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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Reorganization of school districts of Iowa has been an important concern of the people of Iowa. The 1965 Legislative session of the General Assembly brought about many new rules and regulations directing school districts' compliance. One of the new regulations had a direct bearing upon the De Soto Consolidated School District. Iowa Public Law, number 275.1, Code of Iowa, 1962, and amended by Senate File 190 in 1965 directed that non-high school districts be attached to a district or districts maintaining twelve grades. De Soto Consolidated school district has at the present time kindergarten through eighth grade and must on July 1, 1966, become part of one or more of the surrounding school districts.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to: (1) analyze the past attempts of reorganization by the De Soto board, and the procedures used in these attempts; (2) show the relationship of these past attempts with the present attempt to reorganize with the Adel Community school district; (3) show what gains would be made...
by a successful reorganization to both the Adel and De Soto school districts; and (4) show a comparative analysis of the Winterset, Van Meter, Earlham, and Adel school districts.

**Importance of the study.** Within the past fifty years the state of Iowa has advocated the enlargement of the school districts in Iowa, either by consolidation or reorganization. Within these fifty years, Iowa has undergone a considerable amount of change from the one-room schools, to the small consolidated school districts of the 1920 to 1930 era, to the reorganized community school districts in evidence today.

While the majority of Iowa communities have reorganized their schools into community school districts, there remained a considerable number of school districts that chose to remain as consolidated school districts. These consolidated school districts have, because of more demanding regulations by the State Department of Public Instruction, been forced into a position of being unable to provide an economically sound educational program. In an attempt to provide a better educational program, some school districts have closed their high schools and have sent these students to other schools on a tuition basis. The De Soto Consolidated school district is one of these districts.

With the new school regulations enacted by the 1965 General Assembly becoming effective on July 1, 1966, it was
decided by the De Soto board of education to attempt a reorganization with the Adel Community school district, rather than to wait until June 1, 1966, to be split according to the county plans adopted in 1958 by Madison and Dallas counties.

The De Soto Consolidated School District has maintained that it would like to remain as an independent school district as long as possible. Curriculum requirements by the State Department have necessitated a change in their way of thinking. In 1961, the De Soto board of education decided the most economical way for them to proceed was to send their high school students on a tuition basis to one of the districts that border the De Soto district. By an informal vote of the community it was decided by the board of education that the Adel Community School District would be the district to which most, or all, of the high school students would attend. The board of education did make allowances for those families that so desired to go to other districts to do so. During the 1965-66 school year the De Soto district had forty-one students attending Adel, three going to Earlham, two to Van Meter, and one going to Winterset.

In this study an attempt was made to evaluate the four school districts that bordered the De Soto district in terms of area and population, finance, curriculum, educational staffs, and transportation. This evaluation was made
from school records submitted to the State Department of
Public Instruction for the 1964-65 and 1965-66 school years.
In this evaluation an attempt was made to determine the
school district that would have the most desirable character-
istics for joining.

Limitations of the problem. The study was limited in
the search for information about past reorganization attempts,
due to the lack of information contained in the minutes of
the meetings of the board of education. Unless an actual
motion was made during the course of the board meeting, very
little information was included. An example of this may
illustrate this limitation. "Special meeting was held to
discuss Adel's invitation to De Soto to discuss school
reorganization." Other than two items of regular business,
nothing more was included in the minutes to show what was
discussed, or any proposals toward reorganization that were
made at this meeting.

James Troutman, who is now president of the board of
education, and has been a member of the board of education
for the past twelve years furnished much of the information
that is contained in this study. Troutman, after looking
over the information contained in the minutes of the meet-

---

Minutes of meeting of De Soto Board of Education,
Figure 1. School districts surrounding the Adel and De Soto School Districts.
ings of the board of education elaborated on what had transpired during the meetings.

Scope of the problem. The study included ways to proceed after reorganization had taken place, and ways to proceed in the event reorganization was not approved and the county boards of education were to divide the district according to the county plans of 1958.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Consolidation of schools. Consolidation of schools is "Usually defined as the abandonment of one or more attendance units and the bringing of their pupils together into a larger attendance unit; a single attendance unit is the chief characteristic of a consolidated school."

Consolidated school district. Consolidated school district is "A term limited in some states to districts, usually rural, maintaining a single attendance unit while in other states it applies to any school district serving territory once served by two or more districts."

School reorganization. School reorganization is "(1) a change in the internal organization of a school, as

---

2 Ibid., p. 182.
from the eight-four plan to the six-three-three; (2) a change in the geographic area included in an attendance area or administrative unit."1

III. PROCEDURES

The following procedures were used in this study:

1. A survey was made of the records of the board of education of the De Soto Consolidated School District, in an attempt to locate and evaluate the past attempts of the district to reorganize. This survey was also instrumental in finding the information about the past history of the De Soto Consolidated School District.

2. An investigation and evaluation was made of the records of the State Department of Public Instruction of the four school districts that bordered the De Soto district. The investigation used the following criteria for basis of evaluation.
   a. Area and population
   b. Finance
   c. Curriculum
   d. Educational Staffs
   e. Transportation

3. The data collected from the survey of the records of the board of education of the De Soto district,

---

1 Ibid., p. 459.
the investigation and evaluation of bordering school districts were reported.

The present De Soto Consolidated School District consists of the combination of the De Soto Independent School District, of De Soto, and four rural school districts of the surrounding areas. These five school districts were combined into the De Soto Consolidated School District in the spring of 1971. Construction was begun in the fall of 1921 of the present building site. The building was completed in the spring of 1923, and was dedicated on March 7, 1923. The building was first used with the starting of the 1923-24 school year.

The building, since its completion in 1923, has been the only attendance center for the De Soto Consolidated School District, and was used for all grades from kindergarten through high school. The district maintained this arrangement until the advent of the federal school program, at that time the federal government helped support the department of public instruction, and in effect to cut the per-pupil costs at the high schools, closed the high school, and sent the ninth through twelfth-grade students to the high schools of the surrounding communities on a tuition basis.

The board of education, in an effort to let the public have a voice in where they would like their children
CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF DE SOTO CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT

The present De Soto Consolidated School District consists of the combination of the De Soto Independent School District, of De Soto, and four rural school districts of the surrounding areas. These five school districts were combined into the De Soto Consolidated School District in the spring of 1921. Construction was begun in the fall of 1921 of the present building site. The building was completed in the spring of 1923, and was dedicated on March 7, 1923. The building was first used with the starting of the 1923-24 school year.

The building, since its completion in 1923, has been the only attendance center for the De Soto Consolidated School District, and was used for all grades from kindergarten through high school. The district maintained this arrangement until the start of the 1961-62 school year. At that time the district, due to increasingly heavy demands by the Department of Public Instruction, and an effort to cut the per-pupil costs in the high school, closed the high school, and sent the ninth through twelfth grade students to the high schools of the surrounding communities on a tuition basis. In 1985, the Code of Iowa, directed the county superintendent of schools to accept those that desired.

The board of education, in an effort to let the public have a voice in where they would like their children
to go to high school, held a general meeting, open to the public, to determine the high school students were to be designated to attend. 143 persons were in attendance at the meeting, and a "straw" vote was taken. 80 per cent of those in attendance voted on the Adel Community School District as their choice of high school for their children to attend.

The board of education then made arrangements, on the basis of the vote of the community, with the Adel Community School District to take the high school students on a tuition basis. As there had been 20 per cent of the people in attendance at the general meeting who were opposed to the Adel district, arrangements were also made with the Earlham, Winterset, and Van Meter school districts to accept those that desired to attend those districts. During the 1961-62 school year thirty-five pupils, representing 92 per cent of those eligible, attended the Adel Community high school, and one pupil attended each of the other three districts that arrangements had been made with.

Since 1961 over 90 per cent of the high school aged children of the De Soto district have attended the Adel high school. In the 1965-66 school year forty-two students, representing 93 per cent of the high school aged children attended the Adel high school.

In 1958, the Code of Iowa, directed the county superintendents to adopt a county plan of consolidation and reorganization. Under this plan school districts with fewer
than 500 pupils in attendance were to tentatively be placed into school districts of more than 500 in enrollment. The De Soto district, at that time, had approximately 200 students in attendance from kindergarten through high school.

The Dallas County superintendent asked the De Soto board of education their preference of school district for assignment. The county superintendent stated that, "The selection of the district to be assigned to was really unimportant, and that nothing would ever cause the selection to go into effect." The De Soto board of education expressed a desire, at that time, to remain as a consolidated school district, but if this were impossible for the district to be divided as follows:

The south half of the west side would be joined with the Earlham Community school district. The Winterset Community school district would have taken the south fourth of the east side of the school district, and the Adel Community school district would have been allotted the remaining portion of the De Soto district. The town of De Soto, along with the present building would have been in the area allotted to the Adel school district.

Long range reorganization studies were begun in February of 1958. At that time committees were organized to study the various aspects of the county plans in regards to proposed reorganization with the surrounding school districts.

---

1 Statement to De Soto Board of Education, January, 1958, by Lloyd Godfrey, Dallas County Superintendent of Schools.

2 County Plan adopted 1958 by Dallas County.
Figure 2. County plan of Dallas and Madison Counties for De Soto Consolidated District, Adopted 1958.
On March 6, 1958, the Adel-De Soto study committee proposed a unit similar to that of the petitions of 1960 and 1965, in that, the high school and elementary would be housed in Adel, with the junior high being in the De Soto building. The high school curriculum would follow the curricula of the combined schools at the time of the study.

On April 15, 1958, another study committee reported. This committee had been working on a merger of the De Soto-Van Meter school districts. Their conclusions were that the curriculum of the two school districts should remain as was already in existence with an addition of a foreign language and an art course. The committee further proposed that the Van Meter building be utilized as a junior and senior high school, with the De Soto building being used for the elementary unit.

Richard N. Smith, the Regional Consultant of the State Department of Public Instruction, visited the De Soto school on November 12, 1958. The purpose of his visit was to approve the school district as a certified school for purposes of receiving state aid. In a letter to the board of education of the De Soto school he stated:

Mr. Janssen informed me that the board is studying reorganization. This is good. While you are attempting to care for the non-academically talented with your remedial program, little can be done in a school such as yours for those who are academically talented. I am sure you are aware of the limitations of your educational program otherwise you would not be studying reorganization. To provide a broad educational
program a school must have human resources as well as financial resources.

Long range study of reorganization is highly recommended. I understand you have been looking into various possibilities for the past year. The board should keep in mind however that the children presently in school are being handicapped by an inadequate high school program. This statement is not meant to hurry you into an ill-advised reorganization. The board should do all that is possible to combine your district with one permanent in nature.

I am recommending that the De Soto Consolidated school be approved for the present 1958-59 school year and for the coming year. Beyond that it is doubtful that your school can be approved. This should give you adequate time to complete your study.

I would again like to emphasize that in reorganizing your school into a more effective and efficient unit, that the board do all that it can to avoid facing the same problem in three to five years. I am sure you can see the advantages of a unit such that will not be considered too small five or six years from now.

In March of 1959 the board of education of the Adel Community School District invited the De Soto board of education to attend a special meeting to discuss a possible reorganization of the two districts. The invitation was also extended to all other neighboring school districts. The meeting was attended by the De Soto Board of Education, but nothing was done to proceed with a possible merger of the school districts at that time.

On March 7, 1960, the board of education of the Van Meter school district visited the regular monthly meeting of the board of education, and made a proposal for a possible reorganization of the school districts. The board should remember that the same quality level could be maintained at lower cost, or an improved level for the same cost.

Letter to Board of Education of De Soto School by Richard N. Smith, Regional Consultant of the State Department of Public Instruction, January 11, 1959.
the De Soto board. The Van Meter board proposed a merger of the Van Meter and De Soto school districts. Their proposal followed the general lines of the study committees reports made on April 15, 1958.

On March 14, 1960, in a special board meeting, the De Soto Board of Education rejected the proposal of the Van Meter board and elected to proceed with a possible reorganization with the Adel Community School District.

In August of 1960, a reorganization study by Dr. William Dreier and Dr. Howard Knutson of the Iowa State Teachers College was undertaken. Lloyd Godfrey, the Dallas County Superintendent of Schools was instrumental in having the survey taken for a possible consolidation of the existing school districts of the southern part of Dallas County.

The reorganization study was of the Adel, Dallas Center, De Soto, Van Meter, and Waukee school districts.

The summary and recommendations of Dr. Dreier and Dr. Knutson were:

The proposed district would have sufficient financial resources to provide a central high school, and would be able to recover bonding capacity quite rapidly for the eventual erection of centralized junior high school facilities within ten years. Present facilities would be fully utilized, reducing the need for new buildings. Cost of operation would not be excessive, but would depend upon decisions made by the new district. Gain in efficiency should more than offset increased transportation costs, so that the same quality level could be maintained at lower costs, or an improved level for the same cost. It is strongly recommended that improvement in quality be given priority, for this after all should
be the basic motivation for school district reorganization.

1. None of the school districts of the area as presently constituted are of sufficient size to be able to offer efficiently adequate programs of education.

2. None of the school districts of the area have adequate physical facilities for the demands of a quality program of education.

3. Reorganization of the area into one school district would involve approximately 2,000 pupils, with a slowly increasing school population during the next five to ten years.

4. The school district would have sufficient financial ability to erect a central high school for approximately 600 pupils, enabling the component districts to provide elementary and junior high school facilities by utilization of present buildings.

5. Cost of operation of a reorganized district would not be excessive, actual cost depending on decisions made by duly elected board of education.

6. Improved educational programs should characterize all educational levels (kindergarten through Grade 12) in all parts of the reorganized district as resources and facilities improve.

7. Transportation would not be a major problem for the reorganized district. A recommended plan would be for busses to begin loading near the periphery of the district, and picking up high school pupils only, proceed in as direct a route as possible to the location of the central high school. After discharging loads of high school pupils, the same busses would proceed out toward the elementary and junior high school attendance centers, picking up pupils enroute. Auxiliary busses would be needed for this stage. In the evening the process would be reversed, busses leaving the elementary and junior high school attendance centers first, then taking high school pupils home last. This plan would have two advantages:

a. High school pupils could have a longer school day without forcing elementary pupils into the same schedule, which would be for young pupils an overly long school day.

b. Experience indicated that cost of operation would be less, in spite of some
duplication of routes, because total investment in busses would be much less. It has been found that reorganization into larger school districts has generally resulted in shorter bus rides for the children.

Through a joint meeting of the Adel-De Soto Boards of Education on September 21, 1960, it was decided to go ahead with a proposed reorganization, and to secure the legal services of Curtis W. Gregory, attorney, to represent the Adel-De Soto, Dallas and Madison School Districts, Iowa, petition the decision of the two boards at the county hearing.

The petitions prepared by Gregory were signed by 211 people from the De Soto district, and by 495 people from the Adel district. This represented 33 per cent of the eligible voters within the two districts.

At the hearing on November 21, 1960, fifty-three written objections were presented, of which, only thirty-one were residents, with only ten children in school. This represented 1.447 per cent of the entire eligible voters of the two districts. Since none of the objections was from the Adel district, this figure represented 8.7 per cent of the eligible voters of the De Soto district.

The county board of education of Dallas and Madison Counties ruled on November 21, 1960, that:

The county plan of 1958 should be upheld with the south fourth of the east half set aside from the

---

1 Reorganization Study of Adel, Dallas Center, De Soto, Van Meter, and Waukee School areas by Dr. William Dreier and Dr. Howard Knutson, Iowa State Teachers College, August, 1960.

petition to the Winterset school district, and that the land south of the Madison County line and west of U. S. Highway 169 be set aside to the Earlham school district.\(^1\)

On November 28, 1960, the board of education of the De Soto Consolidated School District held a special meeting. At this meeting the following action was taken:

It was moved by Arthur Wright, and seconded by Peter Lienemann, that the De Soto Consolidated school district of De Soto, Iowa, appeal the decision of the County Boards of Education of Dallas and Madison Counties, Iowa, made on November 21, 1960, with reference to the proposed consolidation of the said De Soto Consolidated School District and the Adel Community School District, of Adel, Iowa.\(^2\)

Curtis W. Gregory, attorney for the Adel and De Soto school districts filed an appeal with the State Department of Public Instruction on the twentieth of December, 1960. Date for the hearing before the State Department of Public Instruction was set for February 10, 1961.

The State Department of Public Instruction upheld the decision of the Dallas and Madison County Boards of Education. The State Superintendent of Schools ruled that: "Upholding the present county plans should be mandatory by the State Department of Public Instruction."\(^3\)

---

\(^1\)Ruling of Dallas and Madison County Boards of Education, November 21, 1960.

\(^2\)Minutes of meeting of De Soto Board of Education, November 28, 1960.

\(^3\)Paul Johnston, State Department of Public Instruction, February 15, 1961.
On March 6, 1961, the joint boards of education of the Adel and De Soto School Districts decided to go ahead with the voting on the proposed reorganization, as amended by the Dallas and Madison County Boards of Education, and upheld by the State Department of Public Instruction.

Notice of the vote was published in the Dallas County News on March 15, 1961, and the vote was held on the twenty-seventh of March, 1961.

The voting resulted in the failure of the reorganization attempt to be completed. Out of a total of 619 votes cast, 552 persons voted "NO" against the petition as amended by the county boards of education. A breakdown of the voting was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>De Soto</th>
<th>Adel</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoiled</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The defeat of the petition, by a vote of the people on March 27, 1961, brought an end to the reorganization attempts of the De Soto School District until the present reorganization attempt, which was begun on July 8, 1965.

The legislation passed by the Sixty-first General Assembly
started the De Soto district toward another reorganization attempt.

Iowa Public Law, number 275.1, Code 1962, and amended by Senate File 190 in 1965, dealing with "All area in high school district an Act relating to reorganization of school districts", stated that:

If any area of the state is not a part of such a district by April 1, 1966, or is not included in a reorganization petition filed in accordance with section two hundred seventy-five point twelve (275.12) of the Code on or before April 1, 1966, the area shall be attached by the county board of education to a district, or districts maintaining twelve (12) grades, such attachment to become effective July 1, 1966, and provided such attachment has the approval of the state board of public instruction. Any such district or part thereof attached by the county board of education, with the approval of the state board of public instruction, shall have the right to appeal this attachment to a court of record in the county in which said district or part thereof is located within twenty (20) days after the date of the approval by the state board of public instruction.

Any area included in a reorganization petition filed on or before April 1, 1966 and not becoming a part of a district maintaining twelve (12) grades because of the subsequent failure of the proposal to carry or by reason of judicial appeal proceedings, shall be attached to a district, or districts maintaining twelve (12) grades by the county board of education. Such attachment shall become effective July 1, 1966, or if impossible by said date because of later vote or appeal proceedings, on such date as fixed by the state board of public instruction. The authority of the county board of education to make such attachments shall extend beyond July 1, 1966, when necessary by reason of later vote or appeal proceedings.1

The De Soto Consolidated School District, as one of the non-high school districts that the law was directed toward, decided to attempt during the 1965-66 school year to reorganize with a high school district of one of the school districts surrounding the De Soto district. The board of education of the De Soto school district decided to look into the feasibility of reorganization, rather than wait for the county superintendents of Dallas and Madison Counties to attach the district to a high school district.

By proceeding with a reorganization attempt the school district could find, in the board of education's judgment, the most qualified school to reorganize with from the standpoint of the welfare of the children, the size of the school district, the ease of bus transportation, and the size of the curriculum offered by the school districts. Another factor taken into consideration was the ability of the school districts to handle the increased enrollment gained from the De Soto district. Winterset school district was crowded with its own enrollment, as stated by Donal R. Lillard, Superintendent of the Winterset School District, in a letter to the families of the De Soto district in Madison County:

You likely have heard that the Winterset Schools are crowded and lack facilities. This is true; however the number of pupils to be received from your district could be easily accommodated. There are 34 sections of kindergarten through sixth grade, an additional 34 elementary pupils would add only one
pupil to each section. Eventually there will be a new high school which will modernize the school system.

Winterset has been planning a building program for the last six years. During this time the proposal has been placed before the people six times, and in each case has been defeated by more than a simple majority vote against the proposal. The school district at the present time, has its proposal before the Iowa Supreme Court, and cannot proceed until the matter has been cleared by the courts.

The Adel Community School District has adequate space to handle the increased enrollment. It has, since 1961, taken care of the De Soto high school students on a tuition basis. During the 1965-66 school year forty-two students from the De Soto district attended the Adel high school. Adel passed its proposed building program, and moved the elementary students into the new building in the middle of the 1964-65 school year.

The present reorganization attempt had not formally begun until the eighth of July, 1965. At this time, at the regular July board meeting, the following decision was made by the De Soto Board of Education.

To support any group or organization that was willing to undertake a reorganization attempt with the Adel Community school district. If, in the event

---

1Statement of meeting of De Soto Board of Education, July 8, 1965.
no organization were to undertake such a venture, that
the school board would work for the proposed reorgani-
zation with Adel.1

With this decision of the board taken, a joint meet-
ing of the boards of education of the two school districts
was proposed. The joint meeting was held August 2, 1965.
The joint boards decided to go to the Dallas County Board of
Education to explain their decision to try and reorganize,
and to see whether the county board would take favorable
action to help with the formation of the new school dis-

trict. August 16, 1965, was set as the date to meet with
the Dallas County Board of Education.

Doctor H. C. Banwort, a member of the Dallas County
Board of Education stated that,

No school district or districts had ever come to
the county board to explain the motives of the reorgani-
ization attempt prior to the time for a hearing with the
county board.
He further stated that,

The board appreciated the attempt by the two school
districts to inform the county board of their plans,
and that by a unanimous decision of the county board
that they would support the two districts in their
reorganization attempt.2

Another joint meeting was held by the boards of educa-
tion of the Adel and De Soto school districts on the twenty-
third of August. A final decision was reached at this time

1Minutes of meeting of De Soto Board of Education,
July 8, 1965.
2Doctor H. C. Banwort, member of the Dallas County
for the two school districts to work towards a reorganization of the Adel-De Soto Community School District. It was also decided that James P. Irish should be hired as attorney to represent the school districts in the reorganization procedures.

Irish was contacted on the sixth of September by the presidents of each of the boards of education, Richard Wilcox of the Adel board and James Troutman of the De Soto board, Wilfred Anderson, Superintendent of the Adel School District, and David McConnell, principal of the De Soto School District. Irish agreed to take the case for the school districts and stated, "He would begin immediately to prepare the petitions for the school boards." 1

The petitions2 were prepared and forwarded to the school districts on the fourteenth of September, and were immediately taken by the members of the two boards. The De Soto board had already divided the school district into areas and each board member was assigned an area to cover for signatures. Adel, being a larger district, had a local organization take the petitions to the members of the community for their signatures. Irish advised the schools that they would need the signatures of either 200 voters, or four objections were co-president land owners of the De Soto district. The objections were made to the Adel district.

1 James P. Irish, September 6, 1965.
20 per cent of the registered voters, whichever was the smaller.

The petitions were signed by 267 persons of the De Soto district, and 515 of the Adel district. These signatures represented 72 per cent of the De Soto district, and 35 per cent of the Adel district. The petitions were filed with the Dallas County Superintendent on the first of October, 1965, along with a certification of the number of registered voters within the two districts.

Notice of the hearing was published in the Dallas County News on the thirteenth of October, 1965, and the hearing was set for the twenty-sixth of October, 1965.

Objections to the proposed reorganization were to be filed with the Dallas County Superintendent by twelve o'clock noon on the twenty-sixth of October.

Fifty-two objections were filed with the Dallas County Superintendent on the twenty-sixth of October. Thirty of the objectors wished to go to the Earlham Community School District, nine to the Van Meter School District, and thirteen to the Winterset Community School District. Of the fifty-two objections, only twenty-eight were residents within the De Soto district. The remaining twenty-four objections were non-resident land owners of the De Soto district. No objections were made from the Adel district.

The twenty-eight objections by residents of the De Soto district comprised 9 per cent of the registered voters of the
U. S. Highway #6

Madison-Dallas County Line

U. S. Highway #169

De Soto

Adel

Figure 3. Proposed Adel-De Soto Community School District
district, and had a total of ten children in the De Soto school system.

The joint county boards of education of Dallas and Madison Counties, in a closed session, after the hearing on October 26th, could not agree on the proposed reorganization. The voting was tied, with the Dallas County Board voting for the proposal, and the Madison County Board voting against.

Under the Code of Iowa, section 275.16, as amended by the 1965 General Assembly, stated:

However, if such joint boards cast a tie vote and are unable to agree to an order fixing the boundaries for the proposed school district or to an order to dismiss the petition, the time during which such actions must be taken under the provisions of section two hundred seventy-five point fifteen (275.15) shall be extended from five (5) days to fifteen (15) days after the conclusion of the hearing under the provisions of section two hundred seventy-five point fifteen (275.15), and such joint board shall reconvene not less than ten (10) and not more than fifteen (15) days after the conclusion of such hearing. At such hearing the joint board shall reconsider their action and if a tie vote shall again be cast it shall be deemed on order granting the petition and changing the plans of any and all of the county boards affected by the petition and fixing the boundaries for the proposed school corporation.¹

In accordance with the Code of Iowa, the joint county board reconvened on November 8, 1965, to reconsider their actions of October 26th. At this time the joint county board again failed to reach a decision on the proposed reorganization. The Dallas County Board again voted for the proposal, and the Madison County Board voted against.

With the failure of the joint county board to agree to the proposed reorganization, Lloyd Godfrey, the Dallas County Superintendent declared that the two succeeding tie votes constituted a vote in favor of the petition and that the petition was granted in accordance with section 275.15 of the Code of Iowa. The decision reached was published in the Dallas County News on November 17, 1965, and stated that the aggrieved party or parties must appeal this decision within thirty days of the publication of the decision.

Appeal was made on the second of December by the Madison County Board of Education, the Winterset Community School District, and the Earlham Community School District within the thirty days, to the State Department of Public Instruction. January 10, 1966, was set by the State Department as the date for the hearing.

Irish, the attorney for the Adel and De Soto boards, filed a motion with the State Department of Public Instruction to dismiss the Earlham Community School District and the Winterset Community School District as aggrieved parties, as no part of either the Earlham or Winterset School Districts was included in the proposed reorganization of the new school district. This motion was taken under advisement by the State Department, who subsequently ruled:

Appellee's contention as to the proper party status of Earlham and Winterset is correct under the decision of the Supreme Court of Iowa... However, the Madison County Board of Education is a proper party within the...
meaning of the definition of "aggrieved party" set forth in section 275.8, Code of Iowa, as made applicable to reorganization proceeding in proposals involving more than one county by section 275.16, Code of Iowa ... Thus, it is entirely proper for the Madison County board to stand alone as party appellant in the instant matter and, in so doing, to represent the interest of the individual objectors while endeavoring to hold its county plan. It is to be further noted that one of the duties of county board in fixing boundaries is "due regard for the welfare of adjoining districts" (sec. 275.15), which would further qualify the Madison County board to include such matters as affected the Earlham, Winterset and Van Meter districts, in its presentation on appeal.1

The Madison County board based their appeal to the State Department on the fact that under section 275.15, Code of Iowa, provided that two tie votes constituted a vote in favor of the petition. The Madison County board contended that:

I. That the alleged decision of the Joint County Boards was illegal and contrary to the provision of law.

A. The joint county board did not reconsider its action at the adjourning hearing.
1. The only tie vote which was repeated was the approval of the Petition excluding all of Madison County.

B. The Dallas County Board deliberately refused to honor any of the objections.

C. The Dallas County Board deliberately refused to consider any reasonable division of the De Soto territory.

D. The Dallas County Board refused to abide by its prior commitments made with the Madison County board in their joint planning as to the De Soto territory.

1Decision of State Department of Public Instruction, January 10, 1966.
II. Approval of the entire Adel-De Soto reorganization would be contrary to all facts concerning the preference of residents and interested parties, would violate the intent of chapter 275 and would jeopardize future reorganization plans of the Earlham Community school district, Van Meter Community school district and Winterset Community school district.

A. Prior joint planning between the county boards of Dallas and Madison Counties have always contemplated a division of the De Soto territory between the adjoining school districts.

B. In the areas represented by the signed objectors are the parents of fifty-two (52) children who have indicated a preference to attend school at either Earlham or Winterset.

C. In addition there are now signed objections by parents representing an additional eighteen (18) children.

D. A geographic division of the De Soto territory between the adjoining school districts is required to comply with the intent and purpose of Chapter 275 of the Code of Iowa.¹

Adel and De Soto, being proponents in the hearing to the State Department, based their contentions upon the grounds that the logical school with which the De Soto school might reorganize would be Adel. Adel and De Soto had been, in fact, a tuition district for the past five years, had operated on a sound basis, and that there was no reason to believe that it would not continue to do so on a school district basis.

In the five years that the two districts have been, in fact, a tuition district, eighty-six students from De Soto have attended the Adel high school. Nowhere in any

¹Appellants Brief to State Department of Public Instruction, January 10, 1966.
of the records was any dissatisfaction expressed, either by pupils or by parents of these students; rather the record was replete with showings that the De Soto students actively participated in the activities of the Adel district and were satisfactorily accepted into the district.

The hearing with the State Department of Public Instruction was held on the tenth of January, 1966, and the following decisions were reached by the State Board of Public Instruction:

1. Madison County Board of Education is a proper party within the meaning of the definition of "aggrieved party" set forth in section 275.8, Code of Iowa.

2. The matter of the effect of a tie vote by a Joint County Board was the subject of chapter 241 (SF 499), section 1, Acts of the 61st General Assembly. The provisions of this section shall apply to tie votes under any provision of this chapter where a joint meeting of the members of two or more county boards of education are required and to all petitions pending on the effective date of this Act. Application of the quoted provision to the actual proceedings of the Joint County Board is somewhat complex for the reason that at neither meeting did the board vote on the question whether to approve the petition as presented. However, under the letter of the quoted provision it appears that any motion repeated at both meetings and resulting in a tie upon each of the occasions is deemed "an order granting the petition."

Referral to the shorthand reporter's transcript of the Joint Board hearings reveals that at each meeting the question whether to exclude all territory south of the county line was voted upon and resulted in a tie. This appears to meet the statutory requirements for the purpose of being "deemed an order granting the petition and changing the plans of any and all of the county boards affected by the petition and fixing the boundaries for the proposed school corporation." Any other conclusion would necessitate a finding that the Joint Board had entirely failed
to reach any result in the matter. The finding that the tie votes had amounted to an order, under the statute, granting the petition does not preclude consideration of the merits of such order, on appeal to this department, in the same manner as if the petition had been granted by a majority vote.

3. Therefore, considering the order which resulted from the tie vote on its merits, we reach the conclusion that the objection of the fifty-two objectors merited favorable consideration as did the existing county plans. We further conclude the inclusion of all the existing De Soto Consolidated district within the approved boundaries is neither "for the best interest of the parties concerned" nor does it manifest "due regard for the welfare of adjoining districts" as required by section 275.15.

Under section 275.16 the authority of this department in deciding such matters is defined as follows: "The state department shall have the authority to affirm the action of the joint boards to vacate, to dismiss all proceedings or to make such modification in the action of the joint boards as in their judgment would serve the best interest of the counties." Accordingly, the modification of the action of the joint boards which, on the basis of the record presented, will in our judgment serve the best interest of the counties; while, incidentally, giving consideration to the educational preferences of the objectors, and eliminating creation of a territorial barrier to further reorganization by the adjoining district; will be to exclude from the approved boundaries the territory referred to in one of the motions as "south of U. S. highway 6".

Therefore, the action of the Joint County Board is hereby modified by excluding from the proposed Adel-De Soto Community School District all territory located south of the line commencing at the intersection of the proposed boundary with the north boundary line of section 34 in Adams Township, Dallas County, Iowa, and proceeding east along the north boundary of sections 34, 35, and 36 in Adams Township, Dallas County, Iowa, to the point of intersection between the north boundary of section 32 in Van Meter Township, Dallas County, Iowa, with the proposed district boundaries as approved by the
Joint County Board of Education. As so modified, the action of said Joint County Board is hereby approved.¹

On March 18, 1966, the joint boards of the Adel Community School District, the De Soto Consolidated School District, and the Dallas County Board of Education appealed the state board's decision to the District Court of Dallas County. In the appeal the school districts contended that the state boards ruling was:

1. In re-defining the boundaries of the proposed district to exclude all territory south of U. S. Highway No. 6 was wholly arbitrary, unreasonable, without support in the record, and fails to take into account the best interest of the people in said area.

2. That the arbitrary and unreasonable action of the State Department of Public Instruction in excluding from the proposed reorganization, that part of the territory lying south of U. S. Highway No. 6, while presumably based upon the objections of 52 objectors, results, not in satisfying the objections made by said 52 objectors as alleged, but serves to recognize the objections of only a small proportion of the persons living in the area detached.

3. That said action and decision of the State Board of Public Instruction is arbitrary and unreasonable in that it places the south boundary of said proposed district only one quarter mile south of the limits of the Town of De Soto, Iowa, wherein, the building of the De Soto Consolidated School District is located and thus would make said building of no value to the proposed district.

4. That said decision of the State Department of Public Instruction arbitrarily and unreasonably disregards the wishes of 70% of the voters in the De Soto Consolidated School District which signed said Petition for formation of said district.

5. That said decision of the State Board of Public Instruction arbitrarily and unreasonably disregards the choice of the residents of the De Soto

¹Decision of State Board of Public Instruction, January 10, 1966.
Figure 4. Adel-De Soto district as approved for reorganization by the State Department of Public Instruction, January 10, 1966.
Consolidated School District in that several years ago, they assigned the High School students from said District to Adel and that for several years, said High School students have gone to the Adel Community School District for their High School work.

6. That said pattern has been established and the decision of the State Board of Public Instruction will arbitrarily and unreasonably change said pattern without good cause.

7. That the decision of the State Board of Public Instruction is arbitrary and unreasonable in that it would in effect assign approximately 67% of the students in the De Soto Consolidated School District to the newly formed district, but exclude from said district, 56% of the total taxable valuation of the De Soto Consolidated School District.

8. That the decision of the State Board of Public Instruction is not in line but is contrary to advice given to the De Soto Consolidated School District, by experts employed by the State Department of Public Instruction and sent to the De Soto Consolidated School District in an advisory capacity by said Board. That said decision wholly disregards the advice and suggestions of the Board's own experienced personnel.

9. That the decision of the State Board of Public Instruction is in error, wholly arbitrary and unreasonable in concluding that the welfare of adjoining districts would be better served by eliminating that portion of the proposed district south of the U. S. Highway No. 6.

10. And on the 27th day of March, 1961, pursuant to a decision of the State Board of Public Instruction, a proposed district similar in boundaries to the boundaries established in this cause by the ruling of the State Department of Public Instruction, was submitted to the voters and was defeated 552 to 60. That in view of said election, it would seem obvious that the present decision of the State Board of Public Instruction arbitrarily and unreasonably disregards the wishes of approximately 90% of the eligible voters in said district. That such action is above and beyond the power which the Legislature of the State of Iowa intended to vest in the State Department of Public Instruction.

11. That said opinion was written and adopted by employees of the State Department of Public Instruction without presentation of the facts to
the State Board of Public Instruction and without information or discussion adequate to permit said State Board of Public Instruction to arrive at a decision in the best interest of the Public School System in the area involved in this proposed new district.

The Dallas County District Court, with the honorable Judge S. E. Prall presiding, took the appeal by the Adel and De Soto school districts, and the Dallas County Board of Education under advisement following the hearing on May 13, 1966. In his ruling Judge Prall stated that it was the judgment of the court that,

The ruling of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the state board of education should be and is hereby ratified and confirmed and the appeal dismissed.

He also stated in his ruling that,

The court holds the action of the state superintendent was not arbitrary, unreasonable and capricious and was based upon the record. There is some merit to the ruling and this court refuses to interfere.

With the appeal having been dismissed by the Dallas County District Court, the Adel and De Soto school boards, at a joint meeting on June 6, 1966, decided not to appeal to a higher court. The decision not to appeal was made under the advisement of James P. Irish, attorney for the two school districts. Irish stated,

Further appeal would be useless insofar as the appeal to the District Court has maintained the ruling of the

---

1 Appeal by Adel, De Soto, and Dallas County School Districts to District Court of Dallas County, March 18, 1966. James P. Irish, June 2, 1966.
2 Ruling by S. E. Prall, Judge of Dallas County District Court, May 25, 1966.
state superintendent of Public Instruction, and that in
the ruling of Judge Prall the state superintendent did
not rule arbitrarily, unreasonably, or capriciously.\footnote{1}

The Adel and De Soto school districts have decided to
let the petition, as amended by the State Department of
Public Instruction, come to a vote of the people. The two
districts hope the people will vote "no", and that the
petition will be defeated. If this is the case, the Dallas
County Board of Education will make the attachment of the
district to a high school district.

Area and population. Ranked in order of size per
square mile, the Winterset Community School District is the
largest with an area of 77.6 square miles. This compares
with 67.2 square miles for the Adel Community School Distri-
tect and 42.9 square miles for the De Soto Community
School District. The Winterset District is larger than the
other three school districts combined, and is more than two
and one-half times as large as the next largest district.

On a population basis the Winterset school district
is again the largest with 9,319 people within the district.
and an \footnote{1}{James P. Irish, June 2, 1966.}
CHAPTER III

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF WINTerset, EARLHAM, VAN METER, AND ADEL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A comparative analysis of the school districts that bordered the De Soto district was essential for an evaluation of the school district most desirable for merger. The comparative analysis was made in the following areas of:

(1) Area and population; (2) Finance; (3) Curriculum and educational staffs; and (4) Transportation. The evaluation was based on school records submitted to the State Department of Public Instruction for the 1964-65 and 1965-66 school years.

**Area and population.** Ranked in order of size per square miles the Winterset Community School District is the largest with an area of 266.6 square miles. This compares with 103 square miles for the Earlham Community School District, 62.9 square miles for the Adel Community School District, and 54.6 square miles for the Van Meter Community School District. The Winterset district is larger than the other three school districts combined, and is more than two and one-half times as large as the next largest district.

On a population basis the Winterset school district is again the largest with 7,519 people within the district, and an average of 28.2 persons per square mile. The Adel
district ranks second on the population basis with 3,050 persons within the district. Earlham is third with 2,550 people within the district. Van Meter has the smallest number of people living within the district with 1,152.

A comparison of the districts show the following data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Adel</th>
<th>Winterset</th>
<th>Earlham</th>
<th>Van Meter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area in square miles</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>266.6</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District population</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School census</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment 1965</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. S.</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Attendance 64-65</td>
<td>798.4</td>
<td>1,560.8</td>
<td>541.8</td>
<td>337.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratio of population to area show the Adel school district with the most population. The Adel district has an average of 43.5 persons per square mile. The Winterset dis-

---

1 Secretary's Annual Reports to State Department of Public Instruction by Adel, Winterset, Earlham, and Van Meter School Districts, 1965.

2 Enrollment figures to County Superintendent of Schools of Dallas and Madison Counties for 1965-66 school year.
district is second with an average of 28.2 per square mile. Earlham is third with an average of 24.7 persons per square mile. Van Meter again ranks last of the four school districts with an average of only 20.9 persons per square mile.

**Finance.** As with the area and population analysis, Winterset school district has the largest taxable valuation with $15,693,460. This figure is nearly the same as the other three districts combined of $16,257,553. Adel has the second largest taxable valuation with $6,679,335. Earlham has a valuation of $6,557,390, and Van Meter has the smallest taxable valuation with $3,020,828.

The ratio of assessed valuation to the number of children in average daily attendance shows the districts in the following order: Earlham is first with a valuation per child of $12,332. Van Meter with the smallest number in average daily attendance, and the smallest taxable valuation ranks second with $10,405. Winterset ranks third with a valuation per child of $10,033. Adel with the second largest average daily attendance and the second largest assessed valuation ranks last with an average valuation of $9,262 per child.

For the 1963-64 school year, as to cost per pupil in average daily attendance, the school districts were in the same order as in the case of assessed valuation per child with the exception of the Adel and Winterset school districts.
In this comparison the Adel school district ranks third with an average cost per child of $405, and Winterset ranks last with $394 per child. Earlham ranks first with an average cost per child of $492, with Van Meter second with an average of $461 per child.

Bonded indebtedness is one of the most important financial aspects to be compared. As of July 1, 1965, the bonded indebtedness of the school districts was as follows:

Adel highest with $508,000, Earlham second with $231,000, Winterset third with $162,000, and Van Meter last with only $4,000 bonded indebtedness. Several factors must be taken into consideration regarding bonded indebtedness. New construction or extensive remodeling would increase the amount that school districts owes toward their bonds. Adel, in the spring of 1965, completed a new elementary school building and hot lunch room that supplies the high school at a total cost of $750,000. Earlham has, within the past five years, completed an elementary wing to their high school.

Winterset has made no new construction, nor has it done any extensive remodeling to the present buildings to account for its bonded indebtedness, but has acquired the land for a proposed new high school building. Van Meter with only $4,000 of bonded indebtedness has made some minor repairs to the school plants, but has not made any new construction or extensive remodeling.
TABLE I

COMPARISON OF CERTAIN CENTRAL IOWA SCHOOL DISTRICTS AS TO FINANCIAL FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Adel</th>
<th>Winterset</th>
<th>Earlham</th>
<th>Van Meter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Valuation</td>
<td>6,679,335</td>
<td>15,693,460</td>
<td>6,557,390</td>
<td>3,020,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monies and Credits 1964</td>
<td>1,469,253</td>
<td>2,686,053</td>
<td>676,707</td>
<td>172,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation per resident child in A. D. A. 1963-64</td>
<td>9,262</td>
<td>10,033</td>
<td>12,332</td>
<td>10,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded Indebtedness</td>
<td>508,000</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Bonding Capacity</td>
<td>122,085</td>
<td>1,280,117</td>
<td>349,295</td>
<td>256,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Valuation</td>
<td>1,098,386</td>
<td>1,148,555</td>
<td>700,651</td>
<td>288,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Pupil in A. D. A. 1964</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy 1965</td>
<td>50.105</td>
<td>41,241</td>
<td>46,634</td>
<td>48,284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Secretary's Annual Reports to State Department of Public Instruction by Adel, Winterset, Earlham, and Van Meter School Districts, 1964.
The reported bonded indebtedness pertained to the valuation of the school plants as of July 1, 1965. Winterset has five buildings with a total valuation of $1,148,555. Adel, with two buildings, has a total valuation of $1,098,386. Earlham, with only the one building, but with a new wing added for the elementary, has a total valuation of $700,651. Van Meter has a building valuation of $288,000.

Curriculum. In the comparative analysis of the curriculum offered by the school districts, this investigator contacted each of the superintendents of the Adel, Winterset, Earlham, and Van Meter school districts. The investigator asked each superintendent for a list of courses offered for the 1965-66 school year. Each of the school districts, with the exception of the Van Meter district, offered between forty and forty-three units for the year. The Van Meter district offered only the minimum requirements of the State Department of Public Instruction, twenty-six units.

The Adel curriculum presented the largest number of academic subjects, with emphasis upon Business Education, Communications, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. The Adel district did not present any Vocational Agriculture in its curriculum. Wilfred Anderson, the Adel superintendent, stated at the hearing with the Joint County boards of Dallas and Madison Counties, that, 62.5 per cent of the students of the 1964 graduating class went on to college or vocational courses. Of the
1965 graduating class 66.7 per cent went on to receive a higher education.  

The Winterset curriculum placed emphasis upon Business Education, Communications, and Social Studies. Winterset offered only three units of Science. This compared with the Adel offering of six and one-half units, Earlham with four units, and Van Meter with three units.

The Earlham curriculum was the weakest in the areas of Art and Foreign Language. Earlham offered no Art and only two units of Foreign Language for the 1965-66 school year. Earlham placed the most emphasis upon Communications and Vocational Agriculture.

Van Meter, with a curriculum of twenty-six units, offered only the State Departments minimum for purposes of the largest number of students had the largest professional receiving state aid. Emphasis was placed upon Business staff with eighty-three. Adel and Earlham had forty-five Education, Communications, Mathematics, and Social Studies, and forty-four members to their respective staffs. Van No emphasis was placed upon Art, Driver Education, or Vocational Meter, with the smallest number of pupils enrolled, and the Agricultural Education. No credit was given for Physical Education, although it was a required subject.

The curricula and educational staffs of the schools were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adel</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlham</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterset</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Meter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures indicate teaching staff, including the principal teaching part-time each day.

Statement by Wilfred Anderson, Adel Superintendent, at Joint County Hearing, October 26, 1965.
The educational staff figures to County Superintendent of Schools of Dallas and Madison Counties for 1965-66 school year.
average of 22:1. Adel had a ratio of 20.8:1, Van Meter had 19.9:1, and Earlham, the smallest ratio, with 16.6:1.

Transportation. In the transportation aspect, there was considerable variance among schools in number of bus routes. Winterset with an area of 266.6 square miles transported an average number of pupils daily of 961 on twenty-six bus routes, including the kindergarten routes. This compares with the Earlham school district with an area of 103 square miles, and an average of 368 pupils transported on thirteen bus routes. The Van Meter and Adel school districts run the same number of bus routes, including kindergarten routes, with seven each. The average number of pupils transported by Adel was 280, and by Van Meter, 231.

Area-wise the Adel and Van Meter districts are quite similar with 62.9 square miles for Adel and 54.6 square miles for the Van Meter district.

As noted on the table, the Van Meter district did not run any kindergarten routes, but instead had their kindergarten split into two halves, with each half coming for a full day, every other day. This practice was discontinued by the Van Meter district during the 1965-66 school year, but Van Meter had the highest average number per bus route, and two half day sessions of the kindergarten every day.
pupil costs for transportation had not been figured for the 1965-66 school year. A computational average of pupils per bus route shows forty for Adel, thirty-seven for Winterset, thirty-three for Van Meter, and twenty-eight point three for Earlham. The length of the bus routes varied according to the area in square miles of the districts. The Winterset district operated twenty-six bus routes that varied in length from twelve to forty-seven miles. Van Meter's bus routes ranged in length from nineteen to thirty-three miles, Adel's, from twenty-two point one to twenty-seven point one miles, and Earlham's, from seventeen point eight to twenty-six point six miles of length.

For the 1964-65 school year, Winterset had the longest bus routes, and the second highest average number of pupils transported with the highest transportation costs per student with $82.30. Van Meter had the second longest bus routes, but with the lowest average number transported, and the second highest per pupil cost of $75.95. Earlham was third in per pupil costs for transportation with $67.77, and Adel, with the highest average number per bus routes, and the third longest bus routes, with a per pupil cost of $54.73. By having a larger average number of pupils per bus route, the Adel district was able to maintain a lower average cost per pupil, while the Winterset district, also with a large average number of pupils transported, has the
### Table II

COMPARISON OF CERTAIN CENTRAL IOWA SCHOOL DISTRICTS AS TO TRANSPORTATION FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Adel</th>
<th>Winterset</th>
<th>Earlham</th>
<th>Van Meter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular bus routes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten routes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number pupils transported</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of bus routes in miles</td>
<td>22.1-27.1</td>
<td>12-47</td>
<td>17.8-26.6</td>
<td>19-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per pupil transported 1964-65</td>
<td>54.73</td>
<td>82.30</td>
<td>67.77</td>
<td>75.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Transportation costs</td>
<td>462.07</td>
<td>455.71</td>
<td>575.03</td>
<td>552.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Applications for Reimbursement for Transportation of Pupils to Public Schools made by the Adel, Winterset, Earlham, and Van Meter School Districts to the State Department of Public Instruction for 1964-65 school years.
longer bus routes to bring the per-pupil costs to a much higher average.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Reorganization of school districts of Iowa has been an important concern of the people. In the 1963 legislative session of the General Assembly, the Legislature, by amending section 271.1 of the Code of Iowa, made it imperative that the non-high school districts either reorganize with or be attached to a district maintaining twelve grades. The De Soto Consolidated School District, being a non-high school district, could have been attached by the Dallas County Board of Education. The De Soto Board of Education elected to try to reorganize the entire district prior to the effective date of the 1963 act.

In this study the investigator attempted to analyze the past attempts to reorganize with other districts, and to analyze the procedures used in these attempts. Through these past attempts, a reason can be found for reorganizing the school districts in the state. The study used the De Soto Consolidated School District as an important tool for the evaluation of these districts as to which district had the most desirable characteristics to reorganize with. The comparative analysis was made in terms of area and population, finance, curriculum, educational staff, and transportation of the Adel, Garnett, Van Meter, and Winterset school districts. The study includes recom-
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Reorganization of school districts of Iowa has been an important concern of the people. In the 1965 Legislative session of the General Assembly, the Legislature, by amending section 275.1 of the Code of Iowa, made it imperative that the non-high school districts either reorganize with, or be attached to a district maintaining twelve grades. The De Soto Consolidated School District, being a non-high school district would have been attached by the Dallas County Board of Education. The De Soto Board of Education elected to try to reorganize the entire district prior to the effective date of the attachment.

In this study the investigator attempted to analyze the past attempts to reorganize with other districts, and to analyze the procedures used in these attempts, through information contained in the minutes of the meetings of the De Soto Board of Education. A comparative analysis of the school districts surrounding the De Soto district was an important tool for the evaluation of these districts as to which district had the most desirable characteristics to reorganize with. The comparative analysis was made in terms of area and population, finance, curriculum, educational staff, and transportation of the Adel, Earlham, Van Meter, and Winterset school districts. The study includes recom-
mendations on ways to proceed in the event of a successful reorganization between the De Soto district and the Adel district.

Summary. The De Soto Consolidated School District had since its inception in the Spring of 1921, maintained an educational attendance center consisting of all grades—kindergarten through high school. The district had expressed to the Dallas County Superintendent of Schools a desire to remain as a single unit as late as 1958.

The district received approval for the receipt of state aid for the 1958-59 and 1959-60 school years from Richard N. Smith, the Regional Consultant for the State Department of Public Instruction. At that time Smith stated:

I am recommending that the De Soto Consolidated school be approved for the present 1958-59 school year and for the coming school year. Beyond that it is doubtful that your school can be approved.  

In the Spring of 1958, and prior to this approval, the De Soto district had initiated reorganization studies of the Van Meter and De Soto school districts, and of the Adel and De Soto school districts. Each of these studies indicated that the De Soto district could favorably reorganize with either of the Adel or Van Meter districts with little

1Letter to Board of Education of De Soto School by Richard N. Smith, Regional Consultant of the State Department of Public Instruction, January 11, 1959.
or no change in the present curriculums, and with only the changing of the use of the De Soto building from all grades into either a junior high or into an elementary building.

In the Fall of 1960 a formal proposal of reorganization was attempted between the Adel and De Soto school districts. The petitions were prepared and signed by 33 per cent of the eligible voters of the two districts. At the hearing on November 21, 1960, fifty-three objections to the petition were presented. The boards of education of Dallas and Madison counties amended the original petition by excluding from the petition the south fourth of the east half and the land south of the Madison County line and west of U. S. Highway 169.

The De Soto and Adel boards appealed this decision to the State Department of Public Instruction, but the State Board of Public Instruction upheld the joint counties' ruling. The Adel and De Soto districts then brought the petitions, as amended, before the voters of the districts. The proposal was defeated by a vote of 552 to 60 on March 27, 1961.

As a precaution against the loss of state aid, the De Soto district in 1961, closed the high school and sent the high school students to the surrounding districts on a tuition basis. The Adel district was designated as the district to which most of the students should go, but provision was made with the other districts for those who wished to
attend these districts. Since 1961 to the present, over 90 per cent of the high school aged students have attended the Adel high school.

The Sixty-first Iowa General Assembly amended section 275.1 of the Code of Iowa. In the amended Code of Iowa, any school district not maintaining twelve grades would be attached to a district that was maintaining twelve grades on April 1, 1966. The De Soto district had not maintained twelve grades since 1961, when the students were sent to the surrounding districts on a tuition basis.

The De Soto district began on July 8, 1965, an attempt to reorganize with the Adel Community School District. This was done rather than have the district attached by the county board of education, and in all probability having the district split into three different school districts. By going ahead with a reorganization attempt the De Soto district felt that it could go into the Adel district as an entire unit. A subsequent ruling on an appeal by the Madison County board to the State Department, amended the petition to exclude all the land south of U. S. Highway 6.

The ruling of the State Department of Public Instruction on January 10, 1966 excluded from the petition 56 per cent of the assessed valuation of the De Soto district, but excluded only 33 per cent of the students of the De Soto district. The ruling of the State Department of Public Instruction was appealed by the Adel and De Soto districts.
to the District Court of Dallas County on March 18, 1966. Judge S. E. Prall was the presiding judge, and after deliberation ruled that:

The ruling of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the state board of education should be and is hereby ratified and confirmed and the appeal dismissed.

The court holds the action of the state superintendent was not arbitrary, unreasonable and capricious and was based upon the record. There is some merit to the ruling and this court refuses to interfere. 1

At a joint meeting of the Adel and De Soto boards of education on June 6, 1966, it was decided not to appeal the ruling of the State Department of Public Instruction to a higher court. Instead the two districts have instructed Lloyd Godfrey, the Dallas County Superintendent of Schools, to proceed with the voting of the people. The school districts feel that the petition, as amended, will be defeated by a higher percentage than was the petition on March 27, 1961, as a larger amount of land has been set aside under the 1965 petition.

Conclusions. The reorganization of the Adel and De Soto school districts is in the best interests of the school districts involved. Per pupil costs of the Adel district for the 1964-65 school year were the third highest of the four districts of the comparative analysis. Adel's per

1Ruling by S. E. Prall, Judge of Dallas County District Court, May 25, 1966.
pupil costs for the 1964-65 school year were $462.07 as compared with the Winterset district, with $455.71. The Winterset and Adel districts per pupil costs were somewhat lower than the cost of either the Earlham or Van Meter districts, which had respective costs of $575.03 and $552.65.

The curriculum offered by the Adel district was of the highest level with forty-three units offered. The Winterset district also offered forty-three units. The curriculum of the Adel district was centered mainly with the academic subjects, or college preparatory courses.

The Adel district, with adequate facilities at the present time, and with the addition of the De Soto building, will have a building capacity of approximately 1,250 students. The expected enrollment of the new district will be approximately 968 students. This would allow ample facilities for the expected growth of Adel and De Soto. The completion of Interstate Highway 80 will be in 1967, from Des Moines through the present De Soto district. The major north-south interchange from Interstate 80 will be U. S. Highway 169, which cuts both the Adel and De Soto districts in half. It is expected that construction of many new homes will be undertaken in the near future along the U. S. Highway 169, near the Interstate 80 interchange.

Although the reorganization of the Adel and De Soto districts may be adequate for the present time, it was felt...
by the investigator that the reorganization study by Drs. William Dreier and Dr. Howard Knutson, of the Iowa State Teachers College, merited further investigation by the districts involved. Each of these districts, with the exception of De Soto and Van Meter, have made extensive construction since the study was completed. The Van Meter district is now in the planning stage for new construction, and hopes to begin building this summer. Instruction in this curriculum is.

The reorganization study by Dr. Dreier and Dr. Knutson, would, if completed as proposed, bring the southern half of Dallas County into a single district. Construction of a central high school would have resulted in less construction and building costs than was undertaken by the combined districts involved.

The investigator that the most economical way to proceed would be to have the De Soto

Recommendations. The Adel-De Soto reorganization building, housing all of the fifth and sixth grades, with one will present no problems with the curriculum of the high section except kindergarten, first grade, and a special school, as the De Soto high school students have already attended the Adel high school on a tuition basis since the 1961 school year. Little, or no change will have to be made in the elementary curriculum, as both school districts have been taught in public instruction in area only, have adjusted the same basic texts, and have offered the same general courses. The reorganized school district, as proposed by the petition, would be elected from the town of Adel, De Soto is not in the best interests of the school districts. The junior high should remain attached to the high
school in Adel. The requirements by the State Department of Public Instruction for a junior high are such that a library comparable to the high school's would be necessary. The movement of the junior high to the De Soto building would necessitate the purchase of a complete library, and the hiring of a librarian to equip and run the library. An art instructor would be needed to satisfy the requirements of the State Department of Public Instruction in this curriculum area. In addition, the high school teachers of Industrial Arts, Home Making, and Instrumental Music would have to commute between the two buildings, and would be an excessive cost to the district in transportation and per pupil costs.

It was felt by the investigator that the most economical way to proceed would be to have the De Soto building, housing all of the fifth and sixth grades, with one section each of kindergarten, first grade, and a special education class. This would amount to approximately 200 students in the De Soto building.

With the petition having been amended by the State Department of Public Instruction in area only, some adjustment will have to be made in the election of directors of the reorganized school district. As proposed by the petition, two directors would be elected from the town of Adel, one from North of the South Raccoon River, one from South of
the South Raccoon River, and one at large from the entire district. As the petition has been amended, the three director districts would represent 625 eligible voters, and the district South of the South Raccoon River would represent approximately 450 eligible voters.

The director districts should be adjusted so that each district would represent approximately the same number of eligible voters. This could be accomplished by dividing the district along the township lines, with the Adel and Colfax Townships being one district, the Van Meter and Adams Townships being another. The three remaining director districts could remain as proposed, with two directors elected from the town of Adel, and one director elected at large from the entire district.

The investigator feels that when the petition, as amended by the State Department of Public Instruction, is voted upon, it should be defeated by the voters of the Adel and De Soto districts. If this should occur, the Dallas County Board of Education would have the responsibility of attaching the entire De Soto district to any of the districts involved. An attachment at the Dallas-Madison County line would be more in line with the county plans of the two counties, and would give the Adel-De Soto district nearly half of the assessed valuation, rather than the 44 per cent as the district is now divided.
A vote for the petition, as amended, by the Adel and De Soto districts would make it impossible for the Adel district to gain any further land and valuation. The land voted out of the district would then be attached by the Madison County Board of Education, as the majority of voters would reside in Madison County. The Madison County Board of Education has indicated, although no official action has been taken, that the Winterset district would get that area allocated to it by the county plan, and that the Earlham district would receive the remainder of the land South of U. S. Highway 6.
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APPENDIX A

Comencing at the northeast corner of the 3rd, 8th, and 1st of Section 30, Township 22 North, Range 28 West of the 5th P.M., Dallas County, Texas; thence south along the north lines of Sections 27, 28, 29, and 30 and due west 2.5 miles of Range 27, west of the 5th P.M., thence south to the northwest corner of the 3rd, 8th, 9th, and 10th of Section 28, Township 22 North, Range 28 West of the 5th P.M., Dallas County, Texas; thence south along the northwest line of Section 28 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 27, thence south along the north line of Section 27 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 26, thence south along the north line of Section 26 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 25, thence south along the north line of Section 25 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 24, thence south along the north line of Section 24 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 23, thence south along the north line of Section 23 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 22, thence south along the north line of Section 22 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 21, thence south along the north line of Section 21 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 20, thence south along the north line of Section 20 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 19, thence south along the north line of Section 19 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 18, thence south along the north line of Section 18 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 17, thence south along the north line of Section 17 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 16, thence south along the north line of Section 16 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 15, thence south along the north line of Section 15 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 14, thence south along the north line of Section 14 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 13, thence south along the north line of Section 13 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 12, thence south along the north line of Section 12 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 11, thence south along the north line of Section 11 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 10, thence south along the north line of Section 10 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 9, thence south along the north line of Section 9 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 8, thence south along the north line of Section 8 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 7, thence south along the north line of Section 7 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 6, thence south along the north line of Section 6 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 5, thence south along the north line of Section 5 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 4, thence south along the north line of Section 4 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 3, thence south along the north line of Section 3 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 2, thence south along the north line of Section 2 and 2.5 miles due west of Section 1, thence south along the north line of Section 1 and 2.5 miles due west of the northeast corner of the 3rd, 8th, and 1st of Section 30, Township 22 North, Range 28 West of the 5th P.M., Dallas County, Texas.
PETITION

TO THE COUNTY BOARDS OF EDUCATION OF DALLAS AND MADISON COUNTIES, IN THE STATE OF IOWA.

We, the undersigned, qualified voters of the contiguous territory situation in the Counties of Dallas and Madison, in the State of Iowa, as hereinafter described, do hereby petition the above named two County Boards of Education to form, create, and establish a Community School District which shall be known as "ADEL-DE SOTO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT OF DALLAS AND MADISON COUNTIES, IOWA", which Community School District shall contain the contiguous territory bounded as follows:

Commencing at the Northwest Corner of the NE\(\frac{1}{4}\) of Section 6, Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., Dallas County, Iowa, thence East along the North Lines of Sections 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 of said Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., to the Northeast Corner of said Section 1; thence South to the Southeast Corner of the NE\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 1; thence East to the Southwest Corner of the SE\(\frac{1}{4}\) NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) of Section 6, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence North to the Northwest Corner of the SW\(\frac{1}{4}\) SE\(\frac{1}{4}\) NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 6; thence East to the Northeast Corner of the SE\(\frac{1}{4}\) SW\(\frac{1}{4}\) NE\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 6; thence South to the Southwest Corner of the SE\(\frac{1}{4}\) SW\(\frac{1}{4}\) NE\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 6; thence East to the middle of the channel of the North Raccoon River; thence Southeasterly along the middle of the channel of said North Raccoon River to the point where it intersects the North Line of Section 18, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence East to the Northeast Corner of the NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) of Section 16, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence South to the North Line of Section 21, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence East to the Northwest Corner of the NE\(\frac{1}{4}\) NE\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 21; thence South to the Southwest Corner of the SE\(\frac{1}{4}\) NE\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 21; thence East to the Northeast Corner of the NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) SW\(\frac{1}{4}\) of Section 22, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence South of the North Line of Section 27, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence East to the Northeast Corner of the NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 27; thence South to the Southwest Corner of the NE\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 27; thence East to the Northeast Corner of the SW\(\frac{1}{4}\) of Section 25, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence South to the Southeast Corner of the SW\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 25; thence West to a point 2 Rods West of the Northeast Corner of Section 35, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence South 82 Rods along
a line parallel to the East boundary line of said Section 35; thence East 2 Rods to the East boundary line of said Section 35; thence South to the North boundary line of Section 3, Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence East to the Northeast Corner of said Section 3; thence South to the Northeast Corner of Government Lot 16 in said Section 3; thence West to the Northwest Corner of Government Lot 15 in said Section 3; thence South to the Southwest Corner of the SE\textsubscript{3} of said Section 3; thence West to the Southwest Corner of the SW\textsubscript{1} of said Section 3; thence South to the South Line of the N\textsubscript{2} of said Section 8, Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; thence West to the South Line of the SE\textsubscript{4} of said Section 8; thence South to the Northwest Corner of the SW\textsubscript{1} of said Section 20, in Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M., thence East to the Northeast Corner of the SW\textsubscript{1} of said Section 32, in Dallas County, Iowa; continuing South along the half-section line through Sections 20, 29, and 32 of Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M., in Van Meter Township, Madison County, Iowa, to the Southwest Corner of the SE\textsubscript{4} of said Section 17; thence East to the Southeast Corner of the SW\textsubscript{1} of said Section 17; thence South along the West side of the E\textsubscript{1} of Sections 20 and 29, in Township 77 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M., to the point where it intersects the center of the channel of the North Branch of the North River in said Section 29; thence Northwesterly, following the center of the channel of the North Branch of the North River to a point where the center of said channel crosses the West Line of Section 23, Township 77 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; thence North to the Northeast Corner of said Section 23; thence East to the Northeast Corner of the NW\textsubscript{3} of Section 23; thence North along the half-section Line through Sections 14 and 11, in Township 77 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., to the point where it intersects the North Line of said Section 11; thence West to the Northwest Corner of said Section 11; thence North to the Southeast Corner of Section 34, Township 78 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., in Adams Township, Dallas County, Iowa; thence West to the Southwest Corner of the SE\textsubscript{4} of said Section 34; thence North along
the West Line of the E\textsuperscript{1} of Section 34, 27, 22, and 15, to the point where it intersects the center of the channel of the South Raccoon River; thence Westerly along the center of the channel of the South Raccoon River to the point where it intersects the South Line of the N\textsuperscript{1} W\textsuperscript{1} of Section 17, Township 78 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; thence East to the Southeast Corner of the NE\textsuperscript{4} NE\textsuperscript{2} of said Section 17; thence North to the Southeast Corner of Government Lot 17, in Section 5, Township 78 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; thence West to the Southwest Corner of said Government Lot 17; thence North to the Northwest Corner of said Government Lot 17; thence West to the West Line of said Section 5; thence North along the West Line of said Section 5 to the South Line of Section 33, Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; thence West to the Southeast Corner of the SW\textsuperscript{1} of said Section 33; thence North to the South boundary Line of the Chicago Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific right-of-way; thence in a Southwesterly direction along the South Line of said railroad right-of-way to a point 900 feet East of the West Line of said Section 33; thence North to the South Line of the SW\textsuperscript{1} of the NW\textsuperscript{1} of said Section 33; thence West to the Southwest Corner of the NW\textsuperscript{1} of said Section 33; thence North to the Southeast Corner of Section 17, Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; thence West to the Southwest Corner of the SE\textsuperscript{2} SW\textsuperscript{1} of said Section 17; thence North to the Northwest Corner of the NE\textsuperscript{1} SW\textsuperscript{1} of said Section 17; thence West to the Southwest Corner of the NE\textsuperscript{1} of Section 18, Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; thence North to the point of beginning.

That, if the County Plan of Dallas County, Iowa, or of Madison County, Iowa, should differ in any manner from the proposed new Community School District, above described, we respectfully request that the County Plan of each of said Counties be changed to permit the formation of said proposed new school district.

We do further state that we constitute at least twenty (20%) per cent of the number of eligible voters, or four hundred voters, whichever is the smaller number, of each of the two school districts affected by the formation of above proposed new Community School District.

That School Directors of said proposed new School District shall be elected in accordance with Sub-Paragraph 2(b) of Section 275.12, Code of Iowa 1958, which is more particularly described as follows, to-wit: "The proposed new school district shall be divided into five geographical
sub-districts to be known as Director Districts, each of which Director Districts shall be represented on the new School Board by one Director who shall be resident of such Director District, but who shall be elected by the vote of the electors of the entire proposed new School District.

The boundary of each Director District is described as follows:

1. All that territory within the proposed new Adel-DeSoto Community School District, above described, which lies North of the North Boundary Line of Section 9, 10, 11, and 12, - all being in Township 78 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., now constituting a part of Adams Township, Dallas County, Iowa, and also that territory which lies North of the North boundary Line of Sections 7, 8, 9, and 10, - all being in Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M., now constituting a part of Van Meter Township, Dallas County, Iowa, except that territory lying within the corporation limits of the City of Adel, Iowa, as now constituted or as hereafter changed, shall be excluded from this Director District.

2. All that territory within the Corporation limits of the City of Adel, Dallas County, Iowa, as now constituted or hereafter changed, which lies North of the center of Main Street, as now designated in said City.

3. All that territory within the corporation limits of the City of Adel, Dallas County, Iowa, as now constituted or as hereafter changed, which lies South of the center of Main Street, as now designated in said City.

4. All of that territory within the proposed new Adel-De Soto Community School District, above described, which lies South of the South boundary Line of Sections 4, 3, 2, and 1, - all being in Township 78 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., now constituting a part of Adams Township, Dallas County, Iowa, and also that territory which lies South of the South boundary line of Sections 6, 5, 4, and 3, - all being in Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M., now constituting a part of Van Meter Township, Dallas County, Iowa, except that territory lying within the corporation limits of the Town of De Soto, Dallas County, Iowa, as now constituted, or as hereafter changed, shall be excluded from this Director District.
5. All that territory within the Corporation limits of the Town of De Soto, Dallas County, Iowa, as now constituted or as hereafter changed.

That there resided within the proposed limits of the above described new School District at least three hundred persons of school age who were enrolled in public schools in the preceding school year.

We do further state that the formation of said new School District will effect more economical operation and the attainment of higher standards of education in the schools thereof, will be advantageous and in the best interests of all persons concerned.
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APPENDIX

APPENDIX B
PETITION
FOR FORMATION OF ADEL-DE SOTO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT OF
DALLAS AND MADISON COUNTIES, IOWA

TO THE COUNTY BOARDS OF EDUCATION OF THE COUNTIES OF DALLAS
AND MADISON IN THE STATE OF IOWA:

We, the undersigned, qualified voters of and in the contiguous territory hereinafter described, situated in the counties of Dallas and Madison in the State of Iowa, do hereby petition the County Boards of Education of Dallas and Madison Counties, Iowa to form, create, and establish a Community School District which shall be known as "Adel-De Soto Community School District of Dallas and Madison Counties, Iowa" under the terms and provisions of Chapter 275, Code of Iowa, 1962 as amended, which Community School District shall contain the contiguous territory within the following boundaries:

Commencing at the Northwest Corner of the NE\(\frac{3}{4}\) of Section 6, Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., Dallas County, Iowa, thence East along the North lines of Sections 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 of said Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., to the Northeast Corner of said Section 1; Thence South to the Southeast Corner of the NE\(\frac{3}{4}\) of said Section 1; Thence East to the Southwest Corner of the SE\(\frac{1}{4}\) NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) of Section 6, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence North to the Northeast Corner of the SW\(\frac{1}{4}\) SE\(\frac{1}{4}\) NW\(\frac{3}{4}\) of said Section 6; Thence East to the Northeast Corner of the SE\(\frac{3}{4}\) SW\(\frac{1}{4}\) NE\(\frac{3}{4}\) of said Section 6; Thence South to the Southeast Corner of the SE\(\frac{1}{4}\) SW\(\frac{1}{4}\) NE\(\frac{3}{4}\) of said Section 6, Thence East to the middle of the channel of the North Raccoon River; Thence Southeasterly along the middle of the channel of said North Raccoon River to the point where it intersects the North Line of Section 18, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence East to the Northeast Corner of the NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) NW\(\frac{3}{4}\) of Section 16, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence South to the North Line of Section 21, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence East to the Northwest Corner of the NE\(\frac{3}{4}\) NE\(\frac{3}{4}\) of said Section 21; Thence South to the Southwest Corner of the SE\(\frac{1}{4}\) NE\(\frac{3}{4}\) of said Section 21; Thence East to the Northeast Corner of the NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) SW\(\frac{3}{4}\) of Section 22, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence South to the North Line of Section 27, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence East to the Northeast Corner of the NW\(\frac{1}{4}\) of said Section 27; Thence South to the Southwest Corner of the NE\(\frac{3}{4}\)
of said Section 27; Thence East to the Northeast Corner of the SW¼ of Section 25, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence South to the Southeast Corner of the SW¼ of said Section 25; Thence West to a point 2 Rods West of the Northeast Corner of Section 35, Township 79 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence South 82 Rods along a line parallel to the East Boundary line of said Section 35; Thence East 2 Rods to the East Boundary line of said Section 35; Thence South to the North boundary line of Section 3, Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence East to the Northeast Corner of said Section 3; Thence South to the Northeast Corner of Government Lot 16 in said Section 3; Thence West to the Northwest Corner of Government Lot 15 in said Section 3; Thence South to the Southwest Corner of the SE¼ of said Section 3; Thence West to the Northeast Corner of the NE¼ of Section 9, Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence South to the Southeast Corner of the SE¼ SE¼ NE¼ of said Section 9; Thence West to the Middle of the channel of the North Raccoon River; Thence Northwesterly along the middle of the channel of said North Raccoon River to the point where it intersects the South Line of the NE¼ NE¼ of Section 8, Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence West to the Northeast Corner of the SW¼ NW¼ of said Section 8; Thence South to the Southeast Corner of the SW¼ NW¼ of said Section 8; Thence West to the Northwest Corner of the SW¼ of said Section 8; Thence South to the Northwest Corner of Section 20, in Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence East to the Northeast Corner of the NW¼ of said Section 20; Thence South along the half-section line through Sections 20, 29, and 32 of Township 78 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M., in Van Meter Township, Dallas County, Iowa; continuing South along the half-section Line through Sections 5, 8, and 17 of Township 77 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M., in Jefferson Township, Madison County, Iowa, to the Southwest Corner of the SE¼ of said Section 17; Thence East to the Southeast Corner of the SW¼ SE¼ of said Section 17; Thence South along the West side of the E½ of Sections 20 and 29, in Township 77 North, of Range 27, West of the 5th P. M., to the point where it intersects the center of the channel of the North Branch of the North River in said Section 29; Thence Northwesterly, following the center of the channel of the North Branch of the North River to a point where the center of said channel crosses the West Line of Section 23, Township 77 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence North to the Northwest Corner of said Section 23; Thence East to the Northeast Corner of the NW¼ of Section 23; Thence North along the half-section line through Sections 14 and 11, in Township 77 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., to the point where it intersects the North line of said Section 11;
Thence East to the Northwest Corner of said Section 11; Thence North to the Southeast Corner of Section 34, Township 78 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M., in Adams Township, Dallas County, Iowa; Thence West to the Southwest Corner of the SE$_{1}$ SE$_{2}$ of said Section 34; Thence North along the West line of the E$_{2}$ of Sections 34, 27, 22, and 15, to the point where it intersects the center of the channel of the South Raccoon River; Thence Westerly along the center of the channel of the South Raccoon River to the point where it intersects the South line of the NE$_{2}$ NW$_{2}$ of Section 17, Township 78 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence East to the Southeast Corner of the NE$_{2}$ NE$_{3}$ of said Section 17; Thence North to the Southeast Corner of Government Lot 17, in Section 5, Township 78 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence West to the Southwest Corner, of said Government Lot 17; Thence North to the Northwest Corner of said Government Lot 17; Thence West to the West Line of said Section 5; Thence North along the West Line of said Section 5 to the South Line of Section 33, Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence West to the Southeast Corner of the SW$_{1}$ of said Section 33; Thence North to the South boundary line of the C. M. St. P. & F. R. R. right-of-way; Thence in a southwesterly direction along the South Line of said Railroad right-of-way to a point 900 feet East of the West line of said Section 33; Thence North to the South line of the SW$_{1}$ of the NW$_{1}$ of said Section 33; Thence West to the Southwest Corner of the NW$_{1}$ of said Section 33; Thence North to the Southeast Corner of Section 17, Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence West to the Southwest Corner of the SE$_{2}$ SW$_{2}$ of said Section 17; Thence North to the Northwest corner of the NE$_{2}$ SW$_{2}$ of said Section 17; Thence West to the Southwest Corner of the NE$_{2}$ of Section 18, Township 79 North, of Range 28, West of the 5th P. M.; Thence North to the point of beginning.

The School Directors of said proposed new school District shall be elected in accordance with the provisions of Section 275.12 sub-paragraph 2 (c) of the Code of Iowa, 1962 as amended. The number of Directors shall be five (5). One of said Directors shall be elected at large from the entire District and the remaining Directors from and as residence of designated Director Districts into which the entire School District shall be divided as set forth below. All Directors shall be elected by the electors of the entire School District.

We further propose that the proposed new School District be divided into four (4) director districts, the boundaries of which are described as follows:
1. All that part of the proposed district, with the exception of the Town of Adel, which lies North of the South Raccoon River.

2. All that territory within the corporation limits of the City of Adel, Dallas County, Iowa, as now constituted or as hereafter constituted, which lies North of the Center-line of Main Street as now designated in said City.

3. All that territory within the corporation limits of the city of Adel, Dallas County, Iowa, as now constituted or as hereafter constituted, which lies South of the Center-line of Main Street as now designated in said City.

4. All territory in the proposed new district which lies South of the South Raccoon River.

In the event that said proposed new school district does not conform to the County Plan of Dallas County, Iowa or the County Plan of Madison County, Iowa we respectfully request that the County Plan of each of said counties be changed to permit the formation of said proposed New School District. We state that within the boundaries of said proposed School District there reside more than three hundred persons of school age who are enrolled in public schools in the preceding school year and that more than nine hundred persons of school age are now enrolled in and will hereafter be enrolled in the public schools within the above described area.

We further state that all of the territory and area herein before described is contiguous and situated wholly within the counties of Dallas and Madison, Iowa and we further state that said area is suitable for a School Corporation and said proposed school district will be advantageous and for the best interest of education in said proposed area, and that this petition is presented with due regard for the welfare of adjoining districts.

We further state that all necessary planning required by Chapter 275 of the 1962 Code of Iowa, as amended, has been accomplished by the two school districts affected by this proposed school district, to wit: De Soto Consolidated School District and Adel Community School District.

We further state that the petitioners herein represent at least twenty per cent of the number of eligible voters,
or four hundred voters, which ever is the smaller number in each of the school districts affected by said proposed district.

Wherefore your petitioners respectfully request that the provision of Chapter 275 of the Code of Iowa, 1962, and amendments thereto, and the provisions of any other laws pertaining to reorganization of school districts be carried out and that the respective boards shall take such action as provided by law to insure an election to carry out the purpose and intent of this petition for the formation of said proposed Adel-De Soto Community School District of Dallas and Madison Counties, Iowa.
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