

Summer 6-1-1963

A Review of the Reorganization of School Districts in the State of Washington

William Henry Hallett
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/all_gradpapers



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Education Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hallett, William Henry, "A Review of the Reorganization of School Districts in the State of Washington" (1963). *Graduate Student Research Papers*. 100.
https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/all_gradpapers/100

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship and Creative Works at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Research Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

A REVIEW OF THE REORGANIZATION OF
SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN THE
STATE OF WASHINGTON

A Research Paper
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
William Harry Hallett
June 1963

THIS PAPER IS APPROVED AS MEETING
THE PLAN 2 REQUIREMENT FOR THE
COMPLETION OF A RESEARCH PAPER.

Ernest L. Muzzall
FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer sincerely appreciates the assistance given to him by Mr. Albert H. Poffenroth, Associate Professor of Physical Education, Dr. D. Daryl Basler, Assistant Professor of Education, and, especially, the guidance of his chairman, Dr. Ernest L. Muzzall, Professor of Education, Central Washington State College.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
The Problem	1
Statement of the problem	1
Importance of the study	1
Limitations of the study	1
Definitions of Terms Used	2
Reorganization	2
School district	2
First-class district	2
Second-class district	2
Third-class district	2
Union high school district	3
Consolidated districts	3
Joint district	3
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	4
Historical Background of Education in Washington .	4
Reorganization	7
Basic Reasons for Reorganization	10
Objections to Reorganization	13
Reorganization Recommendations	15
Basic Laws Concerning Reorganization	23
BIBLIOGRAPHY	30

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The vast number of school districts in Washington State has been greatly reduced over a period of years by various consolidation and reorganization laws. These laws cover a span of over sixty years, and many revisions were innovated during that time. An attempt shall be made to expose the reasons why school districts have been reorganized with a short historical background which ultimately affected consolidation.

The basic or main laws governing reorganization shall be written in sequential order from 1903 to 1957.

Importance of the study. While participating in research on reorganization of school districts, little evidence was found that a concise study had been done in this area. To inform the writer and possibly future researchers this paper includes a summarization of the activities involving the reorganization of school districts in Washington State and some of the early history of education to better understand how the educational system in Washington State was developed.

Limitations of the study. Through the years many laws and amendments affecting reorganization of school districts

in Washington State have been passed, acted upon, or changed by the legislature. This research was limited only to those years in which major developments occurred in reorganization and consolidation of school districts.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Reorganization. The formation and establishment of new school districts, the dissolution of existing school districts, the alteration of the boundaries of existing school districts, or all of them (11:395).

School district. The territory under the jurisdiction of a single governing board designated and referred to as the board of directors (11:395).

First class district. Any school district which has a population of at least 10,000 will be a first class district (23:83).

Second class district. Any other school district containing an incorporated city or an area of one square mile with a population of at least 300 or maintaining a fully accredited high school shall be a district of the second class (23:83).

Third class district. All other districts shall be districts of the third class (23:83).

Union high school district. Any school district established for the purpose of maintaining a high school by the union of two or more contiguous districts shall be designated as a union high school district (23:84). Those districts involved can no longer be considered non-high school districts since the union high school is included within their territory.

Consolidated districts. Any school district which has been formed by the consolidation of two or more school districts shall be designated as a consolidated school district (7:271).

Joint district. Any school district composed of territory in two or more counties shall be designated as a joint school district, and shall be designated by a separate number for each county in which any part of its territory may be (3:179).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF EDUCATION IN WASHINGTON

With the formation of Washington Territory in 1853 came the advent of the first Washington schools and school districts. Few schools existed north of the Columbia River at that time, but with increased population more schools were established.

The early settlers were faced with the basic task of sustenance, and this was procured by settling in rich bottom lands, along the rivers, and in those areas which existed on or near the main travel routes. Education has always been of primary importance in our country; consequently, school districts were formed wherever man settled regardless of the size of the community (17:50). Little imagination is required to surmise or understand what happened in school district organization as time progressed and population increased. Districts were formed in a haphazard manner with many lying adjacent to one another. True, lack of planning played an important role in the final analysis, but other variables prevailed which man had no control over until later developments.

Transportation was a major problem. Youngsters were not expected to travel very far under adverse conditions to the local school wherever it might have been located. The

school house might have been an old shack or a log cabin; classes were held in various homes which definitely put limitations on the number of pupils that could be taught at one time (16:16). As the community grew so did the number of districts.

One of the first pieces of legislation concerning the school district was passed in 1849 while Washington was still part of the Oregon school law and provided that:

When it shall occur that any district, by reason of sparseness of population, or their scattered condition, may not be able to keep school, if such district will organize, and make the annual report to the school commissioner, according to this act, they shall be entitled to their county, and it shall be the duty of the school commissioner to loan the money to such district, on good security, at six per centum interest, from year to year, and until such district shall want it to support a school (2:49).

During the first Territorial Legislature the committee on education presented a bill to establish a system of common schools which was passed on September 14 and signed by the speaker of the house on September 19, 1849 (2:56). The provisions of the Common School Law of 1849 were drawn up with tremendous foresight and had much influence upon the educational system in the Territory of Washington after its division from the Oregon Territory in 1853.

The Legislative Assembly of the new Washington Territory passed the act establishing the common-school system on April 12, 1854 (2:86). Some of the main provisions which affected school districts are summarized as follows:

1. Establishing a permanent school fund from lands acquired from the Federal Government. This is an irreducible fund, and the interest is to provide in part the current fund.

2. The annual levy of a two mill tax on all taxable property for the payment of teacher's salaries.

3. Local districts may levy further taxes upon specific vote of the district for each item to provide for buildings, repairs, libraries, and apparatus.

4. All districts were required to raise annually by tax levy or otherwise an amount equal to the amount provided by the county school fund (2:87). This will be used for teacher's salaries and building school-houses; however, the funds can not be used if school has not been maintained at least three months during the previous year.

5. The election of a county superintendent of common schools for each county whose duties are as follows:

- a) To establish district boundary lines.
- b) To apportion all school funds to the districts upon a proportionate basis of the number of census children from four to twenty-one years of age.
- c) To preserve school lands from injury and trespass (2:86-87).

It is interesting to note that these provisions were not novel ideas created by laymen. The school laws can be traced back to the Iowa laws through those established by the Oregon Territory in 1849. Those who were responsible for establishing an educational structure in Washington Territory were dedicated men who realized the value of future education. There is no doubt that many or most of the educational laws and their provisions did not prove to be adequate as time progressed; consequently, as the need arose new laws were

passed and provisions were changed or reworded accordingly. One highly important fact became clear. The basic school laws of the Territory of Washington were well developed, sound laws which were created for education for the following generations to come. Though new laws and amendments are innovated, many of the basic laws still persist.

By 1910 Washington State contained approximately 2,710 individual school districts (18:15). The taxable wealth of districts varied greatly, and this factor is responsible for inequalities in education. Through various studies and recommendations legislative action over a period of years had reduced the number of school districts to 407 in 1963. Financial problems for the support of schools continued to face the state, so it seemed reasonable to believe that reorganization would continue to be the means used to alleviate or minimize this situation (24:16).

REORGANIZATION

The School District Reorganization Act of 1941 was established to form new school districts and to alter the boundaries of old districts in order to further: (a) equalization of educational opportunity and of local district tax rates, and (b) a wiser expenditure of public funds (15:V).

This law was essential since so many districts were prevalent and educational opportunities were far from equal

from one district to another and one area to another. Since the constitution of Washington State made provision for education for all children and a general and uniform system of public schools, it became necessary to seek out a method whereby school districts could be reduced in number by various means to provide maximum education at a minimum or lesser cost (23:60).

School districts were formed with little or no planning for the future, and the result was a grotesque pattern with a poorly located school. All fragments which were left after the population increased were either tossed together to form a new district or, in some instances, were annexed by the old district. This is the result of early laws which made it possible for relatively few people in a community to form their own district. The unplanned district was expensive to operate. To cut unnecessary costs merely meant that more money could be utilized for educational opportunities. The poorly organized district system necessitated the operation of many uneconomic units, excessive transportation, and the unnecessary duplication of facilities and services (24:20). A prime example of excessive costs was found in pupil transportation. One million six hundred thousand dollars were spent during the school year ending in 1936 for transporting 80,000 pupils daily in 2,000 buses (24:21). Much of this expense could not have

been avoided; however, in many instances routes were too long because of badly located schools, and many pupils were not located within the boundaries of their district. Often the poor district spent a major portion of its finances for transportation. To reduce wastes and duplications is to provide more capital for education and a reduction of per-pupil cost.

Providing equal education for all children was an extremely difficult task because of the inequality in the distribution of taxable wealth. Rich and poor districts could be found in any area of the state. A large district in a city might be relatively poor because of lack of industry while a small district might have high valuation as the result of rich farm lands, a railroad, or some form of industry. The ability of each district to assume its educational responsibilities differed greatly; therefore, it had to be recognized that complete equalization of educational opportunity was an unattainable goal in Washington--an objective that may be approached but never reached.

An early method which sought to cure the ills of educational inequalities was the movement for consolidation of districts. At least one attribute of the consolidation laws made equalization impossible in many cases. Since consolidation required a majority vote of the people in those districts involved, wealthier districts frequently refused

to consolidate with their poorer neighbors (25:80). Here again is evidenced the haphazard remains of a poor district "frozen out" by legal means. Though consolidation was not the complete answer to reorganization, the number of school districts did diminish to 1,500 by 1938 (24:18).

BASIC REASONS FOR REORGANIZATION

It has long been an established fact that not only do the smaller school districts have a higher per-pupil cost, but they generally are in possession of the poorest type of education and educational incentives (13:79). The School Code Commission Report which was delivered to Governor Hart and the Legislature in 1921 pointed out many disadvantages and criticisms of the "rural school." Some of the conditions which aroused criticism are:

1. Poor, inadequate facilities.
2. The curriculum and instruction did not meet the needs of rural pupils.
3. Rural teachers are least educated, least experienced, and the poorest paid.
4. One teacher for several grades cannot be efficient.
5. The small districts result in small, inefficient schools lacking money, equipment, and enrollment.
6. The small unit is unable to pay for professional supervision (13:8).
7. Per capita cost of educating pupils in rural schools for the year 1919-20 was greater than in the cities as evidenced by the following:

PER CAPITA COST - ELEMENTARY GRADES
 BASED ON AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE

County	City	Per Capita Cost	Per Capita cost in rural and village schools, same county
King	Seattle	\$76.00	\$77.91
Pierce	Tacoma	56.52	74.97
Spokane	Spokane	61.73	76.64
Snohomish	Everett	67.30	71.15
Whatcom	Bellingham	66.05	63.89
Yakima	Yakima	60.85	67.86
Grays Harbor	Hoquiam	52.28	84.76
Grays Harbor	Aberdeen	59.29	84.76
Walla Walla	Walla Walla	67.07	95.70

(13:9)

It is necessary at this time to establish one basic fact. Research over a period of years has proven that the per pupil cost of education increases with decreasing pupil attendance of the local school district, and educational opportunities become less diversified in the districts with sparse pupil population. In view of this, reorganization of school districts is necessitated if equal, or nearly equal, educational opportunities are to exist. This is not a new problem as is evidenced by the School Code Commission Report of 1921.

Realizing that reorganization was the key to equalization of educational opportunities, Governor Martin requested a study of the problem by the Washington State Planning Council in 1937. The Council completed its report in 1938 and recommended that the state "reorganize local school districts to provide for larger units of administration and areas of attendance as the first step toward equalization of educational opportunity," and to "provide for future alteration of school district boundaries by a less difficult method than now prevails" (26:6).

Governor Martin's initial action apparently was the beginning of a new era in the creation of reorganized school districts, for constant studies have continued since that time.

OBJECTIONS TO REORGANIZATION

Regardless of the advantages of reorganization, individuals and groups are reluctant to accept proposed educational changes. Some are not in favor of this program merely from lack of understanding of the objectives involved; some are simply resistant to change, and others repel the change because of personal interests (26:16).

The basic objections to reorganization are summarized as follows:

1. Misunderstanding or lack of understanding --
A gubernatorial veto in 1955 cancelled the appropriations that would have been used by state staff members to assist authorities on local levels in comprehending the objectives of reorganization. By the time funds were allotted for this campaign, the seed of apprehension had been planted throughout the states small districts. They joined hands and restored the vote-by-individual-district method of approving new reorganization methods.
2. Resistance to change -- Many people in small districts feel that their school system is adequate. "What was good enough for me is certainly good enough for my children." This attitude prevails and will remain a barrier to reorganization until thorough realization occurs.

3. Personal interests -- Some school directors fear the loss of position by incorporating with another administrative unit. Administrators and teachers become apprehensive as to the nature of their positions "under new management"--other taxpayers often feel a greater tax burden will result from a redistricting proposal.

4. Fear that the elementary school will be closed-- Reorganization does not necessarily mean that the school will be closed. If the school houses sufficient enrollment or if pupils would have to be transported long distances, closing the school would not be required; however, these decisions would rest with the newly formed district after it was established.

5. Reorganization will result in centralization of government control -- The small district certainly would not have the amount of original control, but they would still have a voice in policies and decisions. These people forget that their primary concern should be for better educational opportunities.

6. School district organization is a matter of local concern only -- This is an erroneous assumption and ignores the fact that the state provides approximately sixty per cent of all current operating revenue. Some districts receive up to ninety per cent for

school building construction and at least sixty per cent of the total cost of transportation with approved routes (26:16-18).

REORGANIZATION RECOMMENDATIONS

On different occasions authorities have been brought into Washington State to make detailed surveys of the school program and make recommendations for a "desirable advance in educational finance and organization" (13:31). In 1921 Dr. Ellwood P. Cubberley of Stanford University acted as advisor and critic in the formulation of the general plan of the changes in the school code. In his survey he found many districts which were small and expensive to operate; many possessed low valuation. In view of his findings the following proposals were made in an attempt to better equalize the educational opportunities for all.

1. Abolish the present district system and employ a single unit which would be known as the county school district.

2. "Districts containing first, second, or third class cities (population over 1,500) shall be first class districts with the option of becoming a part of the county school district" (13:29).

3. A county board of education of five members from as many districts would be elected by the electors.

This board would have the power to appoint an educational expert as superintendent of the county district whose duties would be the same as those of the county superintendent of schools.

4. "The county board of education provides, at the county seat, adequate office room, clerical and supervisory assistants" (13:29).

5. All school districts that did not contain first, second, or third class cities "shall become sub-districts with one or more appointed sub-district trustees with well defined powers" (13:29).

6. "As far as practicable, there be uniformity in the matter of elections, taxation, distribution of funds, the powers of boards and superintendents, the selection of teachers and business management for first class districts and for the county school districts" (13:29).

The next reasonably thorough survey was conducted by the Washington State Planning Council at the request of Governor Clarence D. Martin in 1937. The director of that survey was Dr. Alonzo G. Grace, Professor of Education of the University of Rochester. Upon completion of the survey the Council made the following recommendations:

1. All school districts should be divided into two classifications. Those districts having a

population of 10,000 or over would be first-class districts, and the rest would be classified as second-class units.

2. The State should set up reorganization machinery to produce "further equalization of educational opportunity" (24:24). Several features of this program have been summarized as follows:

a) A county equalization of education committee composed of fifteen members should be established.

b) The Washington Commission for the Equalization of Educational Opportunity composed of five members should be established to aid and assist the local county committees.

c) The local committees shall make a thorough investigation of their respective counties to determine the necessary reorganization for satisfactory educational systems, and submit to the State Commission within one year of their appointment a comprehensive plan to include: "(1) the description of the boundaries of the proposed school districts; (2) an apportionment of the assets and liabilities of the existing districts; (3) a statement of the views of the committees concerning school building needs and construction requirements, transportation needs, and attendance areas" (24:26).

d) The powers and duties of the State Commission shall include:

(1) To determine whether or not the submitted plans for reorganization are legal and necessary.

(2) Adoption or rejection of the local committee's plans. If rejection occurs, that committee shall have the opportunity to revise the plan and resubmit it within sixty days.

(3) "To take over and discharge all of the functions of the local committee if such committee fails to file a plan which is found to be in accordance with requirements, or if such committee shall have been terminated" (24:26).

(4) "To transmit to appropriate local school authorities all plans for school district reorganization, including supporting materials with regard to attendance units, building use, transportation, and other matters" (24:27). The local school authorities should determine their own attendance units regardless of the outlined units by the local committees. Any elementary school would be discontinued which had an average daily attendance of less than twenty pupils unless they were faced with undue hardships. If it were geographically

feasible, no four year high school would continue to operate with fewer than one hundred pupils in average daily attendance.

e) In the case of a school district overlapping county boundaries, the local committees should meet and devise a satisfactory plan for that area.

f) When a local committee had completed its plan, it would be discharged. County committees would be discharged at the end of two years, and the State Commission had to complete its work within three years.

g) Ten per cent of the voters of a district were required to petition the State Board of Education in writing if they were dissatisfied with the reorganization plan. The petition had to be filed within thirty days. The State Board shall review the situation and "affirm, modify, or rescind the order, and its decision shall be final and conclusive" (24:27).

3. Because of population growth and development future legislation should make possible the ability for the establishment of a new local committee when the need arises concerning new reorganization of school districts (24:24-28).

The Reorganization Act of 1941 expired in 1945 and reorganization nearly came to a halt. More studies of school

districts were needed, so the 1945 State Legislature appropriated \$100,000 from the General Fund to be used by Governor Mon C. Wallgren to conduct a new survey of existing school situations. Governor Wallgren employed a staff to undertake this study, and the director of the survey was George D. Strayer, Professor Emeritus of Education, Columbia University, New York. He felt the need for a new reorganization law which should be as follows:

1. New districts should be formed from two or more other districts or parts of districts lying in the same county or an adjacent county regardless of boundaries. Bonded indebtedness should not restrict reorganization. "Each incorporated city or town should be in one school district" (17:74).
2. County committees of from five to seven members should continue work on school district organization. They should continue work on school district organization, and serve five year terms.
3. County committees should make plans for reorganization whenever it seemed advisable, "when requested by petition, or on the advice of the county superintendent of schools" (17:74). When the plans become completed, they should be sent to the state committee for approval.
4. The State Board of Education should appoint for terms of five years a state committee to continue with school district organization.

5. The state committee should act in an advisory capacity to aid the local county committees with reorganization and the problems involved.

6. Personnel from the State Department of Education should assist the state and county committees in their proposals for new districts or the alteration of boundaries.

7. "The right of the people in any district to petition for alteration in school district organization or for the adjustment of assets and liabilities among newly formed or existing school districts should be preserved" (17:75).

8. "Provision should be made for the annexation of non-high school territory to an adjacent high school district" (17:75). As city boundaries become extended, some method should be devised to extend the school district boundaries.

9. Any school district which had fewer than five pupils enrolled should be annexed by an adjacent district.

10. Formation of a new district should be decided by an election. The proposal would pass if the majority of the voters of the districts involved voted favorably.

11. There should be three school district classifications:

a) First-class includes those over 10,000 in population.

b) Second-class includes those under 10,000 in population that maintain a fully accredited high school.

c) Third-class includes all other districts (17:76).

12. "Provision should be made for the repeal of existing statutes regarding alterations in school district organization that are replaced by provision of the new law" (17:76).

In his 1921 report to the legislature Dr. E. P. Cubberley recommended that the total number of school districts be reduced to less than 100. He felt that this could have been accomplished by "substituting the county unit for town and rural-school administration for the long out-grown district system" (13:31). The cities of each county were to continue to operate as first class districts under this plan.

In Dr. George D. Strayer's report of 1946 it was estimated that "the school population of the State could be served by two hundred and ten unified districts operating schools at all levels and seventy remote or isolated districts not in the service area of any high school" (17:54).

One of the purposes of reorganization was to create larger districts so that ample economic educational

opportunities could be had by all students. A more diversified education could be achieved at a lower per-pupil-cost in a district containing a larger pupil population. This raises several questions which remain unanswered. How large should a district be in population and area? Could a single school district become so large that it would no longer supply adequate education?

BASIC LAWS CONCERNING REORGANIZATION

As time progressed and population increased in Washington State, more school districts were formed in the usual, unplanned methods. By 1910 the fantastic sum of 2,710 districts had been created, but even before this time the people had become aware of a situation that one day would need attention. If equal educational opportunities were to prevail, some form or forms of reorganization were necessary to abolish many small, uneconomic districts.

Although some earlier legislation occurred, the Legislature of 1903 took the first positive steps toward school district organization. Acts were passed for the formation of union high school, joint, or consolidated school districts. Proposals for any type of new district were determined by an election of the voters of those districts involved with a majority vote required for approval. Also, the board of directors of a district possessed the power

and duty to "provide and pay for transportation of children to and from school when in their judgment the best interests of their district will be subserved thereby" (6:177). Even though the previous laws went into effect in 1903, the number of school districts increased from 2,436 in 1904 to 2,710 in 1910.

In 1915 another consolidation law was passed which permitted adjoining districts within the same county to unite by approval of the majority of the voters of each district involved. No boundary changes were permissible for five years following consolidation. Between 1917 and 1918 a total of fifty-four new districts were created as a result of the new consolidation law, and ten years later the total number of first, second, and third-class districts was reduced to 2,004 (19:28:30). It is misleading to look at statistics and reach conclusions about the ineffectiveness of preceding organization laws. It must be remembered that education was becoming accessible to many more pupils, and enrollments increased rapidly. Better methods of transportation certainly had its effect upon school enrollment; so while many new districts were formed by consolidation, the total number of districts did not drop rapidly because new individual districts were also being formed. It is very likely that our early organization laws were inadequate although they must have appeared to be the answer in those days.

By 1937 there was still a total of 1,609 school districts in Washington State. This was the year Dr. Grace made his survey which ultimately had much to do with the formation of the School District Reorganization Act of 1941. This law provided the state with the first comprehensive reorganization machinery in an effort to solve the problem of equalization of educational opportunities.

This act shall be known and may be cited as an act to provide for the reorganization of school districts and shall have for its purpose the formation of new school districts and the alteration of the boundaries of established districts in order to provide a more nearly equalized educational opportunity for pupils of the common schools, a higher degree of uniformity of school tax rate among districts, and a wiser use of public funds expended for the support of the common school system (9:8;34).

Summarizations of the basic features of this law are:

1. County Committees were formed and made a comprehensive study and plan for reorganization of school districts within that county and submitted the plan to the State Committee within one and one-half years after the committee's appointment. The life of each County Committee was four years.
2. The County Committee submitted to the State Committee maps of all existing districts and proposed new district boundaries with a statement of the reasons for the proposals.
3. The State Board of Education appointed a nine member board called the State Committee for the

reorganization of school districts. This board was referred to as the "State Committee." The life of this committee was extinguished at the same time as that of the County Committee.

4. The powers and duties of the State Committee were:

a) "Aid County Committees in the powers and duties vested in and imposed upon them by this act" (9:839).

b) To receive, file, and examine the plans from County Committees for the reorganization of school districts. If the plan was rejected, the County Committee was notified, and they could revise the plan for reconsideration within ninety days after notification.

c) The State Board of Education could extend the life of a County Committee and/or of the State Committee beyond the limit of four years provided that the extension was necessary to complete an unfinished job.

d) The formation of a new district was decided by a majority vote of approval by the voters in those districts involved in the reorganization.

e) The boundaries of a school district which were formed by this act were not subjected to change

within five years after the establishment of those boundaries except by recommendation of the County Superintendent of Schools and approved by the County and State Committees. When these two committees became extinct, the approval was made by the State Board of Education.

f) As of this act a school district with a population in excess of 10,000 was a first-class district. All other districts were second-class districts (9:833-846).

While the School District Reorganization Act was in effect, the number of school districts was reduced from 1,323 to 723; however, the legislature failed to re-enact the law in 1945. Under the 1945 law the County Superintendent of Schools was given the power and authority to determine any need for reorganization. If he felt that two or more adjacent districts or parts of districts needed to combine, he merely planned the boundaries of the new district and held an election by the people of those districts. If the majority of the votes cast by the electors residing within the boundaries of the proposed district approved reorganization, the new district became established. This law did not prove to be satisfactory, and the total number of districts was reduced by only fifty-eight between 1945 and 1947.

In 1947 a new comprehensive reorganization law was enacted on a permanent basis. All previous laws or acts involved in school district organization were abolished. The school district was given corporate powers and all were restored to their previous first, second, or third-class classifications. This law was similar to the 1941 law in many ways, but a greater emphasis was put on the pupil and his school environment. Great population explosions were occurring, and the writer believes that the Legislature provided more freedom for reorganization to compensate for those rapidly expanding areas. This was evidenced by the fact that the County Committees were given a great deal of freedom in their reorganization procedures, and no State Committee was created. The County Committee worked with the State Board of Education which acted only in an advisory capacity. School district boundaries were flexible to enable districts to include expanding population within their boundaries. In the event of a proposal for a new district the votes were tabulated in each component district separately and was approved only by a majority vote cast in each separate district (10:1104-1128). As a result of this law and the efforts put forth the total number of districts decreased to 628 by 1948, 571 by 1951, and 535 by 1954.

The laws of 1955 pertaining to organization of school districts remained relatively the same as the laws of 1947

with a few exceptions. The State Board no longer had to act in an advisory capacity to the County Committees in which reorganization proposals were concerned. The State Board was given the power to approve or disapprove all proposals made by County Committees involving reorganization. The voting procedure was reversed from that of the 1947 law in that approval of a proposal was decided by a majority of sixty percent of all votes cast (11:1705-1713).

Only one major revision occurred in 1957 in reorganization of school districts, and this change reverted back to the 1947 law. A proposal for reorganization was determined by a majority vote of the electors in each component district involved (12:478-480).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Association of School Administrators. The Point of Beginning: The Local School District. Washington D. C., 1930. 15 pp.
2. Bolton, Frederick E. and Bibb, Thomas W. History of Education in Washington. Washington: United States Department of the Interior, 1935. 448 pp.
3. Breckner, Elmer. Education Manual of Washington State. Seattle: Book Publishing Company, 1960.
4. Chisholm, Leslie L. School District Reorganization. Chicago: The Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957. 97 pp.
5. Fitzwater, C. O. Organizing Districts For Better Schools. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1958. 49 pp.
6. Laws of Washington 1903. Eighth Session. Tacoma.
7. Laws of Washington 1909. Eleventh Session. Olympia.
8. Laws of Washington 1915. Fourteenth Session. Olympia.
9. Laws of Washington 1941. Twenty-Seventh Session. Olympia.
10. Laws of Washington 1947. Thirtieth Session. Olympia.
11. Laws of Washington 1955. Thirty-Fourth Session. Olympia.
12. Laws of Washington 1957. Thirty-Fifth Session. Olympia.
13. Report of the Public School Administrative Code Commission of the State of Washington. Olympia: Delivered to the Governor and the Legislature, 1921. 117 pp.
14. Rosenstengel, William E. and Eastmond, Jefferson H. School Finance. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1957. 442 pp.

15. State Committee for the Reorganization of School Districts. School District Reorganization in the State of Washington Under Chapter 248, Laws of 1941 -- The School District Reorganization Act. Olympia, 1944. 39 pp.
16. State Department of Education. Education in the State of Washington. Olympia, 1936. 171 pp.
17. Strayer, George D. Public Education in Washington. Olympia, 1946. 663 pp.
18. Superintendent of Public Instruction. Washington Public Documents, 1909 - 1910, Vol. 1. Olympia, 1910.
19. _____. Washington Public Documents, 1927 - 1928, Vol. 2. Olympia, 1928.
20. _____. Washington Public Documents, 1947 - 1948, Vol. 3. Olympia, 1948.
21. _____. Washington Public Documents, 1951 - 1952, Vol. 2. Olympia, 1952.
22. _____. Washington Public Documents, 1953 - 1954, Vol. 2. Olympia, 1954.
23. Wanamaker, Pearl A. State Manual of Washington (16th ed.). Olympia, 1956. 307 pp.
24. Washington State Planning Council. A Survey of the Common School System of Washington. Olympia, 1938.
25. Washington State Planning Council. Equalization of Educational Opportunity in Washington. Olympia, 1939. 131 pp.
26. Washington State Research Council. What Is a School District. Olympia, 1957. 24 pp.