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## Letter of Transmittal

To Members of the Legislature：
The School District Organization Act of 1957. Chapter 237，Session Laws，1957，invests several du－ ties within the office of the State Commissioner of Education．Among these duties，Section 10 （3）spe－ cifically enjoins the commissioner and his special as－ sistant＂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 seventh annual re－ port on progress in School District Reorganization as of January 1． 1964.

Respectfully submitted，
Byron W．Hansford，
Commissioner of Education

During the calendar year of 1963， the number of school districts in Col－ orado was reduced from 263 to 222. This reduction of 41 districts repre－ sents a decrease of 15.6 percent．

A chronological progress report on reorganization changes effective，to－ gether with dissolutions and annexa－ tions，January 1， 1963 to December 31，1963，under provisions of The School District Organization Act of 1957，is shown in Table I at the right．
（It should be noted that the Arap－ ahoe County election was held in 1962，but the effective date of the new district fell in 1963．）

[^0]
## Table I

Chronological Progress Report for 1963
Changes Through Reorganization，Dissolutions and Annexations Colorado School Districts
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\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Arapahoe Sedgwick} \& 2 \& 12－11－62 \& 2－11－63 \& ．．．．．．．．．．．． \& X \& \& 221 \& 57 <br>
\hline \& Re 1 \& 3－7－63 \& 5．6－63 \& ．．．．．．．．．．．． \& X \& \& 409 \& 53 <br>
\hline \& Re 3 \& 3－7－63 \& 5－6－63 \& \& X \& \& 185 \& 114 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Montezuma Garfield} \& Re 4A \& 4－2－63 \& 6－3－63 \& ．．．．．．．．．．． \& X \& ．．．－ \& 240 \& 20 <br>
\hline \& Re－2 \& 5－13－63 \& 7－15－63 \& \& X \& \& 391 \& 104 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Montezuma
Las Animas} \& $\boldsymbol{R e} 1$ \& 5－14－63 \& 7－16－63 \& ．．．．．．．．．． \& X \& \& 379 \& 322 <br>
\hline \& \& 5－28－63 \& \& \& X \& \& 419 \& 826 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{6}{*}{Morgan Montezuma} \& 6 \& \& ．．． \& 6－27－63 \& ．．．． \& X \& \& <br>
\hline \& 1 \& ．．．．．． \& ．．．．．．．．．．． \& 8－5－63 \& ．．． \& X \& ．．．．． \& ．．．．． <br>
\hline \& Re 4 \& ．．．．．．．． \& ．．．．．．．．． \& 8－5－63 \& ．．．． \& X \& \& ．．．．．． <br>
\hline \& 11 \& ．．．．．．．．．．．． \& ．．．．．．．．．．．． \& 8．5－63 \& ．．．． \& X \& ．．．．．． \& ．．．．． <br>
\hline \& 27 \& ．．．．．．．．．．．． \& ．．．．．．．．．．． \& 8－5－63 \& ．．．． \& X \& ．．．．．． \& <br>
\hline \& 10 \& \& \& 9－3．63 \& ．．．． \& X \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

## Summary

May 1, 1957 to December 31, 1963
$\begin{array}{lrrr}\text { Total elections held } & 146 & \\ \text { Total elections carried } & 111 & (76.03 \%) \\ \text { favorably } & 35 & (23.97 \%) \\ \begin{array}{lrl}\text { Total elections failed } \\ \text { Total reduction in number } \\ \text { of districts }\end{array} & 707 & (76.10 \%)\end{array}$
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 Table II at the right. The table also indicates where the county is completely reorganized ( R ) under conditions presently satisfactory to the requirements of the Act, or partially reorganized (PR). The counties are listed in accordance with their present number of districts 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.
In the Sixth Annual Report (1962) it was pointed out that only three counties in the state needing reorganization had failed to reduce their number of districts since passage of The School District Organization Act of 1957. In 1963, these three counties - Montezuma, Morgan, and Sedgwick - showed progress, Montezuma and Sedgwick completing their reorganizations, and Morgan County accomplishing dissolution and annexation of one of its non-operating districts. Senate Bill 315, passed by the 1963 session of the Colorado General Assembly, clarified state jurisdiction over Indian reservations and federally controlled properties for school district purposes, and materially assisted Montezuma County reorganization,

## Non-Operating School Districts

There were 35 non-operating school districts in Colorado on December 31, 1962. In 1963, the number was reduced to 14 . At the time of this report, there are only four counties in the state having non-operating school districts.
$\left.\begin{array}{lc} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Non-Operating } \\ \text { December }\end{array} \\ \text { COUNTY } & \text { Districts }\end{array}\right) 1963$

Table II

## Colorado Counties

Ranked by Number of School Districts
(December 31, 1963)

|  | COUNTY | No. <br> Dists. <br> 12-31-63 | No. Dists. 5-1-57 |  | COUNTY | No. Dists. 12-31-63 | No. Dists. 5-1-57 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PR | Las Animas | 18 | 46 | R | Huerfano | 2 | 26 |
| PR | Weld | 18 | 78 | R | Kiowa | 2 | 10 |
| PR | El Paso | 17 | 22 | R | Montrose | 2 | 20 |
| PR | Logan | 15 | 25 | R | Ouray | 2 | 2 |
|  | Morgan | 13 | 14 | R | Park |  | 14 |
| PR | Adams | 7 | 19 | R | Phillips | 2 | 13 |
| PR | Arapahoe | 7 | 16 | PR | Pueblo | 2 |  |
| R | Kit Carson | 6 | 15 | R | Rio Blanco | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
| PR | Otero | 6 | 15 | R | Sedgwick | 2 | 13 |
| R | Baca | 5 | 27 | R | Teller | 2 | 8 |
| PR | Elbert | 5 | 8 | R | Yuma | 2 | 27 |
| PR | Lincoln | 5 | 20 | R | Archuleta | 1 | 1 |
| PR | Washington | 5 | 29 | R | Clear Creek | 1 | 7 |
| PR | Conejos | 4 | 17 | R | Crowley | 1 | 9 |
| R | Prowers | 4 | 35 | R | Custer | 1 | 2 |
| R | Cheyenne | 3 | 7 | R | Delta | 1 | 1 |
| PR | Fremont | 3 | 22 | R | Denver | 1 | 1 |
| PR | Garfield | 3 | 25 | R | Dolores | , | 9 |
| R | La Plata | 3 | 15 | R | Douglas | 1 | 17 |
| R | Larimer | 3 | 31 | R | Eagle | 1 | 15 |
| PR | Mesa | 3 | 3 | R | Gilpin | 1 | 7 |
| R | Montezuma | 3 | 15 | R | Gunnison | 1 | 22 |
| R | Rio Grande | 3 | 3 | R | Hinsdale | 1 | $\frac{7}{7}$ |
| R | Routt | 3 | 29 | R | Jackson | 1 | 7 |
| R | Saguache | 3 | 5 | R | Jefferson | 1 | 1 |
| PR | San Miguel | 3 | 7 | R | Lake | 1 | 6 |
| R | Alamosa | 2 | 12 | R | Mineral | I | , |
| R | Bent | 2 | 17 | R | Moffat | , | 23 |
| R | Boulder | 2 | 29 | R | Pitkin | $!$ | $?$ |
| R | Chaffee | 2 | 14 | R | San Juan | 1 | 1 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\mathbf{R} & \text { Costilla } \\ \mathbf{R} & \text { Grand }\end{array}$ |  | 2 | 12 | R | Summit | 1 | 8 |
|  |  | TOTALS |  |  | 222 | 929 |

R-Reorganized (46); PR-Partially Reorganized (16); Needing reorganization but no successful elections under 123-25 (1).

At the time of this writing, Weld County's School Planning Committee is scheduling elections and otherwise making arrangements which would, if successful, eliminate its two non-operating school districts.

## County and Union High School Districts

The Arapahoe and Garfield County elections were significant in that their favorable conclusions resulted in dissolution of the last three union high school districts of the state.
Successful elections in Sedgwick and Montezuma Counties dissolved two of the four county high school dis-
tricts, so that there are only two special high school districts remaining Las Animas County High School District and Logan County High School District.

The districts comprising Las Animas County High School District were involved in a reorganization plan which also included the Trinidad School District and the Hoehne Reorganized School District in a unified proposal which was rejected by the voters on May 28, 1963. This was the only unsuccessful reorganization election of 1963.

The Logan County High School District was included in a reorganizil-
tion plan proposed for hearings by the Logan County School Planning Committee. However, when H.B. 475 passed by the Forty-Fourth General Assembly was vetoed by the Governor, the Logan County School Planning Committee did not pursue this plan, even to the hearing stage.

Las Animas County High School District currently encompasses four non-operating districts, seven operating elementary districts, and the high school district operating one high school at Sopris.

Logan County High School District currently encompasses three nonoperating districts, eight operating elementary districts, and high school branches operating at Crook, Iliff, Padroni, and Sterling.
Thus, these two county high school districts account for 24 of Colorado's 222 school districts.

|  | High | Operating <br> Elemool <br> Elantary | Non- <br> Operating |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | District <br> Districts |  |  |
| Listricts |  |  |  |

Operating Elementary Districts
Five counties of the state have a total of 21 school districts which operate schools which provide education in elementary grades only.


Unified Districts
All other counties and school districts now maintain programs of education grades one through twelve, or kindergarten through twelve, under unified school administration.

Table III shows the complete picture by counties of the number of school districts and their kinds of organization.

Current Committee Activity
June 30, 1963 was the date of termination of office for members of the third county school planning committees elected since the passage of The School District Organization Act of

Table III
Colorado School Districts
Kinds of Organization by County

| COUNTY | No. of Unified (1-12 or K-12) School Districts | Operating <br> Elementary <br> (1-8) <br> Districts | County H. S. (9-12) Districts | Non- <br> Operating <br> School <br> Districts | TOTAI. <br> School Districts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Adams | 7 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alamosa | 2 | ...... | ..... | ...... | 2 |
| Arapahoe | 7 | ...... | ...... | .... | 7 |
| Archuleta | 1 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| Baca | 5 | ..... | ...... | ...... | 5 |
| Bent | 2 | ...... | ...... | ... | 2 |
| Boulder | 2 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 2 |
| Chaffee | 2 | ... | ...... | ...... | 2 |
| Cheyenne | 3 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 3 |
| Clear Creek | 1 | .... | $\ldots$ | ...... | 1 |
| Conejos | 4 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 4 |
| Costilla | 2 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 2 |
| Crowley | 1 | ...... | $\ldots$ | ...... | 1 |
| Custer | 1 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| Delta | 1 | ...... | ...... | ..... | 1 |
| Denver | 1 | ...... | ...... | .... | 1 |
| Dolores | 1 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| Douglas | 1 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| Eagle | 1 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| Elbert | 5 | $\cdots$ | ... | ...... | 5 |
| El Paso | 16 | 1 | ...... | ...... | 17 |
| Fremont | 3 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 3 |
| Garfield | 3 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 3 |
| Gilpin | 1 | ...... | ..... | ...... | 1 |
| Grand | 2 | ...... | ...... | . | 2 |
| Gunnison | 1 | ...... | ...... | $\ldots$ | 1 |
| Hinsdale | 1 | ...... | --.... | $\ldots$ | 1 |
| Huerfano | 2 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 2 |
| Jackson | 1 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| Jefferson | 1 | ...,.. | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| Kiowa | 2 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 2 |
| Kit Carson | 6 | ...... | ...... | ..... | 6 |
| Lake | 1 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| La Plata | 3 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 3 |
| Larimer | 3 | ..... | -.... | $\ldots$ | 3 |
| Las Animas | 6 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 18 |
| Lincoln | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |
| Logan | 3 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 15 |
| Mesa | 3 | $\ldots$ | ...... | ...... | 3 |
| Mineral | 1 | ...... | ...... | .. | 1 |
| Moffat | 1 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| Montezuma | 3 | ...... | ...... | .. | 3 |
| Montrose | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Morgan | 6 | 2 | -..... | 5 | 13 |
| Otero | 6 | ..... | ..... | ...... | 6 |
| Ouray | 2 | ..... | ...... | ...... | 2 |
| Park | 2 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 2 |
| Phillips | 2 | ...... | ...... | $\cdots$ | 2 |
| Pitkin | 1 | ...... | ...... | . | 1 |
| Prowers | 4 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 4 |
| Pueblo | 2 | ...... | .-.... | ...... | 2 |
| Rio Blanco |  | ...... | ...... | ...... | 2 |
| Rio Grande | 3 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 3 |
| Routt | 3 | ...... | ...... | ..... | 3 |
| Saguache | 3 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 3 |
| San Juan | 1 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| San Miguel |  | ...... | ...... | ...... | 3 |
| Sedgwick | 2 | ...... | ...... | - | 2 |
| Summit | 1 | ..... | ...... | ...... | 1 |
| Teller | 2 | ...... | ...... | ...... | 2 |
| Washington | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |
| Weld | 13 | 3 | ..... | 2 | 18 |
| Yuma | 2 | ..... | ...... | .... | 2 |
| TOTAL | 185 | 21 | 2 | 14 | 222 |

1957. Having reviewed the organizational status of the school districts of the respective counties, the Commissioner of Education requested establishment of school planning committees in the following 18 counties:
1958. Adams
1959. Arapahoe
*10. Lincoln
1960. Logan
1961. Mesa
1962. Morgan
1963. Otero
*15. Ouray
*16. Pueblo
1964. San Miguel

8 Garfield
18. Weld
9. Las Animas

All of these counties have complied with the request and have elected and organized their committees. The five counties marked with asterisks (*) have previously completed reorganizations within their own counties, but have territory joint with other counties which have not completed reorganizations. Existence of these committees is required under Sections $4(8)(\mathrm{h})$ and 14 of The School District Organization Act of 1957.

Three of these "stand-by" commit-tees-Dolores, Ouray, and Pueblohave been engaged in activities somewhat more ambitious, however.

The Dolores County Committee has cooperated with Montezuma County in annexing to the Dolores County School District Re No. 1 the "Sago" area of northwest Montezuma County because of geographic considerations. Some study is also being made in this committee of the relationship between the Rico vicinity and Dolores.

The Ouray County Committee is giving some study to the possible interrelationships between Ridgway and Ouray and particularly the separate status of the two high schools of that county.

The Pueblo County Committee is studying the possibility of adjusting the boundary lines between Pueblo City School District No. 60 and Pueblo County Rural School District No. 70. Two alternates are under consideration: (1) The detachment from the Rural District of the northwest portion of that district and its annexation to the City District, and (2) The possible complete consolidation of the two districts into a single unit. Minor changes in the boundary line between

Pueblo County Rural School District and the Fowler District are also being studied.

The major work in reorganization is taking place in counties where reorganization has not generally been completed.

Weld County is holding elections on three plans January 9 which would reorganize the northeast portion of that county into three districts having Briggsdale, New Raymer-Stoneham, and Grover as their centers. The Weld County Committee has also negotiated with Morgan County for the dissolution and annexation of the Masters District No. 71 to the Wiggins District No. 50 J of Morgan and Weld Counties.

The Adams County Committee has thus far assisted in a detachment and annexation proceeding between Districts 12 and 50.

The Elbert County Committee is studying a plan with a view to possible presentation this spring which would unite Kiowa and Elizabeth into one new school district.

The Garfield County Committee is reviewing the problem yet remaining in the west end of that county. This situation also involves Mesa County.

Las Animas County is currently studying the possible reorganization of the unreorganized territory of that county, and is also studying the county high school situation.

Logan County Committee has agreed that it will prepare a plan for the unreorganized portion of that county, currently debating whether there should be one or more than one district in the final plan.

Morgan County's committee is proceeding carefully with a study of the present school situation in the county The Hillrose District has shown considerable interest in closing its high school. Several of the families of that district are already sending their children to the high school in Brush. As was already pointed out, this committee has cooperated with the Weld County Committee in work on the Masters-Wiggins Districts.

Committees in the other counties are organized and have begun their work. Experience has shown that the most productive efforts of the committees come in their second year of
their two-year term of office.

## Detachment and Annexation

In its 1963 Session, the Colorado General Assembly amended The School District Organization Act of 1957 to permit minor adjustments of school district boundaries. The applications of the law were restricted to (1) school districts which were reorganized under the 1949 or the 1957 act, and (2) school districts having over 1500 student population.

Thus far, provisions of this amendment have been successfully and satisfactorily used in Logan, Adams, and El Paso counties. Inquiries indicate that more use will be made of these provisions. The main problem presenting itself thus far, as exemplified by the case in El Paso County, is the matter of bond leveling within the annexed area. The territory in question retains its liability for its share of the bonded indebtedness lying against it in its former districts and also becomes liable for a share of the bonded indebtedness of the district to which it is annexed. There is feeling in this case that the annexed area, being already liable, should not also assume a further indebtedness through annexation.

Annexations to the Denver School District continue to be a problem. Long and involved litigation seems to be a concomitant of many of these instances. The College View Annexation to Denver of March 17, 1962 is the most recent problem of a serious nature. Here, on November 8, 1963. the County Court of Arapahoe County declared this annexation void on the basis that the total legal signatures required by law in the instance of this petition represented less than 50 percent of the unincorporated area proposed to be annexed when streets, alleys, and roads which constitute about 17 percent of the area were taken into consideration. Many problems for present and future educational services of the area are thus posed.

It becomes increasingly apparent that careful study of the educational effects of annexation upon the annexing area, as well as upon the area from which the detachment occurs, is necessary in order to safeguard the educational welfare of the children it. the Denver fringe areas.

SCHOOL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES OF COLORADO



[^0]:    Summary of 1963 Actions
    Total reorganization elections： 7
    Elections with favorable results：
    Dissolutions and annexations：

