Education Excellence Idaho

*Improving Life Through Education Choice* **June 2004**

Policy Briefing

# The Direct Political Clout of the Education Establishment

By John T. Wenders

*"A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves money from the public treasury."* --Scottish historian, Alexander Tytler.

The education establishment employs vast numbers of teachers, other school employees, and bureaucrats. Their livelihood is directly and strongly affected by education funding, especially at the school level. In the jargon of the economist, education funding has very large income effects on these employees' well-being.

The number of employees in the education establishment has been growing rapidly–at well-over twice the rate of student growth–especially at the K-12 level. Nationally, over the period 1980 -2000, student enrollment grew by 15.52 percent, but total school employees grew by 37.39 percent, and teachers grew by 35.2 percent.[1] In Idaho, over the same period, students grew by 20.88 percent and total school employees grew by 45.15 percent. From 1992 to 2002, Idaho's total public school employees grew by 33.7 percent while students grew by only 7.3 percent. Non-certified staff grew by 49.3 percent.[2]

Nationally, public schools now have about one employee for every 6.2 students. In Idaho, the ratio is one employee for every 7.6 students. Nationally, teachers make up only 40 percent of total school employees and in Idaho only 42 percent.

Our public schools have become vast jobs programs, reminiscent of the depression era WPA, rather than educational institutions. School employee numbers and dollars dominate the political process.

Not coincidentally, in the past half century, school funding has also grown dramatically. Since World War II, *inflation-adjusted* spending per pupil in US public schools has increased by a multiple of *over six*–from $1,425 in 1945/46 to $9,354 in 2001/02, (in 2001 dollars). From 1959/60 to 1999/00, inflation-adjusted US spending per pupil rose by a multiple of 3.42. For Idaho, the multiple was similar–3.32. In 2003, Idaho spent $7872 per pupil.[3]

As Tytler predicted, with high and increasing numbers, high motivation, and high pay, public education employees have discovered how "they can vote themselves money from the public treasury."

### How Education Employees Exercise Political Power

Education employees exercise their political power in two complementary ways, one indirect, and well-known, and the other direct, and less known.

Their indirect power comes from their ability as a very well-organized and well-funded special interest group to influence the electoral-legislative process. As Charles Sykes observed:

> "In some states, the teachers union has become the functional equivalent of a political party, assuming many of the roles–candidate recruitment, fund-raising, phone-banks, polling, get-out-the-vote efforts–that were once handled by traditional part organizations. The result in many states is that the legislatures, no less than the educational bureaucracies, function as wholly owned subsidiaries of the teachers union." (Sykes. 1995, p. 230)

This classic political activity is designed to influence others to behave in the education establishment's interest through candidate support and lobbying. The teachers' unions are clearly

John T. Wenders, Ph.D., is emeritus professor of economics at the University of Idaho and Senior Policy Advisor for Education Excellence Idaho.

the important in this process, and much has been written about their influence at all levels of government. (Moe. 2001) In the larger school districts, other school employees are often also unionized. The general conclusion is that these unions, especially the teachers' unions, are probably the single most influential group in the US political process.

The second, and much less discussed, source of education employees' political clout is their direct influence as voters, especially the large number of school employees at the bottom of the pyramid. Regardless of their indirect effect on others through candidate support and lobbying, this source of clout results solely from high and growing numbers of school employees and their disproportionate willingness to go to the polls and vote their pocketbooks.

As noted above, over the past two decades, school employees alone have grown almost 2.5 times faster than students. In my view, the outcome of many elections, whether for candidates, operations levies, school board members, or bond levies, can be explained *solely* by this strong block of school employee/voters, irrespective of this group's ability to influence other voters through normal, indirect political activity. As I discuss below, one of the reasons why this direct clout is underestimated is the systematic under-reporting of school employee numbers and the failure to recognize that each employee undoubtedly carries like-minded family members to the polls too.

#### The Facts: School Employees as Voters

The attached tables give the facts.

Table One shows the impact of school employees in the direct voting process. Column B shows school enrollment, by state, for the 2000-01 school year. Column C shows the *reported* enrollment/staff ratio for each state. This column is computed by NCES by dividing enrollment by the number of employees *as calculated on a full time equivalent (FTE) basis*. But calculating employee numbers on a FTE basis greatly underestimates the gross number of employees, primarily non-certified employees, because a large number of these employees only work during the school year and reporting them on a full-year basis greatly reduces their gross numbers.

For example, teachers' aides are only employed during the school year. Yet their reported FTE numbers are calculated by dividing their total number of hours worked during the year by 2080. The result of this process is that the reported number of FTE aides is about half the number of aides employed during the school year. School employment data in Idaho showed that FTE employment was only about 75.16 percent of gross employment in 2000-01.

From the standpoint of measuring raw voting clout, it is clearly gross employment that is relevant. Thus, to estimate gross school employment, the data in Column C were multiplied by .7516, and the result is shown in Column D. The average adjusted pupil/staff ratio is 6.2. With a national student/ teacher ratio of 16, this means that nationally teachers make up only about 38.9 percent of total school employees. In Idaho, the adjusted pupil staff ratio is 7.6, and teachers make up about 42.4 percent of total school employees.

Column E shows the estimated gross number of school employees for each state, and is computed by dividing Column B by Column D. Column F shows the number of votes cast for US President in 2000, and Column I shows the ratio of school employees to votes cast, which averages 7.27 percent for the US and 6.44 percent in Idaho.

I am not suggesting that school employees actually made up about 7 percent of the presidential vote in 2000. Presidential elections are typically not decided by education issues alone, nor are school employees united on that issue. Yet it is well-known that teachers vote overwhelmingly Democratic, and the teachers' union already has great influence within the Democratic Party. Yet the data also suggest that if school employees alone ever became energized to simply turn out in high numbers and vote for one candidate they could have a very significant impact on even a Presidential election. A 7 percent voter swing would change the results of many presidential elections. And as we shall see, 7 percent may be the lower bound of their direct voting influence.

#### From National to Local Elections

As one moves downward from national, to state, to local school board and levy elections, two things happen: total voter turnout falls dramatically, and the direct income effect of education issues on school employees becomes greater. Both of these factors make school employees potentially a greater fraction of the total votes cast and increase their direct clout in local elections.

Voter turnouts–no matter how measured–for school board, levy and bond elections are notorious low, often barely in the two digit range. A high voter turnout in the various school related elections is usually around 25 percent of registered voters, and registrants are often only a fraction of the voter eligible population (VEP). In two school bond elections in California, teacher turnout was 93 and 88 percent of registrants, while overall turnout was 19 and 23 percent for all registrants. In a bitterly fought election in Los Angeles between the teachers' union and the mayor, the total turnout was only 17 percent of registered voters. (Moe. 2001, p. 167) As LA Unified School District Superintendent Roy Romer recently observed regarding his struggle with the teachers union to influence the school board: "A fundamental problem is that the school board members are elected..."[4]

The conclusion that the school employee vote becomes more important in state and local elections is supported by the fact that school employees were an almost 30 percent greater fraction of votes cast in off-year gubernatorial elections in 1998 than in the presidential election of 2000.

The rising clout of school employees in local elections can be seen by consideration of the next columns of Table One. Column G show the voter eligible population (VEP) in each state, Column J shows schools employees as a percent of VEP, and Columns K and L school employees as a fraction of this population at 10 percent and 20 percent total turnout rates. Since the VEP is usually much larger than registrants, these turnout rates are probably the most relevant for local education elections. These data show that school employees then make up about 20 to 40 percent of VEP over this turnout range, certainly enough to make a huge difference in any local election or levy. At a ten percent turnout rate, across the various states, school employees average 40.8 percent of VEP, ranging from a low of 28.13 percent in Hawaii, to 57.08 percent in Texas. At a twenty percent turnout rate, across the various states, school employees average 20.14 percent of VEP, ranging from a low of 14.57 percent in Hawaii, to 28.54 percent in Texas.

This analysis assumes that the school employee turnout rate is 100 percent, which may be on the high end of the relevant range. Columns M and N show the comparable school employees' percentage of total vote when the school employee turnout rate is 75 percent. As one would expect, these two columns are simply 75 percent of columns K and L.

**Further Considerations**

Two other issues are relevant to the discussion of the direct voting influence of school employees.

First, as I have already mentioned, education funding has a large and direct income effect on the well-being of school employees *and their families*, and this, in itself, provides unusual motivation to turn out and vote for high funding. But this effect is even stronger in the case of most school employees because they are *typically paid well above what they could get in the private sector*, so that any potential loss of employment or pay would be an unusually large hardship. In the jargon of the economist, there are large rents in typical school employee compensation. If these employees were paid much closer to what they could earn elsewhere in the private sector, they would be less apprehensive of the economic effects of school elections on their personal economic well-being. Many of these jobs are real sinecures, and thus there is very high motivation to vote to keep education funding high and growing.

Second, and related to the above, merely looking at the number of school employees potential direct votes undoubtedly greatly under represents the number of direct votes favorable to high education funding that any employee directly produces. Over 75 percent of teachers are married, and with a top heavy age structure, many have children of voting age as well. Spouses, children and other relatives undoubtedly at least double the number of potential votes in favor of high and growing education funding. Further, there are also a large number of retirees. Education school graduates are about twice the three million or so active teachers. The number of school employees may be only the tip of the direct vote iceberg.

### Leveling the Playing Field: A Super Majority for Local School Elections

This analysis begs the question of whether a simple majority rule is fair for local school elections. School bond and levy elections are unique in our political process because it is the only time when a large fraction of voters to vote directly on their own paychecks. It seems reasonable that any election rule relating to school funding should assure that a majority of non school employees determine the outcome.

Let us initially assume an overall voter turnout rate of 20 percent and a school employee turnout rate of 75 percent. (This implies a non-school employee turnout rate of 17 to 18 percent.)

Column B of Table Two shows the required field leveling super-majority needed to neutralize the self-interested vote of school employees alone. It is calculated by adding 50 percent to the results of column N in Table One, which shows the employee percent of votes under the same assumptions. Column B in Table Two shows that a super majority rule of about 65 percent would be needed to level the voting playing field. If the assumed school employee turnout rate were 100 percent, the super-majority needed would be about 70 percent. This result is shown in Column C of Table Two, which merely adds 50 percent to the results of Column L in Table One.

The next four columns of Table Two show the super-majority results under the alternative assumptions that employees are able to bring additional family members–1.5 and 2, respectively–to the polls with their assumed turnout rate of 75 percent and 100 percent. As expected, these results show that field-leveling super-majorities rise to 73 percent to 90 percent on average, and exceed 100 percent for a few states. The results shown in columns D and F are probably the most relevant for drawing conclusions about the direct impact of school employees voting.

Table Three isolates the same analysis for the state of Idaho.

### Concluding Remarks

The upshot of all this is that, especially at the local level, merely energizing a high turnout of school employees alone can produce enough votes to effect high education funding, regardless of these employees significant impact via other, organized, indirect, political activity.

It seems obvious that leveling the political playing field would require a super-majority voting rule for all local school bond and levy elections at least in the range of two-thirds to three-fourths for most states. But this, of course, would do nothing to deter school employee influence in school board elections. This power could only be checked by requiring all school levies to be submitted to the voters and with a super majority requirement.

---

Footnotes

1. These data on school employees were obtained from various annual issues of the National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics*. Spreadsheets are available from the author upon request.

2. Data on Idaho school employees were obtained from the Idaho State Department of Education, *Annual Statistical Report, Public School Certified and Non-Certified Personnel*, various years. Available at: <http://www.sde.state.id.us/finance/annualstats.htm>

3. National Center for Education Statistics, *Statistics of State School Systems*, and Common Core of Data surveys. Table 168.

4. "L.A. Teachers Union Chief Pressures Supt. Romer to Dissolve Subdistricts" *Los Angeles Times*, May 30, 2004 http://www.latimes.com/news/education/la-meunion30may30,1,3591973.story?coll=la-news-learning

References

Moe, Terry M., 2001. "Teachers Unions and the Public Schools" Chapter 7 in Terry M. Moe, Editor, *A Primer on America's Schools*. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University, Hoover Institutions Press Publication 486.

Sykes, Charles J., 1995. *Dumbing Down Our Kids*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

TABLE ONE
Potential School Employee Impact on the Election of Fall 2000

| | Fall 2000 Enrollment | Reported Pupil/Staff | Adjusted Pupil/Staff | Fall 2000 School Employees | Votes Cast President Fall 2000 | Voter Eligible Population (VEP) | Turnout Rate % of VEP | School Employees As % of Votes | School Employees As % of VEP | School Employ. As a % When Turnout = 10% | School Employ. As a % When Turnout = 20% | Employee % of Votes: Voter Turn. = 10% Employee Turn. = 75% | Employee % of Votes: Voter Turn. = 20% Employee Turn. = 75% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 740,176 | 8.2 | 6.2 | 120,098 | 1,666,272 | 3,212,411 | 51.87% | 7.21% | 3.74% | 37.39% | 18.69% | 28.04% | 14.02% |
| Alaska | 133,356 | 8.3 | 6.2 | 21,377 | 284,492 | 413,628 | 68.78% | 7.51% | 5.17% | 51.68% | 25.84% | 38.76% | 19.38% |
| Arizona | 877,696 | 9.7 | 7.3 | 120,389 | 1,532,016 | 3,303,089 | 46.38% | 7.86% | 3.64% | 36.45% | 18.22% | 27.34% | 13.67% |
| Arkansas | 449,959 | 7.3 | 5.5 | 82,009 | 921,781 | 1,902,894 | 48.44% | 8.90% | 4.31% | 43.10% | 21.55% | 32.32% | 16.16% |
| California | 6,142,348 | 11.4 | 8.6 | 716,874 | 10,965,856 | 19,836,004 | 55.28% | 6.54% | 3.61% | 36.14% | 18.07% | 27.11% | 13.55% |
| Colorado | 724,508 | 8.7 | 6.5 | 110,799 | 1,741,368 | 2,988,121 | 58.28% | 6.36% | 3.71% | 37.08% | 18.54% | 27.81% | 13.90% |
| Connecticut | 562,179 | 6.8 | 5.1 | 109,997 | 1,460,177 | 2,312,416 | 63.15% | 7.53% | 4.76% | 47.57% | 23.78% | 35.68% | 17.84% |
| Delaware | 114,676 | 9.1 | 6.8 | 16,767 | 327,529 | 546,120 | 59.97% | 5.12% | 3.07% | 30.70% | 15.35% | 23.03% | 11.51% |
| District of Columbia | 68,925 | 6.4 | 4.8 | 14,329 | 201,894 | 403,536 | 50.03% | 7.10% | 3.55% | 35.51% | 17.75% | 26.63% | 13.32% |
| Florida | 2,434,821 | 8.8 | 6.6 | 368,127 | 5,963,070 | 10,707,136 | 55.69% | 6.17% | 3.44% | 34.38% | 17.19% | 25.79% | 12.89% |
| Georgia | 1,444,937 | 7.8 | 5.9 | 246,472 | 2,583,208 | 5,337,619 | 48.40% | 9.54% | 4.62% | 46.18% | 23.09% | 34.63% | 17.32% |
| Hawaii | 184,360 | 10 | 7.5 | 24,529 | 367,951 | 842,040 | 43.70% | 6.67% | 2.91% | 29.13% | 14.57% | 21.85% | 10.92% |
| Idaho | 245,117 | 10.1 | 7.6 | 32,290 | 501,615 | 891,964 | 56.24% | 6.44% | 3.62% | 36.20% | 18.10% | 27.15% | 13.58% |
| Illinois | 2,048,792 | 8.2 | 6.2 | 332,428 | 4,739,935 | 8,364,981 | 56.66% | 7.01% | 3.97% | 39.74% | 19.87% | 29.81% | 14.90% |
| Indiana | 989,225 | 7.8 | 5.9 | 168,738 | 2,199,302 | 4,388,219 | 50.12% | 7.67% | 3.85% | 38.45% | 19.23% | 28.84% | 14.42% |
| Iowa | 495,080 | 7.3 | 5.5 | 90,233 | 1,314,395 | 2,128,737 | 61.75% | 6.86% | 4.24% | 42.39% | 21.19% | 31.79% | 15.90% |
| Kansas | 470,610 | 7.3 | 5.5 | 85,773 | 1,072,216 | 1,905,418 | 56.27% | 8.00% | 4.50% | 45.02% | 22.51% | 33.76% | 16.88% |
| Kentucky | 665,850 | 7.4 | 5.6 | 119,718 | 1,547,106 | 3,005,543 | 51.48% | 7.74% | 3.98% | 39.83% | 19.92% | 29.87% | 14.94% |
| Louisiana | 743,089 | 7.3 | 5.5 | 135,435 | 1,765,656 | 3,127,657 | 56.45% | 7.67% | 4.33% | 43.30% | 21.65% | 32.48% | 16.24% |
| Maine | 207,037 | 6.2 | 4.7 | 44,429 | 651,790 | 976,006 | 66.78% | 6.82% | 4.55% | 45.52% | 22.76% | 34.14% | 17.07% |
| Maryland | 852,920 | 8.8 | 6.6 | 128,955 | 2,021,987 | 3,594,282 | 56.26% | 6.38% | 3.59% | 35.88% | 17.94% | 26.91% | 13.45% |
| Massachusetts | 975,150 | 8 | 6 | 162,179 | 2,698,994 | 4,519,633 | 59.72% | 6.01% | 3.59% | 35.88% | 17.94% | 26.91% | 13.46% |
| Michigan | 1,743,337 | 8.3 | 6.2 | 279,458 | 4,232,501 | 7,084,922 | 59.74% | 6.60% | 3.94% | 39.44% | 19.72% | 29.58% | 14.79% |
| Minnesota | 854,340 | 8.2 | 6.2 | 138,621 | 2,438,685 | 3,421,159 | 71.28% | 5.68% | 4.05% | 40.52% | 20.26% | 30.39% | 15.19% |
| Mississippi | 497,871 | 7.7 | 5.8 | 86,028 | 994,184 | 2,020,662 | 49.20% | 8.65% | 4.26% | 42.57% | 21.29% | 31.93% | 15.97% |
| Missouri | 912,744 | 7.5 | 5.6 | 161,920 | 2,359,892 | 4,028,516 | 58.58% | 6.86% | 4.02% | 40.19% | 20.10% | 30.15% | 15.07% |
| Montana | 154,875 | 7.9 | 5.9 | 26,084 | 410,986 | 670,802 | 61.27% | 6.35% | 3.89% | 38.88% | 19.44% | 29.16% | 14.58% |
| Nebraska | 286,199 | 7.2 | 5.4 | 52,887 | 697,132 | 1,202,097 | 57.99% | 7.59% | 4.40% | 44.00% | 22.00% | 33.00% | 16.50% |
| Nevada | 340,706 | 10.9 | 8.2 | 41,588 | 605,655 | 1,295,972 | 46.73% | 6.87% | 3.21% | 32.09% | 16.05% | 24.07% | 12.03% |
| New Hampshire | 208,461 | 7.4 | 5.6 | 37,481 | 567,795 | 909,740 | 62.41% | 6.60% | 4.12% | 41.20% | 20.60% | 30.90% | 15.45% |
| New Jersey | 1,307,828 | 7 | 5.3 | 248,580 | 3,187,226 | 5,478,677 | 58.18% | 7.80% | 4.54% | 45.37% | 22.69% | 34.03% | 17.01% |
| New Mexico | 320,306 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 60,023 | 598,605 | 1,221,178 | 49.02% | 10.03% | 4.92% | 49.15% | 24.58% | 36.86% | 18.43% |
| New York | 2,882,188 | 6.9 | 5.2 | 555,759 | 6,821,999 | 12,401,688 | 55.01% | 8.15% | 4.48% | 44.81% | 22.41% | 33.61% | 16.80% |
| North Carolina | 1,293,638 | 8 | 6 | 215,147 | 2,914,990 | 5,687,706 | 51.25% | 7.38% | 3.78% | 37.83% | 18.91% | 28.37% | 14.19% |
| North Dakota | 109,201 | 7.2 | 5.4 | 20,179 | 288,256 | 479,364 | 60.13% | 7.00% | 4.21% | 42.10% | 21.05% | 31.57% | 15.79% |
| Ohio | 1,835,049 | 8.2 | 6.2 | 297,747 | 4,701,998 | 8,281,350 | 56.78% | 6.33% | 3.60% | 35.95% | 17.98% | 26.97% | 13.48% |
| Oklahoma | 623,110 | 8.3 | 6.2 | 99,885 | 1,234,229 | 2,438,695 | 50.61% | 8.09% | 4.10% | 40.96% | 20.48% | 30.72% | 15.36% |
| Oregon | 546,231 | 9.7 | 7.3 | 74,923 | 1,530,549 | 2,412,909 | 63.43% | 4.90% | 3.11% | 31.05% | 15.53% | 23.29% | 11.64% |
| Pennsylvania | 1,814,311 | 8.1 | 6.1 | 298,016 | 4,912,185 | 9,129,698 | 53.80% | 6.07% | 3.26% | 32.64% | 16.32% | 24.48% | 12.24% |
| Rhode Island | 157,347 | 8.9 | 6.7 | 23,522 | 409,112 | 726,930 | 56.28% | 5.75% | 3.24% | 32.36% | 16.18% | 24.27% | 12.13% |
| South Carolina | 677,411 | 7.9 | 5.9 | 114,088 | 1,383,902 | 2,906,974 | 47.61% | 8.24% | 3.92% | 39.25% | 19.62% | 29.43% | 14.72% |
| South Dakota | 128,603 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 24,099 | 316,269 | 547,127 | 57.81% | 7.62% | 4.40% | 44.05% | 22.02% | 33.04% | 16.52% |
| Tennessee | 909,388 | 8 | 6 | 151,242 | 2,075,753 | 4,152,315 | 49.99% | 7.29% | 3.64% | 36.42% | 18.21% | 27.32% | 13.66% |
| Texas | 4,059,619 | 7.5 | 5.6 | 720,174 | 6,407,637 | 12,617,143 | 50.79% | 11.24% | 5.71% | 57.08% | 28.54% | 42.81% | 21.40% |
| Utah | 481,687 | 11.8 | 8.9 | 54,312 | 766,697 | 1,450,192 | 52.87% | 7.08% | 3.75% | 37.45% | 18.73% | 28.09% | 14.04% |
| Vermont | 102,049 | 5.7 | 4.3 | 23,820 | 293,794 | 458,615 | 64.06% | 8.11% | 5.19% | 51.94% | 25.97% | 38.95% | 19.48% |
| Virginia | 1,144,915 | 6.9 | 5.2 | 220,769 | 2,736,640 | 5,005,282 | 54.68% | 8.07% | 4.41% | 44.11% | 22.05% | 33.08% | 16.54% |
| Washington | 1,004,770 | 10.3 | 7.7 | 129,790 | 2,487,433 | 3,944,449 | 63.06% | 5.22% | 3.29% | 32.90% | 16.45% | 24.68% | 12.34% |
| West Virginia | 286,367 | 7.4 | 5.6 | 51,488 | 648,251 | 1,386,967 | 46.74% | 7.94% | 3.71% | 37.12% | 18.56% | 27.84% | 13.92% |
| Wisconsin | 879,476 | 8.1 | 6.1 | 144,462 | 2,598,607 | 3,834,947 | 67.76% | 5.56% | 3.77% | 37.67% | 18.83% | 28.25% | 14.13% |
| Wyoming | 89,940 | 6.4 | 4.8 | 18,698 | 213,726 | 355,953 | 60.04% | 8.75% | 5.25% | 52.53% | 26.26% | 39.40% | 19.70% |
| US | 47,222,778 | 8.2 | 6.2 | 7,662,155 | 105,363,298 | 190,259,483 | 55.38% | 7.23% | 4.01% | 40.06% | 20.03% | 30.20% | 15.10% |

Enrollment: NCES, Digest of Education Statistics, 2002, Table 84. <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/tables/PDF/table84.pdf>
Reported Pupil/Staff: NCES, Digest of Education Statistics, 2002, Table 84. <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/tables/PDF/table84.pdf>
Votes for President, 2000: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2002, Table 374. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/02statab/election.pdf>
Voter Eligible Population: <http://elections.gmu.edu/Voter_Turnout_2000.htm>

TABLE TWO: Field Leveling Super Majority

| | Field Leveling Super Majority When Voter Turn. = 20% Employee Turn = 75% Employees Only | Field Leveling Super Majority When Voter Turn. = 20% Employee Turn = 100% Employees Only | Field Leveling Super Majority When Voter Turn. = 20% Employee Turn = 75% Employees Times 1.5 | Field Leveling Super Majority When Voter Turn. = 20% Employee Turn = 75% Employees Times 2 | Field Leveling Super Majority When Voter Turn. = 20% Employee Turn = 100% Employees Times 1.5 | Field Leveling Super Majority When Voter Turn. = 20% Employee Turn = 100% Employees Times 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 64.02% | 68.69% | 71.03% | 78.04% | 78.04% | 87.39% |
| Alaska | 69.38% | 75.84% | 79.07% | 88.76% | 88.76% | 101.68% |
| Arizona | 63.67% | 68.22% | 70.50% | 77.34% | 77.34% | 86.45% |
| Arkansas | 66.16% | 71.55% | 74.24% | 82.32% | 82.32% | 93.10% |
| California | 63.55% | 68.07% | 70.33% | 77.11% | 77.11% | 86.14% |
| Colorado | 63.90% | 68.54% | 70.86% | 77.81% | 77.81% | 87.08% |
| Connecticut | 67.84% | 73.78% | 76.76% | 85.68% | 85.68% | 97.57% |
| Delaware | 61.51% | 65.35% | 67.27% | 73.03% | 73.03% | 80.70% |
| District of Columbia | 63.32% | 67.75% | 69.97% | 76.63% | 76.63% | 85.51% |
| Florida | 62.89% | 67.19% | 69.34% | 75.79% | 75.79% | 84.38% |
| Georgia | 67.32% | 73.09% | 75.97% | 84.63% | 84.63% | 96.18% |
| Hawaii | 60.92% | 64.57% | 66.39% | 71.85% | 71.85% | 79.13% |
| Idaho | 63.58% | 68.10% | 70.36% | 77.15% | 77.15% | 86.20% |
| Illinois | 64.90% | 69.87% | 72.35% | 79.81% | 79.81% | 89.74% |
| Indiana | 64.42% | 69.23% | 71.63% | 78.84% | 78.84% | 88.45% |
| Iowa | 65.90% | 71.19% | 73.84% | 81.79% | 81.79% | 92.39% |
| Kansas | 66.88% | 72.51% | 75.32% | 83.76% | 83.76% | 95.02% |
| Kentucky | 64.94% | 69.92% | 72.41% | 79.87% | 79.87% | 89.83% |
| Louisiana | 66.24% | 71.65% | 74.36% | 82.48% | 82.48% | 93.30% |
| Maine | 67.07% | 72.76% | 75.61% | 84.14% | 84.14% | 95.52% |
| Maryland | 63.45% | 67.94% | 70.18% | 76.91% | 76.91% | 85.88% |
| Massachusetts | 63.46% | 67.94% | 70.18% | 76.91% | 76.91% | 85.88% |
| Michigan | 64.79% | 69.72% | 72.19% | 79.58% | 79.58% | 89.44% |
| Minnesota | 65.19% | 70.26% | 72.79% | 80.39% | 80.39% | 90.52% |
| Mississippi | 65.97% | 71.29% | 73.95% | 81.93% | 81.93% | 92.57% |
| Missouri | 65.07% | 70.10% | 72.61% | 80.15% | 80.15% | 90.19% |
| Montana | 64.58% | 69.44% | 71.87% | 79.16% | 79.16% | 88.88% |
| Nebraska | 66.50% | 72.00% | 74.75% | 83.00% | 83.00% | 94.00% |
| Nevada | 62.03% | 66.05% | 68.05% | 74.07% | 74.07% | 82.09% |
| New Hampshire | 65.45% | 70.60% | 73.17% | 80.90% | 80.90% | 91.20% |
| New Jersey | 67.01% | 72.69% | 75.52% | 84.03% | 84.03% | 95.37% |
| New Mexico | 68.43% | 74.58% | 77.65% | 86.86% | 86.86% | 99.15% |
| New York | 66.80% | 72.41% | 75.21% | 83.61% | 83.61% | 94.81% |
| North Carolina | 64.19% | 68.91% | 71.28% | 78.37% | 78.37% | 87.83% |
| North Dakota | 65.79% | 71.05% | 73.68% | 81.57% | 81.57% | 92.10% |
| Ohio | 63.48% | 67.98% | 70.22% | 76.97% | 76.97% | 85.95% |
| Oklahoma | 65.36% | 70.48% | 73.04% | 80.72% | 80.72% | 90.96% |
| Oregon | 61.64% | 65.53% | 67.47% | 73.29% | 73.29% | 81.05% |
| Pennsylvania | 62.24% | 66.32% | 68.36% | 74.48% | 74.48% | 82.64% |
| Rhode Island | 62.13% | 66.18% | 68.20% | 74.27% | 74.27% | 82.36% |
| South Carolina | 64.72% | 69.62% | 72.08% | 79.43% | 79.43% | 89.25% |
| South Dakota | 66.52% | 72.02% | 74.78% | 83.04% | 83.04% | 94.05% |
| Tennessee | 63.66% | 68.21% | 70.49% | 77.32% | 77.32% | 86.42% |
| Texas | 71.40% | 78.54% | 82.11% | 92.81% | 92.81% | 107.08% |
| Utah | 64.04% | 68.73% | 71.07% | 78.09% | 78.09% | 87.45% |
| Vermont | 69.48% | 75.97% | 79.22% | 88.95% | 88.95% | 101.94% |
| Virginia | 66.54% | 72.05% | 74.81% | 83.08% | 83.08% | 94.11% |
| Washington | 62.34% | 66.45% | 68.51% | 74.68% | 74.68% | 82.90% |
| West Virginia | 63.92% | 68.56% | 70.88% | 77.84% | 77.84% | 87.12% |
| Wisconsin | 64.13% | 68.83% | 71.19% | 78.25% | 78.25% | 87.67% |
| Wyoming | 69.70% | 76.26% | 79.55% | 89.40% | 89.40% | 102.53% |
| US | 65.10% | 70.14% | 72.65% | 80.20% | 80.05% | 90.06% |

Computed from Table One.

TABLE THREE
Direct Voting Impact of Idaho School Employees.

| Idaho | | | Employees Only | Employees Times 1.5 | Employees Times Two |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 2000 | Enrollment (7.55/employee) | 245,117 | | | |
| Fall 2000 | School Employees | | 32,448 | 48,672 | 64,896 |
| Votes Cast for US President | Fall 2000 | 501,615 | | | |
| Voter Eligible | Population (VEP) | 891,964 | | | |
| Turnout Rate | % of VEP | 56.24% | | | |
| School Employees | As % of Votes | | 6.47% | 9.70% | 12.94% |
| School Employees | As % of VEP | | 3.64% | 5.46% | 7.28% |
| School Employees % When | Turnout = 10% | | 36.38% | 54.57% | 72.76% |
| School Employees % When | Turnout = 20% | | 18.19% | 27.28% | 36.38% |
| Employee % of Votes: | Voter Turn. = 10% | Employee Turn. = 75% | 27.28% | 40.93% | 54.57% |
| Employee % of Votes: | Voter Turn. = 20% | Employee Turn. = 75% | 13.64% | 20.46% | 27.28% |
| Field Leveling Super Majority | When Voter Turn. = 20% | Employee Turn = 75% | 63.64% | 70.46% | 77.28% |
| Field Leveling Super Majority | When Voter Turn. = 20% | Employee Turn = 100% | 68.19% | 77.28% | 86.38% |