.18%
25	POCATELLO	51.12	50.26	-1.68%	373	247	-33.78%
33	BEAR LAKE	6.14	7.51	22.31%	326	216	-33.74%
41	ST. MARIES	7.28	4.91	-32.55%	307	245	-20.20%
44	PLUMMER/WORLEY JT.	4.16	3.00	-27.9%	116	154	32.76%
52	SNAKE RIVER	10.20	9.90	-2.94%	266	225	-15.41%
55	BLACKFOOT	21.49	17.20	-19.96%	281	241	-14.23%
58	ABERDEEN	3.67	4.00	8.99%	304	230	-24.34%
59	FIRTH	4.00	4.11	2.75%	259	240	-7.34%
60	SHELLEY	7.48	9.02	20.59%	347	231	-33.43%
61	BLAINE CO.	12.87	13.27	3.11%	279	202	-27.60%
71	GARDEN VALLEY	1.15	1.72	49.57%	242	174	-28.10%
72	BASIN	2.00	3.00	50.00%	133	149	12.03%
73	HORSESHOE BEND	2.14	2.60	21.50%	146	112	-23.29%
82	BONNER CO.	27.27	24.13	-11.51%	257	230	-10.51%
91	IDAHO FALLS	33.85	38.07	12.47%	464	269	-42.03%
92	SWAN VALLEY	0.25	1.00	300.00%	381	64	-83.20%
93	BONNEVILLE	23.14	30.00	29.65%	353	246	-30.31%
101	BOUNDARY CO.	7.86	10.00	27.23%	321	155	-51.71%
111	BUTTE CO.	3.33	3.49	4.80%	212	182	-14.15%
121	CAMAS CO.	1.88	1.00	-46.81%	159	186	16.98%
131	NAMPA	24.98	37.72	51.00%	432	232	-46.30%
132	CALDWELL	17.00	22.14	30.24%	331	218	-34.14%
133	WILDER	3.08	3.86	25.32%	164	130	-20.73%
134	MIDDLETON	8.33	9.00	8.04%	273	218	-20.15%
135	NOTUS	2.60	2.10	-19.23%	238	171	-28.15%
136	MELBA	4.00	4.44	11.00%	218	145	-33.49%
137	PARMA	4.78	5.22	9.21%	223	181	-18.83%
139	VALLIVUE	10.09	13.90	37.76%	358	217	-39.39%
148	GRACE	2.20	3.95	79.55%	327	150	-54.13%
149	NORTH GEM	1.00	1.42	42.00%	213	139	-34.74%
150	SODA SPRINGS	3.64	5.13	40.93%	369	225	-39.02%
151	CASSIA CO.	21.39	22.75	6.36%	292	219	-25.00%
161	CLARK CO.	0.72	1.58	119.44%	208	124	-40.38%
171	OROFINO	8.38	11.77	40.45%	232	132	-43.10%
181	CHALLIS	3.78	3.49	-7.67%	192	171	-10.94%
182	MACKAY	2.28	1.92	-15.79%	150	143	-4.67%
191	PRAIRIE ELEM.	0.00	0.00	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
192	GLENNS FERRY	4.00	4.14	3.50%	178	149	-16.29%
193	MOUNTIAN HOME	14.70	15.14	2.99%	324	279	-13.89%
201	PRESTON	6.98	7.76	11.17%	395	289	-26.84%
202	WEST SIDE	2.00	3.00	50.00%	397	194	-51.13%
215	FREMONT CO.	11.02	10.66	-3.27%	319	233	-26.96%
221	EMMETT	9.47	10.94	15.52%	368	259	-29.62%
231	GOODING	4.78	6.49	35.77%	270	192	-28.89%
232	WENDELL	3.34	4.40	31.74%	318	234	-26.42%
233	HAGERMAN	2.00	2.43	21.50%	203	163	-19.70%
234	BLISS	1.00	1.56	56.00%	325	107	-67.08%
241	GRANGEVILLE	8.43	8.99	6.64%	259	206	-20.46%
242	COTTONWOOD	4.00	4.14	3.50%	166	116	-30.12%
251	JEFFERSON CO.	12.80	15.40	20.31%	414	250	-39.61%
252	RIRIE	2.50	3.47	38.80%	281	207	-26.33%
253	W. JEFFERSON	2.00	3.49	74.50%	251	203	-19.12%

TABLE 5

District #	District Name	93-94 Admin. FTE	97-98 Admin. FTE	% of Change	93-94 Admin. FTE/ADA	97-98 Admin. FTE/ADA	% of Change
261	JEROME	10.00	12.39	23.90%	408	234	-42.65%
262	VALLEY	2.64	3.15	19.32%	259	213	-17.76%
271	COEUR D'ALENE	30.00	32.70	9.00%	363	256	-29.48%
272	LAKELAND	12.40	13.77	11.05%	267	264	-1.12%
273	POST FALLS	10.49	14.50	38.23%	488	268	-45.08%
274	KOOTENAI	1.72	2.25	30.81%	162	129	-20.37%
281	MOSCOW	13.25	14.50	9.43%	279	173	-37.99%
282	GENESEE	2.00	2.00	0.00%	145	159	9.66%
283	KENDRICK	2.50	3.00	20.00%	140	119	-15.00%
285	POTLATCH	3.66	3.50	-4.37%	195	168	-13.85%
286	WHITEPINE	4.99	5.54	11.02%	163	116	-28.83%
291	SALMON	5.51	7.00	27.04%	294	182	-38.10%
292	SO. LEMHI	1.00	1.13	13.00%	140	142	1.43%
302	NEZPERCE	1.05	1.86	77.14%	181	112	-38.12%
304	KAMIAH	3.30	4.28	29.70%	223	142	-36.32%
305	HIGHLAND	2.20	2.61	18.64%	217	99	-54.38%
312	SHOSHONE	1.67	3.44	105.99%	242	122	-49.59%
314	DIETRICH	1.28	2.00	56.25%	197	100	-49.24%
316	RICHFIELD	1.00	1.86	86.00%	211	102	-51.66%
321	MADISON	16.60	17.61	6.08%	328	225	-31.40%
322	SUGAR-SALEM	6.55	6.08	-7.18%	286	229	-19.93%
331	MINIDOKA CO.	22.00	20.65	-6.14%	283	227	-19.79%
340	LEWISTON	21.37	22.40	4.82%	285	220	-22.81%
341	LAPWAI	5.28	4.00	-24.24%	141	120	-14.89%
342	CULDESAC	1.50	1.50	0.00%	131	149	13.74%
343	TAMMANY	1.00		-100%	337		-100%
351	ONEIDA	3.30	4.16	26.06%	305	236	-22.62%
363	MARSING	3.03	4.20	38.61%	224	159	-29.02%
364	PLEASANT VALLY	0.00	0.00	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
365	BRUNEAU GR-VIEW	3.16	3.26	3.16%	235	171	-27.23%
370	HOMEDALE	5.42	5.70	5.17%	301	206	-31.56%
371	PAYETTE	7.19	7.42	3.20%	385	244	-36.62%
372	NEW PLYMOUTH	4.78	5.28	10.46%	215	179	-16.74%
373	FRUITLAND	4.58	5.42	18.34%	299	238	-20.40%
381	AMERICAN FALLS	5.94	6.50	9.43%	352	251	-28.69%
382	ROCKLAND	1.00	1.28	28.00%	190	132	-30.53%
383	ARBON ELEM.	0.00	0.00	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
391	KELLOGG	8.20	9.88	20.49%	288	145	-49.65%
392	MULLAN	1.36	1.79	31.62%	164	90	-45.12%
393	WALLACE	6.57	5.99	-8.83%	204	121	-40.69%
394	AVERY	0.50	0.40	-20.0%	82	78	-4.88%
401	TETON CO.	4.00	4.23	5.75%	243	282	16.05%
411	TWIN FALLS	22.90	26.90	17.47%	350	251	-28.29%
412	BUHL	4.28	6.72	57.01%	368	202	-45.11%
413	FILER	4.66	5.28	13.30%	245	241	-1.63%
414	KIMBERLY	4.86	5.72	17.70%	264	210	-20.45%
415	HANSEN	3.00	2.70	-10.0%	120	130	8.33%
416	THREE CREEK	0.00	0.00	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
417	CASTLEFORD	1.63	2.00	22.70%	195	164	-15.90%
418	MURTAUGH	1.70	1.40	-17.65%	309	189	-38.83%
421	MCCALL DONNELLY	4.00	4.86	21.50%	282	221	-21.63%
422	CASCADE	1.34	2.63	96.27%	273	145	-46.89%
431	WEISER	7.30	6.88	-5.75%	260	225	-13.46%
432	CAMBRIDGE	1.78	2.22	24.72%	275	119	-56.73%
433	MIDVALE	1.01	1.56	54.46%	191	76	-60.21%
STATEWIDE TOTALS/AVERAGES		901	1,027	14.01%			

TABLE 6

District #	District Name	93–94 Secondary Ave. Salary	97–98 Secondary Ave. Salary	% of Change	93–94 Elementary Ave. Salary	97–98 Elementary Ave. Salary	% of Change
1	BOISE	33,273	39,523	18.78%	32,346	38,717	19.70%
2	MERIDIAN	25,950	30,936	19.21%	26,482	32,158	21.43%
3	KUNA	26,501	31,282	18.04%	26,833	32,433	20.87%
11	MEADOWS VALLEY	28,677	31,176	8.71%	26,381	28,878	9.47%
13	COUNCIL	25,743	30,555	18.69%	28,431	33,830	18.99%
21	MARSH VALLEY	25,845	31,496	21.86%	25,161	31,028	23.32%
25	POCATELLO	28,269	35,153	24.35%	28,053	35,648	27.07%
33	BEAR LAKE	25,665	29,104	13.40%	25,509	29,189	14.43%
41	ST. MARIES	27,089	29,924	10.47%	27,138	32,942	21.39%
44	PLUMMER/WORLEY JT.	25,690	28,671	11.60%	23,508	29,862	27.03%
52	SNAKE RIVER	23,851	33,096	38.76%	25,279	33,570	32.80%
55	BLACKFOOT	26,042	31,372	20.47%	26,679	33,167	24.32%
58	ABERDEEN	27,489	31,465	14.46%	27,529	29,105	5.72%
59	FIRTH	27,978	31,590	12.91%	25,754	29,251	13.58%
60	SHELLEY	26,210	30,070	14.73%	27,182	30,527	12.31%
61	BLAINE CO.	34,227	41,142	20.20%	33,754	40,485	19.94%
71	GARDEN VALLEY	25,445	27,817	9.32%	25,000	29,809	19.24%
72	BASIN	38,003	25,041	–34.11%	25,167	27,528	9.38%
73	HORSESHOE BEND	22,765	27,708	21.71%	21,248	28,130	32.39%
82	BONNER CO.	27,196	31,699	16.56%	27,280	32,031	17.42%
91	IDAHO FALLS	30,250	34,072	12.63%	29,864	33,960	13.72%
92	SWAN VALLEY	0	27,570	0.00%	33,106	26,588	–19.69%
93	BONNEVILLE	25,548	30,456	19.21%	27,150	32,544	19.87%
101	BOUNDARY CO.	27,316	31,984	17.09%	27,797	33,106	19.10%
111	BUTTE CO.	27,199	28,220	3.75%	25,840	30,496	18.02%
121	CAMAS CO.	24,128	27,753	15.02%	23,841	28,957	21.46%
131	NAMPA	27,022	31,490	16.53%	25,530	30,355	18.90%
132	CALDWELL	26,893	32,028	19.09%	25,755	30,074	16.77%
133	WILDER	29,902	32,481	8.62%	26,750	29,750	11.21%
134	MIDDLETON	24,082	30,387	26.18%	23,172	30,604	32.07%
135	NOTUS	22,365	28,009	25.24%	23,512	28,570	21.51%
136	MELBA	24,011	28,850	20.15%	24,510	30,460	24.28%
137	PARMA	25,982	30,421	17.08%	24,019	28,551	18.87%
139	VALLIVUE	29,521	33,400	13.14%	25,692	29,879	16.30%
148	GRACE	29,043	33,759	16.24%	28,690	35,463	23.61%
149	NORTH GEM	24,710	30,691	24.20%	22,670	30,665	35.27%
150	SODA SPRINGS	30,208	30,846	2.11%	30,978	34,174	10.32%
151	CASSIA CO.	25,368	31,073	22.49%	25,755	31,440	22.07%
161	CLARK CO.	24,043	25,465	5.91%	20,571	24,558	19.38%
171	OROFINO	26,038	31,298	20.20%	26,093	30,307	16.15%
181	CHALLIS	26,599	31,404	18.06%	28,052	30,594	9.06%
182	MACKAY	26,642	30,254	13.56%	26,688	29,749	11.47%
191	PRAIRIE ELEM.	0	0	0.00%	25,700	30,000	16.73%
192	GLENNS FERRY	22,111	26,620	20.39%	22,677	27,539	21.44%
193	MOUNTIAN HOME	30,496	34,319	12.54%	28,197	32,611	15.65%
201	PRESTON	27,368	31,505	15.12%	25,229	29,789	18.07%
202	WEST SIDE	27,400	29,135	6.33%	25,145	29,189	16.08%
215	FREMONT CO.	26,249	31,119	18.55%	26,037	30,033	15.35%
221	EMMETT	25,212	33,091	31.25%	25,091	32,890	31.08%
231	GOODING	25,703	30,348	18.07%	25,929	29,339	13.15%
232	WENDELL	25,476	29,342	15.18%	26,704	28,803	7.86%
233	HAGERMAN	22,423	25,027	11.61%	24,041	25,895	7.71%
234	BLISS	23,023	27,568	19.74%	20,644	25,849	25.21%
241	GRANGEVILLE	27,731	31,363	13.10%	27,363	31,587	15.44%
242	COTTONWOOD	24,381	28,759	17.96%	25,368	29,382	15.82%
251	JEFFERSON CO.	25,873	30,158	16.56%	26,353	31,550	19.72%
252	RIRIE	30,121	32,377	7.49%	27,200	31,161	14.56%
253	W. JEFFERSON	28,055	31,583	12.58%	26,007	29,635	13.95%

TABLE 6

District #	District Name	93–94 Secondary Ave. Salary	97–98 Secondary Ave. Salary	% of Change	93–94 Elementary Ave. Salary	97–98 Elementary Ave. Salary	% of Change
261	JEROME	24,956	30,136	20.76%	24,612	30,488	23.87%
262	VALLEY	26,833	29,931	11.55%	26,403	28,588	8.28%
271	COEUR D'ALENE	30,606	34,280	12.00%	29,449	34,071	15.69%
272	LAKELAND	29,371	32,033	9.06%	28,074	32,532	15.88%
273	POST FALLS	30,954	35,285	13.99%	29,560	33,300	12.65%
274	KOOTENAI	23,952	29,383	22.67%	24,919	33,145	33.01%
281	MOSCOW	32,321	36,359	12.49%	31,398	36,760	17.08%
282	GENESEE	24,442	33,168	35.70%	27,482	33,135	20.57%
283	KENDRICK	24,142	27,305	13.10%	26,932	32,763	21.65%
285	POTLATCH	27,584	31,448	14.01%	27,189	32,487	19.49%
286	WHITEPINE	28,651	33,252	16.06%	27,995	32,169	14.91%
291	SALMON	28,028	29,716	6.02%	27,450	31,345	14.19%
292	SO. LEMHI	21,669	27,292	25.95%	22,348	27,247	21.92%
302	NEZPERCE	24,384	27,310	12.00%	25,342	30,588	20.70%
304	KAMIAH	25,828	29,729	15.10%	26,608	31,191	17.22%
305	HIGHLAND	26,563	32,577	22.64%	24,837	29,639	19.33%
312	SHOSHONE	23,991	30,414	26.77%	23,700	29,083	22.71%
314	DIETRICH	20,158	23,632	17.23%	19,264	23,040	19.60%
316	RICHFIELD	20,163	26,123	29.56%	21,727	26,395	21.48%
321	MADISON	27,998	33,028	17.97%	26,475	31,741	19.89%
322	SUGAR–SALEM	26,945	31,689	17.61%	23,540	29,602	25.75%
331	MINIDOKA CO.	24,984	29,913	19.73%	25,932	31,145	20.10%
340	LEWISTON	31,640	36,338	14.85%	31,319	37,174	18.69%
341	LAPWAI	27,895	32,703	17.24%	29,616	33,478	13.04%
342	CULDESAC	23,356	32,136	37.59%	22,926	27,428	19.64%
343	TAMMANY	26,045		–100.00%	26,824		–100.00%
351	ONEIDA	28,101	31,960	13.73%	24,393	28,964	18.74%
363	MARSING	23,514	26,766	13.83%	24,833	29,999	20.80%
364	PLEASANT VALLY	0	0	0.00%	27,256	21,000	–22.95%
365	BRUNEAU GR–VIEW	24,670	27,807	12.72%	21,800	28,159	29.17%
370	HOMEDALE	26,694	30,846	15.55%	25,893	29,371	13.43%
371	PAYETTE	26,268	30,400	15.73%	25,071	31,665	26.30%
372	NEW PLYMOUTH	25,258	27,292	8.05%	25,338	30,955	22.17%
373	FRUITLAND	26,318	33,762	28.28%	21,643	30,640	41.57%
381	AMERICAN FALLS	32,027	34,967	9.18%	31,418	34,442	9.63%
382	ROCKLAND	27,359	34,005	24.29%	27,125	31,244	15.19%
383	ARBON ELEM.	0	0	0.00%	20,104	24,107	19.91%
391	KELLOGG	27,446	31,173	13.58%	28,742	30,935	7.63%
392	MULLAN	27,805	31,211	12.25%	29,995	28,928	–3.56%
393	WALLACE	26,298	32,236	22.58%	27,945	34,442	23.25%
394	AVERY	0	0	0.00%	28,443	34,306	20.61%
401	TETON CO.	26,301	30,415	15.64%	25,753	31,649	22.89%
411	TWIN FALLS	26,020	31,401	20.68%	25,856	31,473	21.72%
412	BUHL	24,124	30,469	26.30%	25,116	31,851	26.82%
413	FILER	24,412	30,221	23.80%	25,518	31,295	22.64%
414	KIMBERLY	23,721	29,477	24.27%	22,556	30,024	33.11%
415	HANSEN	23,495	29,251	24.50%	20,300	26,408	30.09%
416	THREE CREEK	0	0	0.00%	20,787	21,000	1.02%
417	CASTLEFORD	24,237	29,355	21.12%	21,908	26,259	19.86%
418	MURTAUGH	22,102	28,925	30.87%	21,374	27,217	27.34%
421	MCCALL DONNELLY	31,761	35,008	10.22%	33,280	37,308	12.10%
422	CASCADE	24,498	30,934	26.27%	27,456	32,194	17.26%
431	WEISER	26,170	29,785	13.81%	24,593	30,827	25.35%
432	CAMBRIDGE	25,463	32,466	27.50%	23,472	30,257	28.91%
433	MIDVALE	23,381	28,547	22.09%	23,581	28,979	22.89%
	STATEWIDE TOTALS/AVERAGES	27,904	32,750	17.37%	27,621	32,908	19.14%

TABLE 7

District #	District Name	93–94 Admin. Ave. Salary	97–98 Admin. Ave Salary	% of Change	93–94 Classified Ave. Salary	97–98 Classified Ave. Salary	% of Change
1	BOISE	55,916	66,365	18.69%	18,315	21,223	15.88%
2	MERIDIAN	47,894	57,783	20.65%	14,910	17,520	17.51%
3	KUNA	46,695	52,692	12.84%	16,527	19,937	20.63%
11	MEADOWS VALLEY	42,262	45,807	8.39%	17,270	18,313	6.04%
13	COUNCIL	43,800	52,140	19.04%	15,541	19,674	26.59%
21	MARSH VALLEY	41,741	47,890	14.73%	16,179	16,703	3.24%
25	POCATELLO	50,835	60,450	18.91%	17,738	21,522	21.33%
33	BEAR LAKE	46,057	55,081	19.59%	13,953	16,462	17.98%
41	ST. MARIES	42,928	56,916	32.58%	17,852	21,701	21.56%
44	PLUMMER/WORLEY JT.	44,232	50,952	15.19%	16,661	20,044	20.30%
52	SNAKE RIVER	46,861	54,700	16.73%	15,937	16,279	2.15%
55	BLACKFOOT	49,570	57,773	16.55%	17,827	19,866	11.44%
58	ABERDEEN	46,522	52,673	13.22%	15,934	18,898	18.60%
59	FIRTH	44,521	54,827	23.15%	17,352	17,756	2.33%
60	SHELLEY	44,014	56,772	28.99%	15,972	18,336	14.80%
61	BLAINE CO.	53,355	62,300	16.77%	19,101	21,794	14.10%
71	GARDEN VALLEY	36,652	52,741	43.90%	11,969	13,273	10.89%
72	BASIN	46,625	54,732	17.39%	14,960	16,389	9.55%
73	HORSESHOE BEND	43,077	48,666	12.97%	15,308	19,718	28.81%
82	BONNER CO.	46,996	50,072	6.55%	15,959	19,287	20.85%
91	IDAHO FALLS	53,062	59,055	11.29%	18,472	21,538	16.60%
92	SWAN VALLEY	35,000	45,000	28.57%	17,159	20,571	19.88%
93	BONNEVILLE	48,011	56,058	16.76%	15,539	17,669	13.71%
101	BOUNDARY CO.	44,966	52,826	17.48%	17,613	17,570	−0.24%
111	BUTTE CO.	50,076	56,608	13.04%	16,330	16,509	1.10%
121	CAMAS CO.	44,139	62,200	40.92%	19,146	18,290	−4.47%
131	NAMPA	46,116	53,358	15.70%	13,576	16,930	24.71%
132	CALDWELL	49,764	57,776	16.10%	15,212	17,839	17.27%
133	WILDER	50,568	56,336	11.41%	17,382	19,105	9.91%
134	MIDDLETON	47,951	54,265	13.17%	15,751	17,504	11.13%
135	NOTUS	36,123	58,104	60.85%	15,533	18,093	16.48%
136	MELBA	40,333	47,175	16.96%	14,737	17,701	20.11%
137	PARMA	40,083	47,135	17.59%	15,023	17,999	19.81%
139	VALLIVUE	49,966	59,933	19.95%	18,260	20,083	9.98%
148	GRACE	45,906	53,350	16.22%	13,429	16,377	21.95%
149	NORTH GEM	46,000	56,430	22.67%	15,261	16,779	9.95%
150	SODA SPRINGS	51,393	53,718	4.52%	19,887	19,460	−2.15%
151	CASSIA CO.	43,003	54,438	26.59%	17,242	19,785	14.75%
161	CLARK CO.	42,494	55,772	31.25%	14,836	20,419	37.63%
171	OROFINO	44,677	51,024	14.21%	17,042	19,178	12.53%
181	CHALLIS	42,357	54,851	29.50%	18,121	19,170	5.79%
182	MACKAY	38,470	49,194	27.88%	13,052	15,496	18.73%
191	PRAIRIE ELEM.	0	30,000	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
192	GLENNS FERRY	39,808	52,920	32.94%	14,854	18,176	22.36%
193	MOUNTIAN HOME	47,272	55,609	17.64%	15,231	18,706	22.82%
201	PRESTON	50,283	51,499	2.42%	16,731	19,700	17.75%
202	WEST SIDE	40,013	55,082	37.66%	15,733	18,676	18.71%
215	FREMONT CO.	52,542	60,094	14.37%	16,608	17,834	7.38%
221	EMMETT	47,143	57,073	21.06%	15,376	17,598	14.45%
231	GOODING	43,656	51,280	17.46%	15,876	17,602	10.87%
232	WENDELL	45,088	57,218	26.90%	14,793	16,549	11.87%
233	HAGERMAN	46,736	53,853	15.23%	18,066	19,896	10.13%
234	BLISS	46,000	45,446	−1.20%	14,507	15,121	4.23%
241	GRANGEVILLE	44,165	53,643	21.46%	17,295	17,725	2.49%
242	COTTONWOOD	40,437	56,400	39.48%	18,391	20,789	13.04%
251	JEFFERSON CO.	44,451	52,612	18.36%	16,035	18,108	12.93%
252	RIRIE	52,194	48,858	−6.39%	16,413	17,794	8.41%
253	W. JEFFERSON	46,046	54,549	18.47%	18,497	17,389	−5.99%

TABLE 8

District #	District Name	93–94 Secondary Class Size	97–98 Secondary Class Size	% of Change	93–94 Elementary Class Size	97–98 Elementary Class Size	% of Change
1	BOISE	13	18	38.46%	17	18	5.88%
2	MERIDIAN	15	19	26.67%	20	20	0.00%
3	KUNA	17	18	5.88%	20	20	0.00%
11	MEADOWS VALLEY	13	11	−15.38%	13	15	15.38%
13	COUNCIL	15	12	−20.00%	14	15	7.14%
21	MARSH VALLEY	16	17	6.25%	17	16	−5.88%
25	POCATELLO	17	17	0.00%	20	20	0.00%
33	BEAR LAKE	19	16	−15.79%	22	19	−13.64%
41	ST. MARIES	17	18	5.88%	17	16	−5.88%
44	PLUMMER/WORLEY JT.	12	13	8.33%	16	13	−18.75%
52	SNAKE RIVER	18	21	16.67%	19	16	−15.79%
55	BLACKFOOT	16	16	0.00%	19	19	0.00%
58	ABERDEEN	15	14	−6.67%	19	19	0.00%
59	FIRTH	15	19	26.67%	17	15	−11.76%
60	SHELLEY	18	17	−5.56%	20	20	0.00%
61	BLAINE CO.	11	14	27.27%	15	14	−6.67%
71	GARDEN VALLEY	18	12	−33.33%	20	17	−15.00%
72	BASIN	4	12	200.00%	14	12	−14.29%
73	HORSESHOE BEND	14	12	−14.29%	15	15	0.00%
82	BONNER CO.	16	17	6.25%	18	18	0.00%
91	IDAHO FALLS	17	17	0.00%	19	20	5.26%
92	SWAN VALLEY	6	12	100.00%	13	13	0.00%
93	BONNEVILLE	18	17	−5.56%	21	20	−4.76%
101	BOUNDARY CO.	16	16	0.00%	19	17	−10.53%
111	BUTTE CO.	23	15	−34.78%	20	16	−20.00%
121	CAMAS CO.	8	13	62.50%	11	10	−9.09%
131	NAMPA	15	17	13.33%	18	20	11.11%
132	CALDWELL	15	15	0.00%	19	21	10.53%
133	WILDER	11	11	0.00%	17	16	−5.88%
134	MIDDLETON	17	17	0.00%	19	20	5.26%
135	NOTUS	19	13	−31.58%	18	13	−27.78%
136	MELBA	17	13	−23.53%	16	18	12.50%
137	PARMA	15	15	0.00%	19	21	10.53%
139	VALLIVUE	14	18	28.57%	17	16	−5.88%
148	GRACE	21	15	−28.57%	18	15	−16.67%
149	NORTH GEM	16	12	−25.00%	13	11	−15.38%
150	SODA SPRINGS	19	20	5.26%	21	17	−19.05%
151	CASSIA CO.	15	18	20.00%	17	17	0.00%
161	CLARK CO.	12	9	−25.00%	14	14	0.00%
171	OROFINO	14	15	7.14%	15	16	6.67%
181	CHALLIS	14	14	0.00%	16	15	−6.25%
182	MACKAY	19	13	−31.58%	19	13	−31.58%
191	PRAIRIE ELEM.	0	0	0.00%	9	4	−55.56%
192	GLENNS FERRY	15	12	−20.00%	17	19	11.76%
193	MOUNTIAN HOME	12	15	25.00%	18	18	0.00%
201	PRESTON	20	19	−5.00%	22	20	−9.09%
202	WEST SIDE	19	14	−26.32%	19	20	5.26%
215	FREMONT CO.	16	18	12.50%	17	17	0.00%
221	EMMETT	16	20	25.00%	19	17	−10.53%
231	GOODING	15	16	6.67%	18	18	0.00%
232	WENDELL	16	15	−6.25%	19	18	−5.26%
233	HAGERMAN	16	13	−18.75%	18	16	−11.11%
234	BLISS	12	10	−16.67%	12	11	−8.33%
241	GRANGEVILLE	13	18	38.46%	13	13	0.00%
242	COTTONWOOD	14	13	−7.14%	18	19	5.56%
251	JEFFERSON CO.	19	17	−10.53%	21	22	4.76%
252	RIRIE	20	14	−30.00%	19	20	5.26%
253	W. JEFFERSON	16	19	18.75%	18	13	−27.78%

TABLE 8

District #	District Name	93–94 Secondary Class Size	97–98 Secondary Class Size	% of Change	93–94 Elementary Class Size	97–98 Elementary Class Size	% of Change
261	JEROME	16	19	18.75%	20	17	−15.00%
262	VALLEY	15	17	13.33%	17	16	−5.88%
271	COEUR D'ALENE	17	18	5.88%	19	20	5.26%
272	LAKELAND	15	18	20.00%	20	20	0.00%
273	POST FALLS	16	17	6.25%	20	20	0.00%
274	KOOTENAI	15	12	−20.00%	16	17	6.25%
281	MOSCOW	13	16	23.08%	16	15	−6.25%
282	GENESEE	15	11	−26.67%	19	15	−21.05%
283	KENDRICK	15	14	−6.67%	17	15	−11.76%
285	POTLATCH	12	16	33.33%	15	15	0.00%
286	WHITEPINE	15	11	−26.67%	16	15	−6.25%
291	SALMON	19	16	−15.79%	22	19	−13.64%
292	SO. LEMHI	9	10	11.11%	13	12	−7.69%
302	NEZPERCE	10	10	0.00%	12	12	0.00%
304	KAMIAH	15	14	−6.67%	17	16	−5.88%
305	HIGHLAND	16	12	−25.00%	15	13	−13.33%
312	SHOSHONE	16	13	−18.75%	16	14	−12.50%
314	DIETRICH	15	11	−26.67%	13	11	−15.38%
316	RICHFIELD	11	10	−9.09%	11	11	0.00%
321	MADISON	18	19	5.56%	19	17	−10.53%
322	SUGAR–SALEM	21	19	−9.52%	19	15	−21.05%
331	MINIDOKA CO.	16	18	12.50%	17	17	0.00%
340	LEWISTON	16	16	0.00%	17	17	0.00%
341	LAPWAI	9	14	55.56%	12	11	−8.33%
342	CULDESAC	14	14	0.00%	13	13	0.00%
343	TAMMANY	4		−100.00%	18		−100.00%
351	ONEIDA	16	16	0.00%	16	17	6.25%
363	MARSING	16	15	−6.25%	18	19	5.56%
364	PLEASANT VALLY	0	0	0.00%	7	6	−14.29%
365	BRUNEAU GR–VIEW	10	15	50.00%	15	15	0.00%
370	HOMEDALE	15	15	0.00%	19	20	5.26%
371	PAYETTE	14	17	21.43%	21	17	−19.05%
372	NEW PLYMOUTH	14	15	7.14%	17	18	5.88%
373	FRUITLAND	13	17	30.77%	18	21	16.67%
381	AMERICAN FALLS	15	14	−6.67%	18	20	11.11%
382	ROCKLAND	15	11	−26.67%	14	11	−21.43%
383	ARBON ELEM.	0	0	0.00%	11	9	−18.18%
391	KELLOGG	15	13	−13.33%	16	17	6.25%
392	MULLAN	14	8	−42.86%	11	10	−9.09%
393	WALLACE	15	11	−26.67%	15	13	−13.33%
394	AVERY	0	0	0.00%	9	7	−22.22%
401	TETON CO.	13	18	38.46%	17	19	11.76%
411	TWIN FALLS	14	20	42.86%	17	17	0.00%
412	BUHL	14	18	28.57%	17	15	−11.76%
413	FILER	19	15	−21.05%	20	20	0.00%
414	KIMBERLY	14	15	7.14%	18	19	5.56%
415	HANSEN	13	12	−7.69%	15	15	0.00%
416	THREE CREEK	0	0	0.00%	8	5	−37.50%
417	CASTLEFORD	16	13	−18.75%	17	20	17.65%
418	MURTAUGH	16	12	−25.00%	18	13	−27.78%
421	MCCALL DONNELLY	13	14	7.69%	16	16	0.00%
422	CASCADE	15	14	−6.67%	15	13	−13.33%
431	WEISER	17	16	−5.88%	19	19	0.00%
432	CAMBRIDGE	15	13	−13.33%	13	12	−7.69%
433	MIDVALE	9	8	−11.11%	13	9	−30.77%
STATEWIDE TOTALS/AVERAGES		15	17	13.33%	18	18	0.00%