## ED269/1963

 C. 1
## SIXTH/ANNUAL REPORT

ON SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

Government Publications Library
University of Colvado,
JAN 182000

COLORADO STATE DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION

Byron W. Hansford, Commissioner


January 1963
C O L ORADO
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Alva B. Adams, Chairman - . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Pueblo (Third Congressional District)
Anna C. Petteys, Vice Chairman ..... Brush
(Member-at-Large)
Clarence D. Bliss (Second Congressional District)
Hugh E. Chastain $\begin{aligned} & \text { (Fourth Congressional District) }\end{aligned}$ Durango
Bernice S. Frieder ..... Denver
(First Congressional District)

#  

123－25－10，C．R．S．＇53．Duties of Commissioner and Special Assistant

It shall be the duty of the Commissioner and his Special Assistant ．．．．．to publish an annual report on pro－ gress of organization plans in the several counties on or before January l，1958，and each January 1 thereafter．

## Prepared by

Stanley A．Leftwich
Special Assistant to the Commissioner Director，Division of School District Organization

L．M．Hardin，Consultant

Elbie Gann，Assistant Commissioner Office of Administrative Services Colorado State Department of Education Denver 2，Colorado

## IETHER OT TRANSMITTAL

To Members of the Legislature:

The School District Organization Act of 1957, Chapter 237, Session Laws, 1957, invests several duties within the office of the State Commissioner of Education. Among these duties, Section 10 (3) specifically enjoins the commissioner and his special assistant "To publish an annual report of progress of organization plans in the several counties on or before January 1, 1958, and each January 1 thereafter."

In fulfillment of this duty as Commissioner of Education, I herewith submit the sixth annual report on progress in School District Reorganization as of January 1, 1963.

Respectfully submitted,


In the calendar year of 1962, Colorado's school district reorganization progress has moved ahead at about the same rate as previous years. The year began with 316 school districts in existence and ended with 263 , a reduction of 53 in the total number of districts, a decrease of $16.8 \%$.

Alamosa, Crowley, Costilla, Gunnison, Montrose, and Ouray Counties made significant progress in their reorganization efforts during the year.

Reorganizations were accomplished in part of Weld County.
Also, dissolutions and annexations were effected during the year in Alamosa (2), Conejos (3), Crowley (3), and Las Animas (2) Counties.

Arapahoe County had a successful plan election December 11, 1962, but the new district does not become effective until 1963.

Logan County was the only county losing a reorganization election this year.

CHRONOLOGICAL PROGRESS REPORT ON ELECTIONS AND DISSOLUTIONS AND ANNEXATIONS, January l, 1962 to December 31, 1962 UNDER PROVISIONS OF "THE SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1957"

| COUNTY | Name and Number of Dist. | Date of Elec. or Annex. | Re-organization | Diss. and Annex. | Election Results |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | For | Against |
| Alamosa and | 15 J | 2) 1/62 |  | X |  |  |
| Conejos | 4 | 2/ 1/62 |  | X |  |  |
| Crowley | 2 | 4/28/62 |  | X |  |  |
| Logan | Re-IJ | 4/30/62 | X |  | 561 | 1352 |
| Costilla | R-1 | 6/25/62 | X |  | 268 | 115 |
| Crowley | Re-1-J | 6/25/62 | X |  | 586 | 126 |
| Montrose | Re-IJ | 6/29/62 | X |  | 652 | 437 |
| Las Animas | 13 | 7/3/62 |  | X |  |  |
| Las Animas | 21 | 7/3/62 |  | X |  |  |
| Crowley | 7 | 7/23/62 |  | X |  |  |
| Conejos | 8 | 7/26/62 |  | X |  |  |
| Conejos | 18 | 8/30/62 |  | X |  |  |
| Conejos | 32 | 8/30/62 |  | X |  |  |
| Weld | $\mathrm{Re}-2$ | 10/2/62 | X |  | 190 | 79 |
| Weld | Re-9 | 10/2/62 | X |  | 429 | 217 |

## SUMMARY, MAY 1, 1957 to DECEMBER 31, 1962

Total Elections held 139
Total Elections Carried 105
Total Elections Failed
105 (75.55\%)
34
Total Reducation in Number of Districts
666 (71.70\%)

A county-by-county look at the present number of school districts compared with the number of school districts in May of 1957 is presented in the following table. The table also indicates where the county is completely reorganized. ( $R$ ) under conditions satisfactory to the conditions of the Act, or partially reorganized (PR). The counties are listed in accordance with their present number of districds from the counties with the highest number to those with the lowest number, and are listed alphabetically within the group having the same number of districts.

```
        COLORADO COUNTIES RANKED BY NUMBER
    OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
    (December 31, 1962)
```



In the Fifth Annual Report (1961), it was pointed out that only five counties having more than three districts in May of 1957 had not reduced their total number of school districts. Since then, two of these five counties -- Crowley and Costilla -- have completed their reorganizations, so that only three counties -- Montezuma, Morgan, and Sedgwick -- remain as such counties showing no reduction. Sedgwick County has submitted a reorganization plan to the Commissioner at the time of this writing. Sedgwick has also held two elections on reorganization plans, both of which lost by small margins.

Montezuma County has also lost two plan elections and was restrained by the District Court from holding a third election. More will be said about this county's litigation in a later section of this report.

Morgan County has not presented a reorganization plan as yet, although it has cooperated with neighboring counties in the development of districts joint with Morgan County. The present committee is proceeding carefully, leaning toward a three-district plan at the moment.

CHANGES IN NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY CLASSIFICATION
Since "The School District Organization Act of 1957" was passed, sweeping changes have occurred in the distribution of Colorado School districts among the three legal classifications.

The original measure of classification of school districts was school population (children ages $6-21$ resident within a school district). "First class" school districts had a school population of l,000 or more; "second class" school districts had a school population of more than 350 but less than 1,000; and "third class" districts had a school population of less than 350. The following table indicates strikingly how the
small third class school district dominated Colorado's educational system.

NUMBER OF COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY CLASS, 1935 and 1955

| YEAR | Third <br> Class | Second <br> Class | First <br> Class |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1935 | 1,930 | 89 | 36 |
| 1955 | 891 | 79 | 45 |

"The School District Organization Act of 1957 " provided that any new school district formed under its provisions should be a district of the "first class", regardless of the district's school population. In 1962, for the first time in Colorado's history, the number of "first class" school districts exceeded the number of "third class" districts. As a matter of fact, the number of "first class" districts exceeds the total of the other classes.

NUMBER OF COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY CLASS December 31, 1961 and December 31, 1962

| YEAR | Third <br> Class | Second <br> Class | First <br> Class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1961 | 144 | 28 | 134 |
| 1962 | 97 | 22 | 137 |
|  |  |  |  |

Note that County and Union high school districts are not included in this method of tabulation, as their "school population" has already been accounted for in their component elementary districts.

NON-OPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS
The non-operating school district remains a perennial, although gradually declining problem in Colorado's school district structure. At the close of the school year in 1956, there were 247 such nonoperating school districts. On December 31, 1962, there are 35. One reason for the persistency of the non-operating district is that each year some of the smaller elementary school districts of the state change their status from operating a school within their own boundaries to that of transporting their children and payment of tuition to neighboring districts more soundly established. The basic problem, therefore, is the small elementary school district, which gives rise to the non-operating district, rather than the non-operating district. Removal of the countywide 12 mill levy from the state school finance program has tended to restore a tax island advantage to the non-operating district.

It is significant, also, that the non-operating district tends to be associated with county and union high school district structure.

The following table clearly shows this relationship:
COUNTIES HAVING COUNTY OR UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND ASSOCIATED NON-OPERATING DISTRICTS

| COUNTY | Number of Non-Operating |
| :--- | :---: |
| Districts, $12 / 31 / 62$ |  |

Arapahoe 1
Garfield 8
Las Animas 4
Logan 3
Montezuma 3
Sedgwick
Total Non-Operating Districts in counties having County or Union High School Districts27

There are only two other counties in the state -- Weld and Morgan -having non-operating districts. Neither of them has county or union high school districts. They account for the other eight non-operating districts.

| COUNTY |  | Number of Non-Operating <br> Districts, |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 6 |
| Morgan <br> Weld |  | Dec. 31, 1962 |

COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICIS, UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS, and ELEMENTARY DISTRICTS

School District reorganization in Colorado has markedly reduced the number of county high school districts and union high school districts with the attendant elementary school districts. When the results of the Arapahoe County election of December 12, 1962 become effective February 11, 1963, Garfield County will be the only county left with union high school districts, and this county still has two -- the Rifle Union High School District and the Silt Union High School District. We have already noted that Garfield County alone accounts for almost $25 \%$ of the state's non-operating districts.

The basic weakness of the county or union high school district is its continuation of the compartmentalization of educational programs. The following table shows at a glance how such organizations fragment the educational resources of the counties still clinging to them. The results of the Arapahoe County election of December 12 are disregarded in this table.

| COUNTY | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Name of } \\ & \text { High School } \\ & \text { District } \end{aligned}$ | Elementary Districts <br> in County | Non-Operating Districts in County | Total of all Districts in County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arapahoe Garfield | Sheridan Union H.S. | 3 | 1 | 10 |
|  | Rifle Union H.S. |  |  |  |
|  | Silt Union H.S. | 3 | 8 | 16 |
| Las Animas | Las Animas County H.S. | 7 | 4 | 18 |
| Logan | Logan County H.S. | 8 | 3 | 15 |
| Montezuma | Montezuma County H.S. | 9 | 3 | 15 |
| Sedgwick | Sedgwick County H.S. | 4 | 8 | 14 |
| totais | 7 | 34 | 27 | 88 |

Thus, it can be seen that these six counties actually account for approximately one-third of all of the school districts of the state.

Actually, elimination of these county and union high school districts would go far toward developing a unified educational program in these areas. It is significant that the county school planning committees of these counties have unanimously agreed that they should be eliminated. The voters of these counties have apparently been swayed by other factors in rejecting the plans submitted to date by the committees.

ENROLLMENT OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
School board members of reorganized school districts who served on boards of smaller districts prior to reorganization generally report a feeling that the reorganized school district has more tools and more resources to carry on a satisfactory program of education.

A study of enrollments shows that the unreorganized counties generally tend to have numerous very small districts. It should be kept in mind that the average school districd of the state in December, 1962, enrolls approximately 1,600 children.

The totals of the 1962 enrollment table should be contrasted to the 1955-56 picture when 792 school districts of the state had small populations of less than 250 as compared with 124 similar districts in 1962. Of these enrollments, the eight counties of the state having more than 10 districts in December of 1962 should be examined separately.

## DISTRICT ENROLLMENT BY INIERVALS

| COUNTY | No. Dists. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non. } \\ & \text { Op. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 101- \\ & 250 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 751- \\ & 1000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1001- \\ & 1500 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1501- \\ & 2000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2001- \\ & 2500 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2501- \\ & 5000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Over } \\ & 5000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Las Animas | 18 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Weld | 18 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 3 | 5 | - | - | - | 1 |
| El Paso | 17 | - | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Garfield | 16 | 8 | 1 | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Logan | 15 | 3 | - | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Montezuma | 15 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Morgan | 14 | 6 | - | - | 2 | 3 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
| Sedgwick | 14 | 8 | 2 |  | - |  | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TOTALS | 127 | 34 | 10 | 9 | 16 | 22 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 |

These eight counties account for 127 of the 263 school districts of the state. These eight counties account for 91 of the 124 districts of the state enrolling less than 250 children.

These eight counties account for 34 of the 35 non-operating districts of the state.

These eight counties account for six of the seven special high school districts of the state.

These eight counties account for 34 of the 40 separate elementary districts of the state.

Seven of these eight county planning committees are developing plans for submission to their voters prior to the July l, 1963 end of their terms of office. To date, nothing has been heard of any plans to change the present situation in El Paso County.

AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION BY
THE COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The State Department of Education and more particularly the Division of School District Organization is beseiged by inquiries that point up certain areas in which legislation is urgently needed.

The Colorado General.Assembly is urgently requested to give favorable consideration to these areas of needed legislation.

## Appropriation for Expenses of County Cormittees

The county committees in the several counties that still have need of more planning to complete the reorganization of the school districts will require an adequate appropriation for 1963-64. Since the moneys appropriated for 1962-63 were for use to June 30 , 1963, the new committees to be formed July l, 1963 will have need for funds for election expenses, mileage of committee members, postage, secretarial help, publications, maps, and legal aid where necessary.

The amount included in the budget request for implementing the School District Organization Act of 1957 is an estimate of the amount needed for the continuation of the work for the 1963-64 fiscal year under the present statute. Should additional functions be added to the work of the County School Planning Committees or should other counties be required to form said committees, the appropriation should be increased.

Adjustments of Boundaries of Established School Districts
Since "The School District Organization Act of 1957" supersedes all other laws regarding the organization of school districts, there is presently no provision for the changing of district boundaries other
than complete reorganization under provisions of the above 1957 Act or by dissolution of entire districts under certain limiting conditions and annexation of the area to an adjacent district that meets certain conditions.

There is a definite need for some provision to make possible the adjustment of district boundaries.

The Colorado General Assembly should give consideration to such needs in the formulation of laws permitting such adjustments of district boundaries with carefully considered safeguards.

Uniform Effective Date for Denver Detachment and Annexation for School Purposes

The problem of detachment and annexation as is now developing in the Denver Metropolitan Area under procedures established under Article XX of the Colorado Constitution needs consideration. We do not intend here to question the need for Article XX. However, we do feel that there is a need to recognize the problems created by annexation for the Denver School District and its neighboring school districts. These areas are now the only areas of the state where careful planning involving the educational welfare of children does not precede school district boundary changes.

It would be helpful to establish an effective date for these annexations at the end of a school year. Thus, all boards of education involved would be in a better position to plan for the education of the children without upsetting the total program in the middle of the school year.

## Indian Reservation Problem

A serious problem for reorganization in Montezuma County is posed by the findings of the District Court in Civil Action No. 3418, (School District No. 29 vs. School Planning Committee of Montezuma County) in its holding that the County School Planning Committee does not have jurisdiction over the territory embraced by the Ute Mountain Indian Reservation. The court's findings are largely based upon the opinion of the Colorado Supreme Court in the case of "Whyte vs. District Court", 140 Colo. p. 335, and uses this language:
"The State of Colorado has no jurisdiction within such a reservation, unless the state shall, by affirmative legislative action; obligate and bind the state to assumption thereof. Colorado has not taken the steps mentioned in the statute which are essential prerequisites to jurisdiction in this case."

It is the recommendation of this report that the Colorado General Assembly take "affirmative legislative action" and clearly extend jurisdiction over the territory of Indian Reservations generally throughout the State of Colorado to County School Planning Committees, and also to clarify the powers of local boards of education to enter into contracts with the appropriate agencies and officials and perform any other acts necessary to enable Colorado School districts to provide education for children from Indian Reservations in the public schools of the State.

## Abolition of County and Union High School Districts

While the County and Union High School districts have in the past filled a definite need there is little justification presently for this type of organization. So far as is known, there is no recognized research or body of professional opinion that defends separate school
districts for high school purposes only, except in densely populated areas for regional vocational programs.

The relationship of the County and Union High School districts to the continuation of separate elementary districts and the persistence of the great majority of the non-operating districts is clearly emphasized on pages 6 and 7 of this report. Twenty-seven of the thirty-five non-operating school districts presently existing are within the areas of the seven county and union high school districts.

We would strongly urge legislation that would abolish the county and union high school districts.

## Repeal of Inoperative Statutes

Since the enactment of "The School District Organization Act of $1957^{\prime \prime}$ made inoperative several statutes that were previously used as methods of organizing new school districts, changing boundaries of school districts, and combining existing school districts those statutes were in effect repealed by implication. There is always a state of confusion when statutes that are no longer operative remain on the books.

These several statutes should be specifically repealed and the provisions of the 1957 Act broadened to permit the necessary changes in school district boundaries.

，
$\because$

