

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE SENATE

January 26, 1983

The meeting of the Senate Education and Cultural Resources Committee was called to order by Chairman Bob Brown on January 26, 1983, at 1:03 p.m. in Room 442, State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: Roll was called with all members present.

Lorie Maynard and Tim Evanson, music students from Great Falls High School, spoke to the committee about their respective involvements in the music program (attached exhibits #1 and #2). Lorie is a member of numerous vocal groups and Delphian Choir and Tim is in Jazz and Symphonic Band. The students stressed personal development, discipline, and citizenship the program teaches are invaluable and urged the committee to support music programs in schools across the state.

The committee met in Executive Session to discuss Senate Bill 43, Senate Bill 158, and Senate Bill 95.

SENATE BILL 43: In discussion, Senator Haffey stated he felt the message to the committee is to let the taxpayers decide what they want on the local level. Senator Brown said he felt consolidation is already beginning and over the next decade nature will take its course and those necessary consolidations will have occurred. Senator Berg said it is necessary to keep the issue in the public conscience. Concerns were expressed about the number of miles traveled and the number of hours spent in transporting students if wholesale consolidation were to occur.

ACTION ON SENATE BILL 43: Senator Smith moved Senate Bill 43 DO NOT PASS. The motion carried on a roll call vote with Senators Blaylock and Berg voting no (attached exhibit #3).

SENATE BILL 95: Senator Smith stated he understands that of the 25% Federal Forest Funds 2/3 returns to the county for roads and 1/3 goes into the foundation program for schools, not back to the county for local schools. Senator Blaylock said that is the case, however, the 1/3 is discounted to the county. He said passage of the bill would be dangerous tinkering with the foundation program.

EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Page 2

January 26, 1983

ACTION ON SENATE BILL 95: Senator McCallum moved Senate Bill 95 DO PASS. The motion carried on a roll call vote with Senators Blaylock, Berg, and Mazurek voting no (attached exhibit #4).

ACTION ON SENATE BILL 158: Senator Berg moved to amend page 10 line 12, (attached committee report exhibit #5). The motion carried unanimously.

Senator Mazurek moved to amend page 10, lines 14-19 striking subsection (2) (attached committee report exhibit #5). The motion carried unanimously.

Senator Berg moved to adopt the statement of intent (attached committee report exhibit #5). The motion carried unanimously.

Senator Berg moved Senate Bill 158 DO PASS AS AMENDED. The motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURN: There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 2:33 p.m.



Senator Bob Brown, Chairman

jdr

ROLL CALL

EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

COMMITTEE

48th LEGISLATIVE SESSION -- 1983

Date 1/26/83

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
<u>Senator Bob Brown, Chairman</u>	X		
<u>Senator Ed Smith, V. Chairman</u>	X		
<u>Senator Roger Elliott</u>	X		
<u>Senator Delwyn Gage</u>	X		
<u>Senator George McCallum</u>	X		
<u>Senator Elmer Severson</u>	X		
<u>Senator Harry Berg</u>	X		
<u>Senator Chet Blaylock</u>	X		
<u>Senator Jack Haffey</u>	X		
<u>Senator Joseph Mazurek</u>	X		

Exhibit #1
January 26, 1983

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Senate Education Committee, Ladies and
Gentlemen:

As a speech team member, I am required to read Newsweek, Time and U.S. News every week. One recent article on the new rounds of budget cuts had Senator John Tower from Texas commenting on the budget-cutting proposals. He objected to any such proposals because they assume an across-the-board cut. That implies that every program is equal, and yet we know that some are more important than others. Some we cannot afford to cut. This same principle holds true for the states as well. Some programs you just can't cut. Music education is one of these. ~~The~~ It is as essential to the growth of the individual and the school as social security is to the well-being of the elderly.

People insist on calling music education programs "extra-curricular." This implies that they are not necessary for school or individual needs. This cannot be farther from the truth. It is obvious that music influences the school. Pride is engendered, spirit is maintained, and educational entertainment is enjoyed by all.

The student involved in music is affected in much the same way the school is. The average student in music is not an average student. He is generally above average academically, is involved in many programs other than music, and carries a full class load without study halls. Oftentimes, the school music program is this student's only source of music education.

For one reason or another the student cannot take private lessons-- either for lack of money, lack of time, or-- as is the case in many rural communities-- there is no source of private music education.

I am one of these students. In order for me to continue to participate , enjoy, and be an intelligent consumer of music I must take the classes the public schools offer. These classes may include band, chorus, orchestra, music theory, jazzband, and a host of smaller ensembles made up of members of these groups.

These classes not only teach music but discipline as well. You have to subordinate yourself not only to the rules and dictates of the music but to the group as well. Tremendous cooperation is essential to be a member of any large group. If every member musician played or sang as he pleased, it would be pure bedlam and sound terrible.

This sort of group discipline also lends itself to the development of good citizenship. Music educators uphold strict rules of conduct for their groups not only to enforce school policy on trips but to obtain good performance habits as well. Eventually such rules become ingrained in the members, with a well-rounded citizen the result.

Finally, music develops pride. Not only pride in school and for a performance well done, but pride in one's self. This self-esteem shows through not just in music but at work, at home, and in an individual's treatment of others.

This entire speech is summed up by saying, Music not only prepares the mind for a career, but the personality for life as well. Many critics of music programs cite falling school enrollments as reason to cut funds. Yet while overall school enrollment has dropped, enrollments in music have stayed at their 1970's figures, thus showing not only a desire but a need for state funded music programs. With such a need, I ask you to continue funding and requiring music for every student.

Thank you very much for your time.

TIM EVANSON, SENIOR
GREAT FALLS HIGH SCHOOL

605 Carol Dr.

Great Falls, MT 59404

Exhibit #2
January 26, 1983

GREAT FALLS HIGH SCHOOL
1900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
GREAT FALLS, MONTANA 59405

ROBERT W. SWARTHOUT, Principal
CAL RYDER, Assistant Principal
H.F. DAHMER, Dean of Students
ENID IKEDA, Assoc. Dean of Students

I would like to thank all of you here for giving me an opportunity to come and speak about the music education program in my school.

Our music programs today are producing vibrant, as well as mature, youth who are ready to fulfill each charge put to them in ~~life~~^{the future}. The programs are developing every individual as a complete person and they are helping all youth to establish his or her own goals in life.

The music education provided to me by the Great Falls Public Schools has had a major influence on my entire educational life. It may well have even assisted me in my vocational choice.

Beginners starting out in our music program, no matter how timid, will soon learn to reach out and communicate to another human being through personal expression. When music is performed, its aim is to contact the substance, the very inner core of another human being. Since I am in a choir, I can personally relate to you the grandeur created by an intimate bond formed between myself and the audience when the music is performed. The splendor is simply magnificent.

Naturally, this bond doesn't "just happen" the moment a choir steps out on stage. Hours upon hours of sometimes tedious rehearsal tempered by discipline and dedication must be spent by the students as well as the instructors to prepare for a performance. It is perhaps during these times that a music student grows the most.

Every student involved in our music department carries a tremendous responsibility towards themselves, their instructors, and towards the peers with whom they work. And yet I can say for myself, and, I believe, for most others involved in the program, that it is a great personal honor to carry that responsibility. This attitude allows us to set our standards exceedingly high, thus earning honor and respect from our student body as well as our community.

This respect carries over in the ^{cammaraderie} camaraderie we have within our programs. We've built for ourselves and our group a personal pride that radiates from everyone involved. We delight in every accomplished goal, whether it be a daily part-learning assignment or a full-scale Concert. We thrive on each attainment.

Our goals, while considered by many to be admirable, are oftentimes limited by the monetary funding supporting our department. As the cost of fine literature, new instruments, equipment repair and performances increases and our funding decreases, an imbalance is created. This continued imbalance deprives many young and gifted students the opportunity for personal growth, artistic accomplishment and the beauty of musical communication.

My challenge to each of you today is to solve the following dilemma:
How can worthwhile and beneficial educational programs, including music,
be maintained in the face of potentially overwhelming budgetary cuts?
Secondly, can we afford to cut an educational program which continues to
encourage our youth to strive for high standards and not give in until
they are fulfilled?

Ladies and gentlemen, your discussions today could shape the fate
for many expectant young and gifted musicians of tomorrow. Will your de-
cisions be the right ones? I hope so.

Thank you.

Exhibit #3
Jan. 26, 1983

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Date January 26, 1983 Senate Bill No. 43 Time

NAME	YES	NO
<u>Senator Bob Brown, Chairman</u>	<u>X</u>	
<u>Senator Ed Smith, Vice Chairman</u>	<u>X</u>	
<u>Senator Roger Elliott</u>	<u>X</u>	
<u>Senator Delwyn Gage</u>	<u>X</u>	
<u>Senator George McCallum</u>	<u>X</u>	
<u>Senator Elmer Severson</u>	<u>X</u>	
<u>Senator Harry Berg</u>		<u>X</u>
<u>Senator Chet Blaylock</u>		<u>X</u>
<u>Senator Jack Haffey</u>	<u>X</u>	
<u>Senator Joseph Mazurek</u>	<u>X</u>	

Jill Rohyans
Secretary JILL ROHYANS

Bob Brown
Chairman SENATOR BOB BROWN

Motion: by Senator Ed Smith that Senate Bill 43 DO NOT PASS

(include enough information on motion--put with yellow copy of committee report.)

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 27, 1983

MR. PRESIDENT:

We, your committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

having had under consideration **SENATE** Bill No. **43**

Respectfully report as follows: That **SENATE** Bill No. **43**

DO NOT PASS
REXX

110

Exhibit #4

Jan. 26, 1983

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Date Jan. 26, 1983 Senate Bill No. 95 Time

NAME	YES	NO
<u>Senator Bob Brown, Chairman</u>	x	
<u>Senator Ed Smith, Vice Chairman</u>	x	
<u>Senator Roger Elliott</u>	x	
<u>Senator Delwyn Gage</u>	x	
<u>Senator George McCallum</u>	x	
<u>Senator Elmer Severson</u>	x	
<u>Senator Harry Berg</u>		x
<u>Senator Chet Blaylock</u>		x
<u>Senator Jack Haffey</u>	x	
<u>Senator Joseph Mazurek</u>		x

Jill Rohyans
Secretary JILL ROHYANS

Bob Brown
Chairman SENATOR BOB BROWN *jr*

Motion: by Senator McCallum that Senate Bill 95 DO PASS

(include enough information on motion--put with yellow copy of committee report.)

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 27, 19 83

MR. **PRESIDENT:**

We, your committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

having had under consideration **SENATE** Bill No. **95**

Respectfully report as follows: That **SENATE** Bill No. **95**

DO PASS

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

Exhibit #5
Jan. 26, 1983

January 27, 1983

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on EDUCATION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

having had under consideration SENATE

Bill No. 158

Respectfully report as follows: That SENATE Bill No. 158

~~introduced copy~~, be amended as follows:

1. Page 10, line 12.

Following: "skills"

Insert: "as prescribed by the board of public education"

2. Page 10, lines 14 through 19.

Strike: subsection (2) in its entirety

Re-number: subsequent subsection

And, as so amended, DO PASS

~~DO PASS~~

Statement of Intent Attached.

40

Education and Cultural Resources

Page 2

Senate Bill 158

Statement of Intent Senate Bill 158

Sections 3 and 5 of the bill delegate rulemaking authority to the Board of Public Education. The board has already adopted rules in these areas of procedures for admission to the School for the Deaf and Blind (ARM 10.61.201) and of transfers into another educational placement (ARM 10.61.204). The committee would contemplate that the board republish these rules, citing the proper statutory authorities after SB158 is enacted. The board would, of course, retain the power to amend these rules in the future in such manner as it deemed proper for the governance of the school.

Section 13 gives the board authority to establish employment criteria in the area of communications skills for school staff who work with deaf children. Rules in this area should recognize that teachers need a high level of skills such as sign language in order to communicate to deaf pupils, while some custodial or administration employees may be able to work well for the school with a lower level of communications skills. The board should establish a relatively informal procedure for establishing compliance with its criteria, such as certification by the superintendent and one deaf adult, and it may reserve the right to grant waivers from its policy.

PROPOSED FOUNDATION PROGRAM FOR NONISOLATED HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A Report to the
Joint Subcommittee on Education
By Andrea Merrill, Committee Researcher
May 26, 1982

Overview

This proposal would alter the practice of rewarding Montana's smallest high schools with much more foundation program money per pupil than is allowed high schools of larger size. The recognition that small high schools require more money per pupil has been constant throughout the years of the foundation program and this proposal will not disregard this reality. The assumptions in the acknowledgment include: some small schools are inevitable in our sparsely populated communities which are often separated by great distances; small high schools must offer the same basic programs (through the accreditation process) that larger schools offer but cannot take advantage of the economies of scale that result from larger school populations.

Background

The original Foundation Program Act of 1949 attempted to discourage very small high schools by requiring that any high school under 25 ANB had to apply to the county budget board for approval as an "isolated" school. However, the early statutes governing funding did not clearly state that funds would be denied if isolation status was not approved. Legislation in 1961 (Chap. 230 L. 1961) clarified that high schools having under 25 ANB for three consecutive years would not receive state equalization aid unless they were granted isolation status. The 1963 Legislature made considerable changes in the school finance structure and, in the process, amended out the new penalty against nonisolated small high schools.

This deletion may have been inadvertent in light of the fact that interest in school consolidation and reorganization was strong during the late 1950's and early 1960's. In fact, those years represented a high-water mark for such efforts. There has been

minimums of over 400 students. In Montana, only 27 high schools have a student count over 400. It would not be practical or fair to suggest that Montana high schools should consolidate to reach the "minimums" suggested for more populated states.

Small High Schools in Neighboring States

In the course of study on this topic, several neighboring states were queried on the issue of school district reorganization in general. Details of those contacts are documented elsewhere and only comments that relate to small high schools are included at this time. In South Dakota, a district that operates a high school under 35 pupils within 20 miles of another high school does not receive any state aid. A new school may not be initiated unless the available taxable valuation is over the 15th percentile in wealth. South Dakota has only 196 K-12 districts. Wyoming has only 49 districts. The state has only 65 rural school buildings and three high schools under 100 pupils. Idaho reduced its district count to 116 in the early 1960's. At that time, districts of under four teachers had until 1963 to consolidate or lose state aid.

Rationale for Proposal

Montana has 69 high schools with less than 100 pupils, most of which are within 20 highway miles of another school. This suggests that many of these small schools might combine in an attempt to spend local and state financial resources more efficiently and to provide more programs and services to students.

Attempts to mandate or encourage school reorganization or consolidation in Montana have been more than numerous; over 50 legislative or administrative efforts were engaged in before 1964.* Several costly state studies have recommended change in this direction but were largely disregarded or defeated. The foundation program schedules have continued to reward smallness and statutory incentives for consolidation have not overridden such benefits.

* "School District Organization in Montana, 1889-1964; Related to the Proposals and Attempts for Improvement" Winston W. Wetzel, doctoral thesis, M.S.U., 1964.

TABLE I

PROPOSED FOUNDATION PROGRAM FOR "NONISOLATED" HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS
WITH ANB UNDER 100
(Using 1981-82 Actual Schedule Rates)

Size (ANB)	Isolation Approval = Current Rate		Proposed Split for "Nonisolated" Districts			
	FP/ANB	FP Amount	State Share		District Share	
Under 25	FP/ANB	FP Amount	FP/ANB	FP Amount	FP/ANB	FP Amount
1	71,002.40	71,002.40	1,747.976	1,747.98	69,254.42	69,254.42
5	14,200.48	↓	↓	8,739.88	12,452.50	62,262.52
10	7,100.24			17,479.76	5,352.26	53,522.64
15	4,733.49			26,219.64	2,985.52	44,782.76
20	3,550.12			34,959.52	1,802.14	36,042.88
21	3,381.07			36,707.50	1,633.09	34,294.90
22	3,227.38			38,455.47	1,479.41	32,546.93
23	3,087.07			40,203.45	1,339.08	30,798.95
24	2,958.43	71,002.40	1,747.976	41,951.42	1,210.46	29,050.98
25-100						
25	\$ 2,958.40	\$ 73,960.00	\$1,747.976	\$ 43,699.40	\$ 1,210.42	\$ 30,260.60
30	2,877.72	86,331.60	↓	52,439.28	1,129.74	33,892.32
35	2,797.04	97,896.40		61,179.16	1,049.06	36,717.24
40	2,716.36	108,654.40		69,919.04	968.38	38,735.36
45	2,635.456	118,595.52		78,658.92	887.48	39,936.60
50	2,554.776	127,738.80		87,398.00	806.80	40,340.00
55	2,474.096	136,075.28		96,138.68	726.12	39,936.60
60	2,393.416	143,604.90		104,878.56	645.44	38,726.40
65	2,312.736	150,327.84		113,618.44	564.76	36,709.40
70	2,232.056	156,243.92		122,358.32	484.08	33,885.60
75	2,151.376	161,353.20		131,098.20	403.40	30,255.00
80	2,070.696	165,655.68		139,838.08	322.72	25,817.60
85	1,990.016	169,151.36		148,577.96	242.04	20,573.40
90	1,909.336	171,840.24		157,317.84	161.36	14,522.40
95	1,828.656	173,722.32		166,057.72	80.68	7,664.60
100	1,747.976	174,797.60	1,747.976	174,797.60	0.00	0.00
Column	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)

Explanation

Column (A) represents the current foundation program per ANB, which is 80% of the schedules (the remaining 20% is allowed for the permissive portion).

1981-82 High School Schedules

1-24 ANB: Maximum of \$88,753 (80% = \$71,002.40).

25-40 ANB: Maximum per ANB = \$3,698 - \$20.17 for each pupil up to 40 pupils.

41-100 ANB: Maximum per ANB = \$3,375 - \$20.17 for each pupil up to 100 pupils.

Column (B) is Col. (A) x actual ANB = total foundation program amount allowed.

Column (C) is the FP/ANB currently allowed for a high school of 100 pupils.

Column (D) is \$1,747.976 x the actual ANB = total state share paid of amount allowed in Col. (B).

Column (E) is the district share per ANB or Col. (C) - Col. (A).

Column (F) is the total district share or Col. (D) - Col. (B).

County	High School District	ANB	TV/ANB	GF Ratio	GF/ANB	GF/ANB Rank
Valley	Hinsdale	44	73,644	1.52	5,027	140
Beaverhead	Lima*	46	31,252	1.14	3,673	100
Golden Valley	Ryegate	47	52,118	1.39	4,534	129
Liberty	J-I	47	130,612	1.85	6,009	153
Fergus	Denton*	48	78,132	1.49	4,803	133
Musselshell	Nelstone*	48	162,798	1.62	5,223	144
Park	Wilsall	49	35,576	1.11	3,554	94
Fergus	Roy*	49	25,099	1.24	3,976	109
Fergus	Moore	49	51,815	1.31	4,205	121
Phillips	Saco	50	104,508	1.77	5,653	152
Fergus	Grass Range*	51	36,859	1.27	4,018	110
Phillips	Dodson	51	40,248	1.36	4,315	123
Petroleum	Winnett*	52	63,164	1.35	4,247	122
Teton	Dutton	53	76,452	1.56	4,901	135
Richland	Lambert	53	68,571	1.58	4,964	137
Dawson	Richey*	53	76,348	1.70	5,313	147
Richland	Savage	54	67,516	1.59	4,950	136
Fergus	Winifred*	55	39,358	1.33	4,119	117
Blaine	Turner*	55	40,433	1.41	4,361	125
Roosevelt	Brockton*	55	9,930	1.48	4,573	130
Teton	Power	65	29,831	1.24	3,578	95
Valley	Opheim*	65	59,386	1.51	4,358	124
Sheridan	Westby*	66	219,355	1.45	4,169	119
Treasure	Hysham*	67	59,310	1.30	3,705	102
Mineral	St. Regis	68	21,695	1.28	3,620	98
Rosebud	Rosebud	68	45,111	1.39	3,943	106
Gallatin	West Yellowstone*	71	39,292	1.36	3,770	104
Chouteau	Geraldine*	71	77,630	1.48	4,108	116
Madison	Twin Bridges	74	50,507	1.51	4,101	115
Judith Basin	Hobson	76	46,517	1.44	3,852	104
Carbon	Fromberg	77	25,134	1.28	3,393	87
Big Horn	Plenty Coups*	78	8,844	1.71	4,499	128
Park	Gardiner*	81	19,492	1.55	3,968	108
Hill	Blue Sky	83	60,297	1.65	4,164	118
Mineral	Alberton	85	16,069	1.13	2,820	66
Sheridan	Medicine Lake	88	450,262	1.91	4,639	131
Judith Basin	Stanford	91	43,384	1.41	3,325	85
Roosevelt	Culbertson	91	37,216	1.73	4,085	114
Sanders	Hot Springs	92	23,506	1.00	2,346	41
Valley	Nashua	94	25,714	1.53	3,535	93
Granite	Drummond*	96	34,087	1.04	2,355	42
Hill	Box Elder	96	13,265	1.55	3,510	92
Blaine	Hays-Lodge Pole*	98	880	1.57	3,494	91
Lewis & Clark	Augusta*	98	36,545	1.61	3,585	97
Carbon	Joliet	99	30,212	1.26	2,786	61

TABLE III (con't)

High School District
* = isolation

High School District * = isolation	ANB	State Share	District Share
Wilsall	49	85,650.82	40,323.87
Roy*	49		
Moore	49	85,650.82	40,323.87
Saco	50	87,398.80	40,340.00
Grass Range*	51		
Dodson	51	89,146.78	40,323.86
Winnett*	52		
Dutton	53	92,642.73	40,194.72
Lambert*	53		
Richey*	53		
Savage	54	94,390.70	40,081.83
Winifred*	55		
Turner*	55		
Brockton	55	96,138.68	39,936.60
Power	65	113,618.44	36,709.40
Opheim*	65		
Westby*	66		
Hysham*	67		
St. Regis	68	118,862.37	35,111.93
Rosebud	68	118,862.39	35,111.93
West Yellowstone*	71		
Geraldine*	71		
Twin Bridges	74	129,350.22	31,045.67
Hobson	76	132,846.18	29,432.06
Fromberg	77	134,594.15	28,576.86
Plenty Coups*	78		
Gardiner*	81		
Blue Sky (Rudyard)	83	145,082.01	22,767.89
Alberton	85	148,577.96	20,573.40
Medicine Lake	88	153,821.89	17,039.61
Stanford	91	159,065.82	13,215.38

Mileage to Closest School + (ANB)

9 mi. to Clyde Park (42)	
36 mi. to Lewistown	
9 mi. to Hobson (76)	
14 mi. to Lewistown (556)	
13 mi. to Hinsdale (44)	
31 mi. to Lewistown	
17 mi. to Malta (262)	
23 mi. to Grass Range	
15 mi. to Brady (28)	
10 mi. to Power (65)	
20 mi. to Sidney	
24 mi. to Lambert	
18 mi. to Sidney (534)	
37 mi. to Lewistown	
31 mi. to Harlem	
13 mi. to Poplar (213)	
10 mi. to Dutton (53)	
49 mi. to Glasgow	
24 mi. to Plentywood	
21 mi. to Custer	
25 mi. to Forsyth	
14 mi. to Superior (173)	
12 mi. to Forsyth (213)	
9 mi. to Sheridan (131)	
9 mi. to Moore (49)	
18 mi. to Standford (91)	
7 mi. to Bridger (108)	
16 mi. to Joliet (99)	
10 mi. to Joplin (J-I) (47)	
15 mi. to Gildford (K-G) (25)	
15 mi. to Frenchtown (252)	
12 mi. to Froid (41)	
18 mi. to Hobson (76)	
15 mi. to Geyser (40)	

TABLE III

High School District * = isolation	ANB	State Share	District Share	Mileage to Closest School + (A)
Reed Point	19	\$ 33,211.54	\$ 37,799.86	17 mi. to Columbus (171)
K-G (Gildford)	25	43,699.40	30,360.60	15 mi. to Blue Sky (Rudyard) ()
Willow Creek	28	48,943.33	32,536.45	5 mi. to Three Forks (137)
Judith Gap	28	48,943.33	32,536.45	17 mi. to Harlowton (115)
Brady	28	48,943.33	32,536.45	11 mi. to Conrad (317)
Peerless*	28			15 mi. to Dutton (53)
Whitewater*	31			20 mi. to Scobey (134)
Lavina	32	55,935.23	35,119.11	38 mi. to Malta
Rapelje*	33			17 mi. to Ryegate (47)
Bainville	33	57,683.21	35,684.09	25 mi. to Columbus
Belfry	34	59,431.18	36,216.80	15 mi. to Culbertson (91)
Custer*	38			11 mi. to Bridger (108)
Harrison*	39			21 mi. to Hysham
Flaxville	40	69,919.04	38,735.36	26 mi. to Ennis
Geyser	40	69,919.04	38,735.36	20 mi. to Three Forks (137)
Frazer	40	69,919.04	38,735.36	11 mi. to Scobey (134)
Outlook	41	71,667.02	39,032.98	15 mi. to Stanford (91)
Broadview	41	71,667.02	39,032.98	14 mi. to Nashua (94)
Froid	41	71,667.02	39,032.98	19 mi. to Wolf Point (321)
plevna	41	71,667.02	39,032.98	18 mi. to Plentywood (216)
Clyde Park	42	73,414.99	39,307.30	14 mi. to Lavina (32)
Highwood*	42	75,162.97	39,549.33	13 mi. to Culbertson (91)
Roberts	43	76,910.94	39,759.11	12 mi. to Medicine Lake (88)
Hinsdale	44	82,154.87	40,194.78	13 mi. to Baker (252)
Lima*	46	82,154.87	40,194.78	9 mi. to Wilsall (49)
Ryegate	47	82,154.87	40,194.78	20 mi. to Belt (147)
J-I (Joplin)	47			13 mi. to Joliet (99)
Denton*	48			13 mi. to Red Lodge (159)
Melstone*	48			13 mi. to Saco (50)
				50 mi. to Dillon
				17 mi. to Lavina (32)
				10 mi. to Chester (118)
				10 mi. to Blue Sky (Rudyard) (83)
				25 mi. to Stanford
				34 mi. to Roundup

TABLE III (con't)

High School District * = isolation	ANB	State Share	District Share	Mileage to Closest School + (AN
Culbertson	91	159,065.82	13,215.38	15 mi. to Bainville (33)
Hot Springs*	92			13 mi. to Froid (41)
Nashua	94	164,309.74	9,100.71	21 mi. to Plains
				14 mi. to Glasgow (454)
Drummond*	96			14 mi. to Frazer (40)
Box Elder	96	167,805.70	6,196.22	31 mi. to Deer Lodge
Hays-Lodge Pole*	98			10 mi. to Big Sandy (113)
Joliet	99	173,049.67	1,597.47	50 mi. to Harlem
				13 mi. to Roberts (43)
Augusta* 1981-83	50			16 mi. to Fromberg (77)
Lincoln* 1982-83	50			21 mi. to Simms
				58 mi. to Augusta
Shares under proposed plan		\$3,932,946.08	\$1,325,351.77	
State share under status quo		\$5,258,297.85		
State savings under plan		\$1,325,248.82		

* For the purposes of this table, a district is considered isolated if it is 20 miles or more to the closest high school.

TABLE II

This chart lists the districts with ANB under 100 and presents 1981-82 general fund budget data and taxable valuation per ANB. The starred districts are those that are more than 20 miles from another high school and that would probably be considered isolated because of distance, road conditions and/or pupil service area. There are probably many additional districts that would qualify for isolation status under existing criteria.

All but 14 of the 68 districts listed are above the median level (\$29,310) in taxable valuation per ANB. Fifty districts are at or above the 80th percentile in taxable wealth per ANB. Thirty-five districts are below the median level of 1.50 for the general fund ratio (total general fund to maximum general fund ratio) and 35 districts are above the median level.

The above facts suggest that many of the small high school districts could provide part of their own funding without undue hardship because taxable valuation per student is high.

Eight of the schools below the median in taxable valuation may find it difficult to provide additional local funding. The remaining six low valuation districts are on or near Indian reservations and have had access to federal impact aid (P.L. 874 funds) for general fund needs.

County	High School District	ANB	TV/ANB	GF Ratio	GF/ANB	GF/ANB Rank
Stillwater	Reed Point	19	\$ 53,819	1.35	\$ 6,319	156
Hill	K-G	25	57,286	1.73	11,074	162
Gallatin	Willow Creek	28	27,558	1.28	4,673	132
Wheatland	Judith Gap*	28	46,274	1.52	5,530	149
Pondera	Brady	28	120,263	1.69	6,146	155
Daniels	Peerless*	28	62,332	1.77	6,421	158
Phillips	Whitewater*	31	306,234	2.42	8,654	161
Golden Valley	Lavina	32	60,220	1.24	4,414	127
Stillwater	Rapelje*	33	110,680	1.73	6,130	154
Roosevelt	Bainville	33	352,373	1.89	6,699	159
Carbon	Belfry	34	292,271	2.01	7,061	160
Yellowstone	Custer*	38	51,091	1.48	5,082	142
Madison	Harrison*	39	25,503	1.18	4,031	112
Daniels	Flaxville	40	55,486	1.47	4,998	138
Judith Basin	Geyser	40	57,859	1.55	5,270	145
Valley	Frazer	40	59,526	1.64	5,554	150
Sheridan	Outlook	41	91,602	1.49	5,026	139
Yellowstone	Broadview	41	83,026	1.58	5,344	148
Roosevelt	Froid	41	57,146	1.66	5,596	151
Fallon	Plevna	41	341,060	1.87	6,326	157
Park	Clyde Park	42	33,224	1.25	4,192	120
Chouteau	Highwood*	42	69,907	1.52	5,099	143
Carbon	Roberts	43	27,229	1.21	4,044	113