ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1987-1988 8672
5253 SHES SB 45

828

TABLE 4D: REAA ESTIMATED P.L. 81-874 REVENUE

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ADM	P.L. 81-874 FY87 ESTIMATED REVENUE	P.L. 81-874 FY87 ESTIMATED REVENUE PER ADM	P.L. 81-874 AS % OF TOTAL REVENUE	P.L. 81-874 AS % OF FOUNDATION REVENUE
ADAK	607	$2,104,016	$3,466	47%	101%
ALASKA GATEWAY	516	$775,872	$1,504	17%	22%
ALEUTIANS	87	$355,000	$4,080	19%	26%
ANNETTE ISLAND	413	$1,639,104	$3,969	53%	120%
BERING STRAITS	1,233	$4,141,068	$3,359	26%	37%
CHATHAM	306	$964,156	$3,151	32%	49%
CHUGACH	129	$140,000	$1,085	9%	10%
COPPER RIVER	575	$135,000	$235	3%	4%
DELTA GREELY	1,084	$1,252,226	$1,155	19%	26%
IDITAROD	399	$1,038,030	$2,602	19%	25%
KASHUNAMIUT	166	$750,000	$4,518	35%	53%
KUSPUK	408	$1,440,106	$3,530	27%	40%
LAKE AND PENISULA	370	$1,322,008	$3,573	21%	28%
LOWER KUSKOKWIM	2,675	$7,100,000	$2,654	23%	30%
LOWER YUKON	1,286	$5,413,552	$4,210	39%	73%
PRIBILOF ISLANDS	169	$748,731	$4,431	41%	73%
RAILBELT	357	$100,000	$280	3%	3%
SOUTHEAST ISLANDS	458	$849,550	$1,855	20%	29%
SOUTHWEST	486	$2,155,859	$4,436	32%	51%
YUKON FLATS	377	$714,000	$1,894	12%	14%
YUKON KOYUKUK	596	$1,721,696	$2,889	23%	32%
YUPIIT	285	$0	$0	0%	0%
TOTAL	12,982	$34,860,024	$2,685	24%	34%

Exhibit B, p. 6

SOURCE: DOE

Exhibit B, p. 7

TABLE 4E: RANKED REAA ESTIMATED P.L. 81-874 REVENUES PER ADM

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ADM	P.L. 81-874 FY87 ESTIMATED REVENUE	P.L. 81-874 FY87 ESTIMATED REVENUE PER ADM	P.L. 81-874 AS % OF TOTAL REVENUE	P.L. 81-874 AS % OF FOUNDATION REVENUE
KASHUNAMIUT	166	$750,000	$4,518	35%	53%
SOUTHWEST	486	$2,155,859	$4,436	32%	51%
PRIBILOF ISLANDS	169	$748,781	$4,431	41%	73%
LOWER YUKON	1,26[illegible]	$5,413,552	$4,210	39%	73%
ALEUTIANS	87	$355,000	$4,080	19%	26%
ANNETTE ISLAND	413	$1,639,104	$3,969	53%	120%
LAKE AND PENISULA	370	$1,322,008	$3,573	21%	28%
KUSPUK	408	$1,440,106	$3,530	27%	40%
ADAK	607	$2,104,016	$3,466	47%	101%
BERING STRAITS	1,233	$4,141,068	$3,359	26%	37%
CHATHAM	306	$964,156	$3,151	32%	49%
YUKON KOYUKUK	596	$1,721,696	$2,889	23%	32%
LOWER KUSKOKWIM	2,675	$7,100,000	$2,654	23%	30%
IDITAROD	399	$1,038,030	$2,602	19%	25%
YUKON FLATS	377	$714,000	$1,894	12%	14%
SOUTHEAST ISLANDS	458	$849,550	$1,855	20%	29%
ALASKA GATEWAY	516	$775,872	$1,504	17%	22%
DELTA GREELY	1,084	$1,252,226	$1,155	19%	26%
CHUGACH	129	$140,000	$1,085	9%	10%
RAILBELT	357	$100,000	$280	3%	3%
COPPER RIVER	575	$135,000	$235	3%	4%
YUPIIT	285	$0	$0	0%	0%
TOTAL	12,982	$34,860,024	$2,685	24%	34%

SOURCE: DOE

TABLE 4: REAA TOTAL REVENUE/ALL SOURCES

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ADM	FY87 STATE FOUNDATION ENTITLEMENT (EST)	P.L. 81-874 FY87 ESTIMATED REVENUE	MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE: TOTAL ALL SOURCES	TOTAL REVENUE: ALL SOURCES	TOTAL REVENUE: ALL SOURCES/ADM
ADAK	607	$2,092,326	$2,104,016	$310,600	$4,506,942	$7,425
ALASKA GATEWAY	516	$3,559,313	$775,872	$347,205	$4,682,390	$9,074
ALEUTIANS	87	$1,370,960	$355,000	$158,728	$1,884,688	$21,663
ANNETTE ISLAND	413	$1,366,767	$1,639,104	$101,721	$3,107,592	$7,524
BERING STRAITS	1,233	$11,193,524	$4,141,068	$735,313	$16,069,905	$13,033
CHATHAM	306	$1,070,021	$964,156	$44,000	$2,978,177	$9,733
CHUGACH	129	$1,370,890	$140,000	$15,000	$1,525,890	$11,829
COPPER RIVER	575	$3,838,705	$135,000	$501,000	$4,474,705	$7,782
DELTA GREELY	1,084	$4,802,648	$1,252,226	$652,007	$6,706,881	$6,187
IDITAROD	399	$4,134,454	$1,038,030	$166,537	$5,339,021	$13,381
KASHUNAMIUT	166	$1,417,382	$750,000	$0	$2,167,382	$13,057
KUSPUK	408	$3,644,698	$1,440,106	$261,496	$5,346,300	$13,104
LAKE AND PENISULA	370	$4,647,795	$1,322,008	$205,000	$6,174,803	$16,689
LOWER KUSKOKWIM	2,675	$23,996,368	$7,100,000	$402,441	$31,498,809	$11,775
LOWER YUKON	1,286	$7,426,071	$5,413,552	$1,193,480	$14,033,103	$10,912
PRIBILOF ISLANDS	169	$1,019,227	$748,781	$50,000	$1,818,008	$10,757
RAILBELT	357	$3,174,347	$100,000	$242,839	$3,517,186	$9,852
SOUTHEAST ISLANDS	458	$2,952,223	$849,550	$416,821	$4,218,594	$9,211
SOUTHWEST	486	$4,206,731	$2,155,859	$415,653	$6,778,243	$13,947
YUKON FLATS	377	$4,935,528	$714,000	$168,000	$5,817,528	$15,431
YUKON KOYUKUK	596	$5,429,081	$1,721,696	$297,369	$7,448,146	$12,497
YUPIIT	285	$3,667,899	$0	$60,000	$3,727,899	$13,080
TOTAL	12,982	$102,216,958	$34,860,024	$6,745,210	$143,822,192	$11,079

Exhibit B, p. 8

SOURCE: DOE

TABLE 20: MAJOR REVENUE BY SOURCE FOR CITY/BOROUGH DISTRICTS

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ADM	FY87 CITY/BOROUGH APPROPRIATION PER ADM	STATE FOUNDATION PER ADM	P.L. 81-874 PER ADM	TOTAL REVENUE: MAJOR SOURCES PER ADM
ANCHORAGE	40,674	$1,561	$3,169	$0.00	$4,730
BRISTOL BAY	241	$166	$8,950	$1268.13	$10,384
CORDOVA	390	$1,603	$5,142	$30.38	$6,775
CRAIG	186	$58	$7,265	$178.51	$7,501
DILLINGHAM	465	$215	$7,792	$860.22	$8,867
FAIRBANKS	13,431	$1,597	$3,599	$3.72	$5,200
GALENA	146	$34	$10,663	$2939.91	$13,637
HAINES	351	$1,108	$5,917	$85.47	$7,111
HOONAH	214	$47	$6,654	$1146.29	$7,848
HYDABURG	97	$12	$8,975	$0.00	$8,987
JUNEAU	4,700	$1,755	$3,473	$7.66	$5,236
KAKE	202	$74	$7,692	$2253.71	$10,020
KENAI	8,548	$2,129	$3,446	$23.40	$5,598
KETCHIKAN	2,439	$2,213	$3,529	$8.20	$5,750
KING COVE	120	$83	$9,215	$475.33	$9,773
KLAWOCK	156	$0	$7,507	$1661.92	$9,168
KODIAK	2,278	$967	$5,344	$116.93	$6,427
MAT-SU	9,366	$2,078	$2,966	$0.00	$5,044
NENANA	126	$397	$9,150	$47.62	$9,594
NOME	850	$242	$7,153	$94.12	$7,489
NORTH SLOPE	1,155	$11,156	$8,485	$5714.29	$25,355
NORTHWEST ARCTIC**	1,526	$0	$7,755	$2444.57	$10,200
PELICAN	54	$259	$11,333	$0.00	$11,592
PETERSBURG	597	$1,095	$4,054	$8.38	$5,158
SAND POINT	115	$870	$7,775	$0.00	$8,644
SITKA	1,654	$1,801	$3,768	$72.55	$5,641
SKAGWAY	136	$353	$7,140	$0.00	$7,493
ST. MARY'S	115	$0	$10,949	$1739.13	$12,688
TANANA	78	$26	$13,583	$3005.81	$16,615
UNALASKA	141	$1,227	$8,245	$1347.52	$10,820
VALDEZ	791	$5,169	$4,334	$25.28	$9,527
WRANGELL	451	$1,193	$4,809	$0.00	$6,002
YAKUTAT	157	$182	$7,979	$382.17	$8,543
TOTAL	91,950	$1,756	$3,706	$152.75	$5,615

Exhibit B pg. 9

**TRANSITION DISTRICT (REF: AS14.17.210)

SOURCE: DOE AND CRA

TABLE 2A: DISTRICT RANKINGS BY MAJOR REVENUE SOURCES

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ADM	FY87 CITY/BOROUGH APPROPRIATION PER ADM	STATE FOUNDATION PER ADM	P.L. 81-874 PER ADM	TOTAL REVENUE: MAJOR SOURCES PER ADM		
NORTH SLOPE	1,155	$11,156	$8,485	$5714.29	$25,355		
TANANA	78	$26	$13,583	$3005.81	$16,615		
GALENA	146	$34	$10,663	$2939.91	$13,637		
ST. MARY'S	115	$0	$10,949	$1739.13	$12,688		
PELICAN	54	$259	$11,333	$0.00	$11,592		
UNALASKA	141	$1,227	$8,245	$1347.52	$10,820		
BRISTOL BAY	241	$166	$8,950	$1268.13	$10,384		
NORTHWEST ARCTIC*	1,526	$0	$7,755	$2444.57	$10,200		
KAKE	202	$74	$7,692	$2253.71	$10,020		
KING COVE	120	$83	$9,215	$475.33	$9,773		
NENANA	126	$397	$9,150	$47.62	$9,594		
VALDEZ	791	$5,169	$4,334	$25.28	$9,527		
KLAWOCK	156	$0	$7,507	$1661.92	$9,168		
HYDABURG	97	$12	$8,975	$0.00	$8,987		
DILLINGHAM	465	$215	$7,792	$860.22	$8,867		
SAND POINT	115	$870	$7,775	$0.00	$8,644		
YAKUTAT	157	$182	$7,979	$382.17	$8,543		
HOONAH	214	$47	$6,654	$1146.29	$7,848		
CRAIG	186	$58	$7,265	$178.51	$7,501		
SKAGWAY	136	$353	$7,140	$0.00	$7,493		
NOME	850	$242	$7,153	$94.12	$7,489		
HAINES	351	$1,108	$5,917	$85.47	$7,111		
CORDOVA	390	$1,603	$5,142	$30.38	$6,775		
KODIAK	2,278	$967	$5,344	$116.93	$6,427		
WRANGELL	451	$1,193	$4,809	$0.00	$6,002		
KETCHIKAN	2,439	$2,213	$3,529	$8.20	$5,750		
SITKA	1,654	$1,801	$3,768	$72.55	$5,641		
KENAI	8,548	$2,129	$3,446	$23.40	$5,598		
JUNEAU	4,700	$1,755	$3,473	$7.66	$5,236		
FAIRBANKS	13,431	$1,597	$3,599	$3.72	$5,200		
PETERSBURG	597	$1,095	$4,054	$8.38	$5,158		
MAT-SU	9,366	$2,078	$2,966	$0.00	$5,044		
ANCHORAGE	40,674	$1,561	$3,169	$0.00	$4,730		
TOTAL	91,950	$1,756	$3,706	$152.75	$5,615		

Exhibit B, pg. 10

**TRANSITION DISTRICT (REF: AS14.17.210)

SOURCE:DOE AND CRA

TABLE 2E: DISTRICT P.L. 81-874 REVENUE

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ADM	LOCAL ADM AS OF STATE ADM	FEDERAL REVENUE: P.L. 81-874	P.L. 81-874 PER ADM
ANCHORAGE	40,674	44.23%	$0	$0.00
BRISTOL BAY	241	0.26%	$305,619	$1268.13
CORDOVA	390	0.42%	$11,848	$30.38
CRAIG	186	0.20%	$33,203	$178.51
DILLINGHAM	465	0.51%	$400,000	$860.22
FAIRBANKS	13,431	14.61%	$50,000	$3.72
GALENA	146	0.16%	$429,227	$2939.91
HAINES	351	0.38%	$30,000	$85.47
HOONAH	214	0.23%	$245,306	$1146.29
HYDABURG	97	0.11%	$0	$0.00
JUNEAU	4,700	5.11%	$36,000	$7.66
KAKE	202	0.22%	$455,250	$2253.71
KENAI	8,548	9.30%	$200,000	$23.40
KETCHIKAN	2,439	2.65%	$20,000	$8.20
KING COVE	120	0.13%	$57,040	$475.33
KLAWOCK	156	0.17%	$259,260	$1661.92
KODIAK	2,278	2.48%	$266,360	$116.93
MAT-SU	9,366	10.19%	$0	$0.00
NENANA	126	0.14%	$6,000	$47.62
NOME	850	0.92%	$80,000	$94.12
NORTH SLOPE	1,155	1.26%	$6,600,000	$5714.29
NORTHWEST ARCTIC**	1,526	1.66%	$3,730,416	$2444.57
PELICAN	54	0.06%	$0	$0.00
PETERSBURG	597	0.65%	$5,000	$8.38
SAND POINT	115	0.13%	$0	$0.00
SITKA	1,654	1.80%	$120,000	$72.55
SKAGWAY	136	0.15%	$0	$0.00
ST. MARY'S	115	0.13%	$200,000	$1739.13
TANANA	78	0.08%	$234,453	$3005.81
UNALASKA	141	0.15%	$190,000	$1347.52
VALDEZ	791	0.86%	$20,000	$25.28
WRANGELL	451	0.49%	$0	$0.00
YAKUTAT	157	0.17%	$60,000	$382.17
TOTAL	91,950	100.00%	$14,044,982	$152.75

Exhibit B, p 11

**TRANSITION DISTRICT (REF: AS14.17.210)

SOURCE:DOE

DISTRICT BY DISTRICT AND SCHOOL BY SCHOOL ANALYSIS OF PUPILS AND CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEES IN SCHOOLS OF VARIOUS SIZES

Where teachers are listed the total number of teachers at the school is listed first, then within the first parentheses, the number of adminstrator at the school is listed, and, within the second parentheses, the number of special program personnel at the school is listed-special education, gifted and talented and bilingual. The number of classroom teachers can be calculated by subtracting from certificated employees the following:

(1) Adminstrators in the first pair of parentheses

(2) Special program personnel in the second pair of parenthcses

Source: Alaska Education Directory 1986 Published by Alaska Department of Education based on enrollment statistics for 1984-85 school year

Exhibit C, p. 1

The ratio of certificated employees to pupils and of headquarters certificated employees to pupils is steadily decreasing from the numbers reported by the schod districts for the FY 1984-85 year.

Frontiersman Jan 23, 1987 page 6

Deep cuts proposed for schools' staff

By CONNIE BRANDEL
Frontiersman staff

MAT-SU—Rumors, guesses and possibilities turned into cold, hard facts and figures Wednesday when the Mat-Su School Board got its first look at the district's proposed 1987-88 budget.

To absorb a predicted 15-percent cut in state funding, the district's budget was cut by more than $5 million, from a revised 1986-87 budget of $53.5 million to just over $48 million next year.

State funding will drop from $31.5 million to $26.4 million next year, and federal funding will drop from $1.2 million to $990,000. The budget assumes borough support will be unchanged at $19.4 million.

The board also received a list of items and programs that disappeared in the administration's preliminary budget, and discussed priorities for rearranging final budget expenditures.

Superintendent Bruce DeMond gave the board a list of existing items that were eliminated from the preliminary budget. Depending on board and community priorities—and finding sufficient money in the budget—those items can be reinstated by the board.

Among the items missing from the preliminary budget are:

- About 67.5 certificated staff positions, including teachers and building administrators. DeMond said the cuts were based on a formula that reduced each building's teacher allocation by 15 percent.

That number includes the equivalent of nearly four full-time principals and assistant principals. DeMond said one position would be cut from full to half-time at small elementary schools and at junior and senior high schools with multiple administrators.

- Nearly 30 classified staff positions, including classroom aides, bilingual-bicultural tutors, and activity bus drivers.
- Funding for Wasilla Elementary School, which would be closed and the kindergarten students assigned to Iditarod or Tanaina schools.
- Elementary swimming program.
- Remedial reading program.
- Sherrod strings program.
- Elimination of the district's per-school contribution for extra-curricular activities. The exact activities to be cut have not been identified.
- The assistant personnel director, public information officer, and several warehouse, accounting and transportation employees.

By consensus the board agreed that its highest priority in further budget deliberations is to maintain the lowest possible pupil-teacher ratio.

Also mentioned as high priorities were maintaining accreditation of the district schools, complying with state and federal regulations, and minimizing the number of

(Please see Schools Backpage)

Exhibit C, p-2

Schools

(Continued from Page 1)

employees layed off.

The reduction of 67 certificated staff positions includes 56 classroom teachers, which will have a significant impact on classroom PTRs, DeMond said.

Current PTR figures, based on actual classroom teaching assignments without music and physical education teachers and librarians, range from about 21 students per teacher at the kindergarten level to nearly 27 per teacher at the sixth grade level.

According to next year's budget, the average PTRs will range from 24.3 at the kindergarten level to 31 in the fourth grade and 27.7 in the sixth grade. However, the PTR for the elementary grades at several schools ranged from 35 to 38 students.

At the high school level, where teachers teach five or six sections per day, each teaching position eliminated means that many fewer class sections can be offered, DeMond said. The average high school PTR is expected to rise from the current 19.5 students per teacher to 23 students per teacher next year, and some classes could range as high as 40 students.

Assistant Superintendent Norm Palenske said that according to research studies, the district's current PTRs probably are well within limits conducive to learning at all grade levels.

However, as proposed in the budget, some of next year's PTRs probably exceed those standards, Palenske said. Board members asked him to report on the maximum acceptable PTRs indicated in the research at a future workshop session.

DeMond estimated that lowering the average pupil-teacher ratio by one student at all elementary schools would require between 10 and 12 additional teaching positions for a cost of about $500,000. Unless the board can find other sources of revenue, that money would have to be cut from an item or program still in the budget, he said.

The administration's preliminary budget includes a $600,000 reduction in transtation costs by implementing a triple-tier schedule.

In that plan, district schools would have three, rather than two, staggered starting times, meaning many buses would make additional daily runs and fewer buses would be needed. The plan would probably work only in the Palmer and Wasilla areas where schools are relatively close, DeMond said.

Other issues under consideration by the board include:

- A reduction in wages or elimination of step increases for next year. DeMond imposed a wage freeze last fall as the state' budget situation worsened, and the district is still negotiating with teachers for a contract for the current year.

No funding was included in the preliminary 1987-88 budget for additional salary or step increases.

- Shortening the workday to seven hours for classified employees.
- Increasing the secondary school schedule from six to seven periods, either by shortening the periods or lengthening the school day.

New PTR
K 21:1
6 27:1

New PTR
High School
from 19.5:1
to
23:1
some classes
up to 40:1

Exhibit C, p. 3

School District	1–16 No. of Pupils	1–16 No. of Cert. Pers.	1–16 P RS	17–24 No. of Pupils	17–24 No. of Cert. Pers.	17–24 P RS	25–40 No. of Pupils	25–40 No. of Cert. Pers.	25–40 P RS	41–70 No. of Pupils	41–70 No. of Cert. Pers.	41–70 P RS	71–120 No. of Pupils	71–120 No. of Cert. Pers.	71–120 P RS	121–200 No. of Pupils	121–200 No. of Cert. Pers.	121–200 P RS	200 plus No. of Pupils	200 plus No. of Cert. Pers.	200 plus P RS	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at District HQ	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio
Anchorage	19	4	4.7	39	3	13.0	34	4	8.5				216	25	8.6				39,577	2,523	15.7	40,562	88	460.93
Bristol Bay	16	1	16.0										219	23	9.5							241	2	120.50
Cordova																170	18	9.4	218	17	12.8	388	1	388.00
Craig													168	22	7.6							168	1	168.00
Dillingham																166	26	6.4	245	21	11.7	411	9	45.67
Fairbanks							40	6	6.7				177	17	10.4	571	56	10.2	11,074	755		12,708	34	373.76
Galena													138	22	6.3							138	2	69.00
Haines																390	39	10.0				390	2	195.00
Hoonah													211	19	11.1							211	1	211.00
Hydaburg										108	13	8.3										108	1	108.00
Juneau	13	1	13.0				37	5	7.4										4,519	317	14.3	4,569	28	163.18
Kake													206	27	7.6							206	5	41.20
Kenai				21	2	10.5	120	14	8.6	43	4	10.8	297	30	9.9	5[illegible]	59	9.6	7,085	482	14.7	8,130	27	301.11
Ketchikan				18	2	9.0	40	4	10.0				178	4	44.5				2,281	165	13.8	2,517	14	179.79
King Cove													114	15	7.6							114	1	114.00
Klawock							31	4	7.6	46	5	9.2	78	4	19.5							155	7	22.14
Kodiak							152	16	9.5	62	7	8.9	177	20	8.9				1,912	124	15.4	2,303	14	164.50
Mat-Su	13	2	13.5				72	10	7.0	59	6	9.[illegible]	96	11	8.7	158	9	10.8	7,885	511	15.4	8,437	42	200.88
Nenana													184	22	8.4							184	1	184.00
Nome																			741	71	10.4	741	10	74.10
North Slope							96	23	4.2	127	21	6.1	111	13	8.5	138	18	7.7	556	71	7.8	1,028	18	57.11
Pelican										42	6	7.0										42	2	21.00
Petersburg																			571	46	12.4	571	1	571.00
Sand Point													109	10	10.4							109	2	54.50
Sitka													221	17	13.0	132	8	16.5	1,298	86	15.1	1,651	3	550.33
Skagway																134	11	12.2				134	3	44.67
St. Mary's							29	6	4.8				72	5	14.4							101	4	25.25
Tanana										66	11	6.0										66	1	66.00
Unalaska										128	14	9.1										128	3	42.67
Valdez													71	9	7.9	299	22	13.6	204	20	10.2	783	5	156.60
Wrangell																			458	38	12.1	464	2	232.00
Yakutat													164	20	8.2							164	2	82.00
TOTAL	61	8	7.6	78	7	11.1	651	92	7.1	681	87	7.8	3,202	335	9.6	2,721	266	10.0	84,620	5,256	16.1	87,922	435	202.12

Exhibit C, p 4

School District	1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			200 plus					
Adak																186	23	8.1	345	27	12.3	531	4	132.75
Alaska Gateway				60	7	8.6	63	7	9.0				77	10	7.7							447	5	89.40
Aleutians	13	3	4.3	61	9	6.8	28	3	9.3													102	3	34.00
Annette Isl.																166	16	10.4	222	19	11.7	338	4	84.50
Bering Straits				18	1	18.0	92	16	5.6	259	29	8.9	87	8	10.9	704	68	10.4				1,160	25	46.40
Chatham	14	5	2.8				62	7	8.9							161	20	8.1				270	2	135.00
Chugach				24	2	12.0	29	4	7.3	55	7	7.9										108	4	27.00
Copper River	9	1	9.0	23	3	7.7	30	2	15.0	118	11	10.7	118	4	29.5	174	17	10.2				569	2	284.50
Delta Greely																			932	66	14.12	932	9	103.56
Iditarod	61	10	6.1	24	2	12.0	31	3	10.3	135	15	9.0				138	15	9.2				389	13	29.92
Kashunamiut																166	21	7.9				166	2	83.00
Kuspuk	29	6	4.8	22	4	5.5	83	11	7.6	104	13	8.0	114	13	8.8							352	14	25.14
Lake & Penisula	52	8	6.5	56	7	8.0	59	11	5.4	159	23	6.9										326	6	54.33
Lower Kuskokwim	47	9	5.2	20	4	5.0	129	36	3.6	285	39	7.3	497	59	8.4	278	29	9.6	897	60	15.0	2,248	18	124.89
Lower Yukon							73	10	7.3				354	33	10.7	650	62	10.5	219	19	11.5	1,296	11	117.82
Pribilof Isl.				20	2	10.0										131	14	9.4				161	1	161.00
Railbelt	13	1	13.0				33	3	11.0				114	12	9.5	184	15	12.3				344	5	68.80
Southeast Isl.	54	10	5.4	82	10	8.2	35	4	8.6	64	7	9.1	92	10	9.2							327	11	29.73
Southwest	14	2	7.0	24	2	12.0	76	11	6.9	44	5	8.8	187	23	8.1	136	15	9.1				496	12	41.33
Yukon Flats	39	7	5.6	32	4	8.0	91	8	11.4	65	7	9.3	118	14	8.4							359	15	23,93
Yukon Koyukuk	13	2	6.5	60	7	8.6	38	5	7.6	226	26	8.7	102	11	9.2							439	23	19.09
Yupiit							39	5	7.8	152	16	9.5	88	7	12.6							128	1	128.00
N.W. Arctic	12	1	2.0	17	2	8.5	94	11	8.5	481	65	7.4	275	23	12.0	129	23	12.0	286	26	11.0	1,343	10	134.30
TOTAL	370	71	5.3	543	64	8.5	1,055	157	6.7	3,160	263	12.0	2,423	227	10.7	3,203	336	9.5	2,901	218	13.3	12,831	200	64.16
	431	79	5.5	621	71	8.7	1,672	245	6.8	3,841	350	11.0	5,625	562	10.0	5,625	562	9.7	86,165	5,211	16.5	100,753	635	158.67

Exhibit C, p. 5

	District	Enrollment	Cert Pers	Cert Pers at Hq	Cert Pers at schools	Classroom teachers	Cert pers to pupils	Cert pers at school to pupils	Classroom teachers to pupils
1	Anchorage	40562	2630	85	2543	2000	15.4	16.0	20.2
2	Fairbanks	12708	927	34	893	747	13.7	16.6	17.1
3	Matsu	8437	577	42	535	471	14.6	15.8	17.9
4	Kenai	8130	618	27	591	468	13.2	13.8	17.4
5	Juneau	4569	351	28	333	295	13.0	13.7	15.5
6	Ketchikan	2517	189	14	175	152	13.5	14.4	16.6
7	Kodiak	2303	181	14	167	143	12.7	13.8	16.1
8	Sitka	1651	114	3	111	98	14.5	14.9	16.9
9		80877	5587	250	5348	4374	14.5	15.1	18.5
10									
11	Adak	531	55	4	47	41	9.7	11.3	13.0
12	Alaska Gateway	447	49	5	44	38	9.1	10.2	11.8
13	Aleutian	102	18	3	15	15	5.7	6.8	9.9
14	Annette Island	388	39	4	35	33	9.9	11.1	11.8
15	Bering Strait	1160	147	25	122	101	7.9	9.5	11.5
16	Bristol Bay	235	26	2	24	20	9.0	9.8	11.8
17	Chatham	270	30	2	28	24	9.0	9.6	11.3
18	Chugach	108	17	4	13	9	6.4	8.3	12.4
19	Copper River	569	46	2	44	46	12.4	12.9	10.8
20	Cordova	388	36	1	35	31	10.7	11.1	12.5
21	Craig	168	23	1	22	17	7.3	7.6	9.9
22	Delta-Greely	932	75	9	66	61	12.4	14.1	15.3
23	Dillingham	411	56	9	47	38	7.3	8.7	10.8
24									
25									

Exhibit C, p. 6

	District	Enrollment	Cert Pers	Cert Pers at Hq	Cert Pers at schools	Classroom teachers	Cert Pers. to 10 pupils	Cert Pers at school to pupils	Classroom teachers to pupils
1	Galena	1358	24	2	22	18	5.8	6.3	7.7
2	Haines	390	41	2	39	31	9.5	10.0	12.6
3	Hoonah	211	20	1	19	15	10.6	11.2	14.1
4	Hydaburg	108	14	1	13	10	7.7	8.3	10.8
5	Iditarod	589	58	13	45	42	6.8	8.6	9.2
6	Kake	206	32	5	27	23	6.4	7.6	9.0
7	Kashunamiut		21	2	19	12			
8	King Cove	174	16	1	15	13	7.1	7.6	8.8
9	Klawock	155	20	7	13	12	7.8	11.9	13.9
10	Kuspuk	357	61	14	47	43	5.8	7.5	8.2
11	Lake and Peninsula	326	53	6	47	45			
12	Lower Kuskokwim	1048	257	18	239	192	8.7	9.4	11.7
13	Lower Yukon	1296	138	11	127	102	9.3	10.1	12.7
14	Nenana	184	23	1	22	17	8.0	8.4	10.8
15	Nome	741	71	10	61	47	10.4	12.3	15.5
16	North Slope	1628	164	18	146	112	6.4	7.0	9.2
17	Northwest	1343	154	10	144	125	8.7	9.3	10.7
18	Pelican	42	8	2	6	4			10.5
19	Petersburg	571	47	1	46	40	12.1	12.4	14.3
20	Pribilof	161	17	1	16	14	9.5	10.1	11.5
21	Railbelt	344	37	5	32	28	9.3	10.8	12.3
22	St Mary's	161	15	4	11	10	6.7	9.1	10.1
23	Sand Point	109	12	2	10	9	9.1	10.9	12.1
24									
25									

Exhibit C, p. 17

	District	Enrollment	Cert Pers	Cert Pers at Hq	Cert Pers at schols	Classroom teachers	Cert pers to pupils	Cert pers at school to pupils	Classroom teachers to pupils
1	Skagway	134	14	3	11	10	9.6	12.1	13.4
2	Southeast Island	327	52	1:1	41	41		8.0	8.0
3	Southwest Region	496	70	12	58	48	7.1	8.6	10.3
4	Tanana	66	12	1	11	9	6.0	7.3	11.0
5	Unalaska	128	17	3	14	12	7.5	9.1	10.6
6	Valdez	783	71	5	66	41	11.0	11.7	19.1
7	Wrangell	464	40	2	38	32	11.6	12.1	14.5
8	Yakutat	164	23	2	20	15	7.5	8.2	10.9
9	Yukon Flats	359	55	1.5	40	38	6.5	9.0	9.5
10	Yukon Koyukuk	431	74	23	51	42	5.9	8.6	10.5
11	Yupiit	128	29	1	28	26	4.4	4.5	4.9
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									

Exhibit C p 8

1 Size
M)

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at 20th/15	Pupil/SQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	P RS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	P RS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	P RS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	P RS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	P RS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers	P RS
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			201 plus
ANCHORAGE																					
1 Abbot Loop E	735	25																			735 25(1)(6)
2 Airport Hgts E	354	22																			354 22(1)(4)
3 Aurora E	523	28																			523 28(1)(4)
4 Bartlett SHS	1635	99																			1635 99(3)(19)
5 Baxter E	498	28																			498 28(1)(3)
6 Bayshore E	466	24																			466 24(1)(2)
7 Bear Valley E	489	25																			489 25(1)(1)
8 Birchwood E	424	21																			424 21(1)(1)
9 Booth Second							22	2(0)(2)													
10 Campbell E	443	23																			443 23(1)(3)
11 Career Center		58																			0 58(4)(3)
12 Central JHS	670	46																			670 46(1)(10)
13 Ches. Vall.E	374	19																			374 19(1)(1)
14 Chinook E	548	26																			548 26(1)(2)
15 Chugach E	221	13																			221 13(1)(1)
16 Chuglak E	614	28																			614 28(1)(3)
17 Chuglak HS	1302	76																			1302 76(4)(7)
18 Clark JHS	824	47																			824 47(2)(4)
19 College Gate E	355	18																			355 18(1)(2)
20 Crkside Park E	341	18																			341 18(1)(2)
21 Denali Fund E	229	41																			229 41(1)(24)

Exhibit 5, p. 9

Size

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Personnel - Schools	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers
					1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200		201 plus
	Dimond HS	1857	104																		1857 104(1)(12
	Eagle River E	658	22																		658 22(1)(2)
	East HS	1744	102																		1744 102(3)(7.5
	Fairview E	317	19																		317 19(1)(5)
	Fire Lake E		26																		26(1)(2)
	Girdwood K-8	100	8														100	8(1)(1)			
	Gladys Wood E	672	33																		672 33(1)(1)
	Gov't Hill E	254	15																		254 15(1)(2)
	Gruening JHS	78	47																		780 47(2)(5)
	Hanshew JHS	1226	63																		1226 63(2)(6)
	Homestead E	555	26																		555 26(1)(1)
	Huffman E	502	25																		502 25(1)(1)
	Inlet View E	255	14																		255 14(1)(1)
	Jes L. Hm 1-12	34	4								34	4(0)(4)									
	Kennedy E	232	14																		232 14(1)(1)
	Klatt E	540	31																		540 31(1)(5)
	Lake Otis E	454	21																		454 21(1)(1)
	M Kinley Hgts	17	1					17	1(0)(1)												
	McLaughlin YC	116	17														116	17(1)(1)			
	Mears JHS	948	55																		948 55(2)(5)
	Mount Illiamna	299	15																		299 15(1)(1)
	Nuvia		24																		24(0)(1)

Exhibit C, p. 19

ol Size
DM)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at Schools	Pupil/EQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	PERS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers
					1-16			17-24			25-40				41-70			71-120			121-200		201 plus
45	Mount Spur E	388	20																			388 20(1)(1
46	Mt View E	645	35																			645 35(1)(6
47	Muldoon E	385	21																			385 21(1)(2
48	North Star E	441	23																			441 23(1)(3
49	No. Lts. E	371	18																			371 18(1)(0
50	Northwood	441	24																			441 24(1)(3
51	Nunaka Valley E	343	17																			343 17(1)(3
52	Ocean View E	489	25																			489 25(1)(1
53	O'Malley E	525	27																			525 27(1)(2
54	Orion E	296	18																			296 18(1)(4
55	Prov. Hts	13	3		13	3(0)(3)																
56	Ptarmigan E	382	20																			382 20(1)(4
57	Rabbit Crk E	464	24																			464 24(1)(2
58	Rab.Crk GH 7-12	6	1		6	1(0)(0)																
59	Ravenwood E	615	31																			615 31(1)(2
60	Rigel SpecServ	28	21																			28 21(1)(19
61	Roger Park E	373	21																			373 21(1)(4)
62	Romig JHS	660	42																			660 42(2)(11)
63	Russian Jack E	362	27																			362 27(2)(10)
64	Sand Lake E	438	22																			438 22(1)(11)
65	Sav 1 Prg 10-12	223	13																			223 13(1)(1
66	Scenic Park E	492	25																			492 28(1)(2

Exhibit C, p. 11

Bise

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at Schools	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PERS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PERS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PERS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PERS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PERS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PERS
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			201 plus
Service HS	1910	105																			1910 105(3)(5), 27(1)(2),
Spring Hill E		27																			
Steller HS	236	14																			236 14(1)(0)
Susitna E	466	27																			460 27(1)(5)
Taku E	455	19																			455 19(1)(3)
Tudor E	637	29																			637 29(1)(1)
Turnagain E	585	27																			585 27(1)(1)
Ursa Major E	338	21																			338 21(1)(5)
Ursa Minor E	342	18																			342 18(1)(1)
Wendler JHS	1062	54																			1082 54(2)(2)
West Anch HS	1646	92																			1646 92(5)(0)
Whaley Center	37	143																			37 143(2)(99)
Willaway E	329	20																			329 20(1)(3)
Willow Crest E	521	27																			521 27(1)(3)
Wonder Park E	358	71																			358 71(1)(6)
	40,562		88 460.93	19	4(0)(3)		39	3(0)(3)		34	4(0)(4)					216	25(2)(2)				39577 2523(96)(4)
FAIRBANKS																					
Anderson E	540	23																			540 23(1)(1)
Aurora E	174	14																	174	14(1)(2)	
Lathrop HS	1150	77																			1150 77(3)(5)
Badger Road E	622	38																			622 38(1)(7)
Barnette E	455	27																			455 27(1)(1)

Exhibit C, p 12

ol Size
DM)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at school	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 1-16	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 17-24	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 25-40	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 41-70	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 71-120	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 121-200	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers / PTRS 201 plus
6	Eielson HS	533	47								533 47(2)(4)
7	Birch Sp.Ed K-	40	6				40 6(1)(5)				
8	Chena E	256	20								256 20(1)(3)
9	Denali E	321	22								321 22(1)(6)
10	Fbks Alt 1-12	126	9							126 9(1)(0)	
11	Ft WainwrightE	149	13							149 13(1)(3)	
12	Hunter E	391	27								391 27(1)(4)
13	Hutch.Car.Ctr	—	22								22(1)(2)
14	Joy E	403	24								403 24(1)(4)
15	McKinley JHS	75	10						75 10(1)(0)		
16	Nordale E	487	27								487 27(1)(2)
17	North Pole E	710	36								710 36(1)(6)
18	No Pole Mid6-8	677	52								677 52(2)(4)
19	North Pole HS	667	56								667 56(3)(3)
20	Pearl Ck E	553	31								553 31(1)(2
21	Pennell Elem / Rosa. Weller E	313 / 634	32 / 38								313 22(1)(4
22	Ryan Middle	650	50								634 38(1)(5
23	Salcha E	102	7						102 7(1)(1)		
24	Tanana JHS	509	42								509 42(1)(4
25	Taylor E	231	18								231 18(1)(2
26	Two Rivers E	122	10							122 10(1)(2)	
27	Univ Park E	457	32								457 32(1)(4)

Size
)

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at school	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-7[illegible]			[illegible]			12[illegible]			[illegible]		
W. Valley HS	824	61																				824	61(1)(5)	
Woodriver E	507	32																				507	32(1)(6)	
	12,708	893	34/374							40	6(1)(5)					177	17(2)(1)		571	56(4)(7)		11,920	755(28)(9)	
MATSU																								
Big Lake E	451	25																				451	25(1)(2)	
Butte E	440	22																				440	22(1)(4)	
Cottonwd Ck E	703	32																				703	32(1)(3)	
Glacier View E	37	6								37	6(1)(.5)													
Iditarod E																						461	29(1)(3)	
Matsu Corresp.	314	8																				314	8(1)(0)	
Palmer HS	727	55																				727	55(2)(3)	
Palmer JHS	481	29																				481	29(1)(6)	
Pioneer Pk E		28																				—	28(1)(6)	
Pt McKenzie E		1		—	1([illegible])([illegible])																			
Sherrod E	644	31																				644	31(1)(5)	
Skwentna E	13	1		13	1(1)([illegible])																			
Snowshoe E	673	31																				673	31(1)(2)	
Susitna V HS	151	14																	151	14(1)(5)				
Sutton E	59	6											59	6(1)(.5)										
Swanson E	592	27																				592	27(1)(6)	
Talkeetna E	96	11														96	11(1)(2)							
Tanaina E	382	29																				382	29(1)(5)	

Exhibit C, p 14

Size

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 11-16	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 17-24	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 25-40	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 41-70	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 71-120	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 121-200	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 200 plus
Trappers Ck E	35	4				35 4(0)(1)				
Wasilla E		8								1045 79(3)(6.5)
Wasilla HS	1045	79								760 50(2)(4)
Wasilla JHS										
Willow	158	9							158 9(1)(1)	
	8437	535	42 20038	13 2(1)(0)		72 100(1.5)	59 6(0)(.5)	96 11(1)(2)	309 23(2)(1.5)	7885 511(18)(46.5)
KENAI								86 12(1)(1)		
Bartlett E	86	12								206 17(1)(2)
Chapman E	206	17								
Crop. Land.E	36	4				36 4(0)(0)				
English Bay HS	43	4					43 4(0)(0)			
Homer Int. 4-6	125	12								128 12(1)(1)
Homer JHS 7-8	232	12								232 12(1)(2)
Homer HS	387	36								387 36(2)(2)
Hope E	27	3				27 3(0)(0)				
Kalifonsky E.	490	31								490 31(1)(6)
Kenai Ctral HS	688	56								688 56(3)(6)
Kenai E	315	21								315 21(1)(5)
Kenai JHS	403	27								403 27(2)(4)
McNeil Canyon	101	7						101 7(1)(3)		
Moose Pass E	30	3				30 3(0)(0)				
Nikiski E	499	29								499 29(2)(5)
NikolaevskE/H	134	11							134 11(1)(1)	

Exhibit C, pg 15

Size

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at Schools	Pupil/EQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41--70			71-120			121-200			201 plus
1 Kinilchik E	150	17																	150	17(1)(3)		
2 Paul Banks E	447	23																				447 23(1)(5)
3 Port Graham E	27	4								27	4(0)(0)											
4 Razdolna E	21	2					21	2(0)(0)														
5 Redoubt E	373	26																				373 26(1)(7)
6 Seward E	387	23																				387 23(1)(8)
7 Seward HS	152	19																	152	19(1)(2)		
8 Soldotna E	507	29																				507 29(2)(4)
9 Soldotna HS	795	59																				795 59(3)(6)
10 Soldotna JHS	433	34																				433 34(2)(5)
11 Sterling E	267	19																				267 19(1)(4)
12 Sterling Sears	431	26																				431 26(1)(6)
13 Susn B Eng.E/HS	110	11														110	11(1)(0)					
14 Tustamena E	225	14																				225 14(1)(2)
	8130	591	27/301.11				21	2(0)(0)		120	14(0)(0)		43	4(0)(0)		297	30(3)(4)		564	59(3)(6)		7085 483(27)(50)
	JUNEAU																					
1 Auke Bay E	37	5								37	5(0)(0)											
2 Capital E	467	31																				467 31(1)(4)
3 Floy Dry. Mid	316	22																				316 22(1)(2)
4 Gastineau E	589	44																				589 44(2)(3)
5 Glacier Val E	295	21																				295 21(1)(2)
6	411	26																				411 26(1)(3)

Exhibit C, p. 16

Size

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at Schools	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			201 plus
Harbor View E	315	22																			315 22(1)(4)
Jun. Douglas HS	1158	86																			1158 86(2)(3)
Mar. H Drake HS	473	33																			473 33(1)(3)
Menden. Riv K-6	495	32																			495 32(1)(3)
St Judes Ctr	13	1		13	1	(0)(0)															
	4569	323	28	163.18	13	1 (0)(0)				37	5	(0)(0)									4519 317(11)(27)
KETCHIKAN																					
Correspondence	178	4																	178	4	(0)(1)
Fire Cove K-12	18	2					18	2	(0)(0)												
Houghtaling E	540	31																			540 31(1)(3)
Ketchikan HS	655	56																			655 55(2)(3)
Revilla HS	40	4								40	4	(0)(0)									
Schoenbar JHS	368	32																			368 32(1)(4)
Valley Pk E	339	26																			339 26(1)(3)
White Cliff E	379	26																			379 26(1)(3)
	2517	175	14	179.79			18	2	(0)(0)	40	4	(0)(0)							178	4	(0)(1) 2251 165(2)(16)
KODIAK																					
Akhiok K-12	25	3								25	3	(0)(5)									
Chiniak K-8	28	5								28	5	(0)(1)									
East E	328	18																			328 18(1)(3)
Karluk K-10	30	3								30	3	(0)(5)									
Correspondence	32	1								32	1	(0)(0)									

Exhibit C pg 17

Size

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at School	Pupil/EQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS
				1-16			17-25			26-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			200 plus
Kodiak JHS	273	25																			273 25(2)(1)
Kodiak /AleutHS	533	44																			533 44(2)(3.5)
Larsen Bay K-12	62	7											62	7	(1)(.5)						
Main E	468	20																			468 20(1)(4)
Old Harbor K-12	100	12														100	12	(1)(0)			
Ouzinkie 1-11	37	4								37	4	(1)(1)									
Petersen E	310	17																			310 17(1)(1)
Port Lions K-12	77	8														77	8	(1)(1)			
	2303	167	14 164.50							152	16	(1)(7.5)	62	7	(1)(.5)	177	20	(2)(1)			1912 124(7)(15.5)
SITKA																					
Baranof E	457	28																			454 28(1)(4)
Blatchley JHS	385	24																			385 24(2)(4)
Etolin St E	107	11														107	11	(1)(2)			
Lincoln St E	114	6																	114	6	(0)(0)
Mt. Edgecombe HS	132	8																	132	8	(0)(4)
Sitka HS	454	34																			454 34(2)(3)
	1651	111	3 550.33													107	11	(1)(2)	246	14	(0)(4) 1298 86.(5)(11)

Exhibit 18

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at School	Pupil/SQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS
				1-16			17-25			26-40			41-70			71-120			120-200			200 plus
ADAK																					
Ann Stevens E	345	28																			345 28(1)(3)
Bob Reeve HS	186	23																	186	23(1)(1)	
	531	51	4/132.75																186	23(1)(1)	345 28(1)(3)
ALEUTIAN																					
Akutan	10	2		10	2(0)(0)																
Atka	22	4					22	4(0)(0)		28	3(0)(0)										
Cold Bay	25	3																			
False Pass	19	2					19	2(0)(0)													
Nelson Lagoon	20	3					20	3(0)(.5)													
Nikolski	3	1		3	1(0)(0)																
	102	15	3/34	3	3(0)(0)		71	9(0)(.5)		28	3(0)(0)										
METTE ISLAND																					
Metlakatna E	222	19																			222 19(1)(3)
Metlakatna HS	166	16																	166	16(1)(1.5)	222 19(1)(3)
	388	4	4/97																		

Exhibit 6, p. 19

.ool Size
.ADM)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at 5/20/85	Pupil/SQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS
	ALASKA GATEWAY				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			200 plus
1	Dot Lake	32	3								32	3	(0)(.5)									
2	Eagle Community	31	4								31	4	(0)(.5)									
3	Hentnota Lake	18	2					18	2	(0)(.5)												
4	Walter Northway	77	10														77	10	(1)(1)			
5	Tanacross	20	3					20	3	(0)(0)												
6	Tetlin	22	2					22	2	(0)(.5)												
7	Tok	247	20																			247 20 (1)(1)
		447	44	5/89.40				60	7	(0)(1)	63	7	(0)(1)				77	10	(1)(1)			247 20 (1)(1)
	BERING STRAITS																					
1	Aniguin	64	6											64	6	(.5)(2)						
2	Anthony Andrews	87	8														87	8	(1)(1)			
3	Previg Mission	34	6								34	6	(.5)(.5)									
4	Diomede HS	43	5											43	5	(0)(.)						
5	Gambell	133	14																	133	14	(1)(2)
6	Golovin	28	4								28	4	(.5)(1)									
7	James C Isabell	46	6											46	6	(.5)(0)						
8	Koyuk Malemute	52	6											52	6	(.5)(1)						

Exhibit C, p. 30

1 Size
IX)

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at School	Pupil/EQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS
				1-16			17-25			26-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			200 plus	
9 Savoonga	134	12																	134	12(2)(1)			
10 Shaktoolik	5	C								5	6(.5)(1)												
11 Shishmaref	138	14																	138	14(1)(1)			
12 Stebbins	126	11																	126	11(1)(1)			
13 Unalakleet	173	17																	173	17(1)(2)			
14 Wales-Kingikme	18	1					18	1(0)(0)															
15 White Mountain	30	6								30	C(1)(0)												
	1160		8/46.40				60	7(0)(1)		125	17(1)(7)		205	23(1.5)(3)		164	18(2)(2)		133	14(1)(2)			
BRISTOL BAY																							
1 Bristol Bay HS	109	14														109	4(1)(2)						
2 Naknek E	110	9														110	9(0)(1)						
3 South Naknek E	16	1		16	1(0)(0)																		
	241		2/120.50	16	1(0)(0)											219	13(1)(3)						
CHATHAM																							
1 Angoon	161	26																	161	20(1)(2)			
2 Corner Bay	–	1		–	1(0)(0)																		
3 8 Fathom Bight	–	1		–	1(0)(0)																		
4 Elfin Bay	–	1		–	1(0)(0)																		
5 Gustavus	26	3								26	3(0)(1)												
6 Klukwan	36	4								36	4(0)(0)												
7 Tenakee	14	2		14	2(0)(0)																		
	270	2	2/135.00	14	5(0)(0)					62	7(0)(1)								161	20(1)(2)			

Exhibit C, p. 21

I Size
K)

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at School	Pupil/SQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 1-16	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 17-24	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 25-40	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 41-70	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 71-120	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers. / PTRS 121-200	No. of Pupils / No. of Cert. Pers / PTRS 201 plus
CHUGACH										
1 Chenega	24	2			24 2(0)(.5)	29 4(1)(1)				
2 Tatitlek	29	4					55 7(1)(0)			
3 Whittier	55	7								
	108	13	4/27.00		24 2(0)(.5)	29 4(1)(1)	55 7(1)(0)			
COPPER RIVER										
1 Chistochina	30	2				30 2(0)(0)				
2 Copper Center	45	4					45 4(0)(1)			
3 Correspondence	52	2					52 2(0)(0)			
4 Gakona	23	3			23 3(0)(0)					
5 Glenallen E	118	4						118 4(0)(0)		
6 Glenallen HS	174	17							174 17(1)(1)	
7 Kenny Lake E	65	5					65 5(0)(0)			
8 Kenny Lake HS	54	6				54 6(1)(0)				
9 Paxson	9	1		9 1(0)(0)						
	569	44	2/284.50	9 1(0)(0)	23 3(0)(0)	84 8(1)(0)	162 11(0)(1)	118 4(0)(0)	174 17(1)(1)	
CORDOVA										
1 Cordova HS	170	18							170 18(1)(1)	
2 Mt Eccles E	218	17								218 17(1)(4)
	388	35	1/388.00						170 18(1)(1)	218 17(1)(4)
CRAIG										
1 Craig HS	79	11						79 11(1)(0)		
2 Craig E	89	11						89 11(1)(2)		
	168	22	1/168.00					168 22(2)(2)		

Exhibit G, p. 22

Exhibit C, p 23

1 District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at School	Pupil/SQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers	PTRS
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			201 plus
ACH																					
ega	24	2					24	2(0)(.5)													
tlek	29	4								29	4(1)(1)										
tier	55	7											55	7(1)(0)							
	108	13	1/27.00				24	2(0)(.5)		29	4(1)(1)		55	7(1)(0)							
ER ER																					
tochina	30	2								30	2(0)(0)										
per Center	45	4											45	4(0)(1)							
respondence	52	2											52	2(0)(0)							
na	23	3					23	3(0)(0)													
nallen E	118	4														118	4(0)(0)				
nallen HS	174	17																	174	17(1)(1)	
ny Lake E	65	5											65	5(0)(0)							
ny Lake HS	54	6								54	6(1)(0)										
son	9	1		9	1(0)(0)																
	569	44	2/284.50	9	1(0)(0)		23	3(0)(0)		84	8(1)(0)		162	11(0)(1)		118	4(0)(0)		174	17(1)(1)	
DOVA																					
dova HS	170	18																	170	18(1)(1)	
Eccles E	218	17																			218 17(1)(4)
	388	35	1/388.00																170	18(1)(1)	218 17(1)(4)
IG																79	11(1)(0)				
ic HS	79	11														89	11(1)(2)				
ic F	89	11														168	22(2)(2)				
	168	22	1/168.00																		

ol Size
DM)

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at School	Pupil/EQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	1-16 No. of Pupils	1-16 No. of Cert. Pers.	1-16 PTRS	17-24 No. of Pupils	17-24 No. of Cert. Pers.	17-24 PTRS	25-40 No. of Pupils	25-40 No. of Cert. Pers.	25-40 PTRS	41-70 No. of Pupils	41-70 No. of Cert. Pers.	41-70 PTRS	71-120 No. of Pupils	71-120 No. of Cert. Pers.	71-120 PTRS	121-200 No. of Pupils	121-200 No. of Cert. Pers.	121-200 PTRS	200 plus No. of Pupils	200 plus No. of Cert. Pers
DELTA-GREELY																							
1 Delta Jct E	358	20																				358	20(1)(6
2 Delta Jct HS	216	20																				216	20(1)(1
3 Ft Greely E	358	26																				358	26(0)(0
	932	66	1/10.3.56																			932	66(2)(3
DILLINGHAM																			245	21(1)(6)			
1 Dillingham E																			166	26(1)(1)			
2 Dillingham HS																			411	47(2)(7)			
	411		9/45.67																				
GALENA																82	9(0)(2)						
1 Galena E	82	9																					
2 Galena HS	56	13														56	13(0)(2)						
	138	22	2/69.00													138	22(0)(4)						
HAINES																			178	18(1)(3)			
1 Haines E	178	18	1													112	15(1)(3)						
2 Haines HS	112	15														81	4(0)(0)						
3 Haines JHS	81	4																					
4 Mosquito Lk E	19	2					19	2(0)(0)								193	19(1)(3)		178	18(1)(3)			
	390		2/195.00				19	2(0)(0)															
HOONAH																119	9(1)(1)						
1 Hoonah E	119	9														92	10(1)(1)						
2 Hoonah HS	92	10														211	19(2)(2)						
	211	19	1/211.00																				

Exhibit G p 24

ol Size
DK)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at School	Pupil/EQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS
					1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			201 p/45
	HYDABURG													61	5	(0)(1)						
1	Hydaburg E													47	8	(1)(.5)						
2	Hydaburg HS	108		1:108										108	13	(1)(1.5)						
	IDITAROD																					
1	Blackwell	15	2		15	2	(0)(0)															
2	Davis-Lewis	66	7											66	7	(0)(0)						
3	Holy Cross	69	8											69	8	(0)(1)						
4	Correspondence	10	2		16	2	(0)(0)															
5	Innoko River	31	3								31	3	(0)(0)									
6	Lime Village	7	1		7	1	(0)(0)															
7	McGrath	138	15																	138	15	(1)(1)
8	Takotna	13	4		13	4	(0)(0)															
9	Telida	10	1		10	1	(0)(0)															
10	Top-Kuskokwim	24	2					24	2	(0)(0)												
		389	45	1:29.92	61	10	(0)(0)	24	2	(0)(0)	31	3	(0)(0)	135	(15)	(0)(1)				138	15	(1)(1)
	KAKE																			120	10	(1)(1)
1	Kake E																86	17	(1)(1)			
2	Kake HS	206		5:41.20													86	17	(1)(1)	120	10	(1)(1)
	KASHUNAMIUT																					
1	Chevak	166		2:83.00																166	21	(1)(6)
		166																		166	21	(1)(6)

Exhibit C, p 25

1

ol Size
DM)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at Schools	Pupil/SQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS
					1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			201 p/us
	KING COVE																					
1	King Cove	114	15														114	15	(0)(2)			
		114	15	1 114													114	15	(0)(2)			
	KLAWOCK																					
1	Klawock E	78	4														78	4	(0)(1)			
2	Klawock HS	46	5											46	5	(0)(1)						
3	Klawock JHS	31	4								31	4	(0)(0)									
		155	13	1/2214							31	4	(0)(0	46	5	(0)(1)	78	4	(0)(1)			
	KUSPUK																					
1	Aniak	114	13														114	13	(1)(3)			
2	Chuathbaluk	25	3								25	3	(0)(0)									
3	Crooked Creek	32	4								32	4	(0)(0)									
4	Geo. Mgn Sr HS	52	8											52	8	(1)(1)						
5	Gus. Michael H	22	4					22	4	(0)(0)												
6	Correspondence	12	1		12	1	(0)(0)															
7	Lower Kalskag	52	5											52	5	(0)(.5)						
8	Red Devil	8	4		8	4	(0)(0)															
9	Sleet Mute	26	4								26	4	(0)(0)									
10	Upper Kalsag	9	1		9	1	(0)(0)															
		352	47	1425.14	29	6	(0)(0)	22	4	(0)(0)	83	11	(0)(0)	104	13	(1)(1.5)	114	13	(1)(2)			
	LAKE AND PENINSULA																					
1	Chignik	17	3					17	3	(0)(0)												
2	Chignik Lagoon	21	3					21	1	(0)(0)												

Exhibit C, p 26

el Size
DM)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at Schools	Pupil/EQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers	Pers
					1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			201 plus
3	Chignik Lake													44	6	(0)(0)							
4	Egekik	8	1		8	1	(0)(0)																
5	Igiugig	7	1		7	1	(0)(0)																
6	Ivanof Bay	9	1		9	1	(0)(0)																
7	Kokhanok	26	3								26	3	(0)(0)										
8	Newhalen	64	10											64	10	(0)(1)							
9	Nondalton	51	7											51	7	(.5)(0)							
10	Pedro Bay	9	2		9	2	(0)(0)																
11	Perryville	33	8								33	8	(0)(.5)										
12	Pilot Point	10	2		10	2	(0)(0)																
13	Port Alsworth	9	1		9	1	(0)(0)																
14	Port Heiden	18	3					18	3	(0)(0)													
		326	47	1/54.33	52	8	(0)(0)	66	7	(0)(0)	59	11	(0)(.5)	159	23	(.5)(1)							
	LOWER KUSKOKWIM																						
1	Akul Elit-Nau.																82	14	(1)(6)				
2	Anna Tobeluk										36	10	(1)(1)										
3	Arvuq				15	2	(0)(0)																
4	Ayaprun							20	4	(0)(0)													
5	Bethel Reg HS																					332	25 (2)(2)
6	Bethel-Kibuck E																					361	24 (1)(2)
7	Bethel ME E																					204	11 (0)(1)
8	Chaptnguak										34	7	(1)(0)										

Exhibit C, p27

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at Schools	Pupil/EQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	FTRS
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			200 plu.
	Buk												64	7	(1)(0)							
0	JoAnne A Alexie												67	8	(1)(0)							
1	Kipnuk									29	10	(.5)(0)										
2	Kongiganak															71	7	(.5)(1)				
3	Kwethluk																		147	18	(1)(1)	
4	Kwigillingok															73	8	(1)(1)				
5	Lewis Angapak									30	9	(1)(1)										
6	Napakiak															73	9	(1)(1)				
7	Nelson Island												65	13	(1)(0)							
18	Nightmute				16	5	(1)(0)															
19	Nunivaarmiut												43	5	(.5)(1)							
20	Oscarville				16	2	(.5)(1)															
21	Paul T. Albert															89	10	(1)(2)				
22	Quinhagak																		131	11	(1)(1.5)	
23	Rocky Mt												46	6	(.5)(1)							
24	Z. John Williams															109	11	(1)(1)				
		2,248		18	124.89	47 9 (1.5)(2)		20. 4 (0)(0)		129	36	(35)(2)	285	39	(4)(2)	497	59	(5.5)(2)	278	29	(2)(2.5)	897 40 (5)(5.)
	LOWER YUKON																					
1	Alakanuk	172	17																172	17	(1)(2)	
2	Arca Wide Voc	—	3			3(0)(0)																
3	Emmonak	189	17																189	17	(1)(1)	
4	Hooper Bay	168	17																168	17	(1)(2)	

Exhibit C, p. 27

1 Size
M)

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at Schools	Pupil/MQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200		200 plus
5 Kotlik	101	8														101	8	(1)(1)			
6 Marshall	87	9														87	9	(1)(1)			219 19(1)(2)
7 Mt Village	9	19																			
8 Pilot Station	1	11																	121	11(1)(1)	
9 Pitka s Point	36	5								36	5	(1)(1)									
10 Russian Mission	75	7														75	7	(1)(1)			
11 Scammon Bay	91	9														91	9	(1)(1)			
12 Sheldon Point	37	5								37	5	(1)(1)									
	1296	127	1/117.82							73	16	(2)(2)				354	33	(4)(4)	650	62(4)(6)	219 19(1)(2)
NENANA																					
1 Nenana E	105	13														105	13	(0)(2)			
2 Nenana HS	79	9														79	9	(1)(2)			
	184	22	1/184.													184	22	(1)(4)			
NOME																					435 33(1)(7)
1 Nome E	435	33																			306 28(2)(4
2 Nome/Beltz HS	306	28																			741 61(3)(11
	741	61	10/74.10																		
NORTH SLOPE																					
1 Alak	111	13														111	13	(1)(1)			
2 Atqasuk	40	8								40	8	(1)(1)									245 25(2)(2
3 Barrow HS	245	25																			
4 Cully	27	6								27	6	(1)(1)									
5 Harold Kaveolok	29	9								29	9	(1)(1)									

Exhibit C, p. 28

Mise

School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at schools	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PPRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PPRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PPRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PPRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PPRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PPRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PPRS
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			201 plus		
Noorvik HS	49	8											49	8	(0)(1)									
NW Arc Lrn Ctr	–	5											–	5	(1)(1)									
Selawik E	93	10														93	10	(1)(0)						
Selawik HS	42	5											42	5	(0)(0)									
Shungnak	65	8											65	8	(5)(1)									
	1343	144	10/134.00	12	1	(0)(0)	17	2	(1)(0)	94	11	(0)(1)	481	65	(5)(7)							706	26	(1)(4)
PELICAN																								
Pelican	42	8											42	8	(1)(1)									
	42	8	2/21.00										42	8	(1)(1)									
PETERSBURG																								
Petersburg E	321	24																				321	24	(1)(2)
Petersburg HS	250	22																				250	22	(1)(2
	109	46	2/54.50																			571	46	(2)(4)
PRIBILOF																								
St George							20	2	(0)(0)															
St Paul																			131	14	(1)(1)			
	161		1/161.00				20	2	(0)(0)										131	14	(1)(1)			
RAILBELT																								
Anderson	114	12														114	12	(1)(1)						
Browns	13	1		13	1	(0)(0)																		
Cantwell	33	3								33	3	(0)(0)												
Tri-Valley	184	15																	184	15	(1)(1)			
	344	31	5/68.80	13	1	(0)(0)				33	3	(0)(0)				114	12	(1)(1)	184	15	(1)(1)			

Exhibit C, p 29

ool District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.
				1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200		200 plus
T MARY'S																				
ndreafski	29	6								29	6	(0)(0)								
. Mary's	72	5														72	5	(0)(1)		
	101	11	4/25.25							29	6	(0)(0)				72	5	(0)(1)		
AND POINT																				
and Point E													66	6	(0)(1)					
and Point HS													43	4	(0)(0)					
	109		2/54.50										109	10	(0)(1)					
KAGWAY																				
kagway																			134	11 (0)(1)
	134		3/44.67																134	11 (0)(1)
SOUTHEAST ISLANDS																				
Bruce Hill	10	2		10	2	(0)(0)														
Dolomi	10	1		10	1	(0)(0)														
Edna Bay	18	2					18	2	(0)(0)											
Gildersleeve	21	3					21	3	(0)(0)											
Hollis	14	2		14	2	(0)(0)														
H. Valentine	64	7											64	7	(0)(0)					
Kasaan	10	1		10	1	(0)(0)														
LaRouchere	22	3					22	3	(0)(0)											
Long Island	35	4					35	4	(0)(0)											
Meyers Chuck	10	1		10	1	(0)(0)														
Port Alexande	21	2					21	2	(0)(0)											

Exhibit C, p 30

ol Size
DM)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at 5=hour/5	Pupil/NQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	Pers
					1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			200 plus
12	Kowan Bay		2		-	2(0)(0)																
13	Thorne Bay	92	10														92	10(0)(0)				
14	Whale Pass		1		-	1(0)(0)																
		327	41	11/29.73	54	10(0)(0)		117	14(0)(0)					64	7(0)(0)		92	10(0)(0)				
	SOUTHWEST REGION																					
1	Aleknagik	36	5								36	5(0)(1)										
2	Clarks Point	14	2		14	2(0)(0)																
3	Koliganek	44	5											44	5(0)(1)							
4	Levelock	40	6											40	6(0)(1)							
5	Manokotak	95	12														95	12(1)(2)				
6	New Stuyahok	92	11														92	11(1)(1)				
7	Togiak	136	15																	136	15(1)(1)	
8	Wm "Son." Nel.	24	2					24	2(0)(0)													
		496	58	12/41.33	14	2(0)(0)		24	2(0)(0)		36	5(0)(1)		84	11(0)(2)		187	23(2)(3)		136	15(1)(1)	
	TANANA																					
1	Tanana	66	11											66	11(1)(1)							
		66	11	1/66										66	11(1)(1)							
	UNALASKA																					
1	Unalaska E	63	7											63	7(0)(1)							
2	Unalaska HS	65	7											65	7(0)(1)							
		128	14	3/42.67										128	14(0)(2)							
	VALDEZ																					
1	Gibson JHS	121	9																	121	9(1)(3)	

Exhibit C, p 31

el Size
DM)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at schools	Pupil/MQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS
					1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			201 plus	
2	Growden-Har.E	178	13																	178	13	(1)(1)		
3	Hutchins E	209	15																				209	15(1)(2)
4	Hutchins SpEd	71	9														71	9	(1)(8)					
5	Valdez HS	204	20																				204	20(1)(1)
		783	66	5/156.60													71	9	(1)(8)	299	22	(3)(9)	413	35(2)(3)
	WRANGELL																							
1	Wrangell E	240	16																				240	16(1)(1)
2	Wrangell HS	218	22																				218	22(1)(3)
		464	38	2/232.00																			458	38(2)(4)
	YAKUTAT																							
1	Yakutat E	87	9														87	9	(1)(0)					
2	Yakutat HS	77	11														77	11	(1)(2)					
		164	20	2/82.0													164	20	(2)(3)					
	YUKON FLATS																							
1	Arc. Village	34	3								34	3	(0)(0)											
2	Beaver Cruik.	23	2					23	2	(0)(0)														
3	Central	29	3								29	3	(0)(0)											
4	Chalkyitsik	28	2								28	2	(0)(0)											
5	Circle	12	2		12	2	(0)(0)																	
6	Fort Yukon	118	14														118	14	(1)(1)					
7	No. Lights	14	1		14	1	(0)(0)																	
8	Rampart	13	2		13	2	(0)(0)																	
9	Stevens Villag	19	2					19	2	(0)(0)														

Exhibit C, p 32

ool Size
ADM)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at SCHOOLS	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.	PTRS	No. of Pupils	No. of Cert. Pers.
					1-16			17-24			25-40			41-70			71-120			121-200			200 pl
6	Ipalook	311	46																			311 46(2
7	Nuiqsut	66	11											66	11(1)(2)							
8	Nunamuit	66	10											61	10(1)(1)							
9	Tikigaq	138	18																	138	18(2)(2)	1
		1028	146	18/57.11							86	23(3)(3)		127	21(2)(3)		111	13(1)(1)		138	18(2)(2)	556 71(4)(1
	NORTHWEST ARCTIC																					
1	Ambler	61	6											61	6(.5)(1)							
2	Ambler HS	27	3								27	3(0)(0)										
3	Buckland HS	17	2					17	2(1)(0)													
4	Buckland E	50	6											50	6(0)(1)							
5	Deering	42	6											42	6(1)(0)							
6	Kiana E	67	6											67	6(1)(0)							
7	Kiana HS	42	5								42	5(0)(1)										
8	Kobuk	12	1		12	1(0)(0)																
9	Kotzebue E	286	26																			286 26(1
10	Kotzebue HS	129	21																	129	21(2)(1)	
11	Kotzebue JHS	104	7														104	7(0)(1)				
12	McQueen E	49	5											49	5(.5)(1)							
13	McQuown HS	25	3								25	3(0)(0)										
14	Noatak E	63	6											63	6(.5)(1)							
15	Noatak HS	42	4											42.4	(0)(0)							
16	Noorvik E	78	6														78	6(.5)(0)				

Ex. 16, * C, p. 33

...ool Size
(ADM)

	School District	Enrollment	No. of Certificated Persons at school	Pupil/HQ Cert. Personnel Ratio	1-16 No. of Pupils	1-16 No. of Cert. Pers.	1-16 PFRS	17-24 No. of Pupils	17-24 No. of Cert. Pers.	17-24 PFRS	25-40 No. of Pupils	25-40 No. of Cert. Pers.	25-40 PFRS	41-70 No. of Pupils	41-70 No. of Cert. Pers.	41-70 PFRS	71-120 No. of Pupils	71-120 No. of Cert. Pers.	71-120 PFRS	121-200 No. of Pupils	121-200 No. of Cert. Pers.	121-200 PFRS	200 plus No. of Pupils	200 plus No. of Cert. Pers.	200 plus PFRS
10	Venetie	65	7											65	7(1)(0)										
11	Yukon Flts VC		2		—	2(0)(0)																			
		359	40	15/23.92	41	7(0)(0)		42	4(0)(0)		91	8(0)(0)					118	14(1)(1)							
	YUKON-KOYUKUK																								
1	Allakaket	38	5								38	5(0)(0)													
2	Bettles	18	3					18	3(0)(0)																
3	Hughes	13	2		13	2(0)(0)																			
4	Huslia	61	6											61	6(0)(4)										
5	Kaltag	68	8											68	8(0)(1)										
6	Koyukuk	23	2					23	2(0)(0)																
7	Man. Hot Sprgs	19	2					19	2(0)(0)																
8	Kangas	52	7											52	7(0)(2)										
9	Minto	45	7											45	5(0)(0)										
10	Nulato	102	1														102	11(0)(1)							
		439	43	23/19.09	13	2(0)(0)		60	7(0)(0)		38	5(0)(0)		226	26(0)(7)		102	11(0)(1)							
	YUPIIT																								
1	Akiachak	88	7														88	7(0)(1)							
2	Arlicaq	61	8								61	8(.5)(.5)													
3	Peter E. HS	39	5								39	5(0)(1)													
4	Tulkisarmuit E	41	3											41	3(0)(0)										
5	Tulkisarm. HS	50	5											50	5(.5)(0)										
		279	28	279							100	13(.5)(1.5)		91	8(.5)(0)		88	7(0)(1)							

Exhibit C, p 34

COMPARISON OF SCHOOL DISTRICT AVERAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT SALARIES AND SALARY SCHEDULES WITH ANCHORAGE - FY 85-86

	DISTRICT T&E INDEX	SALARY SCHEDULE INDEX	ANCH BASE SALARY	SALARY BASED ON ANCH	ACTUAL SALARY	DIFFERENCE
Adak	1.412	1.072	26,078	36,822	44,673	1.21
Ak Gateway	1.425	1.093	26,078	37,161	45,549	1.23
Aleutians	1.413	1.235	26,078	36,848	51,466	1.40
Anchorage	1.598	1.000	26,078	41,673	41,673	1.00
Anne*te	1.384	1.000	26,078	36,092	41,673	1.15
Bering St	1.308	1.101	26,078	34,110	45,882	1.35
Bristol Bay	1.443	1.061	26,078	37,631	44,215	1.17
Chatham	1.446	0.894	26,078	37,709	37,255	.99
Chugach	1.325	0.914	26,078	34,553	38,089	1.10
Copper River	1.518	1.204	26,078	39,586	50,174	1.27
Cordova	1.517	1.017	26,078	39,560	42,381	1.07
Craig	1.308	0.956	26,078	34,110	39,839	1.17
Delta	1.450	1.058	26,078	37,813	44,090	1.17
Dillingham	1.484	1.109	26,078	38,700	46,215	1.24
Fairbanks	1.484	1.040	26,078	38,699	43,340	1.12
Galena	1.428	1.193	26,078	37,239	49,716	1.34
Haines	1.541	1.022	26,078	39,482	42,590	1.08
Hoonah	1.462	1.026	26,078	38,126	42,756	1.12
Hydaburg	1.234	0.962	26,078	32,180	40,060	1.24
Iditarod	1.481	1.070	26,078	38,622	44,590	1.15
Juneau	1.609	1.063	26,078	41,959	44,298	1.06
Kake	1.324	0.958	26,078	34,527	39,922	1.16
Kenai	1.547	0.971	26,078	40,343	40,464	1.00
Ketchikan	1.513	1.010	26,078	39,456	42,090	1.07
King Cove	1.477	1.057	26,078	38,517	44,048	1.14
Klowock	1.377	0.951	26,078	35,909	39,590	1.10
Kodiak	1.448	1.020	26,078	37,761	42,506	1.13
Kuspuk	1.410	1.085	26,078	36,770	45,215	1.23
Lake & Penn	1.357	1.079	26,078	35,388	44,965	1.27
Lower Kuskokwim	1.383	1.078	26,078	36,065	44,923	1.25
Lower Yukon	1.398	1.222	26,078	36,457	50,924	1.40
Mat-Su	1.448	0.994	26,078	37,760	41,422	1.10
Nenana	1.483	1.015	26,078	38,682	42,298	1.09
Nome	1.524	1.151	26,078	39,743	47,966	1.21
North Slope	1.458	1.283	26,078	38,021	53,466	1.41
Northwest Arctic	1.438	1.158	26,078	37,500	48,257	1.29
Pelican	1.535	0.941	26,078	40,029	39,214	.98
Petersburg	1.551	0.954	26,078	40,447	39,217	.97
Pribilof	1.538	1.149	26,078	40,108	47,882	1.19
Railbelt	1.491	1.020	26,078	38,882	42,506	1.09
Sand Point	1.388	1.113	26,078	36,197	46,382	1.28
Sitka	1.585	1.038	26,078	41,334	43,257	1.05
Skagway	1.407	0.965	26,078	36,692	40,214	1.10

EXHIBIT D, p. 1

	DISTRICT T&E INDEX	SALARY SCHEDULE INDEX	ANCH BASE SALARY	SALARY BASED ON ANCH	ACTUAL SALARY	DIFFER-ENCE
Southeast Island	1.442	1.023	26,078	37,604	42,631	1.13
Southwest Region	1.451	1.066	26,078	37,839	44,423	1.17
St. Mary's	1.318	1.069	26,078	34,370	44,548	1.30
Tanana	1.430	1.111	26,078	37,292	46,299	1.24
Unalaska	1.541	1.095	26,078	40,186	45,632	1.14
Valdez	1.496	1.087	26,078	39,013	45,299	1.16
Wrangell	1.585	0.950	26,078	41,334	39,589	.96
Yakutat	1.403	0.960	26,078	36,587	40,001	1.09
Yukon Flats	1.419	1.114	26,078	37,005	46,424	1.25
Yukon/ Koyukuk	1.237	1.069	26,078	35,127	44,548	1.26

EXHIBIT D, p 2

Alaska Geographic Differential Study 1985

SCHOOL DISTRICT	STATE FOUND. AID PER ADM	ONE MILL GENERATION PER ADM	INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT ALLOT. AS14.17.056	COST OF LIVING DIFFERENTIALS*	PERCENTAGE EQUALIZER
CITIES/BOROUGHS:					
ANCHORAGE	$3,088	$476	104%	100%	97.42994
BRISTOL BAY	$8,746	$421	155%	129%	97.72305
CORDOVA	$5,054	$318	95%	111%	98.28228
CRAIG	$7,186	$201	120%	102%	98.91613
DILLINGHAM	$7,694	$231	150%	129%	98.75047
FAIRBANKS	$3,531	$352	113%	103%	98.09806
GALENA	$10,583	$138	155%	129%	99.25575
HAINES	$5,828	$278	112%	105%	98.49697
HOONAH	$6,605	$137	112%	105%	99.26166
HYDABURG	$8,908	$138	104%	102%	99.25245
JUNEAU	$3,406	$359	104%	103%	98.05796
KAKE	$7,668	$60	112%	98%	99.67392
KENAI	$3,361	$457	104%	101%	97.53099
KETCHIKAN	$3,458	$371	100%	102%	97.99813
KING COVE	$9,113	$203	140%	126%	98.90154
KLAWOCK	$7,491	$37	104%	102%	99.79765
KODIAK	$5,274	$243	135%	106%	98.68941
MAT-SU	$2,919	$290	104%	94%	98.43244
NENANA	$9,079	$144	125%	129%	99.22371
NOME	$7,084	$178	155%	132%	99.03593
NORTH SLOPE	$8,230	$11750	175%	144%	97.00000
NORTHWEST ARCTIC	$7,691	$154	155%	144%	99.16761
PELICAN	$11,163	$278	110%	105%	98.50010
PETERSBURG	$4,004	$227	90%	98%	98.77474
SAND POINT	$7,541	$649	115%	126%	97.00000
SITKA	$3,714	$267	104%	101%	98.55854
SKAGWAY	$6,973	$434	80%	105%	97.65409
ST. MARY'S	$10,926	$39	180%	126%	99.79083
TANANA	$13,473	$151	140%	129%	99.18555
UNALASKA	$7,998	$678	120%	126%	97.00000
VALDEZ	$4,203	$2141	115%	111%	97.00000
WRANGELL	$4,746	$241	90%	98%	98.69784
YAKUTAT	$7,929	$116	115%	105%	99.37571
REAAS:					
ADAK	$3,447		125%	126%	100.00000
ALASKA GATEWAY	$6,898		185%	139%	100.00000
ALEUTIANS	$15,758		145%	129%	100.00000
ANNETTE ISLAND	$3,309		155%	139%	100.00000
BERING STRAITS	$9,078		125%	129%	100.00000
CHATHAM	$6,436		165%	129%	100.00000
CHUGACH	$10,827		160%	129%	100.00000
COPPER RIVER	$6,676		145%	132%	100.00000
DELTA GREELY	$4,430		150%	129%	100.00000
IDITAROD	$10,362		140%	126%	100.00000
KASHUNAMIUT	$8,538		175%	129%	100.00000
KUSPUK	$8,933		120%	126%	100.00000
LAKE AND PENISULA	$12,562		105%	126%	100.00000
LOWER KUSKOKWIM	$8,971		95%	126%	100.00000
LOWER YUKON	$5,775		125%	111%	100.00000
PRIBILOF ISLANDS	$6,031		140%	111%	100.00000
RAILBELT	$8,892		100%	105%	100.00000
SOUTHEAST ISLANDS	$6,446		165%	103%	100.00000
SOUTHWEST	$8,658		125%	103%	100.00000
YUKON FLATS	$13,092		108%	102%	100.00000
YUKON KOYUKUK	$9,109		115%	103%	100.00000
YUPIIT	$12,870		90%	102%	100.00000

Source:
Statistics compiled
by William Thompson,
Southeast Resource Center
from DOE statistics
and from McDowell Group
Report

EXHIBIT D, p 3

EXHIBIT E

COMPARISON OF SCHOOL DISTRICT TEACHER SALARY SCHEDULES BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA WITH ANCHORAGE SALARY SCHEDULE AND WITH 1985 ALASKA GEOGRAPHIC COST OF LIVING DIFFERENTIALS PROPOSED GROUPINGS BASED UPON EXISTING DIFFERENCES IN SALARY SCHEDULES.

Anchorage, Kenai Peninsula Borough, and Matanuska-Susitna Borough	1.00
Southeast Alaska boroughs and cities over 500 population, including Chatham	1.06
Southeast smaller and isolated school districts	1.12
Prince William Sound and Kodiak	1.12
Fairbanks and road served interior districts	1.12
Western Coast	1.20
Rural	1.24
Remote	1.40

EXHIBIT E, p. 1

TEACHER SALARY SCHEDULES IN DIFFERENT AREAS COMPARED TO ANCHORAGE (1:00)

Southeast teacher salaries compared to Anchorage salaries (1:00)

	Anchorage (1:00)	Ak. Geo. Diff.
Wrangell	.96	98
Petersburg	.97	98
Pelican	.98	105
Chatham	.99	129
Sitka	1.05	101
Juneau	1.06	103
Ketchikan	1.07	105
Haines	1.08	105
Yakutat	1.09	102
Klawock	1.10	105
Skagway	1.10	105
Hoonah	1.12	105
Southeast Island	1.13	1.03
Annette	1.15	1.39
Craig	1.17	1.02
Kake	1.16	98%
Klawock	1.10	102%
Alaska Gateway	1.23	1.39
Hydaburg	1.24	1.02

For Southeast cities -
Juneau, Ketchikan, Sitka, Petersburg, Wrangall, Haines and Skagway - all municipalities with more than 700 persons, use 1.06. Include Chatham because of the large number of Haines and Juneau based pupils. Use 1.06

For isolated southeast school districts use 1.12.

Prince William Sound and Kodiak teacher salaries compared to Anchorage salaries (1:00)

	Anchorage (1:00)	Ak. Geo. Diff.
Cordova	1.07	111
Chugach	1.10	129
Kodiak	1.12	106
Valdez	1.16	111

Use 1.12

Consider use of 1.06 for Kodiak

Consider use of 1.12 for Prince William Sound

Exhibit E, p 2

Matsu and Kenai teacher salaries compared to Anchorage salaries (1:00)

	Anchorage (1:00)	Ak. Geo. Diff.
Anchorage	1.00	100
Kenai	1.00	101
Matsu	1.10	94

Use 1.00

Fairbanks and road served interior district teacher salaries compared to Anchorage salaries (1:00)

	Anchorage (1:00)	Ak. Geo. Diff.
Nenana	1.09	129
Railbelt	1.10	105
Fairbanks	1.12	103
Delta-Greely	1.17	129
Copper River	1.27	132

Use 112

Consider use 1.16 for Delta-Greely and Copper River

Consider use of 106 for Fairbanks

Western Coast teacher salaries compared to Anchorage salaries (1.00)

	Anchorage (1.00)	Ak. Geo. Diff.
Adak	1.21	126
King Cove	1.14	126
Unalaska	1.14	126
Southwest Region	1.17	103
Bristol Bay	1.17	129
Pribilof	1.19	111
Dillingham	1.24	129
Lake and Peninsula	1.27	126
Sand Point	1.28	126

Use 1.20

Exhibit E, p. 3

Rural districts teacher salaries compared to Anchorage salaries(1.00)

	Anchorage (1.00)	Ak. Geo. Diff.
Bering Strait	1.35	129%
Iditarod	1.15	126%
Kuspuk	1.23	126%
Lower Kuskokwim	1.25	126%
Yukon Flats	1.25	102%
Yukon Koyuku't	1.26	103%
Northwest Arctic	1.29	144%
St Marys	1.30	126%
Galena	1.34	129%
Lower Yukon	1.40	111%
Kashunamuit		129%
Nome	1.21	132%
Yupiat	1.40	102%

Use 1.24

Remote district teacher salaries compared to Anchorage salaries (1.00)

	Anchorage (1.00)	Ak. Geo. Diff.
Aleutians	1.40	129%
North Slope	1.40	144%

Use 1.40

Exhibit Exp. 4

SCHOOL DISTRICT	STATE FOUND. AID PER ADM	ONE MILL GENERATION PER ADM	INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT ALLOT. AS14.17.056	COST OF LIVING DIFFERENTIALS*	PERCENTAGE EQUALIZER
CITIES/BOROUGHS:					
ANCHORAGE	$3,088	$476	104%	100%	97.42994
BRISTOL BAY	$8,748	$421	155%	129%	97.72305
CORDOVA	$5,054	$318	95%	111%	98.28228
CRAIG	$7,186	$201	120%	102%	98.91613
DILLINGHAM	$7,694	$231	150%	129%	98.75047
FAIRBANKS	$3,531	$352	113%	103%	98.09808
GALENA	$10,583	$138	155%	129%	99.25575
HAINES	$5,828	$278	112%	105%	98.49697
HOONAH	$6,605	$137	112%	105%	99.26166
HYDABURG	$8,908	$138	104%	102%	99.25245
JUNEAU	$3,406	$359	104%	103%	98.05796
KAKE	$7,666	$60	112%	98%	99.67392
KENAI	$3,361	$457	104%	101%	97.55099
KETCHIKAN	$3,458	$371	100%	102%	97.99613
KING COVE	$9,113	$203	140%	126%	98.90154
KLAWOCK	$7,491	$37	104%	102%	99.79765
KODIAK	$5,274	$243	135%	106%	98.68941
MAT-SU	$2,919	$290	104%	94%	98.43244
NENANA	$9,079	$144	125%	129%	99.22371
NOME	$7,084	$178	155%	132%	99.03593
NORTH SLOPE	$8,230	$11750	175%	144%	97.00000
NORTHWEST ARCTIC	$7,691	$154	155%	144%	99.16761
PELICAN	$11,163	$278	110%	105%	98.50010
PETERSBURG	$4,004	$227	90%	98%	98.77474
SAND POINT	$7,541	$649	115%	126%	97.00000
SITKA	$3,714	$267	104%	101%	98.55854
SKAGWAY	$5,973	$434	80%	105%	97.65409
ST. MARY'S	$10,926	$39	160%	126%	99.79083
TANANA	$13,473	$151	140%	129%	99.18555
UNALASKA	$7,998	$678	120%	126%	97.00000
VALDEZ	$4,203	$2141	115%	111%	97.00000
WRANGELL	$4,746	$241	90%	98%	98.69784
YAKUTAT	$7,929	$116	115%	105%	99.37571
REAAS:					
ADAK	$3,447		125%	126%	100.00000
ALASKA GATEWAY	$6,898		185%	139%	100.00000
ALEUTIANS	$15,758		145%	129%	100.00000
ANNETTE ISLAND	$3,309		155%	139%	100.00000
BERING STRAITS	$9,078		125%	129%	100.00000
CHATHAM	$8,438		165%	129%	100.00000
CHUGACH	$10,627		160%	129%	100.00000
COPPER RIVER	$6,676		145%	132%	100.00000
DELTA GREELY	$4,430		150%	129%	100.00000
IDITAROD	$10,362		140%	126%	100.00000
KASHUNAMIUT	$8,538		175%	129%	100.00000
KUSPUK	$8,933		120%	126%	100.00000
LAKE AND PENISULA	$12,562		105%	126%	100.00000
LOWER KUSKOKWIM	$8,971		95%	126%	100.00000
LOWER YUKON	$5,775		125%	111%	100.00000
PRIBILOF ISLANDS	$6,031		140%	111%	100.00000
RAILBELT	$8,892		100%	105%	100.00000
SOUTHEAST ISLANDS	$5,446		165%	103%	100.00000
SOUTHWEST	$8,656		125%	103%	100.00000
YUKON FLATS	$13,092		108%	102%	100.00000
YUKON KOYUKUK	$9,109		115%	103%	100.00000
YUPIIT	$12,870		90%	102%	100.00000

Exhibit E, p. 5

EXHIBIT F - Ranked Analysis of District Extimated Expenditures by Function - Operations and Maintenance (O&M)

Exhibit F, p 1

TABLE 5: ANALYSIS OF REAA ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTION

SCHOOL DISTRICT	FUNCTION: GENERAL SUPPORT	GENERAL SUPPORT EXPEND. AS A % OF TOTAL EXPEND	GENERAL SUPPORT EXPENDITURES BY ADM	FUNCTION: OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	OPERATION & MAINT. EXPEND. AS % OF TOTAL EXPEND	OPERATION & MAINT. EXPEND. BY ADM
ADAK	$745,170	14.59%	$1,228	$817,462	16.01%	$1,347
ALASKA GATEWAY	$664,800	12.56%	$1,288	$1,277,961	24.14%	$2,477
ALEUTIANS	$435,306	23.10%	$5,004	$322,037	17.09%	$3,702
ANNETTE ISLAND	$429,832	13.90%	$1,041	$649,200	21.00%	$1,572
BERING STRAITS	$1,440,324	8.96%	$1,168	$4,506,051	28.04%	$3,655
CHATHAM	$468,607	14.75%	$1,531	$520,835	16.39%	$1,702
CHUGACH	$233,450	15.63%	$1,810	$280,950	18.82%	$2,178
COPPER RIVER	$505,025	9.68%	$878	$969,800	18.59%	$1,687
DELTA GREELY	$1,196,320	16.95%	$1,104	$1,220,495	17.29%	$1,126
IDITAROD	$821,158	14.52%	$2,058	$1,567,997	27.73%	$3,930
KASHUNAMIUT	$261,136	9.81%	$1,573	$775,711	29.14%	$4,673
KUSPUK	$665,865	10.33%	$1,632	$1,478,211	22.93%	$3,623
LAKE AND PENISULA	$659,200	10.68%	$1,782	$1,772,186	28.70%	$4,790
LOWER KUSKOKWIM	$3,452,342	10.86%	$1,291	$7,796,353	24.52%	$2,915
LOWER YUKON	$1,433,186	9.57%	$1,114	$3,720,414	24.86%	$2,893
PRIBILOF ISLANDS	$288,927	15.11%	$1,710	$329,337	17.23%	$1,949
RAILBELT	$468,191	13.12%	$1,311	$689,417	19.32%	$1,931
SOUTHEAST ISLANDS	$467,625	10.18%	$1,021	$908,736	19.79%	$1,984
SOUTHWEST	$616,174	8.58%	$1,268	$2,147,789	29.92%	$4,419
YUKON FLATS	$602,160	9.42%	$1,597	$1,571,507	24.60%	$4,168
YUKON KOYUKUK	$691,196	8.80%	$1,160	$1,528,109	19.45%	$2,564
YUPIIT	$535,505	14.42%	$1,879	$833,659	22.45%	$2,925
TOTAL	$17,081,499	11.29%	$1,316	$35,684,219	23.58%	$2,749

Exhibit F, p. 2

TABLE 3: RANKED ANALYSIS OF DISTRICT ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTION

SCHOOL DISTRICT	FUNCTION: GENERAL SUPPORT	GENERAL SUPPORT EXPEND. AS A % OF TOTAL EXPEND	GENERAL SUPPORT EXPENDITURES BY ADM	FUNCTION OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	OPERATION & MAINT. EXPEND. AS % OF TOTAL EXPEND	OPERATION & MAINT. EXPEND BY ADM
NORTH SLOPE	$4,907,800	16.67%	$4,249	$8,051,900	27.35%	$6,971
KENANA	$218,992	10.29%	$1,738	$411,885	19.36%	$3,269
ST. MARY'S	$294,610	15.91%	$2,562	$482,200	26.05%	$4,193
GALENA	$431,816	18.58%	$2,958	$541,468	23.29%	$3,709
KING COVE	$232,080	13.94%	$1,934	$392,150	23.56%	$3,268
PELICAN	$151,480	21.94%	$2,805	$102,246	14.81%	$1,893
UNALASKA	$221,200	13.35%	$1,569	$284,800	17.18%	$2,020
BRISTOL BAY	$290,705	10.64%	$1,206	$653,049	23.89%	$2,710
VALDEZ	$600,030	7.29%	$759	$1,865,431	22.67%	$2,358
NORTHWEST ARCTIC**	$1,747,221	11.71%	$1,145	$4,282,597	28.70%	$2,806
KAKE	$376,914	19.17%	$1,866	$355,582	18.08%	$1,760
KLAWOCK	$226,753	14.96%	$1,454	$210,070	13.86%	$1,347
DILLINGHAM	$423,162	9.76%	$910	$704,709	16.26%	$1,516
YAKUTAT	$245,031	16.88%	$1,561	$247,246	17.04%	$1,575
HYDABURG	$117,737	13.48%	$1,214	$300,545	34.42%	$3,098
HAINES	$364,876	11.73%	$1,040	$547,033	17.59%	$1,558
SAND POINT	$159,113	16.18%	$1,384	$150,904	15.35%	$1,312
NOME	$650,938	9.14%	$766	$1,827,235	25.64%	$2,150
HOONAH	$218,209	12.31%	$1,020	$298,222	16.82%	$1,394
CORDOVA	$447,072	14.52%	$1,146	$552,905	17.96%	$1,418
CRAIG	$246,743	17.24%	$1,327	$284,994	19.92%	$1,532
SKAGWAY	$184,847	17.97%	$1,359	$116,639	11.34%	$858
KODIAK	$2,021,672	12.99%	$887	$2,859,480	18.38%	$1,255
KENAI	$6,281,548	11.60%	$735	$11,490,900	21.22%	$1,344
WRANGELL	$247,327	8.80%	$548	$424,906	15.11%	$942
SITKA	$1,187,348	11.59%	$718	$1,335,251	13.04%	$807
FAIRBANKS	$8,376,602	10.43%	$624	$12,716,287	15.84%	$947
KETCHIKAN	$1,397,532	9.61%	$573	$2,592,313	17.82%	$1,063
PETERSBURG	$369,417	10.85%	$619	$691,692	20.32%	$1,159
JUNEAU	$2,602,212	10.38%	$554	$3,201,902	12.77%	$681
MAT-SU	$7,184,868	14.46%	$767	$8,489,172	17.09%	$906
ANCHORAGE	$20,622,821	10.25%	$507	$32,114,913	15.96%	$790
TANANA	N/A	N/A	$0	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	$63,048,676	11.44%	$686	$98,580,626	17.88%	$1,072

Exhibit F, p. 3

AN ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE LEGISLATION IN ALASKA: 1958 to 1987

Prepared for the State of Alaska
Senate Health, Education and Social Services Committee

January 1987

INDEX

EXHIBITS

AN ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE LEGISLATION IN ALASKA: 1958 to 1987

I INTRODUCTION

In considering a new school finance system it is desirable to first create a budget for a single system of enterprises, in this case, public schools, each with their salary and non-salary costs and each with their costs of administration. Once an Alaska education program for elementary and secondary schools has been established ("basic need"), various formulas for allocating the dollars to meet that need can be considered and an allocation method selected. This is no different than arriving at a budget for a number of schools within a school district.

If the state does not choose to pay 100% of the costs of each school district, formulas for allocating the remaining portion of the costs among school districts can be compared and decisions reached as to the share to be paid by local property taxpayers. Previous school finance programs can be reviewed to see if there have been logical and successful approaches. They can also be reviewed for blind alleys that should be avoided.

This history heavily relies on a 1985 report entitled "A General History of Public School Finance in Alaska - Operating and Capital Costs" prepared by Dr. Nathaniel H. Cole for the Alaska Department of Education. Current education statistics are derived from tables prepared by William Thompson of the Southeast Resource Center in Juneau.

The major school finance acts have been:

ACLA 37-3 - School Reimbursement Program

Ch. 164, SLA 1962 -School Foundations Program

Ch. 238, SLA 1970 -Instructional Unit Program

AS 14.17 as of June 30, 1982 - (Ch.238, SLA 1970 as extensively amended)- Instructional Unit Program, as extensively modified

Ch. 75, SLA 1985 - Schedule of per pupil funding for each district

Ch. 75, SLA 1986 - Current formula

Since 1962 a consistent system has been used for assigning section numbers to subjects in school funding acts. For convenience references are made to the same section, e.g. AS 14.17.071, as various chapters are analyzed, it being understood that the reference to the statute is to the statute as it existed on the day the act was adopted, and not to that section as it exists today or on June 30, 1983 the day before all previous formulas were set aside.

II TERRITORIAL REIMBURSEMENT SYSTEM

The Territorial reimbursement system of finance was in place from 1929 (or before) until July 1, 1963. The legal basis for the system was simple accounting for no more than a page and a half of Alaska Compiled Laws Annotated (ACLA).

ACLA Section 37-3-62 provided for a refund of public elementary and secondary school expenditures for operations - 75% of the approved casts for larger school districts, 80% for middle sized districts and 85% for small districts.

The other provisions were:

> ACLA Sec 37-3-62. Amount of refund. Where the total resident school enrollment by school year is less than 150 pupils, eighty-five per centum and where it is 150 pupils or over and less than 300, eighty per centum and where it is 300 pupils or over, seventy-five per centum of the total amount expended for maintenance of public elementary schools and high schools within the limits of incorporated cities or incorporated school districts or independent school districts shall be refunded to such city or school district from the moneys of the Territory appropriated for such purposes.
>
> ACLA Sec 37-3-63. Annual budget or statement of proposed expenditures. The school board for each incorporated city or incorporated school district shall annually before the first day of July submit to the Commissioner of Education a budget or detailed statement of proposed expenditures for the maintenance of the schools of such incorporated city or incorporated school district during the following school year. Said detailed statement shall be submitted in duplicate and shall set forth the salaries of teachers in each grade and of janitors or other employees of the school district, and proposed expenditures for fuel, light, water, school books and supplies, janitor's supplies, manual training, domestic science, library, and for miscellaneous purposes. The Commissioner of Education may disapprove or reduce any items in the budget and shall approve for Territorial refund only such parts of the proposed expenditures as come within the purview of this article, and are reasonable and necessary. (emphasis added)

It is apparent that the Commissioner of Education would have a thorough understanding of the actual expenditures of each school district in each budget category. There would be a historical record of such expenditures for each district for each year. A change in proposed expenditure for which reimbursement would be sought would be easy to analyze in light of previous expenditures of the school district and of similarly situated school districts.

On July 1, 1962, the State of Alaska adopted a formula system of funding. One byproduct of this decision was that the state began to lose track of the expenditures of city and borough school districts. In administering the program the commissioner would obtain a clear record of how much in state, federal and local revenues each district received because these amounts were included in the formula, but there would be no good record of how these monies were used.

In addition the Commissioner was directly responsible for the budgeting for about one half of the schools outside of city, borough and independent school districts. As of statehood the federal Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) operated about 60% of the rural schools with the state operating the other 40%. The State of Alaska continued to operate its schools plus additional schools acquired from BIA until 1976 when Rural Education Attendance Areas (REAA's) were created in the unorganized borough. At that time the state department of education lost track of expenditures of rural schools.

III FOUNDATION FOR ALASKA SCHOOLS - the total need recognized

In 1960 the State of Alaska received a grant from the Ford Foundation for a school finance study. The State Board of Education appointed an Educational Advisory Committee to oversee the study. The committee consisting of educational, political, governmental and lay citizen leaders of the state was headed by Dr. Eric Lindman of the University of California, Los Angeles, and was assisted by a group of nationally-known education finance and administration consultants. The Committee worked for about a year to complete a very comprehensive study, released by the State Board of Education in September 1961 as: A Foundation for Alaska's Public Schools.

In 1962 the legislature accepted nearly all of the Committee's recommendations on changes in Alaska school finance. The legislature enacted Ch. 164, SLA 1962, with a July 1, 1963 effective date.

The fiscal building blocks used in Ch. 164, SLA 1962 were simple.

(a) Per pupil funding. The formula was almost entirely ADM (average daily membership) driven. If there were more children, more teachers would be needed, and, more teacher units would be allocated. There would be enough funding from state, federal and local sources to support about one teacher to a classroom with about 23 pupils in the classroom.

(b) Additional funding for small schools. If there were fewer than 100 elementary school pupils, a greater than average number of teacher units would be allocated on the basis that average class sizes would necessarily be small. The range started at one teacher unit for 8 to 15 pupils and gradually increased to 6 teachers for 81-100 elementary school pupils. From 101-300 pupils there would be an additional unit for each 20 pupils, for 301 and over there would be one teacher unit for each 25 pupils.

(c) Additional per pupil funding for secondary pupils. The schedule for smaller secondary schools was slightly higher, allowing 7 teacher units for 81-100 pupils, allowing one teacher unit for up to 10 secondary students and at the upper end 7 teacher units for 81-100 teacher units.

(d) Allowance for superintendents and assistants. For school districts with more than 600 pupils, additional teacher units were allowed for the superintendent and assistants, as follows:

Total ADM	Allowable Number of Teacher Units
601-300	1
3001-5999	2
Over 6000	3

(e) Principals and vice principals. In addition to assigning teacher units as an allowance for superintendents and assistants, provision was made for principals and vice principals as follows:

(1) School district with ADM of 700 or plus with eight or more classrooms--one teacher unit.

(2) School district with one or more buildings with 24 or more classrooms--a teacher unit for each such building for vice principal for such building.

(f) Area cost differential allotments. The final adjustment in determining need was a per pupil payment to reflect area cost differentials which provided additional dollars as follows:

(1) Southeastern Senate District--$140 x ADM.

(2) Southcentral Senate District (includes Anchorage)--$150 x ADM.

(3) Central (Fairbanks) and Northwest (Nome) Senate Districts and Southcentral west of 152o latitude (Alaska Peninsula)--$160 x ADM.

(g) Attendance center allotment. And, finally, there was an allocation of $1000 for each attendance center (elementary or secondary school which functioned as distinct administrative units each with a principal).

The 1962 foundation act was simple and easy to understand. It was almost entirely an ADM driven formula. There was little room for manipulation of classrooms or programs to increase entitlements.

The foundation program established the need of a school district without regard to sources of revenues to fund this need.

The last two steps established by the foundation formula were simple. The local school district was required to provide a "local effort" equivalent to what a 3.5 mill levy would raise on the real and personal property in the district plus one-half of any Public Law 874 monies received from the federal government. To the extent this local effort did not raise sufficient monies to meet the basic need, the state would make up the difference through annual appropriations from the "public school foundation account".

As a practical matter, the ADM driven formula did not produce results which were much different than the old Territorial reimbursement program. To make the program politically acceptable, the legislature added a relatively small amount of funding so that there would be a number of winners and so that any losers would lose very little. Anchorage, which at the time was a

relatively wealthy school district compared to other school districts, may have been a loser, but, if so, by very little.

The historically poor school districts with high property tax mill levies, mostly the seacoast communities of Petersburg, Wrangell, Skagway, Haines, Cordova, Valdez, Seward and Kodiak, did well under the program and were able to reduce their property taxes as the state now paid for a larger percentage of their basic need.

Overall, the percentage of local dollars to state dollars to federal dollars stayed fairly constant. In school districts such as Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau and Ketchikan, the local taxpayers continued to pay for about 25-30% of their school district budgets, while in the middle sized school districts, the taxpayers, the percentage of local contribution was more in the 15-20% range with the state paying the remainder from the school foundation program. See Cole, supra, p.32 for sources of school operating costs in 1962-1970.

Every school district contributed an amount equivalent to what a 3.5 mill property tax levy would raise on the real and personal property tax within the school district. Very poor school districts, with very little tax base, such as King Cove and Nenana, contributed very small amounts in local revenues with a 3.5 mill effort, and the state paid close to 98% of their total education budgets.

The use of a 3.5 mill property tax or equivalent as the maximum a school district would have to raise would have major financial consequences for higher tax school districts today. The results would be approximately as follows:

School District	Assessed valuation (in millions)	Mill levy	Present local effort	3.5 mill levy	3.5 mill levy effort	Difference (in thousands)
Anchorage	$19,343,000	3.28	$63,492	3.5	$67,700	(4208)
North Slope	13,571,000	.89	12,885	3.5	47,498	(34,613)
Fairbanks	4,727,000	4.54	21,449	3.5	16,545	4904
Kenai	3,905,000	4.66	18,202	3.5	13,668	4534
Matsu	2,716,000	7.16	19,462	3.5	9,506	9956
Valdez	1,693,000	2.41	4,088	3.5	5,926	(1838)
Juneau	1,689,000	4.88	8,250	3.5	5,911	2339
Ketchikan	904,000	5.97	5,398	3.5	3,164	2234
Kodiak	552,000	3.99	2,201	3.5	1,932	269
Sitka	441,000	6.75	2,978	3.5	1,544	1434

Total

See Exhibit A for assessed valuations.
The foregoing assessments have been adjusted by the state Department of Community and Regional Affairs to bring them up to 100% of fair market value.

Any dollar savings to other city and borough school districts as a result of a 3.5 mill cap would be minor, because their present mill levies are either less than 3.5 mills or very little in excess of 3.5 mills.

IV AMENDMENTS TO THE 1962 SCHOOL FOUNDATION ACT - redefining "basic education".

The legislature expanded the concept of a "basic education" on two occasions.

The 1983 Legislature added special education before the new School Foundation Act took effect. Ch. 70, SLA 1963.

Although a number of school districts, including Anchorage and Juneau, provided kindergartens, the Legislature had never regarded kindergartens as a necessary part of a "basic education" until 1966 when kindergarten pupils were allowed to be counted in the ADM allotment along with 1-12 pupils (Ch. 153, SLA 1966). The state did not pick up 100% of the cost of kindergartens any more than it did for grades 1-12 and, as a result, districts with little district wealth and unusually high mill levies, such as Matsu did not immediately add kindergarten to their programs even though state funding covered 75% or more of the costs for those districts. Matsu added kindergarten for a K-12 program in 1981 when its property tax mill rate was reduced from 6.9 mills to 4.9 mills.

The concept of a "basic education" was further expanded in the 1970's when "gifted and talented" and "bilingual" were added to the educational program which the state would fund.

V 1970 INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS PROGRAM

The 1970 "instructional units" formula enacted by the 1970 Legislature was based upon recommendations of a second school finance study, prepared by the State Board, the Department of Education and the Governor, with a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. As in the case of the 1962 effort, there was a council composed of representatives of school groups. This council was advised by the school finance consultants who had served on the earlier 1962 study, headed by Dr. H. Thomas James, Dean of the School of Education, S nford University.

Among the recommendations of the study were:

> 2) that the state adopt an equalized percentage method for determining the state's share of operating revenue for the basic program for each district;
>
> 3) that the state share of oper revenues for basic programs be set at a sta average of 90%;

The following from a speech of H. Thomas James, Dean, School of Education, Stanford University, entitled "An Agenda for Approving Education in Alaska", given in Anchorage, August 13, 1969, gives an indication of the heady atmosphere of the times:

> In addition to these normal indicators of the increasing fiscal strength of the Alaska Government, there is also the remarkable promise of revenue potential in the oil discoveries on the Kenai Peninsula and more recently on the North Slope. I hesitate to enter the "numbers game" but some of the figures one hears now in Alaska are truly startling. I am advised that state revenues for fiscal year 1970 are estimated at 246 million, which is probably a low estimate (Note: North Slope lease revenues came in at about 900 million in 1969.) When one begins playing with some of the more sensible estimates of what the North Slope bonus might be, one gets into exciting numbers games, such as noting that if $1 billion was invested at 6%, the income would be more than all state revenues in 1963.

The 1970 Legislature was prepared to relieve much of the former tax burden of the local governments and, in addition, was prepared to appropriate substantially more state monies to education than before.

The report recognized the continued importance of local effort, but proposed that it be handled differently than in 1962. Required local support had been repealed by Ch. 95, SLA 1969. The 1962-70 approach had required a local effort equal to the proceeds

of a 3.5 mill rate on taxable real and personal property. The study recommended a new approach based upon "an equalized percentage that took into account the variation of district wealth per pupil when compared to the average per pupil wealth of all districts". With this approach, the school districts with greater district wealth would get less than 90% of their need from state revenues probably as low as 80-85% of their need and districts with below average district wealth would receive more than 90%, up to 98% of their need. The statewide average would be 90%. This would yield a mix of state and local effort very similar to that which existed during Territorial days and throughout the 1960s, but overall it would provide more generous state funding. Final Report and Recommendations of the Advisory Council on State Financial Support to Public Schools (Juneau: Alaska Department of Education, January 1970).

The legislature rejected the proposal that some districts receive less than 90% and other districts receive more than 90%. Instead, they established 90% as the floor for all school districts, so that no district, regardless of wealth, would receive less than 90% of "basic need" from the state. However there was some continuing recognition of the role of local effort in school financing, presumably with respect to the 10% maximum that a school district would be expected to be responsible for. The legislature did enact a weak tax equalization provision similar to today's provision in Ch. 75, SLA 1986.

In the next legislative session the Legislature increased this "floor" from 90% to 100% of "basic need" supposedly with a concurrent reduction of the 10% local effort to eliminate any need for local taxation. Now, the state was supposedly shouldering the full financial burden of providing a standard K-12 program, including special education and kindergarten in every school district in the state.

From the first day the legislature's policies on 90% state funding across the board, later 100%, proved to be fictitious. The "foundation" slipped out from under the bill. The actual percentages of state funding for the larger school districts almost immediately evolved into percentages similiar to those of the 1960's, but with state support being more generous. A school district which formerly had received 65-70% state support now received 70-75% state support. Total state expenditures for education did increase. About half of the 900 million dollars received by the state in 1969 for the Prudhoe Bay leases went into additional funding for education.

There was now a major gap between form and substance. This was to complicate all future efforts to adjust the formula so that it would make sense for every school district. The total of the instructional units now had no relationship to the "basic need" of the larger school districts. Nor did the total of the instructional units have any relationship to the achievement of any state-wide educational goal.

The 1962-70 formula had created building blocks of approximately equal size--more students meant more building blocks, more classrooms meant more principals and vice principals, etc. All of these units were based on the costs of delivering equal amounts of education.

The 1970 formula was intended to create fiscal building blocks that would cover many measures of educational need other than need that can be measured in number of pupils and classrooms. Dr. Nathaniel H. Cole described the new instructional unit concept in glowing terms:

> The instructional unit concept with its definitions is flexible enough to address large groups, small groups, general education needs, special education needs, density, sparsity, etc. As long as the parameters of an educational program can be described, the program can be placed within the instructional unit structure. The unit value can also be adjusted for varying cost factors from one geographical area to another. In other words, the instructional unit concept is much more adaptable to program needs and much less constraining as to how and what resources are utilized to address program needs than the earlier system.

Ibid. p. 36.

The 1970 formula that accounted for the bulk of the distribution was fairly simple. A base instructional unit would generate $19,250 (the beginning salary of a teacher was then about $10,000 a year). Basic instructional units were generated by numbers of pupils (ADM) or number of class hours (FTE or fulltime equivalents).

In elementary and secondary schools (not school districts) with under 1000 pupils, each 18 pupils would generate at least one unit each. Fewer than 81 per 18 pupils would generate more than one unit. (Under 10 would generate 1, 10-20 would generate 2, 21-32:3, etc.)

In elementary and secondary schools (not school districts) each 23 pupils would generate at least one unit each. Fewer than 3005 (100-3005) pupils would generate at least one unit per 19 pupils and fewer than 100 pupils would generate more than one unit per 19 pupils. (Under 10:1; 10-20:2; 21-32:3, etc.)

Vocational education generated at least one additional unit for each 50 full-time equivalent (FTE). Five to 10 full-time equivalent pupils would generate one unit (5-10 FTE pupils would be the same as 30-60 pupils enrolled and in average daily membership in a one hour per day vocational education program); 11-20 FTE would generate 2 units etc.

Pupils enrolled in special education would generate at least one additional unit per 9 pupils. Five to 8 pupils in ADM (not FTE) would generate one additional unit, 9-15 would generate 2.

The 1970 formula used an odd term for area cost differentials. The term was "Instructional Unit Allotment" the same term as was later used in Ch. 75, 1986. The multipliers were:

Souteastern and Anchorage, Mat-Su, Kenai area -	1.00
Central (Fairbanks and Interior) -	1.05
Northwest -	1.10
Any school district which does not have access to Anchorage, Ketchikan or Fairbanks, by road, railroad, or ferry	1.00, 1.05, or 1.10 depending on location plus 5%

The 5% isolation factor was dropped in 1977. (Ch. 90, SLA 1977)

There were also elaborate tax equalization provisions which were repealed in subsequent years. The formula, had relatively little effect on the amounts allocated to school districts. With 100% state financing of the basic need a tax equalization formula should not have been necessary - there would be no need for local taxation.

The 1970 Legislature, by abandoning local effort, and by pretending that 100% of each school districts financial needs for a K-12 education were being satisfied with state funding alone, created a puzzle that no succeeding legislature or consultant could solve.

This is the puzzle:

> The need for a "basic education" for all Alaska schools shall be measured by instructional units uniformly applied throughout Alaska. The need will be the same regardless of the wealth or lack of wealth of the school district.
>
> The state will meet 100% of the "need" for all Alaska schools, whether they are in wealthy schools districts or poor school districts with little ability to raise local revenues.
>
> The state has to meet 100% of the basic need of some very poor school districts, particularly after the creation of Rural Education Attendance Areas (REAAs) in 1977, which lack the power to tax.

How can 100% funding of smaller poorer school districts be achieved with only 75% state funding for schools in Alaska?

Somehow the instructional units which would generate 65% of Anchorage's requirements for a "basic education" must supply 98-100% of the cost of the "basic need" of the poor school district. Otherwise the city school district with little taxable wealth will have a 65% program--they will have a K-8 program or a 4-12 program, but they cannot have a K-12 program unless they combine grades, have 50 or more pupils to a classroom, etc.

The legislature had broken the linkage between costs of delivering an educational program and the number of instructional units. There now had to be a mechanism for pumping up the number of instructional units for some school districts, while not permitting this to happen in other school districts. Somehow a poor school district with the same number of pupils and the same number of schools and classrooms as a wealthy school district had to receive 20-30% more instructional units than the comparable wealthy district.

Most of the many later amendments to Ch. 238, SLA 1970 represented efforts to back into a formula. First, the Legislature conceived of different dollar amounts they would like each school district to receive. Then the legislature provided for new types of instructional units or new applications of units to generate those dollar amounts.

The state fudged its numbers with respect to school districts that have some ability to raise local tax revenues. From 1970 to 1976 large city and borough school districts were generally wealthy, middle sized school districts were neither rich nor poor and small districts were generally poor. Most of the problem could be solved by being especially generous in allocating units to the smaller school districts. To the extent larger school districts did not receive enough state monies to meet their actual requirements for a K-12 program, they could make up the difference from property taxes and sales taxes just as they had done in the 1950's and 1960's.

This was similar to the Territorial approach - under the Territoral program large school districts were reimbursed 75% of their approved costs, middle sized school districts 80% and small school districts 85%.

Unfortunately there were a few large school districts which were also poor and at least one middle sized school district, Valdez, which was rich. This adhoc solution was bound to break down when 20 more school districts the Rural Education Attendance Areas were created in 1976. Now there were some large school districts which were as poor as any district can be since they lacked the power to tax.

The 100% program was off of the tracks. Dr. James' dream of an oil wealth financed education system slipped away. Alaska now had the same system that created inequities and lawsuits in many other states - a system based upon a mix of state dollars - mostly oil dollars - and local property tax dollars, a system where there was no logical basis for the percentage of local tax dollars to be supplied or the amount of the local property tax to be levied for education. Alaska now had a much more inequitable school finance system than it had in 1963.

VI MODIFICATIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS APPROACH (1975-1982)

Despite its deficiencies the 1970 Instructional Unit approach was kept intact for its first five years. In the first five years the amendments dealt with changes in the basic instructional unit value (1973-78, 80, 81) or with minor adjustments in the tables of allowable instructional units (1972, 75,77, 78, 80-81).

The instructional unit wa. still largely based on classroom building blocks. Add enough pupils to generate a teacher and there would probably be another fiscal building block - a unit large enough to pay for the teacher, for the cost of janitor time for the new classroom, heat and light for the new room and supplies for the additional pupils. In 1975, after the creation of twenty new rural school districts, this changed. Major substantive changes came fast and furious after the creation of the REAAs in 1975. The changes accelerated in 1980 as new oil money became available.

Every school, no matter how small, would receive a minimum of three instructional units - in the case of an eight pupil school, enough money to pay for three teachers. Every school with more than 20 pupils, would receive a second batch of instructional units for a secondary school, <u>even if there were no pupils secondary school age pupils at the school</u>. The number of instructional units for special education pupils was increased. Much of the effort was to create new instructional units to be allocated to small schools and, to a much lesser extent, to take instructional units away from larger schools.

The instructional unit now became less of a fiscal building block. A group of pupils numbering eight could now generate three new instructional units, far more than would be required to provide a new teacher with the necessary support. A group of twenty pupils at a new school could generate six new units - three for the elementary school and three for secondary school - again, far more would be required to provide teachers and classroom support. Six teachers would not be hired to teach 20 pupils.

The additional money generated by these monies went mostly to district headquarters, new hires at district headquarters and new activities at that level.

These were not the only changes. Administrators were, for the first time , given an opportunity to manufacture new units by reconfiguring their enrollments - by counting pupils different ways and by counting the same pupil two or three times on the basis of new programs.

Before describing the new opportunities for manipulating units to generate additional entitlements, the cumulative effect of the 1975-1982 changes will be described.

Robert Van Slyke, Deputy Commissioner Department of Education, in a memorandum to Marshall L. Lind, Commissioner Department

of Education, dated January 15, 1982 stated;

> The cumulative result of eleven years of tinkering with various bits and pieces of the original foundation program structure has been that the original intention of a simplified, equitable system of state support for education has become neither simple, nor, in the minds of many, equitable. While the writer may have overlooked a few additional amendments to the program, the above listing begins to reveal the nature and scope of such changes and to give some indication of the complexity of the current system.
>
> ...
>
> First, the current program is essentially on "open system"; that is, changes over the years in unit schedules have allowed districts a wide number of options in configuring groups of students to generate maximum amounts of funds. Such configurations focus administrative attention of "body counts" and away from program.
>
> The "body count" system results in the second major problem; that the current system is no longer program driven, even in the case of categorical funds which were originally established to fund program needs of special students (e.g., the handicapped, limited English speaking, vocational oriented). In recent years, changes in the jr. high definition as well as the ability to count each elementary school separately have encouraged districts to establish jr. high programs for funding, rather than programmatic purposes; and to consider multiple elementary facilities for one or more elementary grades. Finally, the existence of categorical revenues, established with unfortunate similarity to the federal categorical funding schemes, have encouraged boards and adminstrators to consider such reveues as expenditure "caps" for categorical programs, without particular regard to the specialized needs of the target group students.

This is a statement that education has taken a back seat to manipulation of programs--manipulation of programs not to meet the educational needs of pupils, but to generate as much in revenue as is mathematically possible. It is also a statement that the state has been wasting its educational dollars.

The new program placed a premium on a superintendent and staff who concentrate on games playing and not the traditional role of an educator of balancing programs to meet the educational need of pupils. It diverted administrators from the task of delivering the best possible education to the pupils.

The easiest way to generate additional units was simply to incorporate new programs in the school curriculum for which units could be obtained in excess of additional costs incurred.

This is the way it works:

Assume six grades in 1-6, each with a teacher, a classroom and 23 students. Under the typical average daily membership driven finanacial program, each classroom would generate the same number of units, say 1 unit for each 23 children enrolled in K-6 programs.

Assume that there are 8 children in each class who can qualify for special education and that funding formula provides for one instructional unit for each 8 special education students.

The school district would apply for 6 instructional units, one for each grade, because 8 pupils from each grade will now be served by a special education program and be in "daily membership".

The school district would then, possibly, arrange for a newly hired special education teacher to teach 8 persons from the first grade between 9-10:00 a.m., 8 persons from the second grade from 10-11:00a.m., 8 persons from the third grade from 11-12:00 p.m., 8 persons from the the fourth grade from 1-2:00 p.m., 8 persons from the fifth grade from 2-3:00 p.m. and 8 persons from the sixth grade from 3-4:00 p.m.

The school teacher would be teaching a total of 48 children each day. The teacher would be serving 48 children per day, which means that 48 children per day could be counted towards the "average daily membership" for special education. The full time equivalent (FTE) for these students would only be 8, because the teacher, on the average, would only be teaching 8 children throughout the day. However, since units are being counted on the basis of pupils served, and not the length any one student is served, it would be possible to generate 6 units to cover the cost of one teacher in a classroom.

The foregoing example is exaggerated because it would be difficult for a special education teacher to schedule 8 students each hour of the work week. Also the standard teaching load sought for special education teachers in Anchorage is about 25 pupils to a resource teacher as opposed to the 48 pupils used in the example. Nevertheless, the methodology for pyramiding instructional units is accurate.

Now, assume that another 8 pupils in each classroom can be qualified for gifted and talented program. By following the same process as used for special education students, it can be seen that 6 units can be generated to generate revenues sufficient to hire six teachers, in classrooms, finance 1 gifted and talented teacher with a classroom.

Now, assume that a group of 8 students from each classroom can be qualified for a bilingual program. Once again, if 8 pupils will generate 1 unit, 1 bilingual teacher teaching 8 children per hour, for a total of 48 served per day, would generate enough money for 6 bilingual/bicultural teachers--the school district could generate funding equal to that which would finance 6 regular classroom units. (This is exaggerated as a "weighted average daily membership" is used for bilingual students which means that the number of bilingual pupils counted is fewer than the number served unless the pupil is in bilingual program 100% of the time.)

Now, for contrast, consider what would happen if the state separately funded vocational education students, not on the basis of how many are served each day (pupils in ADM), but rather on the basis of how many hours they are served (full time equivalents). This time assume that there are 8 pupils in each classroom which can qualify for a vocational education program and assume that the vocational education teacher has 8 pupils each hour of the day for a total of 48 vocational education pupils served during the day.

Now, since the instructional units are not based upon vocational education students in "average daily membership" or on the basis of number of pupils served each day, but are rather based upon the number of hours of instruction, the 8 pupils per hour will generate one unit and not six. The opportunity to manipulate does not exist with the full time eqivalent (FTE) approach.

The cumulative total of units for these 138 pupils is 25, 4.15 pupils to a teacher. The funding for these units would also include funding supporting personnel for these teachers, including assistant superintendents, principals, secretaries, and maintenance personnel plus non-salary costs.

The 1970 instructional unit allotment program, as amended after 1975, did provide for allocation of instructional units for special education programs based upon special education pupils in "average daily membership". This created an opportunity for pyramiding units which was aggressively pursued by some school districts until 1983.

Ch. 75, SLA 1986, at AS 14.17.041 provides for vocational education students being counted on a ADM basis, not an FTE basis, special education students on a ADM basis, not an FTE basis and bilingual education on a "weighted ADM" basis, which is closer to "full time equivalent" basis than a ADM basis.

Under AS 14.17.041, as amended by Ch. 75, SLA 1986, 18 elementary school pupils will generate at least 1 instructional unit per 18 pupils, 16 secondary school pupils will generate at least 1 instructional unit, 5-10 vocational education students will generate at least 1 unit, 1-15 special education students will generate at least one unit, and 1-12 bilingual educational students will generate at least 1 instructional unit. There is an

opportunity to pyramid units for vocational education and special education and possibly for bilingual.

The first major change to Chapter 17 was enacted in 1975 to provide state aid through the foundation formula to the newly created REAAs. The 1975 amendments allowed REAAs 1) 100% of basic need, 2) a flat payment per pupil in lieu of local tax (to provide for more than 100% of basic need?), and 3) certain advantages in the instructional unit tables to compensate for very small student populations. In addition new regional cost multipliers for REAA's were added.

In 1977 the 5% isolation factor was repealed.

In 1980 it became apparent that Alaska was going to have much more in oil revenues than in previous years. The second major change occurred in 1980 with the passage of FCCS SB 199. The 1980 changes were intended to generate additional money for some school districts. The major sections of SB 199 were:

a. Three instructional units minimum. Revised the elementary formula to establish a minimum generation of three instructional units--enough for three teachers regardless of the number of pupils in the school. (An elementary school enrollment could drop to 5 but enough state aid would be generated for a minimum of three teachers.) AS 14.17.031 (c).

b. Separate counting of elementary schools. Allowed each elementary school to be counted as a separate attendance area. AS 14.17.031(b) as amended by S6-8, Ch. 26 SLA 1980.

c. Reduction of ADM generated revenues. Revised, in two-phases, the secondary formula which increased the minimum units generated and compressed the number of ADM at the top of the formula table--this increased the allocation to smaller school districts and reduced the amount for larger districts. AS 14.17.041.

d. Tax relief. Established a supplemental equalization aid program tied to the area differential rate to provide a form of "in lieu of local taxes" relief for all school districts. AS 14.17.023. This had a relatively insignificant effect on school district revenues.

e. Additional units for junior high school. Defined "jr. high school" on the basis of ADM as opposed to program--if there are 20 children in grades 5-8, at least three instructional units will be generated for a secondary school even though there are no secondary school students. AS 14.17.031(c).

f. Local effort repealed. Eliminated any reference to required local effort. AS 14.17.070 as repealed by S21, Ch. 26, SLA 1980; AS 14.17.030 on required local effort had been repealed by S11, Ch. 95, SLA 1969.

g. PL 81-874 monies. Allowed REAAs to "recapture" up to 20% of the PL 874 payments. (This would provide, in some cases, another 30%-40% in addition to the basic need being met by the state.)

h. 55% instructional expenditure requirement. Required each district spend at least 55% of its operating budget on instructional components. AS 14.17.081 added by S15, Ch. 26, SLA 1980.

Items (a), (b), (c) and (e) made it possible to generate a large number of additional units based on no or very few additional pupils. The legislation enacted in 1970 contained, in addition to regular elementary and secondary computation schedules, separate schedules for vocational and special education.

In 1978, the program was amended to include a separate schedule for bilingual/bicultural education. In 1981, SB23 changed special education from its original FTE basis to an ADM basis and established two separate schedules based on district total ADM. This opened the door to pyramiding of special education units.

In addition to the above; the legislature made periodic changes affecting 1) the area differential percentage schedules, 2) the differentials of specific districts, 3) the percentage of required local effort, 4) final entitlement (e.g., first quarter or year end "floor"), 5) revenue losses due to reduced instructional unit entitlement, 6) district and centralized correspondence program funding, and 7) foundation support for community schools programs.

Finally, successive legislatures have repealed several fund generation mechanisms, e.g.,"mini" 874 (1980) and a 5% isolation factor (1977).

The foregoing changes are summarized in a Memorandum of Robert Van Slyke, Deputy Commissioner of Education to Commissioner Marshall L. Lind, dated January 15, 1982, at pp. 1-2.

VII SUSPENSION OF INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS PROGRAM

Robert Van Slyke, Deputy Commissioner of Education, in his memorandum of January 15, 1982, recommended a suspension of the 1970 formula because of "assumed inequities inherent" in the program. He proposed

> ...that the department seek relief from the requirements of AS 14.17 for a two to three year period, during which time state funding would be allocated on a straight per ADM per district allocation. The per ADM per district rate would be established, based on FY 83 figures. ... Increases in enrollment would generate the per ADM figure; decreases would be adjusted on the same basis. If the administration and the legislature wish to increase state support on some percentage basis, the percentage of increase would be applied to the statewide ADM figure as opposed to the instructional unit value.
>
> It is also proposed that during the two-three year exemption period, an intensive study of total state funding for education be conducted which would culminate in a new distribution system which addresses the perceived current inequities in both operational and capital state support programs.

At about the same time there was a great deal of newspaper publicity about the steadily mounting fund balances of school districts receiving a large amount of dollars per pupil. In 1983, there was heavy newspaper coverage of the Bering Straits School District expenditures. That school district had sent a number of pupils and adult chaperones on a trip to Europe. In addition, the school superintendent had hired a consultant to act as acting superintendent while the superintendent campaigned in Atlanta, New Jersey for a seat on the executive board of the American Association of School Administrators. School officials were, according to the Alaska Professional Teaching Practices Commission, pressured to contribute to the effort and were invited to fly to the convention to campaign for the superintendent. Large salary increases for administrators soon followed. Anchorage Daily News, December 1985, C3. This suggested that revenues were outstripping needs for traditional K-12 programs.

The 1983 Legislature acted upon the recommendation of Mr. Van Slyke or of the State Department of Education and suspended the 1970 formula in favor of per pupil payments. Ch. 82, SLA 1983. The 1984 Legislature also suspended the formula but increased all payments by 4.5%. Ch. 6, SLA 1984. The 1985 Legislature reenacted the previous year program. Ch. 75, SLA 1985. Thus the formula was suspended for a total of three years.