

Indiana Property Tax Equalization Study

Grant County Equalization Report



February 19, 2005

Indiana Property Tax Equalization Study

County Report for Grant County

February 19, 2005

This document summarizes the data, the equalization statistics, and the results of the Ratio Study performed on Grant County. The first section of this document entails specific results for Grant County, while the Appendices provide a general overview of the Indiana Property Tax Equalization Study, the processes used to complete the task, and detailed statistics for Grant County.

County Overview

Grant County is bordered by Wabash, Huntington, Wells, Blackford, Delaware, Madison, Tipton, Howard, and Miami counties in northeastern Indiana. Marion is the largest city (population 30,609) and the county seat. Grant County's population is 71,572 (2003),¹ ranking it 21st in population. There are 12 townships in Grant County: Center, Fairmount, Franklin, Green, Jefferson, Liberty Mill, Monroe, Pleasant, Richland, Sims, Van Buren and Washington.

Grant County completed its March 1, 2002 reassessment on October 17, 2003. The tax base for real property, including assessed value and number of parcels, by property class, is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Real Property Assessed Values and Number of Parcels, Grant County

Real Property in Grant County	Residential	Commercial & Industrial	Agricultural	Utility & Other	Total
Number of Parcels	34,575	4,474	6,502	3,138	48,689
Assessed Value	\$1,597,872,000	\$624,657,800	\$358,843,000	\$195,846,900	\$2,777,219,700

Ratio Study Data

Beginning in 2001 with the enactment of HEA 1499, IC 6-1.1-4-25 (b), Indiana Code stated:

“the township assessor in a county having a consolidated city, or the county assessor in every other county, shall:

(1) maintain an electronic data file of the parcel characteristics and parcel assessments of all parcels for each township in the county as of each assessment date that is in the form required by:

- (A) the legislative services agency (LSA); and
 - (B) the department of local government finance; and
- (2) transmit the data with respect to the assessment date of each

¹ Population Statistics from Stats Indiana <http://stats.indiana.edu/profiles/pr18001.html>

- year before October 1 of the year to:
- (A) the legislative services agency; and
 - (B) the department of local government finance.”²

In addition, the Act required, in I.C. 6-1.1-4-19.5, the Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF) to develop a standard contract or standard provisions for contracts to be used in securing professional appraisal services that include provisions stipulating:

- “...the contractor will generate complete parcel characteristics and parcel assessment data in a manner and format acceptable to the legislative services agency and the department of local government finance; and
- ...the legislative services agency and the department of local government finance have unrestricted access to the contractor's work product under the contract.”³

Simply stated, the Indiana General Assembly required local assessing officials to submit assessment data in a standard electronic file structure and format (“standardized format”) developed by the DLGF, which met the requirements of the DLGF and the LSA.

In addition, 50 IAC 12-16-28 sets forth the electronic record layout for sales disclosure information administration under authority of IC 6-1.1-31.5, which required the DLGF to promulgate computer specification standards, including those for assessment and sales disclosure data.

The primary data required to perform equalization analysis are parcel-by-parcel new and prior year assessments and market value information, specifically, the sales prices and property characteristics of recently sold properties. The collection and transmission of the assessment and sales data in accordance with statute and rule discussed above provide the means by which the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute (IFPI) can perform the equalization study.

Because local officials and their software vendors, in some cases, did not comply with the data transmission requirements, the IFPI found it necessary to obtain sales disclosure data directly from the paper sales disclosure form (State Form 46201). The IFPI had the paper forms “digitized,” that is, electronically scanned and the information on them converted to an electronic format which allowed them to be used in the equalization analysis. In addition, the IFPI obtained Multiple Listing Service (MLS) sales data from Boards of Realtors across the state with the assistance of the Indiana Association of Realtors in order to supplement the sales disclosure form data.

For Grant County, the IFPI evaluated the accuracy of the assessment of 45,551 parcels of residential, commercial and industrial, and agricultural property (see Table 1). This was

² HEA 1499 - 2001, Section 16.

³ HEA 1499 - 2001, Section 15.

done by making a ratio study of the categories of property listed in 50 IAC 14 and by testing for “sales chasing” (the practice of assessing recently sold properties in a manner different from unsold properties).

The ratio study was based on sales data for Grant County provided in the standardized format, digitized sales disclosure forms, and from the MLS database from Metropolitan Indianapolis Board of Realtors (MIBOR). From all sources, the IFPI received 8,588 records of sales. Grant County provided parcel data via the County Assessor, including 7,501 sales records in the standardized format. Records were excluded because:

- There was no sales price;
- The sales occurred outside the date range;
- There was other needed information missing from the record;
- There were duplicate records;
- There were new construction records; and
- There were some extremes (or outliers).

This left 31.3% of the sales records to use in the equalization analysis, or a total of 2,690 sales records. The 2,690 sales represent 5.9% of the total number of parcels. Of the 2,690 sales, 2,518 are improved residential sales and 108 are improved commercial and industrial sales.

Ratio Study Methodology

The main methodological steps taken to perform the ratio study in Grant County were:

- (1) assemble the data,
- (2) determine the study groups (“strata”),
- (3) make statistical analyses.

The Legislative Services Agency and Almy, Jacobs, Gloude-mans, and Denne (“the consultant”) cleaned the data, meaning that records with incomplete information or with data in an unusable format were eliminated from analysis unless the problems could be rectified. In addition, both the parcel and sales disclosure data were screened to determine whether a specific sale should be used in the ratio study. Reasons that a sale would be excluded include non-arm’s length sales, construction on the property since the last assessment, and extreme values.⁴

Computerized statistical programming was used to match the sale with an assessment. Since sales from 1998 through 2003 were included, adjustments to reported sales prices were made to account for the difference between the sale’s date and the assessment date.

⁴ See the IFPI’s “Background Tool Kit” July, 2004 for a more complete discussion of sales screening at <http://www.indianafiscal.org/docs/BackgroundToolKit.pdf>.

In accordance with 50 IAC 14-5-1, the Department of Local Government Finance’s equalization standards require equalization be performed for each of the following classes of property in each Township:

- Improved Residential
- Unimproved Residential
- Improved Commercial
- Unimproved Commercial
- Improved Industrial
- Unimproved Industrial
- Agricultural Land (use value basis)

When a sample of sales is small, when it does not represent the makeup of the total assessment roll well, and when the variation in sales ratios is great, ratio study statistics may not reliably portray the quality of appraisals.

In Grant County, sales sample sizes were small in some townships and for some classes of property. Therefore, the consultant “re-stratified,” or combined, first, some of the classes of property and, then, collapsed all classes in all townships to the county-wide level. When considered necessary, the first level of re-stratification was to combine (1) improved commercial and improved industrial property into a broader commercial and industrial property stratum and (2) unimproved commercial, industrial, and residential property into a broader vacant land stratum. Then, all townships were re-stratified to the county-wide level, to produce statistics with higher sample sizes for the county.

As previously noted, the IFPI used 2,690 sales to evaluate the assessments of 45,551 residential, commercial and industrial, and agricultural properties. We calculated standard ratio study statistics and used performance standards promulgated by the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) to evaluate the results.⁵ The following statistics were calculated:

- The *median ratio* was selected as the measure of central tendency used to describe the *level of assessment*—how close assessments are, overall, to 100 percent of market value. The IAAO standard is that assessments should be within 10% of market value. That means the median ratio should be between 90% and 110% (0.9 and 1.1).
- The 95% *confidence interval* around the median. The confidence interval provides an indication of the reliability of the calculated median. It measures the probability that a range of values is likely to include the median value. The width of the confidence interval at a given level of confidence (e.g., 95%) is a statement regarding the certainty of the estimate based on both the amount and variability of the sample data. Said another way, since we use a sample to estimate the median,

⁵ Each of these standards, and their statistical procedures, are discussed in more detail in the “Indiana Property Tax Equalization Study Background Tool Kit.” It may be obtained at <http://www.indianafiscal.org/docs/BackgroundToolKit.pdf>. A full discussion of the IAAO standards may be obtained in the “Standard on Ratio Studies,” 1999, International Association of Assessing Officers.

we are uncertain of the actual median value of the population. A 95% confidence interval says that while we are uncertain of the true value of the median, that true median will fall within the range of values calculated as the confidence interval 95 times out of 100. The IAAO standard for medians states that the 95% confidence interval should encompass at least some part of the standard for the median (from 0.9 to 1.1).

- The *coefficient of dispersion* (COD) is a statistic that describes the uniformity or consistency of assessments by measuring the variability of the sales ratios. The higher the COD, the less uniform or consistent the assessments. The IAAO standard is that the COD should be no more than 15.0 for improved residential property and no more than 20.0 for other classes of property.
- The *price related differential* (PRD) examines the uniformity of assessments between high-value and low-value properties. In other words, the PRD is a measure of the “vertical equity” of assessments. A PRD below 1.0 indicates that lower valued properties are assessed at a lower percentage of market value than higher value properties. In other words, lower value properties have lower sales/assessment ratios. A PRD above 1.0 indicates that higher value properties are assessed at a lower percentage of market value than lower value properties. The IAAO standard is that the PRD should be between 0.98 and 1.03.

The IAAO standards include guidance on sample sizes needed to allow confidence in the statistical measures. Small sample sizes preclude definitive interpretation of some results in some classes of property within some townships and counties. However, re-stratification of related property classes (vacant land classified as commercial, industrial, and residential; or improved commercial and industrial properties, for example) has been done in most cases, which increases sample sizes. The larger sample sizes mean that statistical analysis will provide valid results, albeit for more general interpretation.

The IAAO standards state that assessment level should be uniform across property use strata and township assessment jurisdictions. The IAAO standard is that the level of assessment (the median) should not vary across townships by more than 5% from the county-wide measure. Again, sample size affects the ability to make judgments on this standard in some cases.

Finally, the IFPI analyzed whether there were differences in changes of assessment between properties that were part of the ratio study, on the one hand, and properties that did not sell recently, on the other. Systematic differences would indicate that assessors engaged in “sales chasing.” We compared the percentage changes between two groups of properties: unsold properties and those properties that had been sold and had been included in the ratio calculations. Percentage changes of assessments were computed for each property, in total and with respect to both land and improvements. The differences between the two groups were analyzed by reviewing the distributions of the changes for the two groups at the township level. Summary statistics were calculated, and statistical tests were used to determine the likelihood that the observed differences would arise by

chance alone or that they reflected systematic difference in the treatment of the two groups of properties.

Disproportionate increases in sold properties were taken as potential evidence of sales chasing. When observed, such differentials were then tested for statistical significance using the Mann Whitney test.

Ratio Study Results for Grant County

Table 2					
Standards Compliance Matrix for Grant County					
Class: Residential Improved Sample Size: 2,518					
Measures	IAAO Standard	County Wide Value	95% CI Overlaps Standard	Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
Median Sales Ratio	.9 to 1.1	0.990		x	
Coefficient of Dispersion	< 15.0	23.76			x
Class: Commercial & Industrial Improved Sample Size: 108					
Measures	IAAO Standard	County Wide Value	95% CI Overlaps Standard	Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
Median Sales Ratio	.9 to 1.1	1.028		x	
Coefficient of Dispersion	< 20.0	42.91			x

Standards and Compliance – County-wide

Grant County met the standards for the Median Sales Ratio for both the class Residential Improved property and for the restratified class Commercial and Industrial improved standard. The county did not meet the standard for uniformity of assessment embodied in the COD metric as shown in Table 2 for either class. However, 50 IAC 14-7-1 provides that if a county believes that circumstances or reasons exist why the standard was not attained which mitigate the requirement for a new reassessment, the county may appeal to the DLGF not to do a new reassessment.

The IFPI has found that many, if not most, of the counties reviewed have not met the COD standards. The reasons are several, but may be summarized to: a) this is the first ever statewide reassessment under market value standards for the state of Indiana, and b) the sample sizes are so small that it makes deriving an acceptable COD difficult. It is therefore the IFPI’s judgment that a new reassessment in Grant County, if ordered, would not, in the absence of larger samples of market value proxies [sales information], change the result. It is our recommendation that the county immediately begin procedures to collect and electronically record sales information but that no reassessment action be required.

Standards and Compliance – Townships

The sample sizes were large enough in the improved residential class in 11 of the 13 townships to have confidence in the township level statistics. The sample size for improved commercial & industrial property was large enough in one township to have confidence in those statistics. Table 3 presents ratio study statistics for those townships.

Table 3						
Standards Compliance Matrix: Townships						
Class: Residential Improved						
Township	Sample Size	Median	Median Meets Standard?	Within +/- 5% of County?	Coefficient of Dispersion	COD Meets Standard?
Center Twp	902	1.000	x	x	28.863	
Fairmount Twp	142	0.987	x	x	19.343	
Franklin Twp	283	1.002	x	x	27.490	
Jefferson Twp	140	0.977	x	x	21.998	
Mill Twp	308	0.962	x	x	25.347	
Monroe Twp	23	1.074	x		17.165	
Pleasant Twp	420	0.986	x	x	10.324	x
Richland Twp	41	0.984	x	x	26.697	
Sims Twp	64	1.001	x	x	19.615	
Van Buren Twp	60	1.012	x	x	21.890	
Washington Twp	105	1.077	x		25.814	
Class: Commercial & Industrial Improved						
Township	Sample Size	Median	Median Meets Standard?	Within +/- 5% of County?	Coefficient of Dispersion	COD Meets Standard?
Center Twp	43	1.207			41.318	

The detailed results of the analysis are presented in Appendix A. Appendix A contains the summary statistics for the re-stratified sample that combined similar property classes across the entire county to increase the sample size, as well as the township by township results.

In addition to the statistical tests performed relating to the level and uniformity of assessment, the IFPI attempted to perform the tests required to determine if sales chasing was evidenced in Grant County. Sales chasing is indicated when the distribution of percentage changes in assessed value for properties that sold is significantly different than the distribution of percentage changes in assessed value of properties that did not sell recently. Because assessed values prior to reassessment were not available, we were unable to perform this test.

Summary Quality Evaluation of Grant County’s Reassessment Results

Small sample sizes preclude definitive evaluation of the reassessment quality for all classes of property in all townships.

For those townships with adequate sample sizes in improved residential property, we find them to meet acceptable standards of assessment quality. Monroe and Washington Townships did not meet the standard for uniformity across jurisdictions in the Residential Improved class. These townships' median ratio varied from the county-wide median ratio by more than 5%.

For improved commercial and industrial property, Center Township did not meet the acceptable standards of assessment quality, nor did it meet the standard for uniformity across jurisdictions in the commercial and industrial class. This township's median ratio varied from the county-wide median ratio by more than 5%.

For the county as a whole in both the residential improved and restratified improved commercial and industrial classes, we find assessment quality with respect to the median sales ratio met the standard. Neither class met the standard for the coefficient of dispersion.

Overall, we find Grant County meeting an acceptable standard of quality of assessment with respect to the level of assessment.

Appendix A
County Data

**Grant County Property Tax Reassessment Equalization Analysis
Indiana Property Tax Equalization Project**

Standard Equalization Via Median

	MajrClas	ParclCnt	AV - Total Land & Improvements	Sample Size	Sample Parcels Pct of Popln	Sample Assessed Value Pct	Coefficient of Dispersion	Price Related Differential	Median	Lower bound of 95% confidence interval for Median	Upper bound of 95% confidence interval for Median	Imputed Market Value per Median Ratio
1	Agri-Vac	4,373	124,353,300	3	0.07	0.26	3.90	1.01	0.772	0.75	0.84	161,117,145
2	Agri-Imp	2,129	234,489,700	55	2.58	3.08	31.50	1.19	0.901	0.87	1.06	260,194,294
3	Ind-Vac	343	8,976,100
4	Ind-Imp	524	161,571,500	5	0.95	0.68	32.53	0.93	1.470	0.38	2.18	109,948,797
5	Coml-Vac	807	22,049,600
6	Coml-Imp	2,800	432,060,600	103	3.68	3.83	42.43	1.07	1.025	0.96	1.13	421,571,526
7	Res-Vac	9,559	45,216,400	6	0.06	1.88	21.08	1.14	0.998	0.79	1.80	45,287,870
8	Res-Imp	25,016	1,552,655,600	2,518	10.07	11.27	23.76	1.08	0.990	0.98	1.00	1,567,870,021
Total		45,551	2,581,372,800	2,690								

Restratified Equalization Via Median

	MjrCls2	ParclCnt	Asmt Total, New	Sample Size	Sample Parcels Pct of Popln	Sample Assessed Value Pct	Coefficient of Dispersion	Price Related Differential	Median	Lower bound of 95% confidence interval for Median	Upper bound of 95% confidence interval for Median	Imputed Market Value per Median Ratio
1	Agri-Vac	4,373	124,353,300	3	0.07	0.26	3.90	1.01	0.772	0.75	0.84	161,117,145
2	Agri-Imp	2,129	234,489,700	55	2.58	3.08	31.50	1.19	0.901	0.87	1.06	260,194,294
3	C+I-Vac	1,150	31,025,700
4	C+I-Imp	3,324	593,632,100	108	3.25	2.97	42.91	1.06	1.028	0.97	1.16	577,622,191
5	Res-Vac	9,559	45,216,400	6	0.06	1.88	21.08	1.14	0.998	0.79	1.80	45,287,870
6	Res-Imp	25,016	1,552,655,600	2,518	10.07	11.27	23.76	1.08	0.990	0.98	1.00	1,567,870,021
Total		45,551	2,581,372,800	2,690								

Restratified (2) Equalization Via Median

	MjrCls3	ParclCnt	Asmt Total, New	Sample Size	Sample Parcels Pct of Popln	Sample Assessed Value Pct	Coefficient of Dispersion	Price Related Differential	Median	Lower bound of 95% confidence interval for Median	Upper bound of 95% confidence interval for Median	Imputed Market Value per Median Ratio
1	Agri-Vac	4,373	124,353,300	3	0.07	0.26	3.90	1.01	0.772	0.75	0.84	161,117,145
2	Agri-Imp	2,129	234,489,700	55	2.58	3.08	31.50	1.19	0.901	0.87	1.06	260,194,294
3	C+I-Imp	3,324	593,632,100	108	3.25	2.97	42.91	1.06	1.028	0.97	1.16	577,622,191
4	C+I+R Vac	10,709	76,242,100	6	0.06	1.12	21.08	1.14	0.998	0.79	1.80	76,362,609
5	Res-Imp	25,016	1,552,655,600	2,518	10.07	11.27	23.76	1.08	0.990	0.98	1.00	1,567,870,021
Total		45,551	2,581,372,800	2,690								

Grant County Property Tax Reassessment Equalization Analysis Indiana Property Tax Equalization Project

Standard Equalization Via Median

CntyXtpw	MajrClas	ParclCnt	AV - Total Land & Improvements	Sample Size	Sample Parcels Pct of Popln	Sample Assessed Value Pct	Coefficient of Dispersion	Price Related Differential	Median	Lower bound of 95% confidence interval for	Upper bound of 95% confidence interval for	Imputed Market Value per Median Ratio
										Median	Median	
1 Center Twp	Agri-Vac	170	2,875,400	1	0.59	2.65	.	1.00	0.841	.	.	3,417,449
2 Center Twp	Agri-Imp	205	14,163,000	6	2.93	3.36	12.45	1.02	0.995	0.78	1.14	14,238,393
3 Center Twp	Ind-Vac	44	411,800
4 Center Twp	Ind-Imp	242	38,448,600
5 Center Twp	Coml-Vac	301	6,836,900
6 Center Twp	Coml-Imp	1,111	152,027,700	43	3.87	3.90	41.32	1.00	1.207	0.98	1.58	125,923,300
7 Center Twp	Res-Vac	2,826	12,549,300
8 Center Twp	Res-Imp	8,501	438,655,000	902	10.61	12.13	28.86	1.09	1.000	0.98	1.01	438,741,341
9 Fairmount Twp	Agri-Vac	468	10,021,900
10 Fairmount Twp	Agri-Imp	185	18,595,500	3	1.62	2.09	18.60	1.01	0.917	0.87	1.38	20,268,483
11 Fairmount Twp	Ind-Vac	59	311,200
12 Fairmount Twp	Ind-Imp	22	2,585,000
13 Fairmount Twp	Coml-Vac	97	582,700
14 Fairmount Twp	Coml-Imp	152	10,161,900	8	5.26	3.31	25.64	1.05	0.893	0.38	1.31	11,380,751
15 Fairmount Twp	Res-Vac	729	3,252,100
16 Fairmount Twp	Res-Imp	1,610	93,432,900	142	8.82	9.28	19.34	1.05	0.987	0.97	1.02	94,627,607
17 Franklin Twp	Agri-Vac	441	14,744,900
18 Franklin Twp	Agri-Imp	101	13,065,300	4	3.96	3.84	19.57	1.10	0.993	0.83	1.39	13,163,088
19 Franklin Twp	Ind-Vac	62	2,270,800
20 Franklin Twp	Ind-Imp	85	67,479,300	3	3.53	1.38	15.23	1.11	1.557	1.47	2.18	43,326,873
21 Franklin Twp	Coml-Vac	173	5,172,900
22 Franklin Twp	Coml-Imp	587	88,522,300	13	2.21	4.10	37.91	0.93	1.021	0.59	1.44	86,717,226
23 Franklin Twp	Res-Vac	1,690	5,986,300
24 Franklin Twp	Res-Imp	2,780	133,636,800	283	10.18	10.27	27.49	1.10	1.002	0.98	1.04	133,436,345
25 Green Twp	Agri-Vac	312	11,009,800
26 Green Twp	Agri-Imp	112	13,619,600	2	1.79	2.56	63.79	1.95	1.511	0.55	2.48	9,012,094
27 Green Twp	Ind-Imp	8	2,033,500
28 Green Twp	Coml-Vac	1	12,400
29 Green Twp	Coml-Imp	5	490,400	1	20.00	7.03	.	1.00	2.736	.	.	179,220
30 Green Twp	Res-Vac	34	126,200
31 Green Twp	Res-Imp	163	11,737,900	16	9.82	10.79	27.96	1.19	0.952	0.77	1.06	12,326,239
32 Jefferson Twp	Agri-Vac	430	8,955,500
33 Jefferson Twp	Agri-Imp	223	23,898,700	9	4.04	4.70	49.18	1.22	0.918	0.46	1.71	26,025,166
34 Jefferson Twp	Ind-Vac	14	84,400
35 Jefferson Twp	Ind-Imp	37	3,399,700	1	2.70	1.34	.	1.00	0.966	.	.	3,518,690
36 Jefferson Twp	Coml-Vac	55	1,280,100

**Grant County Property Tax Reassessment Equalization Analysis
Indiana Property Tax Equalization Project**

CntyXtpw	MajrClas	ParclCnt	AV - Total Land & Improvements	Sample Size	Sample Parcels Pct of Popln	Sample Assessed Value Pct	Coefficient of Dispersion	Price Related Differential	Median	Lower bound of 95% confidence interval for	Upper bound of 95% confidence interval for	Imputed Market Value per Median Ratio
										Median	Median	
37 Jefferson Twp	Coml-Imp	111	14,855,000	4	3.60	1.70	52.50	1.48	1.172	0.48	2.82	12,674,376
38 Jefferson Twp	Res-Vac	779	3,721,700
39 Jefferson Twp	Res-Imp	1,461	99,578,400	140	9.58	10.52	22.00	1.08	0.977	0.94	1.01	101,961,840
40 Liberty Twp	Agri-Vac	492	18,595,300	1	0.20	0.89	.	1.00	0.772	.	.	24,092,820
41 Liberty Twp	Agri-Imp	168	21,551,400	4	2.38	2.77	22.48	1.12	0.881	0.38	1.16	24,464,168
42 Liberty Twp	Ind-Vac	1	30,000
43 Liberty Twp	Ind-Imp	3	300,400
44 Liberty Twp	Coml-Vac	3	40,500
45 Liberty Twp	Coml-Imp	14	1,974,500
46 Liberty Twp	Res-Vac	69	212,200
47 Liberty Twp	Res-Imp	258	21,194,600	14	5.43	6.21	17.39	1.12	0.996	0.90	1.02	21,270,805
48 Mill Twp	Agri-Vac	233	5,039,800
49 Mill Twp	Agri-Imp	155	14,418,900	1	0.65	0.58	.	1.00	1.008	.	.	14,305,033
50 Mill Twp	Ind-Vac	48	2,031,200
51 Mill Twp	Ind-Imp	26	18,745,100
52 Mill Twp	Coml-Vac	55	849,600
53 Mill Twp	Coml-Imp	356	40,689,800	9	2.53	1.67	42.68	1.14	0.987	0.66	1.87	41,238,915
54 Mill Twp	Res-Vac	1,857	8,730,500	1	0.05	0.88	.	1.00	1.026	.	.	8,512,681
55 Mill Twp	Res-Imp	4,274	248,504,600	308	7.21	7.59	25.35	1.08	0.962	0.94	0.99	258,218,225
56 Monroe Twp	Agri-Vac	361	7,668,700
57 Monroe Twp	Agri-Imp	294	30,575,200	9	3.06	3.45	9.00	1.02	0.906	0.87	1.07	33,748,179
58 Monroe Twp	Ind-Vac	4	1,012,900
59 Monroe Twp	Ind-Imp	6	7,396,400	1	16.67	1.67	.	1.00	0.382	.	.	19,342,921
60 Monroe Twp	Coml-Vac	21	2,640,900
61 Monroe Twp	Coml-Imp	24	11,613,900	3	12.50	8.82	21.19	1.15	0.866	0.67	1.22	13,404,829
62 Monroe Twp	Res-Vac	86	325,700
63 Monroe Twp	Res-Imp	354	34,334,000	23	6.50	6.64	17.16	1.05	1.074	0.92	1.12	31,979,938
64 Pleasant Twp	Agri-Vac	299	9,221,800
65 Pleasant Twp	Agri-Imp	129	16,435,500	4	3.10	6.79	38.12	1.05	0.437	0.41	1.07	37,567,405
66 Pleasant Twp	Ind-Vac	7	2,001,000
67 Pleasant Twp	Ind-Imp	5	4,401,300
68 Pleasant Twp	Coml-Vac	53	4,333,100
69 Pleasant Twp	Coml-Imp	209	92,626,100	14	6.70	4.58	19.87	1.03	0.921	0.64	1.12	100,520,490
70 Pleasant Twp	Res-Vac	375	4,496,700	4	1.07	16.47	10.52	1.02	0.901	0.79	1.03	4,991,555
71 Pleasant Twp	Res-Imp	2,442	248,184,800	420	17.20	18.43	10.32	1.01	0.986	0.97	1.00	251,762,755
72 Richland Twp	Agri-Vac	219	7,905,700
73 Richland Twp	Agri-Imp	91	11,697,100

**Grant County Property Tax Reassessment Equalization Analysis
Indiana Property Tax Equalization Project**

CntyXtwp	MajrClas	ParclCnt	AV - Total Land & Improvements	Sample Size	Sample Parcels Pct of Popln	Sample Assessed Value Pct	Coefficient of Dispersion	Price Related Differential	Median	Lower bound of 95% confidence interval for	Upper bound of 95% confidence interval for	Imputed Market Value per Median Ratio
										Median	Median	
74 Richland Twp	Ind-Vac	1	600
75 Richland Twp	Ind-Imp	4	291,900
76 Richland Twp	Coml-Vac	1	7,700
77 Richland Twp	Coml-Imp	10	1,982,200
78 Richland Twp	Res-Vac	164	681,800
79 Richland Twp	Res-Imp	304	22,314,300	41	13.49	15.26	26.70	1.07	0.984	0.91	1.13	22,675,307
80 Sims Twp	Agri-Vac	384	10,659,200
81 Sims Twp	Agri-Imp	90	10,545,500	1	1.11	1.62	.	1.00	0.859	.	.	12,273,594
82 Sims Twp	Ind-Vac	8	77,000
83 Sims Twp	Ind-Imp	18	617,700
84 Sims Twp	Coml-Vac	14	50,100
85 Sims Twp	Coml-Imp	90	4,663,400
86 Sims Twp	Res-Vac	282	1,005,700
87 Sims Twp	Res-Imp	710	48,139,700	64	9.01	9.80	19.61	1.06	1.001	0.93	1.05	48,104,494
88 Van Buren Twp	Agri-Vac	273	9,835,600	1	0.37	0.77	.	1.00	0.751	.	.	13,095,792
89 Van Buren Twp	Agri-Imp	208	24,110,300	7	3.37	3.00	34.18	1.34	1.154	0.38	2.05	20,895,945
90 Van Buren Twp	Ind-Vac	19	146,300
91 Van Buren Twp	Ind-Imp	22	6,009,800
92 Van Buren Twp	Coml-Vac	23	84,300
93 Van Buren Twp	Coml-Imp	52	1,996,700	2	3.85	2.63	6.12	1.02	1.317	1.24	1.40	1,515,966
94 Van Buren Twp	Res-Vac	137	421,300
95 Van Buren Twp	Res-Imp	637	37,954,700	60	9.42	9.99	21.89	1.08	1.012	0.94	1.08	37,490,928
96 Washington Twp	Agri-Vac	291	7,819,700
97 Washington Twp	Agri-Imp	168	21,813,700	5	2.98	2.87	25.93	1.08	0.744	0.65	1.40	29,301,565
98 Washington Twp	Ind-Vac	76	598,900
99 Washington Twp	Ind-Imp	46	9,862,800
100 Washington Twp	Coml-Vac	10	158,400
101 Washington Twp	Coml-Imp	79	10,456,700	6	7.59	3.53	51.34	1.52	1.112	0.44	2.48	9,399,670
102 Washington Twp	Res-Vac	531	3,706,900	1	0.19	0.91	.	1.00	1.801	.	.	2,058,553
103 Washington Twp	Res-Imp	1,522	114,987,900	105	6.90	6.59	25.81	1.08	1.077	0.99	1.13	106,798,660
Total		45,551	2,581,372,800	2,690								

**Grant County Property Tax Reassessment Equalization Analysis
Indiana Property Tax Equalization Project**

Restratified (2) Equalization Via Median

CntyXtwp	MjrCls3	ParclCnt	Asmt Total, New	Sample Size	Sample Parcels of Popln Pct	Sample Assessed Value Pct	Coefficient of Dispersion	Price Related Differential	Median	Lower bound of 95% confidence interval for Median	Upper bound of 95% confidence interval for Median	Imputed Market Value per Median Ratio
1 Center Twp	Agri-Vac	170	2,875,400	1	0.59	2.65	.	1.00	0.841	.	.	3,417,449
2 Center Twp	Agri-Imp	205	14,163,000	6	2.93	3.36	12.45	1.02	0.995	0.78	1.14	14,238,393
3 Center Twp	C+I-Imp	1,353	190,476,300	43	3.18	3.11	41.32	1.00	1.207	0.98	1.58	157,769,960
4 Center Twp	C+I+R Vac	3,171	19,798,000
5 Center Twp	Res-Imp	8,501	438,655,000	902	10.61	12.13	28.86	1.09	1.000	0.98	1.01	438,741,341
6 Fairmount Twp	Agri-Vac	468	10,021,900
7 Fairmount Twp	Agri-Imp	185	18,595,500	3	1.62	2.09	18.60	1.01	0.917	0.87	1.38	20,268,483
8 Fairmount Twp	C+I-Imp	174	12,746,900	8	4.60	2.64	25.64	1.05	0.893	0.38	1.31	14,275,804
9 Fairmount Twp	C+I+R Vac	885	4,146,000
10 Fairmount Twp	Res-Imp	1,610	93,432,900	142	8.82	9.28	19.34	1.05	0.987	0.97	1.02	94,627,607
11 Franklin Twp	Agri-Vac	441	14,744,900
12 Franklin Twp	Agri-Imp	101	13,065,300	4	3.96	3.84	19.57	1.10	0.993	0.83	1.39	13,163,088
13 Franklin Twp	C+I-Imp	672	156,001,600	16	2.38	2.93	42.55	0.97	1.054	0.62	1.56	148,055,897
14 Franklin Twp	C+I+R Vac	1,925	13,430,000
15 Franklin Twp	Res-Imp	2,780	133,636,800	283	10.18	10.27	27.49	1.10	1.002	0.98	1.04	133,436,345
16 Green Twp	Agri-Vac	312	11,009,800
17 Green Twp	Agri-Imp	112	13,619,600	2	1.79	2.56	63.79	1.95	1.511	0.55	2.48	9,012,094
18 Green Twp	C+I-Imp	13	2,523,900	1	7.69	1.37	.	1.00	2.736	.	.	922,374
19 Green Twp	C+I+R Vac	35	138,600
20 Green Twp	Res-Imp	163	11,737,900	16	9.82	10.79	27.96	1.19	0.952	0.77	1.06	12,326,239
21 Jefferson Twp	Agri-Vac	430	8,955,500
22 Jefferson Twp	Agri-Imp	223	23,898,700	9	4.04	4.70	49.18	1.22	0.918	0.46	1.71	26,025,166
23 Jefferson Twp	C+I-Imp	148	18,254,700	5	3.38	1.64	46.90	1.38	1.112	0.48	2.82	16,418,160
24 Jefferson Twp	C+I+R Vac	848	5,086,200
25 Jefferson Twp	Res-Imp	1,461	99,578,400	140	9.58	10.52	22.00	1.08	0.977	0.94	1.01	101,961,840
26 Liberty Twp	Agri-Vac	492	18,595,300	1	0.20	0.89	.	1.00	0.772	.	.	24,092,820
27 Liberty Twp	Agri-Imp	168	21,551,400	4	2.38	2.77	22.48	1.12	0.881	0.38	1.16	24,464,168
28 Liberty Twp	C+I-Imp	17	2,274,900
29 Liberty Twp	C+I+R Vac	73	282,700
30 Liberty Twp	Res-Imp	258	21,194,600	14	5.43	6.21	17.39	1.12	0.996	0.90	1.02	21,270,805
31 Mill Twp	Agri-Vac	233	5,039,800
32 Mill Twp	Agri-Imp	155	14,418,900	1	0.65	0.58	.	1.00	1.008	.	.	14,305,033
33 Mill Twp	C+I-Imp	382	59,434,900	9	2.36	1.14	42.68	1.14	0.987	0.66	1.87	60,236,983
34 Mill Twp	C+I+R Vac	1,960	11,611,300	1	0.05	0.66	.	1.00	1.026	.	.	11,321,607
35 Mill Twp	Res-Imp	4,274	248,504,600	308	7.21	7.59	25.35	1.08	0.962	0.94	0.99	258,218,225
36 Monroe Twp	Agri-Vac	361	7,668,700

**Grant County Property Tax Reassessment Equalization Analysis
Indiana Property Tax Equalization Project**

CntyXtwp	MjrCls3	ParclCnt	Asmt Total, New	Sample Size	Sample Parcels of Popln	Sample Assessed Value Pct	Coefficient of Dispersion	Price Related Differential	Median	Lower bound of 95% confidence interval for	Upper bound of 95% confidence interval for	Imputed Market Value per Median Ratio
										Median	Median	
37 Monroe Twp	Agri-Imp	294	30,575,200	9	3.06	3.45	9.00	1.02	0.906	0.87	1.07	33,748,179
38 Monroe Twp	C+I-Imp	30	19,010,300	4	13.33	6.03	33.78	1.04	0.766	0.38	1.22	24,822,946
39 Monroe Twp	C+I+R Vac	111	3,979,500
40 Monroe Twp	Res-Imp	354	34,334,000	23	6.50	6.64	17.16	1.05	1.074	0.92	1.12	31,979,938
41 Pleasant Twp	Agri-Vac	299	9,221,800
42 Pleasant Twp	Agri-Imp	129	16,435,500	4	3.10	6.79	38.12	1.05	0.437	0.41	1.07	37,567,405
43 Pleasant Twp	C+I-Imp	214	97,027,400	14	6.54	4.37	19.87	1.03	0.921	0.64	1.12	105,296,906
44 Pleasant Twp	C+I+R Vac	435	10,830,800	4	0.92	6.84	10.52	1.02	0.901	0.79	1.03	12,022,714
45 Pleasant Twp	Res-Imp	2,442	248,184,800	420	17.20	18.43	10.32	1.01	0.986	0.97	1.00	251,762,755
46 Richland Twp	Agri-Vac	219	7,905,700
47 Richland Twp	Agri-Imp	91	11,697,100
48 Richland Twp	C+I-Imp	14	2,274,100
49 Richland Twp	C+I+R Vac	166	690,100
50 Richland Twp	Res-Imp	304	22,314,300	41	13.49	15.26	26.70	1.07	0.984	0.91	1.13	22,675,307
51 Sims Twp	Agri-Vac	384	10,659,200
52 Sims Twp	Agri-Imp	90	10,545,500	1	1.11	1.62	.	1.00	0.859	.	.	12,273,594
53 Sims Twp	C+I-Imp	108	5,281,100
54 Sims Twp	C+I+R Vac	304	1,132,800
55 Sims Twp	Res-Imp	710	48,139,700	64	9.01	9.80	19.61	1.06	1.001	0.93	1.05	48,104,494
56 Van Buren Twp	Agri-Vac	273	9,835,600	1	0.37	0.77	.	1.00	0.751	.	.	13,095,792
57 Van Buren Twp	Agri-Imp	208	24,110,300	7	3.37	3.00	34.18	1.34	1.154	0.38	2.05	20,895,945
58 Van Buren Twp	C+I-Imp	74	8,006,500	2	2.70	0.66	6.12	1.02	1.317	1.24	1.40	6,078,819
59 Van Buren Twp	C+I+R Vac	179	651,900
60 Van Buren Twp	Res-Imp	637	37,954,700	60	9.42	9.99	21.89	1.08	1.012	0.94	1.08	37,490,928
61 Washington Twp	Agri-Vac	291	7,819,700
62 Washington Twp	Agri-Imp	168	21,813,700	5	2.98	2.87	25.93	1.08	0.744	0.65	1.40	29,301,565
63 Washington Twp	C+I-Imp	125	20,319,500	6	4.80	1.82	51.34	1.52	1.112	0.44	2.48	18,265,476
64 Washington Twp	C+I+R Vac	617	4,464,200	1	0.16	0.75	.	1.00	1.801	.	.	2,479,104
65 Washington Twp	Res-Imp	1,522	114,987,900	105	6.90	6.59	25.81	1.08	1.077	0.99	1.13	106,798,660
Total		45,551	2,581,372,800	2,690								

Indiana Property Tax Equalization Study

Appendix B:

Background Tool Kit

Introduction

The State of Indiana is completing a mass reassessment of all real property in accordance with the requirements of the Indiana Supreme Court set forth in the decision in State Board of Tax Commissioners v. Town of St. John and subsequent order of the Indiana Tax Court.

The Indiana Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF) laid out the reassessment rules and procedures in Indiana Administrative Code 50 IAC. The regulations require the reassessment to produce assessments that comply with the Supreme Court Decision and the Tax Court order; specifically, that they be “objectively verifiable.” Market value is the objectively verifiable standard which the reassessment must meet.

In addition, Indiana statute (I.C. 6-1.1-34) requires a School Assessment Ratio Study and the DLGF regulations require a state-wide, county-by-county report on both the processes used for and the results of the reassessment. Finally, the State needs a dynamic, accurate, consistent database for effective, ongoing property tax administration.

Therefore, the DLGF and the State Budget Agency have asked the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute (IFPI) to perform a Property Tax Equalization Study that will provide the State with a determination of the strengths, weaknesses, and accuracy of the reassessment process and its results. The key features of the study are:

- A county-by-county analysis of the property tax equalization performed by the counties,
- A school assessment sales ratio study,
- An analysis, by jurisdiction, of the tax burden shift between classes of property,
- An analysis, by jurisdiction, of tax bill changes and property class,
- A study of the assessment methodology and process, with recommendations for improvements in future years,

- An analysis, by jurisdiction, of the effects on tax bills of levy increases, and
- An analysis of the data requirements for future property tax reassessments.

This Toolkit provides background material for local government officials, members of the media, and taxpayers to assist in their understanding of the objectives of the study and the process the IFPI used to conduct it. It includes an explanation of the need for the study, discussion of property tax administration and analysis concepts, and definitions of terms.

Why is an independent ratio study needed?

First, the Indiana Constitution requires that property tax “assessment and taxation” be “uniform and equal.” It is the State’s constitutional responsibility to administer the property tax system such that local governments perform the ministerial duties of assessment and tax collection in accordance with state law. In State Board of Tax Commissioners v. Town of St. John, the Supreme Court mandated a market value based assessment standard.

Therefore, the State’s responsibility is to ensure compliance, by the local assessors, of the DLGF’s reassessment rule. Since the Supreme Court mandated that assessments be objectively verifiable, an independent study that measures the relationship between assessments and market value is required to determine compliance by the local assessors. The best method to make that determination is an independent ratio study.

Second, a ratio study essentially is an audit of the quality of an assessment. A cursory review of county equalization studies revealed several things that called into question their general reliability. The following problems were noted:

- There were variations in study methods, and some studies used non-standard statistics.ⁱ
- There seemingly are discrepancies in the numbers of properties in the various mandated strata.ⁱⁱ
- There were discrepancies in the numbers of sales considered usable in the studies.

- At least as furnished by the state, most studies were poorly documented.
- Most important, the reported statistics too often were incredibly good, which lowered confidence in the county studies.

Background, Definitions, and Explanation of Concepts

Taxation is integral to civil society, and public finance experts usually recommend property taxes to bring diversity to, and help balance, a state and local revenue system. When public revenues come from several types of taxes and other sources of revenue, it is easier to find a balance among competing policy objectives, weather economic difficulties, and compete effectively in the global economy. A tax on the current market value of real property is an important part of such a system, because a market value-based property tax has a comparatively stable and reliable base, which is attractive during troubled economic times (see the box on the next page for a discussion of market value in the Indiana property tax system).

Property value can be a measure of a taxpayer's wealth or ability to pay. A real property tax is an especially suitable source of revenue for local governments. The immovability of the tax base makes clear which government is entitled to the tax revenue. If the property is security for the tax, it cannot be evaded. In addition, many local government services are provided to properties or to their owners and occupants. The tax captures for local government some of the increases in the value of land that are partially created by public expenditures, such as streets and highways, water and sewer, public safety, etc. Further, a dedicated source of revenue promotes local autonomy. Finally, the visibility of property taxes focuses attention on the overall quality of governance and promotes accountability.

What is market value?

There are many legal and textbook definitions of market value. In valuation theory however, *market value* essentially is an *expected price*—the price for a property that the seller and an unrelated buyer would most likely agree to in an open market. The definition of market value also carries the assumption that both parties were reasonably well informed about how the property could be used in the future and about prices for similar properties.

Furthermore, it would be assumed that neither was under any unusual pressure to buy or sell.

How is market value for property tax purposes determined?

Valuation or *appraisal* is the activity of *estimating* what property values are. In essence, part of the job of an appraiser is to look at properties the way typical buyers and sellers would. Although many methods may be used to estimate market values, professional appraisers have agreed to standard procedures and methods (discussed below), which require them to work systematically, document their work, and communicate their opinions of value clearly. *Assessment* is the act of officially determining the value estimate to be used as the basis for taxation; the specialist appraiser who has the responsibility for making these determinations is an *assessor*.

Real estate markets reflect the ways people who want to buy or sell real estate think and act. Tracts of land may be used for such purposes as quiet enjoyment, agriculture, exploitation of mineral resources, and development either immediately or eventually. Developed land (land with buildings and other structures) may be used for housing or for carrying out economic activities. A person may want to own real estate to use it for such purposes directly or to rent it to others. One reason for owning real estate is to receive the rental income it can generate. Another reason to own real estate is the hope that it will appreciate in value. Of course, real estate may be held for more than one purpose. The important point is that the real estate market naturally is segmented, and an important valuation activity is deciding how to best estimate its market value.

Indiana’s property tax assessment standard: True tax value

The meaning of “true tax value” seems subject to interpretation. A common interpretation is that it is “market value in use.” For properties whose future use would be the same as the current use, market value and true tax value is the same thing. When the future use would be different from the current use, true tax value can be inferred from the market value of similar properties whose use is unlikely to change or that are not subject to the same economic pressures, whether positive or negative. Indiana courts have ruled that true tax values must be “objectively verifiable”—hence the need for the tax equalization study.

In appraisal practice, there are three basic “approaches” to estimating market values. These reflect market participants’ behaviors and the resulting evidence of market values.

- The *sales comparison approach*: Gathers information on recent open-market sales prices of similar propertiesⁱⁱⁱ, analyzes why their prices differ, and uses that information to estimate the value of each appraisal property^{iv}. It provides the best way to appraise residences and vacant land plots.
- The *income approach*: Uses the estimated future income stream over the remaining economic life of a property and uses a rate-of-return on investments of comparable risk to “capitalize” the income stream into a present value as of the appraisal date. It provides an excellent way to appraise properties that commonly are rented.
- The *cost approach*: Combines three components: the replacement cost of improvements *minus* accrued depreciation *plus* land value, which are separately estimated. Replacement cost is what it would cost to replace the existing structures and other improvements with new construction. Accrued depreciation is the loss in value due to physical depreciation, functional obsolescence, and economic obsolescence. Land value is what vacant land with the same characteristics and allowable uses would sell for in the open market^v.

Appraisal standards recommend using as many of the approaches as is practical. Theoretically, all three approaches would yield the same estimate of value. However, market imperfections, data limitations, differences in appraisal skills, and other factors conspire to produce differing value estimates in practice. Consequently, appraisers must evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the above approaches and chose the figure that is most appropriate in the circumstances. This process is known as “reconciliation”.

Although the summary above has not provided the details, all three approaches to value require analysis of available sales of comparable properties. This requires assessors to collect information on sales of real estate in their jurisdictions (and desirably to consider comparable sales from other areas as well). Each sale should be evaluated (or screened) to determine whether it is usable in appraisal (that is, meets the criteria of an open-market, arm’s-length sale) and whether it is usable in ratio studies (discussed below). To help with this process, Indiana law requires buyers and sellers to complete a sales disclosure form.

The *purpose* of an appraisal greatly affects how the appraisal should be conducted. Two factors especially affect appraisals for property tax purposes: (1) the need for efficiency in the appraisal process and (2) the need to treat taxpayers consistently.

Mass appraisal in Indiana

The 2002 Real Property Assessment Manual, which Indiana township and county assessors are required to use, lays out a framework for a mass appraisal system. System specifications reinforce it. The cost approach is the default valuation approach.

Efficiency is warranted because the costs of administering a tax should be kept to a minimum.^{vi} Relative to most other purposes for commissioning an appraisal (such as determining the price of a property or whether the property provides sufficient collateral for a mortgage), the amounts at stake in a property tax appraisal (the taxes in question) are low. Consistency is warranted for the intended goal of equity and for quality assurance. So-called “mass appraisal” methods serve both goals. As defined by the International Association of Assessing Officers, mass appraisal is “the process of valuing a group of properties as of a given date, using standard methods, employing common data, and allowing for statistical testing.” Modern mass appraisal relies considerably on computer support.

What does “equalization” mean and why is it needed?

“Equalization” is a loosely used term in property tax administration. Formally, equalization is used to describe processes by which an agency with authority over two or more assessment districts (like the Indiana Department of Local Government Finance) makes adjustments to total assessments in the districts so that the assessments within the agency’s jurisdiction all bear the same relationship to total market value.

Informally, property tax officials may use “equalization” as a synonym for reassessment, review of assessments, or deciding assessment appeals. Equalization, as defined above, also is known as *inter*-jurisdictional equalization. Sometimes equalization agencies have authority to adjust total assessments of classes of property within an assessment district; this is known as *intra*-jurisdictional equalization.

Equalization programs sometimes are classified as “direct” or “indirect,” although the distinction may be blurred in certain instances. In direct equalization, by application of an equalization factor or reassessment order,

the equalization agency causes local assessments to be changed. In indirect equalization, neither local assessments nor local taxes are affected; the equalized value estimates merely figure in aid distribution formulas and the like.

States “equalize” property tax assessments for three main reasons:

- To ensure that local governments comply with the law – that is, to ensure equitable treatment of taxpayers under the law.
- To ensure that taxpayers benefit equally from state-mandated exemptions.
- To improve the allocation of state aid.

In order to have a rational basis for equalization, measurement of the quality of property tax assessments must be performed. Ratio studies provide that rational measurement by analyzing property tax assessments.

What is a “ratio study”?

Here we consider only basic concepts; later we consider some of the issues involved. A “ratio study” is an investigation of how closely the *appraisals* that underlie property tax assessments approach *market values* and how consistent those appraisals are across all property. As will be illustrated through an example later, there are two principal concerns:

1. Level – Do the assessments meet the State’s standard? In other words: on average, how close are the assessments to market value?
2. Uniformity or Consistency – How close are individual assessment ratios to assessment ratios across all property?

A ratio study is a form of applied statistical analysis. This means that conclusions are drawn about the overall *quality of assessments* on the basis of data about a sample of properties—those that happen to have sold on the open market. For those

Two views of statistics

“There are three kinds of lies: Lies, damned lies, and statistics.”

Benjamin Disraeli (1804-1881)

“Statistics is a body of methods for making wise decisions in the face of uncertainty.”

W. Allen Roberts and Harry V. Roberts,
Statistics: A New Approach, 1956

conclusions to be valid, certain conditions need to be met. This also means that uncertainty cannot be completely dispelled. Judgment always is needed in interpreting the results of a ratio study.

What are the steps in completing a ratio study?

The main steps in a ratio study are: (1) assemble the data, (2) determine the study groups (“strata”), (3) make statistical analyses, (4) evaluate results, and (5) report the results.

Data assembly - the most labor-intensive phase of a ratio study - requires:

1. Collecting raw sales data—in Indiana the primary source of sales data is the sales disclosure form that buyers must file. Other sources may be used.
 - Key data are computerized; quality checks are made.
 - Screening the sales to determine whether a particular sale should be used in the ratio study—recall that only open-market, arm’s-length sales provide reliable evidence of market values. Family sales, foreclosure sales, and the like often do not. In addition, sales that would produce extremely high or low sales ratios are excluded. These are called “outliers.”
 - Matching the sale price with an assessment. In doing this, it is important to determine whether the property that was sold essentially is the same as the property that was assessed. A sale can take place any day of the year, while assessments are as of a single date. If significant physical changes to a property took place between the two dates, the sale cannot be used to evaluate the quality of the assessor’s appraisal.
 - Making necessary adjustments to reported sales prices. Sometimes adjustments to actual sales prices are warranted to make the evaluation of assessments fairer. For example: If a sale included significant personal property that was not considered in the real property assessment, the estimated value of the personal property inflates the price above market value. Such distortions should be removed. After these steps have been completed, the sales file is ready for analysis.

2. *Stratification.* Recalling that the real estate market is naturally segmented and that different methods may be used to appraise different types of property, a better picture of assessment performance can be obtained if different subsets of property are studied separately. This is called “stratification.” Common subsets (“strata”) are the main types of property—residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and vacant land. In equalization, different taxing districts may be studied separately.
3. *Data analysis.* After data assembly and stratification, analysis can begin. The next section discusses and illustrates the main statistical computations using a fictitious data set.
4. *Evaluation of results.* When a sample of sales is small, when it does not represent the total makeup of the total assessment roll well, and when the variation in sales ratios is great, ratio study statistics may not reliably portray the quality of appraisals. The same is true if appraisals of parcels in the ratio study sample are adjusted so that they approximate sales prices (so-called “sales chasing”), with the result being ratio study statistics that imply quality appraisals. Another method of misrepresenting the quality of appraisals is to select for inclusion in the sample only sales with “good” ratios (“cherry picking”). Analysts should consider such possibilities before drawing conclusions based on ratio study statistics about the quality of appraisals.
5. *Reporting.* The final step in a ratio study is to report the results. What is reported will depend on the purpose of the study and the audience. More detail is required when the audience includes non-specialists. It often is helpful to compare observed performance with standards of performance, such as those promulgated by the International Association of Assessing Officers.

How are ratio-study statistics calculated and what do they mean?

When actual sales are used as evidence of market values, the investigation is known as a “sales ratio study.” A sales ratio (R) is formed by dividing the appraised value (A) by the sales price (S). For example, if a property was appraised for \$148,000 and it was sold for \$154,000, the sales ratio would be:

$$R = A / S = 148,000 / 154,000 = 0.961.$$

That is, the appraisal is 96 percent of the sale price. In a ratio study, sales ratios would be calculated for all the sales that were deemed usable and patterns in the ratios would be examined.

Table 1: Data used to illustrate calculation of basic ratio study statistics

<i>Sample sales data to illustrate the calculation of ratio study statistics</i>	ID			
	No.	Assessment	Sale Price	Ratio
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
The adjoining nine sales will be used to show how ratio study statistics are calculated. They have been randomly selected from a data set of 75 sales that has been concocted to illustrate both calculations and points.	61	99,200	772,000	0.128
	3	28,000	59,250	0.473
	16	54,110	99,000	0.547
	20	36,320	63,300	0.574
	27	50,560	70,500	0.717
	29	61,360	78,000	0.787
	33	58,080	69,000	0.842
	68	182,000	153,000	1.190
	57	160,000	129,600	1.235
	Total	729,630	1,493,650	6.493

The statistics calculated in ratio studies mainly deal with the *level* of value (assessment) and the *uniformity* of values as previously noted. Another area of statistical inquiry is whether the primary statistics described below may be considered *reliable*. Level of value is measured by a *measure of central tendency*, such as the *median*, the common *arithmetic mean*, and the *weighted mean*. There are several aspects to uniformity. If the question is whether two or more groups of property are valued uniformly, measures of central tendency are compared. If the question is whether all the properties in a group are valued uniformly, a *measure of variability* is calculated. The *coefficient of dispersion* is the chief measure used. Sometimes, the concern is whether high-value properties and low-value properties are valued uniformly. The *price-related differential* is used here.

- *Median*—the median ratio is the *middle* sales ratio when the ratios are arrayed in order of magnitude. When the total number of sales is even, the median is the arithmetic mean of the two middle-most ratios. In table 1, the sales ratios in column 4 have already been arrayed from lowest (0.128) to highest (1.235). The middle ratio (the median) is that of the fifth sale (ID no. 27), which is 0.717. If the sale with ID

- no. 57 were not in the sample, the median would be the average of the ratios of sales 20 and 27, which would be 0.646 ($[0.574+0.717]/2$). The value of the median is unaffected by the values of the ends of the array. For this reason, the median generally is the preferred measure of central tendency when evaluating the quality of a reassessment.
- *Arithmetic mean*—the arithmetic mean is the sum of the individual ratios divided by the number of ratios. If the nine ratios in table 1 were added, they would total 6.493, the average of which would be 0.721. Although not evident from this small sample of nine sales, the value of the mean is strongly affected by the values of the extreme ratios. Hence, it is not relied upon in sales ratio studies.
 - *Weighted mean*—the weighted mean ratio is the sum of the appraisals (assessments) divided by the sum of the sales prices. In table 1, the sum of appraised values (column 2) is 729,630, and the sum of the sales prices (column 3) is 1,493,650. Dividing 729,630 by 1,493,650 results in a ratio of 0.488. As inspection of table 1 would reveal, this ratio is heavily influenced by sale 61, which sold for \$772,000. This dollar-weighting feature makes the weighted mean the preferred measure of central tendency when the objective is to estimate to total market value of a district (as in indirect equalization).
 - *Coefficient of dispersion*—the coefficient of dispersion (COD) measures the average percentage deviation of individual ratios from the median ratio. The lower the COD, the more uniform the appraisals. Table 2 (below), which is derived from table 1, illustrates the calculations.
 1. subtracting the median from each ratio (result in column 3),
 2. taking the absolute value (negative signs are ignored) of the differences (result in column 4),
 3. summing these values (result = 2.332),
 4. dividing by the number of ratios to obtain the “average absolute deviation” ($2.332 / 9 = 0.259$),

5. dividing by the median ($0.259 / 0.717 = 0.361$, and
6. multiplying by 100 to express the results in percentage terms (result = 36.1%).

Table 2: Calculation of the coefficient of dispersion (COD)

ID No. (1)	Ratio (2)	Ratio- Median (3)	Absolute Value (4)
61	0.128	-0.589	0.589
3	0.473	-0.245	0.245
16	0.547	-0.171	0.171
20	0.574	-0.143	0.143
27	0.717	0.000	0.000
29	0.787	0.070	0.070
33	0.842	0.125	0.125
68	1.190	0.472	0.472
57	1.235	0.517	.0517
		Sum =	2.332
Average Absolute Deviation:		$2.332 / 9$	= 0.259
Coefficient of Dispersion:		$0.259 / 0.717$	= 0.361
COD expressed as percentage:		$0.361 * 100$	= 36.1%

- *Price-related differential*—the price-related differential (PRD) is the mean ratio divided by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD of the nine ratios in table 1 is 1.477 ($0.721/0.488$). PRDs close to 1.0 signify uniform appraisals. If the PRD is much above 1.0 (as is the case here), high-value properties tend to be valued at a lower percentage of value than low-value properties. This is known as “assessment regressivity.” PRDs much below 1.0 signify “progressivity.”

Endnotes

- ⁱ Computational errors also were noted.
- ⁱⁱ Some studies provided no information on the numbers of properties in each stratum making it impossible to determine whether omitted strata should have been studied.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Referred to as “comparables.”
- ^{iv} also known as the “subject property.”
- ^v Although it is the least direct approach, the cost approach often is the default valuation approach because it was the first mass appraisal approach to be developed and because data on replacement costs are inexpensively available from specialist publishers.
- ^{vi} Adam Smith’s fourth canon of taxation states “Every tax ought to be so contrived as both to take out and keep out of the pockets of the people as little as possible, over and above what it brings into the public treasury of the state” (*Wealth of Nations*, 1776).

For more information, contact the Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute:

**Indiana Fiscal Policy Institute
One N. Pennsylvania St., Ste 1000
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
(317) 237-2890
FAX (317) 237-2893
ifpi@indianafiscal.org
www.indianafiscal.org**