

#### **Department of Local Government Finance**

# **Ratio Study**

#### 2024 Level I Tutorials



- Annual Adjustments: The process of adjusting assessments annually for the effects of time. Adjustments made to assessments to reflect the effects of inflation and deflation.
- Trending: The process of adjusting assessments for the effects of time. Adjustments made to assessments to reflect the effects of inflation and deflation.
- Trending Factor: Factor to apply to properties to bring them to the assessment level in Indiana of 100%. Arrived at by dividing the assessment level by the median percentage. The trending factor represents for the relative difference in value between two time periods. This is a percentage.



Assessment Level

The common or overall ratio of assessed values to market values. This term is synonymous with assessment ratio and level of assessment. In Indiana, this is the common or overall ratio of assessed values to market values in use. The assessment level in Indiana is 100% per IC 6-1.1-1-3. This is a percentage.

IC 6-1.1-1-3 "Assessed value" or "assessed valuation" defined Sec. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), "assessed value" or "assessed valuation" means an amount equal to:

(1) for assessment dates before March 1, 2001, thirty-three and one-third percent (33 1/3%) of the true tax value of property; and

(2) for assessment dates after February 28, 2001, the true tax value of property.

(b) For purposes of calculating a budget, rate, or levy under IC 6-1.1-17, IC 6-1.1-18, IC 6-1.1-18.5, IC 6-1.1-20, IC 20-46-4, IC 20-46-5, and IC 20-46-6, "assessed value" or "assessed valuation" does not include the assessed value of tangible property excluded and kept separately on a tax duplicate by a county auditor under IC 6-1.1-17-0.5. (Formerly: Acts 1975, P.L.47, SEC.1.) As amended by P.L.24-1986, SEC.2; P.L.6-1997, SEC.6; P.L.291-2001, SEC.204; P.L.2-2006, SEC.35; P.L.146-2008, SEC.46.



- Level of Assessment: The fractional relationship an assessed value bears to the market value in use of the property in question. The common or overall ratio of assessed values to market values in use. This is a percentage.
- True Tax Value: Synonymous with market value in use. The market value- inuse of a property for its current use, as reflected by the utility Received by the owner or by a similar user, from the property.
- Assessed Value: The dollar amount for a property entered into the assessment roll. Beginning with the 2001 assessment year, the assessed value equals 100% of the True Tax Value.
- Assessment Ratio: The fractional relationship an assessed value bears to the market value in use of the property in question. The true tax value divided by the sales price. This is a percentage.



- Rank: Assessment Ratios listed in Ascending or Descending order.
- Central Tendency: The tendency of most kinds of data to cluster around some typical or central value such as the Mean or Median.
- Mean: A measure of Central Tendency. The result of adding all the assessment ratios and dividing by the number of assessment ratios.
- Weighted Mean: An aggregate ratio determined by adding the TTV of the entire sample and dividing that total by the sum of the sale prices for the entire sample. This is a percentage.
- Median: A measure of central tendency. The middle assessment ratio in a rank of assessment ratios. This is a percentage.
- Absolute Deviation: The difference between the assessment ratio and the median. It is not negative or positive.



- Average Absolute Deviation: This is the total of all the absolute deviations divided by the number of assessment ratios.
- Coefficient of Dispersion (COD): The average deviation of a group of numbers from the median expressed as a percentage of the median. In ratio studies it is the average percentage deviation from the median ratio. It is calculated by dividing the absolute average deviation by the median. This is expressed as a percentage.
- Price Related Differential (PRD): A statistic for evaluating whether high value properties are under or over assessed compared to low value properties. It is calculated by dividing the mean by the weighted mean. This is expressed as a percentage.
- Sales Ratio: The true tax value divided by the sales price.



# **Statutory Authority**

• IC 6-1.1-4-4.5

Annual adjustment of assessed value of real property; state review and certification; base rate methodology; adjustment in assessed value based on estimated true tax value

Sec. 4.5. (a) The department of local government finance shall adopt rules establishing a system for annually adjusting the assessed value of real property to account for changes in value in those years since a general reassessment of property last took effect.

(b) Subject to subsection (e), the system must be applied to adjust assessed values beginning with the 2006 assessment date and each year thereafter that is not a year in which a reassessment becomes effective.

(c) The rules adopted under subsection (a) must include the following characteristics in the system:



# Statutory Authority (cont.)

(1) Promote uniform and equal assessment of real property within and across classifications.

(2) Require that assessing officials:

- (A) reevaluate the factors that affect value;
- (B) express the interactions of those factors mathematically;
- (C) use mass appraisal techniques to estimate updated property values within statistical measures of accuracy; and
- (D) provide notice to taxpayers of an assessment increase that results from the application of annual adjustments.

(3) Prescribe procedures that permit the application of the adjustment percentages in an efficient manner by assessing officials.

(d) The department of local government finance must review and certify each annual adjustment determined under this section.

As added by P.L.198-2001, SEC.8. Amended by P.L.245-2003, SEC.4; P.L.228-2005, SEC.4; P.L.136-2009, SEC.2; P.L.112-2010, SEC.1.



# **Annual Adjustment Rule**

- 50 IAC 27-1-1 Purpose
- Sec. 1. The purpose of this article is to establish procedures and standards to govern local assessing officials and the department in the annual adjustment of assessed valuations of real property under IC 6-1.1-4-4.5 and IC 6-1.1-13. The procedures, procedural requirements, and standards established by this article:
  - (1) shall be followed to attain a just, equal, and uniform basis and level of assessment among taxpayers in a county and from county to county; and
  - (2) will ensure that the annual assessed valuations are reflective of current market value-in-use conditions.
- (Department of Local Government Finance; 50 IAC 27-1-1; filed Apr 8, 2010, 1:45 p.m.: 20100505-IR-050090502FRA)



#### **Ratio Studies – Basis for Annual Adjustments**

- "The accuracy and uniformity of the assessments produced by any mass appraisal method shall be measured by an assessment ratio study." (This comes from the Real Property Assessment Manual.) The Manual also contains a detailed explanation of ratio studies.
- IAAO Standard on Ratio Studies
- As referenced in our Annual Adjustment Rule (50 IAC 27-1-1) the standards to be used are the 2013 IAAO Standards. This standard provides recommendations on the design, preparation, interpretation, and use of ratio studies for equalization, the evaluation of appraisal performance, and the quality control operations of an assessor's office.
- Ratio studies are the primary tool used to measure mass appraisal performance. They compare assessed values to "objectively verifiable data". In our case, a ratio study compares the assessor's estimate of TTV to indicators of market value in use. (i.e. sales prices and independent appraisals) This gives us our assessment ratio.



• An assessment ratio is calculated using the following formula: True Tax Value divided by market value in use (Sales Price) = Ratio

|        | True Tax Value | / Sale Price = | Ratio       |
|--------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Sale # | True Tax Value | Sale Price     | Sales Ratio |
| 1      | \$45,800       | \$49,800       | 0.920       |
| 2      | \$48,200       | \$52,400       | 0.920       |
| 3      | \$42,200       | \$40,000       | 1.055       |
| 4      | \$57,150       | \$58,125       | 0.983       |
| 5      | \$55,300       | \$51,450       | 1.075       |



- Ratio studies measure certain aspects of assessments:
- 1. Accuracy the level of assessment; the overall percentage that TTV represents of market value-in-use.
- 2. Uniformity relates to fair and equitable treatment of individual properties; uniformity requires that properties be valued equitably within classes and townships and that each of these groups be valued at the same level of assessment.
- 3. Regressivity/Progressivity relates to whether lower valued properties are under- or over-assessed in relation to higher valued properties.



- 1. Accuracy shown by measures of central tendency:
  - mean (arithmetic average)
  - weighted mean
  - median (this is the preferred measure)
- 2. Uniformity shown by measures of dispersion and relative dispersion:
  - average absolute deviation
  - coefficient of dispersion (this is the preferred measure)
- 3. Regressivity/Progressivity
  - price-related differential



## **Ratio Studies - Statistics**

- Measures of Central Tendency
- Mean (arithmetic average) The result of adding all the individual ratios
- and dividing by the number of ratios.
- Mean = sum of ratios ÷ number of ratios

|        | True Tax Value / | Sale Price = | - Ratio     |
|--------|------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Sale # | True Tax Value   | Sale Price   | Sales Ratio |
| 1      | \$45,800         | \$49,800     | 0.920       |
| 2      | \$48,200         | \$52,400     | 0.920       |
| 3      | \$42,200         | \$40,000     | 1.055       |
| 4      | \$57,150         | \$58,125     | 0.983       |
| 5      | \$55,300         | \$51,450     | 1.075       |
|        | TOTAL OF SA      | ALES RATIOS  | 4.9530      |
|        | TOTAL NUMB       | 5            |             |
|        | ME               | AN           | 99.1%       |



## **Ratio Studies - Statistics**

- Measures of Central Tendency
- Weighted Mean the total of the TTV's for all sales divided by the
- total of the sales prices for all sales
- Weighted Mean = Sum of the TTV's ÷ Sum of the Sales

| Sale # | True Tax Value |               | Sale Price        |  |  |
|--------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1      | \$45,800       |               | \$49 <i>,</i> 800 |  |  |
| 2      | \$48,200       |               | \$52,400          |  |  |
| 3      | \$42,200       |               | \$40,000          |  |  |
| 4      | \$57,150       |               | \$58,125          |  |  |
| 5      | \$55,300       |               | \$51,450          |  |  |
|        | \$248,650      | Divided by    | \$251,775         |  |  |
|        |                |               |                   |  |  |
|        |                | Weighted Mean |                   |  |  |



- Measures of Central Tendency
- Median The middle ratio in a rank order of ratios. A rank order lists the ratios in ascending or descending order. Location of the Median in a rank order = (Number of ratios + 1) ÷ 2

| Sales Ratio | Sales Ratios Ranked |
|-------------|---------------------|
| 0.9200      | 0.9200              |
| 0.9200      | 0.9200              |
| 1.0550      | 0.9830              |
| 0.9830      | 1.0550              |
| 1.0750      | 1.0750              |
| Median      | 98.3%               |



- Measures of Uniformity
- Average Absolute Deviation The arithmetic average of the absolute deviations of the individual ratios from the median.

| Sale # | True Tax Value | Sale Price | Sales Ratio  | Median         | ABS DEV |
|--------|----------------|------------|--------------|----------------|---------|
| 1      | \$45,800       | \$49,800   | 0.920        | 0.983          | 0.063   |
| 2      | \$48,200       | \$52,400   | 0.920        | 0.983          | 0.063   |
| 3      | \$42,200       | \$40,000   | 1.055        | 0.983          | 0.072   |
| 4      | \$57,150       | \$58,125   | 0.983        | 0.983          | 0.000   |
| 5      | \$55,300       | \$51,450   | 1.075        | 0.983          | 0.092   |
|        | \$248,650      | \$251,775  | Total Absolu | te Deviation   | 0.290   |
|        | ,              | ,          |              | lute Deviation | 0.058   |



- Measures of Uniformity ۲
- Coefficient of Dispersion (COD)= Ave. Abs. Deviation ÷ Median ۲

| True Tax Value    | e Tax Value Sale Price Sales Ratio Median                |   |   |   |  |
|-------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| \$45,800          | \$49,800   | 0.9200  | 0.9830  | 0.063   |  |
| \$48,200          | \$52,400   | 0.9200  | 0.9830  | 0.063   |  |
| \$42,200          | \$40,000   | 1.0550  | 0.9830  | 0.072   |  |
| \$57,150          | \$58,125   | 0.9830  | 0.9830  | 0.000   |  |
| \$55 <i>,</i> 300 | \$51,450   | 1.0750  | 0.9830  | 0.092   |  |
| \$248,650         | \$251,775  | Total Absolu  | te Deviation  | 0.290   |  |
|                   |  | Average Abso  | 0.058   |   |  |
|                   |  |   | 0.983   |   |  |
|                   |  |   | 5.9%  |   |  |
|                   | \$45,800<br>\$48,200<br>\$42,200<br>\$57,150<br>\$55,300 | \$45,800 \$49,800<br>\$48,200 \$52,400<br>\$42,200 \$40,000<br>\$57,150 \$58,125<br>\$55,300 \$51,450 | \$45,800 \$49,800 0.9200   \$48,200 \$52,400 0.9200   \$42,200 \$40,000 1.0550   \$57,150 \$58,125 0.9830   \$55,300 \$51,450 1.0750   \$248,650 \$251,775 Total Absolution   Med Med Med | \$45,800 \$49,800 0.9200 0.9830   \$48,200 \$52,400 0.9200 0.9830   \$42,200 \$40,000 1.0550 0.9830   \$57,150 \$58,125 0.9830 0.9830   \$55,300 \$51,450 1.0750 0.9830 |  |



- Measures of Regressivity/Progressivity
- Price-Related Differential (PRD) The mean ratio divided by the weighted mean ratio. PRD = Mean ÷ Wtd. Mean

| Mean percentage from Slide 16: | 99.1%   |
|--------------------------------|---------|
| Divided by                     |         |
| Weighted Mean % from Slide 17: | 98.8%   |
|                                |         |
| Equals a PRD of                | 100.30% |



- Measures of Regressivity/Progressivity
- PRD's above 103% tend to indicate assessment regressivity; higher valued properties are under-assessed in relation to lower valued properties.
- PRD's below 98% tend to indicate assessment progressivity; higher valued properties are over-assessed in relation to lower valued properties.



# **Evaluating Ratio Study Results**

- The annual adjustment rule sets the following standards:
- Accuracy Median assessment ratio for any class within a township must be between 90% and 110% of TTV.
- Uniformity The coefficient of dispersion for the Improved Residential Property class within a township must be 15% or less, while the remaining Property Classes must be 20% or less.
- Regressivity/Progressivity The PRD for all property classes within a township must be between 98% and 103%.



# **Ratio Studies – Evaluating Results**

| Median Assessment<br>Ratio | <b>Coefficient of Dispersion</b> | Action Required    |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Accurate                   |                                  |                    |  |  |  |  |
| (90% to 110%)              | Uniform                          | No action required |  |  |  |  |
| Accurate (90% to 110%)     | Non-uniform                      | Reassess           |  |  |  |  |
| Inaccurate                 | Uniform                          | Apply factors      |  |  |  |  |
| Inaccurate                 | Non-uniform                      | Reassess           |  |  |  |  |



# **Ratio Studies – Evaluating Results**

- Evaluating the results of the sample ratio study presented in this presentation yields the following:
- Median is 98.3% and is within the 90% to 110% range we discussed and meets the 2013 IAAO Standards. This would be considered accurate.
- COD is 5.9% and meets the 15% or less 2013 IAAO Standards for Improved Residential Property. This would be considered uniform.
- PRD is 100.30% and is within the 98% to 103% range we discussed and meets the 2013 IAAO Standards.
- After evaluating the above, this study meets the 2013 IAAO Standards and as such needs no further action.



#### **Review of Terms**

- 1. Annual Adjustments: Adjusts assessments annually for effects of time.
- 2. Trending: The process of adjusting assessments for the effects of time.
- 3. Trending Factor: A figure representing the increase or decrease in values over time. Expressed as a percentage
- 4. Assessment Level: The overall ratio of assessed values to market values. In Indiana this is 100%. Expressed as a percentage.
- 5. Level of Assessment: Synonymous with Assessment Level.
- 6. True Tax Value: The market value-in-use of a property for its current use, as reflected by the utility received by the owner or by a similar user, from the property.
- 7. Assessed Value: the assessed value equals 100% of the True Tax Value.
- 8. Assessment Ratio: True Tax Value divided by Sale Price. (a percentage)
- 9. Rank: Ratios listed in Ascending or Descending order.



#### **Review of Terms**

- 10. Central Tendency: Clustering of data around a central point.
- 11. Mean: Total of all assessment ratios/Total number of sales.
- 12. Weighted Mean: Total of all TTV of all the sales/Total sales price of all sales. Expressed as a percentage.
- 13. Median: Number of Ratios + 1 divided by 2 (middle ratio) Expressed as a percentage.
- 14. Absolute Deviation: Individual Ratio minus the Median
- 15. Average Absolute Deviation: Total Absolute Deviation divided by the number of ratios.
- 16. COD: Average Absolute Deviation divided by the Median. Expressed as a percentage.
- 17. Price Related Differential: Mean divided by the Weighted Mean. Expressed as a percentage.



#### Sample Ratio Study for the Residential Improved Class

| -      | -                |                   |                |        |         |  |
|--------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------|---------|--|
| Sale # | True Tax Value   | Sale Price        | Sales Ratio    | Median | ABS DEV |  |
| 1      | \$45,800         | \$49 <i>,</i> 800 | 0.920          | 0.983  | 0.063   |  |
| 2      | \$48,200         | \$52 <i>,</i> 400 | 0.920          | 0.983  | 0.063   |  |
| 3      | \$42,200         | \$40,000          | 1.055          | 0.983  | 0.072   |  |
| 4      | \$57,150         | \$58,125          | 0.983          |        | 0.000   |  |
| 5      | \$55,300         | \$51,450          |                |        | 0.092   |  |
| Totals | \$248,650        | \$251,775         |                |        | 0.290   |  |
|        | Results          | . ,               |                |        |         |  |
|        | Median           | 0.983             | 0.983 OR 98.3% |        |         |  |
|        | Mean             | 0.991             | OR             | 99.1%  |         |  |
| Avg    | . Abs. Deviation | 0.0580            | OR             | 5.8%   |         |  |
|        | Wght Mean        | 0.988             |                | 98.8%  |         |  |
|        | COD              | 0.059             |                | 5.9%   |         |  |
|        | PRD              | 1.003             |                | 100.3% |         |  |



- Please go to the Ratio Study Problem / Answer packet with audio for review along with working Problems #1 #4.
- \*\* These are very good problems to know how to calculate or where to find the information on how to calculate them \*\*



- If statistics are outside of IAAO standards, adding trending factors to improvements is one way to correct the issue. We will discuss one method to calculating trending factors called a neighborhood factor.
- A neighborhood factor takes a sample of sold properties (that are valid armslength transactions) and compares the sold properties' sale prices to their respective assessed values.
- However, the land value must be subtracted from each sale price (called improvement sale price) and only the improvement value should be used for the comparison (RCN – Depreciation = Improvement Value).



- Once each sale has the land value subtracted, and each improvement value is figured, the improvement sale prices are summed, and the improvement values are summed as well. This produces the Total Improvement Sale Price and Total Improvement Value.
- See next slide for an example.



| SALE  | SALE      | LAND     | IMP.        | TOTAL     | DEPR.         | IMP.        |
|-------|-----------|----------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| #     | PRICE     | VALUE    | SALE PRICE  | RCN       | (Expressed in | VALUE       |
|       |           |          |             |           | Dollars)      |             |
| #1    | \$118,000 | \$23,000 | \$95,000    | \$137,600 | (\$41,280)    | \$96,320    |
| #2    | \$122,600 | \$23,000 | \$99,600    | \$140,100 | (\$30,820)    | \$109,280   |
| #3    | \$139,900 | \$25,000 | \$114,900   | \$164,600 | (\$39,500)    | \$125,100   |
| #4    | \$127,500 | \$23,000 | \$104,500   | \$143,000 | (\$42,900)    | \$100,100   |
| #5    | \$117,500 | \$23,000 | \$94,500    | \$136,300 | (\$27,260)    | \$109.040   |
| #6    | \$125,000 | \$23,000 | \$102,000   | \$150,600 | (\$27,110)    | \$123,490   |
| #7    | \$147,500 | \$25,000 | \$122,500   | \$176,700 | (\$42,410)    | \$134,290   |
| #8    | \$135,000 | \$23,000 | \$112,000   | \$158,000 | (\$34,760)    | \$123,240   |
| #9    | \$149,900 | \$23,000 | \$126,900   | \$174,600 | (\$41,900)    | \$132,700   |
| #10   | \$130,000 | \$23,000 | \$107,000   | \$151,300 | (\$45,390)    | \$105,910   |
| Total |           |          | \$1,078,900 |           |               | \$1,159,470 |

30



- From the prior slide, we see that the Total Improvement Sale Price is \$1,078,900. What we are saying is that the improvements sold for this combined total after subtracting each sale's land value.
- Also from the prior slide, we see the Total Improvement Value is \$1,159,470. What we are saying is that the improvements are assessed for this combined total after subtracting depreciation.
- To find a neighborhood factor for this sample, we then take the Total Improvement Sale Price and divide by the Total Improvement Value (NF = TISP/TIV).



- \$1,078,900/\$1,159,470 = .9305113
- The neighborhood factor for this sample would be 93%, which means that we are over-assessing this neighborhood and need to lower each properties' value by multiplying the remainder value by .93.

| SUMMARY OF RESIDENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS             |   |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
|---|---|---------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--|-------|-----------|----------|-----|-----------|--------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------------|
| ID  | Use                                     | Story<br>Hgt. | Const.<br>Type | Grade | Year<br>Const. |  | Cond. | Base Rate | Features | L/M | Adj. Rate | Size or Area | Replacement<br>Cost | Total<br>Depr. | Remainder<br>Value | %<br>Camp | Nhbd<br>Factor | Improvement<br>Value |
| 01  |   |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
| 02  |   |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
| 03  |   |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
| 04  |   |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
| 05  |   |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
| 06  |   |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
| 07  |   |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
| Supplemental Card Residential Improvement Total |   |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
|   | Total Residential Improvement Value     |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |
|   | SUMMARY OF NON-RESIDENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS |               |                |       |                |  |       |           |          |     |           |              |                     |                |                    |           |                |                      |



**Ratio Study** 

- This concludes the ratio study tutorial and is a reminder that should you have • any questions you can email these questions to the Department.
- Please send emails to <u>Level1@dlgf.in.gov</u>. ۲